

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

**Second Session of the Forty-Eighth Parliament
(1994)**

Parliament, which adjourned on 18 May, was prorogued by proclamation dated 16 June. By proclamation dated 16 June, it was summoned to meet on Tuesday 2 August, and the Second Session began on that date.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday 2 August 1994**

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Peter Dunn) took the Chair at 12 noon.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

The Clerk (Mrs J.M. Davis) read the proclamation by Her Excellency the Governor (Dame Roma Mitchell) summoning Parliament.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Her Excellency the Governor, having been announced by Black Rod, was received by the President at the Bar of the Council Chamber and by him conducted to the Chair. The Speaker and members of the House of Assembly having entered the Chamber in obedience to her summons, Her Excellency read her opening speech as follows:

Honourable members of the Legislative Council and members of the House of Assembly:

1. I have called you together for the dispatch of business.

RECOVERY THROUGH REFORM

2. During this session, you will be asked to pass legislation to allow wide-ranging reform of the Public Sector.

Public Sector reform is considered by my Government to be essential in rebuilding the State's economic and financial position and reducing unemployment.

My Government recognises community concerns to ensure that key services are maintained at adequate levels and it has invited public sector employees to participate fully in a process of recovery through reform.

The response of Public Sector employees and their desire to contribute to the recovery process is acknowledged and very much appreciated by my Government.

This is a process which challenges all South Australians.

Public Sector employees confront, on a daily basis, requirements to ensure that budget targets are met while the community seeks new and improved services.

My Government believes that with a careful and creative approach, the challenges posed by the State's financial position can be turned into opportunities to enhance the delivery of services required by the general community and to generate new economic opportunities for South Australia.

In doing so, my Government accepts a responsibility to ensure that public sector employment remains a satisfying and rewarding career option for South Australians and that the work and expertise of Public Servants are recognised by the wider community as very important ingredients in our State's recovery.

THE COMMISSION OF AUDIT

3. Since the previous address to this House, my Government has received the report of the Commission of Audit.

A response by my Government to each of the Commission's 336 recommendations will be made to the Parliament by October.

This will be assisted by the many hundreds of submissions my Government received from Public Sector employees and from members of the public following its invitation for public comment on the Commission's recommendations.

The Commission's report has charted a course for the State's financial recovery.

The 1994/95 Budget will be the first stage in the elimination of the underlying deficit in the non-commercial sector and a significant reduction in the real level of State debt over the next four years.

In developing its response to the Commission of Audit, my Government is taking particular note of the Commission's advice that public sector reform 'will restore confidence in the community that the financial affairs of the State are under control' and that 'an efficient public sector focused on its clients and customers will encourage enhanced private sector business activity.'

PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

4. To ensure that Public Service Chief Executive Officers have greater autonomy and flexibility to implement reforms and improve service delivery, legislation will be placed

before you to repeal the Government Management and Employment Act. It will be replaced by a new Act to support my Government's objectives to encourage improved Public Sector performance.

5. Wage restraint in the Public Sector is central to the achievement of my Government's budget targets. To ensure that this Parliament sets an example, amendments to the Remuneration Act will be introduced to contain members' salaries.

6. My Government will introduce legislation to establish a new contributory scheme for all Government employees to reduce accruing liabilities.

7. My Government is giving the highest priority to reform of its commercial business activities.

8. This reform will continue with the introduction of legislation to streamline and re-focus the operations of the Electricity Trust. Nine separate Acts will be replaced with a single new Act governing the Trust's operations. Another bill will be placed before you to corporatise the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

9. These measures aim to ensure that services which are important to the State's economic wellbeing are provided efficiently at a competitive cost. As a result of reforms enacted in the last session to establish the Ports Corporation, reductions in port charges will be implemented from the beginning of 1995.

10. My Government believes that in undertaking major reform of Public Sector activities and devising new ways to maintain key services at a lower cost opportunities will open up to make available the expertise of the Public Sector and its employees to some of our neighbouring countries with rapidly developing economies. The Economic Development Advisory Board recently appointed by my Government will be working with the Public Sector to develop opportunities identified by the honourable the Premier during his recent visit to the Asian region.

11. Other major agencies in which significant reform is being undertaken include the former SACON, now the Department for Building Management, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the South Australian Housing Trust and the Department of Correctional Services. In relation to the prison system, legislation will be introduced to allow the private management of prisons and the contracting out of some correctional service activities.

12. While a range of public sector activities are being commercialised and corporatised, the sale of some assets is an important element of my Government's debt reduction program. An Asset Management Task Force of public and private sector specialists has been working since March to coordinate and implement asset sales. Planning for the sale of the Pipelines Authority, Enterprise Investments and parts of the State Government Insurance Commission is now well under way while the Urban Land Trust is developing a carefully managed program to dispose of its landholdings.

13. As well as withdrawing from some commercial activities, my Government is also attempting to improve the climate for private business operations and job creation by eliminating regulations which impede economic development or impose unnecessary costs on business and consumers. A new Deregulation Office has been established within the Department of Premier and Cabinet to coordinate this work. During this session, you will be asked to consider legislation affecting regulation of shop trading hours, the real estate industry, the sale of second hand motor vehicles and residential tenancies.

14. In summary, my Government's primary objective in implementing the major Public Sector reforms I have described is to provide a firm foundation for long term employment growth through a State economy which is competitive and outward looking, and has the capacity to take up the opportunities emerging in those countries which are our near neighbours.

SEASONAL CONDITIONS

15. While my Government believes that some recent major investment decisions will increase employment in manufacturing, tourism and high technology industries, it is conscious that some of our farmers could be heading towards a serious drought. On top of the existing financial problems of many farmers, a poor season would force more families to leave their farms. Our thoughts and prayers are with those families.

16. My Government has made representations to the Federal Government seeking an urgent review of criteria for determining an area eligible for special rural assistance.

THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

17. My Government recognises that improving the quality of education in State Schools is vital for our long term economic needs as well as to serve the legitimate aspirations of young South Australians and their parents.

18. Through an 'Early Years of Education' strategy, additional funding will be allocated to improve learning outcomes for students in the early years of schooling and to develop in all students a sound base of skills and knowledge.

19. The curriculum framework for students will be provided through South Australian adaptations of the nationally developed statements and profiles. Reporting of student achievement using the profiles will commence. Basic skills tests in aspects of literacy and numeracy will commence in 1995 for students in years 3 and 5 while a number of schools have expressed a keen interest in having trials of a new Fair Discipline Code in 1995.

20. During this financial year, new preschools will be completed at Blakeview and Salisbury Heights and commenced at Woodcroft Heights and Willaston. There will be new primary school developments at Harkness Heights, Goolwa, Woodend and Regent Gardens, and a major expansion of high school facilities at Seaford and Hallett Cove.

21. In further education, South Australia will actively participate in the national system of vocational education and training. To ensure locally-based decision making, my Government will introduce legislation setting out South Australia's relationship with the Australian National Training Authority and establishing a Vocational Education, Employment and Training Board.

A MORE RESPONSIVE HEALTH SYSTEM

22. My Government will continue with its plans to provide a health system more responsive to community needs.

23. Legislation will be introduced to restructure the provision of health services and devolve functions more appropriately carried out at a regional level. Local input into decisions about health priorities and service needs will be strongly encouraged.

24. A Citizens' Charter for Health will be developed. This will be multi-lingual and set out the rights of citizens to adequate health services and the way in which they can participate in decisions about their health care.

25. In women's health, two new community-based breast X-ray screening clinics will be established and a second mobile unit will augment services to country women.

26. My Government is developing a policy to assist health service planning into the next decade and to help improve the health and well being of older people. A draft policy statement will be issued in the near future for public comment.

27. My Government will give the Parliament the opportunity to consider legislation to bring together consent to treatment laws and to regulate medical practice affecting the care of the dying.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

28. In this, the International Year of the Family, my Government has established an Office of the Family to co-ordinate advice on the needs of families. The Keeping Families Together program, a major initiative undertaken with the private sector aimed at family preservation, will be extended later this year.

29. Domestic violence is a fundamental issue for families and women in particular. To augment a phone service introduced recently, a Domestic Violence Zero Tolerance campaign will be launched as a community education initiative providing a clear message that domestic violence is unacceptable and that those responsible for it must change their behaviour.

30. My Government has established the South Australian Women's Advisory Council as part of its commitment significantly to upgrade women's policy advice. In its first term, the Council is focusing on four main areas—women and representation, women and the economy, women and violence and women in regional and rural areas.

31. For senior citizens, a new Seniors Card Directory has been published to include 50 additional businesses offering concessions. The number of Seniors Cardholders is expected to reach 200 000 over the next 12 months.

32. The Office of the Commissioner for the Ageing, in cooperation with the Ethnic Communities Council, is producing a series of information packages in 21 languages for use by the ethnic media, covering topics of interest to older people of non-English speaking background and their families.

33. My Government is committed to the advancement of Aboriginal people. It is working with Aboriginal communities to develop enterprise initiatives. A Business Enterprise forum will be convened shortly with a focus on employment and training opportunities based on eco-tourism and cultural tourism.

LAW REFORM

34. There has been considerable public comment recently about judicial independence. My Government is conscious of the need to preserve this important principle. In consultation with the judiciary and the Law Society, my Government intends to pursue the preservation of this principle as well as explore, in the longer term, what arrangements may be appropriate by which Judicial officers may be accountable for matters other than their judicial decisions.

35. During this session, wide ranging law reform measures will be presented.

36. My Government will introduce a bill to require the electronic recording of police interviews with people suspected of having committed serious offences. The proposal has a number of benefits to offer the criminal justice system, most notably a reduction in accusations of police fabrications.

37. The criminal law as it applies to those accused of crime who suffer from mental impairment is in need of substantial reform. My Government will introduce legislation to bring this area of law in line with modern standards of criminal justice and criminal responsibility.

38. Following a High Court decision, it is necessary to clarify how legal assistance is to be provided to indigent defendants in criminal trials. Legislation to be presented will ensure that criminal trials are not stayed indefinitely because people charged with criminal offences are unable to afford legal representation.

39. A review of equal opportunity legislation by Mr Brian Martin QC is expected to result in recommendations to improve the efficacy of the legislation and to remove anomalies which have arisen as a result of overlap with Federal laws.

40. My Government will introduce legislation which will reaffirm the protection of freedom of speech in Parliament. This will clarify the relationship between members' rights to freedom of speech and the courts' right to ensure that citizens are not defamed unjustifiably as a result of the exercise of that privilege.

41. A review of all South Australian legislation is continuing to identify those Acts requiring amendment to ensure that they are not inconsistent with the Commonwealth's Racial Discrimination and Native Title Acts in light of the High Court Mabo decision. My Government expects to be introducing further bills in addition to the three tabled at the close of the last session.

42. In the interests of road safety, legislation will be proposed requiring the more serious drink driving offenders to install breath testing ignition interlock devices as a condition of their licences being returned.

PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

43. My Government is addressing a range of issues to ensure the protection of the South Australian Environment.

44. A National Environment Protection Council Bill will be presented. This will provide for the establishment of the Council as foreshadowed in the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment endorsed by the Commonwealth and the States earlier this year.

45. My Government continues to support the principles of the Native Vegetation Act controlling clearance of native vegetation and providing assistance to land owners to protect and manage native vegetation and encourage its replanting. Administration of the Act is being reviewed to ensure that people whose land is affected are dealt with fairly and sensitively. Consultation with a range of organisations and community groups is expected to lead to amendments to the Act.

46. Amendments will be proposed to the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act to allow the grant of a continuous pastoral lease as an incentive for improved land management.

47. The fragile nature of our soils was emphasised recently when a prolonged dry spell resulted in dust storms across the State. Responsible land management is the focus of the State's Landcare program, with more than 250 Landcare groups now formed in South Australia.

48. The results of an environmental impact analysis of dryland salinity in the Upper South East will be available soon. This will help my Government to finalise a timetable for the provision of infrastructure required to deal with this problem which has the potential to severely damage some of the State's most productive farm land.

49. A program to protect the mound springs and the Coongie Lakes region in the Lake Eyre Basin has been initiated.

50. A South Australian Water Plan is being developed to provide a broad policy and planning framework for decision making and action relating to the future sustainable development of the State's water resources.

51. There has been good progress in implementing a 'clean waters' program for shellfish quality assurance which is essential in establishing South Australia as an exporter of high quality oysters. As a result, accreditation under the United States Foods and Drugs Administration Act will enable export to most parts of the world.

ARTS, RECREATION AND SPORT

52. My Government continues to encourage community participation in the arts, sport and recreation at all levels.

53. My Government has given in principle endorsement to changes to the management and structure of the Adelaide Festival of Arts. The changes, to be implemented over the next three months, will ensure that the Festival retains its status as the pre-eminent arts festival in the nation, and one of the best in the world.

54. My Government has received a report from a Task Force appointed to recommend an Arts and Cultural Development strategic plan and will begin to implement its proposals to position the arts and cultural industries to play a significant role in the social and economic development of South Australia.

55. The South Australian Sports Institute will help to implement the Olympic Athlete Plan in this State. This is designed to ensure successful participation in the Sydney Olympic Games. South Australia is well represented in our national team for the forthcoming Commonwealth Games in Canada and I am sure all members join me in wishing our competitors success.

56. A State Recreation and Sports Strategy Plan has been completed. It takes in twelve regions and will form the basis for determining the priorities of my Government in recreation and sport over the next three years.

FORMER MEMBERS

57. Finally, it is with regret that I record the deaths, since the last address, of a member of the House of Assembly and three former members.

Mr Joe Tiernan was elected member for Torrens in December last year. He died on 31 March. In his brief time in the Parliament, Mr Tiernan gained respect for the enthusiasm and dedication with which he approached his duties.

Mr Reg Groth was the member for Salisbury for nine years, including more than four years service as a member and Chairman of the Public Works Committee.

Mr Keith Plunkett was another former Chairman of the Public Works Committee. He was member for Peake for 10 years.

Mr Lloyd Hughes was the member for Wallaroo for almost thirteen years, including five years as a member and Chairman of the Industries Development Committee.

I know that all honourable members will join me in expressing sympathy to the relatives of these former members.

They made an important contribution to the conduct of Parliament and Government in this State.

I now declare the session open and trust that your deliberations will be guided by Divine Providence to the advancement of the welfare of the people of this State.

The Governor retired from the Chamber, and the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly withdrew.

The President again took the Chair and read prayers.

PLUNKETT, Mr K.H., DEATH

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the death of Mr Keith Henry Plunkett, former member of the House of Assembly, places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Mr Plunkett died during the parliamentary recess, since last we sat in May. Before entering Parliament Mr Plunkett was a former shearer and joined the Australian Workers' Union as an organiser in the late 1960s. He was eventually elected President of the union in 1976. It is fair to say that that route to both State and Federal Parliament has been followed by a number of prominent members of the ALP. Indeed, Mr Plunkett was someone who followed that route successfully to preselection when he won preselection for the western suburbs seat of Peake and then into the South Australian Parliament in 1979.

As Her Excellency indicated in opening this parliamentary session, Mr Plunkett not only served his local electorate with distinction in representing the interests of the constituents of Peake but also served in the Parliament on a number of parliamentary committees, particularly the Public Works Standing Committee. Mr President, I think he served for a period similar to the period that you served on that committee and he served as its Chair for some period. Not that I had a conversation with him, but I am sure that he would have been pleased to see the reintroduction in the last session of a new Public Works Committee in the Parliament, because I know that he was a strong advocate of the work that the committee was able to do.

I note in the obituary published in the *Advertiser* in June that a close friend of Mr Plunkett, the Secretary of the AWU, Mr John Dunnery, spoke with him just prior to his death and asked him how he wanted to be remembered, and Mr Dunnery is quoted in the *Advertiser* as saying:

'He said he wanted to be remembered as a good shearer, a good union organiser and a good member of Parliament,' Mr Dunnery said. 'What struck me most about Keith was the intensity of his dedication to the union members and his commitment to the Australian Workers' Union.'

On behalf of members of the Government in this Chamber I pass on my condolences to his wife and family.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I second the motion on behalf of the Opposition because I worked for Keith from the time he was elected until 1980. I had been working for the former member for Peake, the Hon. Don Simmons, and stayed on to work for Keith. Keith was the member for Peake for 10 years: he was elected on 15 September 1979 and retired on 24 November 1989. During his parliamentary career Keith became the Chairman of the Public Works Committee. Keith came from the union movement and he continued to support the unions throughout his political career. He was a shearer from a very early age and joined the Australian Workers' Union as an organiser in the late 1960s. He was elected union president in 1976, a position he held until he resigned to contest the seat of Peake.

Keith was a plain man in the sense that what you see is what you get. He always spoke his mind and that did not

always please some people, but Keith was always accessible to his constituents in what was then a strong Labor seat. Keith had an empathy with the people of Peake. They were from the working class, as he was. Keith had good friends in the union movement and, as the Hon. Mr Lucas has already mentioned, in the *Advertiser* obituary Keith's good friend John Dunnery, Secretary of the AWU, said of Keith when he last spoke to him:

He said he wanted to be remembered as a good shearer, a good union leader and a good member of Parliament.

These sentiments were echoed at his funeral by his old shearing mates, Jack Wright and Mick Young. The bonds that these men forged in the union movement held them together throughout their parliamentary lives.

Keith had another message to leave behind. At his funeral Jack spoke of Keith's long battle with illness: he had very severe asthma, and that affected his whole life. Keith wanted everyone to know what he believed had been the cause of his ill health, and he said to Jack, 'Tell them, Jack, not to smoke.' These were the words that Keith wanted passed on, and I am passing them on today.

Keith will be remembered with affection by his friends in the Labor Party and the union movement. My sympathy goes out to his widow, Betty, to his two daughters, Sue and Linda, and to his son, John. Keith was very proud of his family, and I know that they will miss him, as will all his friends in the ALP and the union movement.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 12.52 to 2.30 p.m.]

IMMUNISATION

A petition signed by 70 residents of South Australia, praying that the Legislative Council urge the Federal Government, through our State Health Minister, to reconsider funding the most important program for immunisation against measles, mumps and rubella and, failing this, that this honourable House request the Government to consider setting aside sufficient State funds so that the program can be implemented, was presented by the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

- Department for Education and Children's Services—
Report of the Chief Executive Officer, 1993
- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Boating Act 1974—Glenelg Foreshore—Jet Ski Speed Limit
 - Fees Regulation Act 1927—Water and Sewerage Planning—Fees
 - Financial Institutions Duty Act 1983—S.A. Produce Credit Pty. Ltd.
 - Gaming Machines Act 1992—Fees
 - Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—
 - Declared Vocations
 - Declared Vocations—Machining and Cutting (Textiles)
 - Declared Vocations—Machine Operating (Plastics)
 - MFP Development Act 1992—Extension of Core Site Sewerage Act 1929—
Fees
 - Water and Sewerage Planning—Fees
 - Summary Offences Act 1953—Traffic Infringement Notice Expiation Fees

- Superannuation Act 1988—
CAFHS Employees
STA Employees—Varying Contributions
- Waterworks Act 1932—
Examination/Registration Fees
Fees

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin)—

- Animal and Plant Control Commission—Report, 1993
- Remuneration Tribunal—Report relating to Determination No. 2 of 1994
- Magistrates Court Act 1991—Rules of Court—Elect for trial
Restraining Orders
- Summary Offences Act 1953—
Road Block Establishment Authorisations, 1/1/94 to 31/3/94
- Dangerous Area Declarations, 1/1/94 to 31/3/94
- Regulations under the following Acts—
Administration and Probate Act 1919—Interest on Pecuniary Legacies
- Associations Incorporation Act 1985—Fees
- Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1968—Fees
- Business Names Act 1963—Fees
- Citrus Industry Act 1991—Interest on unpaid contributions
- Co-operatives Act 1983—Fees
- Correctional Services Act 1982—Conduct of Prisoners
- Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988—Driver's Licence Disqualification Notice Fee
- Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Fees
- District Court Act 1991—Court Fees
- Domestic Violence Act 1994—Foreign Domestic Violence Restraining Orders
- Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993—Transcript Fees
- Explosives Act 1936—Fees
- Fees Regulation Act 1927—Appointment of Proclaimed Bank Managers/Justices of the Peace
- Fisheries Act 1982—
Abalone Fisheries—Licence Fees
General—Licence Fees
Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Licence Fees
Marine Scalefish Fisheries—Licence Fees
Miscellaneous Fisheries—Licence Fees
Port Noarlunga Reef Aquatic Reserve
Prawn Fisheries—Licence Fees
Processor Registration Fee
River Fishery—Licence Fees
Rock Lobster Fisheries—Licence Fees
Variation of Schedule 3
- Gas Act 1988—Gas Fitters—Exam Fees
- Lifts and Cranes Act 1985—Fees
- Magistrates Court Act 1991—Court Fees
- National Crime Authority (State Provisions) Act 1984—Service of Summons
- Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—
Asbestos—Fees
Construction Safety—Fees
- Seeds Act 1979—Fees
- Sheriff's Act 1978—Court Fees
- Summary Procedure Act 1921—Restraining Orders
- Supreme Court Act 1935—
Court Fees
Probate Fees
- Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986—
Claims and Registration
Exclusion from Coverage
Forewood Products Pty. Ltd.—Extension of Exemption
- Medical Report Fees—Reviews and Appeals
Returns by Employers
- Remuneration Tribunal—Report relating to Determination No. 2 of 1994

By the Minister for Consumer Affairs (Hon. K.T. Griffin)—

- Regulations under the following Acts—
Builders Licensing Act 1986—Fees

Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986—Fees
 Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Fees
 Consumer Credit Act 1972—Fees
 Consumer Transactions Act 1972—Fees
 Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Fees
 Liquor Licensing Act 1985—
 Fees
 Dry Areas—City of Noarlunga/City of Port Lincoln
 Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913—
 Cinematographers/Theatre Firemen
 Retirement Villages Act 1987—Code of Conduct
 Second-Hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—Fees
 Travel Agents Act 1986—Fees

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw)—

Local Government Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial
 Review, 30/6/93
 South Australian Planning Commission and the Advisory
 Committee on Planning—Report, 1992-93
 Regulations under the following Acts—
 Beverage Container Act 1975—Exemption—Milk
 Containers
 Bills of Sale Act 1886—Fees
 Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978—
 Consumption of Alcohol
 Fees and Charges
 Clean Air Act 1984—Fees
 Crown Lands Act 1929—Fees
 Marine Environment Protection Act 1990—
 Fees
 Licensing Guidelines
 Medical Practitioners Act 1983—Qualifications for
 Specialists
 Motor Vehicles Act 1959—
 Accident Towing Roster Scheme Fees
 Fees and Charges
 Lectures
 National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—
 Code of Management—Emu Farming
 Fees
 Hunting Permit Fees
 Occupational Therapists Act 1974—Registration Fees
 Passenger Transport Act 1994—
 Accreditation—Vehicles Standards and Inspections
 Conduct of Passengers
 Fares and Charges
 Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act
 1989—Fees
 Racing Act 1976—Statutory Deductions/Sports Bet-
 ting
 Real Property Act 1886—Fees
 Registration of Deeds Act 1935—Fees
 Road Traffic Act 1961—Inspection Fees
 Omnibus
 Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991—Fees
 South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—
 Recognised Hospitals/Health Care Centre Fees
 South Australian Local Government Grants
 Commission Act 1992—Persons/Bodies Prescribed
 as Councils
 Strata Titles Act 1988—Fees
 Water Resources Act 1990—Fees
 Worker's Liens Act 1893—Fees
 Waste Management Act 1987—Fees
 Noarlunga Health Services Inc.—By-laws
 Julia Farr Centre—By-laws
 Corporation By-laws—
 Noarlunga—No. 15—Moveable Signs
 Salisbury—No. 2—Streets (Amendment)
 Tea Tree Gully—No. 10—Moveable Signs on Streets
 and Roads
 Thebarton—No. 2—Streets and Public Places (Amend-
 ment)
 Unley—
 No. 2—Traffic
 No. 3—Bees
 No. 5—Garbage Bins
 No. 6—Gunpowder and Fireworks (Amendment)
 No. 7—Inflammable Undergrowth (Amendment)
 No. 8—Restaurants and Fish Shops (Amendment)

No. 9—Signboards (Amendment)
 No. 10—Streets and Footways (Amendment)
 No. 12—Recreation Area (Amendment)
 No. 13—Soldiers' Memorial Garden of Honour
 (Amendment)
 No. 14—Dogs
 No. 15—Poultry (Amendment)
 No. 16—Height of Hedges and Fences
 (Amendment)
 No. 17—Caravans (Amendment)
 No. 18—Keeping of Cattle (Amendment)
 No. 20—Street Trader's Licence (Amendment)
 No. 22—Removal of Garbage (Amendment to No.
 47)
 No. 23—Permits and Penalties
 District Council By-laws—
 Millicent—No. 4—Garbage Containers (Amendment)
 Port Elliot and Goolwa—No. 7—Building Sites
 Stirling—No. 42—Moveable Signs
 Yankalilla—
 No. 33—Jet Skis
 No. 34—Moveable Signs

COMMONWEALTH-STATE RELATIONS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table a copy of a Ministerial statement made in another place today by the Premier on the subject of recent and ongoing developments in Commonwealth-State relations.

Leave granted.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGES' SEPARATION PACKAGES

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement about District Court judges' separation packages.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In June 1994 Cabinet approved a scheme whereby separation packages would be offered to four judges of the District Court. This decision was based upon the view of the Government that there was a genuine need to reduce the judicial strength of the District Court by four judges. The decision to reduce the judicial strength of the District Court took account of a number of factors and, in particular, the general and continuing downturn in the civil work of the District Court.

A summary of the lodgments in the civil jurisdiction in the District Court by monthly total, over the past three years, shows that the monthly average has fallen significantly from 239.08 in January 1992 to 128.83 monthly average for the first half of this year. In the combined criminal jurisdiction for both the Supreme Court and District Court, statistics indicate a decline in trials listed and trials pending over the financial years 1991-92 to 1993-94 (up to March 1994).

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Management by the previous Government.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I did not criticise you, did I?
The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is a good trend. An analysis of the workload of the District Court indicates that there has been a decline in personal injury claims and claims arising from motor vehicles generally. The Government has had the benefit of a detailed briefing from the Compulsory Third Party Claims managers from the State Government Insurance Commission. The State Government Insurance Commission has played a major role as a litigator in the civil jurisdiction of the District Court, and the State Government Insurance

Commission experience in claims and in litigation—both in terms of pre-trial conferences and trials—in the District Court over a number of years indicates a significant and continuing decline in the number of cases coming to pre-trial conferences and then to trial. The decision by the previous Government to abolish common law claims in the WorkCover context has also impacted on the workload of the District Court.

Further, the Government also had regard to the fact that the District Court was already two judges over strength due to the transfer of judges of the Industrial Court to the District Court three years ago. In addition, Judge Newman transferred back to the District Court from the Children's Court on 1 January, 1994; Judge Roder transferred from the Planning Appeal Tribunal when the Environment, Resources and Development Court commenced; and Judge Noblet is almost full time in the District Court, from the Commercial Tribunal.

Another important factor taken into account by the Government was that the Courts Administration Authority was already in effect making savings of \$457 000 in one year, equivalent to the administrative and support resources necessary for four District Court judges. The Courts Administration Authority has advised Government that those savings had already been made and taken into account for the 1993-94 budget year, put in place by the previous Government. The 1994-95 budget has been structured, at the request of the Courts Administration Authority, on the basis that quite apart from the resignation of the four judges the Government cannot claim those savings which have already been utilised elsewhere in the authority's budget.

There has been some criticism of the fact that separation packages were offered to District Court judges and there was an assertion that this has breached the principle of 'judicial independence'. That assertion is rejected completely.

On 12 May 1994 the Supreme Court judges promulgated a resolution dealing with the appropriate conditions upon which judges may be offered and may accept separation packages. Paragraph 2 of the resolution of the Supreme Court judges states:

Where there is a genuine need to reduce the numbers of judges on a particular court, a separation package would be proper if offered in accordance with a published scheme which made the package available to the judges of the court in order of length of service, beginning with the longest serving judge.

In fact, the offering of the separation packages was in accordance with the requirements of the resolution of the Supreme Court judiciary. Throughout the process consultation with the Chief Justice occurred. He raised no objection to the process although he did not indicate support for the actual reduction.

In accordance with the decision by the Government, offers were made in order of seniority to the District Court judges. The offers were accepted by Judge Nicholas Birchall, Judge John Roder, Judge Iris Stevens and Judge Brian Greaves. The Government anticipates a cost saving of \$1.6 million per year after the first year as a result of this action.

QUESTION TIME

ELECTION ERRORS

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about election errors.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In today's *Advertiser* there was a report of a significant error in the counting of the votes for the seat of Unley at the last election. Some 600 votes were wrongly allocated to the now sitting member, Mr Brindal. This did not affect the result as it turned out, although it was a significant error and therefore deserves to be examined in this Parliament. The questions that arise are whether other errors have been found in the conduct of the last elections and, if so, what action will be taken and indeed what action is being taken as a result of this matter coming to light. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. How did this error come to light and come to be known to him (I assume) and others?
2. When did it become known?
3. Who discovered the error and in what circumstances?
4. What steps has the Attorney-General or the Electoral Commissioner taken to ensure that no other errors of that magnitude occurred at the last election?
5. What steps do the Attorney-General and/or the Electoral Commissioner intend to take to ensure that there is no recurrence of this serious matter at future elections?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have sought a report from the Electoral Commissioner on the issue. The report in the *Advertiser* did raise some important issues. To some extent, however, the report was wrong, because as I understand it Mr Brindal won with an absolute majority of votes and did not need preferences. Notwithstanding that, the issue is important and I hope that I will have the report by tomorrow, and I will bring back a reply.

STAMP DUTY

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services as Leader of the Government a question about the stamp duty rebate.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Along with many other members of Parliament from both sides of the Council, I had the privilege of attending the opening of the new Carrington Gardens inner city development last Saturday morning. As members would know, this development was undertaken by the Karidis Corporation as a private investment project with no Government funding or risk involved. It was commenced in a difficult economic climate while many other developers put their projects on hold or approached Government to share their risk. During his address at the opening of his development, Mr Gerry Karidis, the principal of the company, expressed the belief that governments could do more to encourage inner city development, which is a goal I believe we would all like to see realised. He expressed disappointment that the current Government had abolished a stamp duty rebate introduced by the previous Government for people purchasing strata title in the inner city. He said:

It costs governments as much as \$15 000 a block to provide the infrastructure for broadacre housing, but governments save thousands when people buy in the inner city. That's a saving to the taxpayer. We believe some of those savings ought to be passed on—not to the developer but direct to the people who choose to buy an apartment in the inner city, through a stamp duty rebate. That way, everybody benefits. That's one of the ways we can all work together.

In the light of the views that were expressed by Mr Karidis, who is a major developer in South Australia—views that were shared by many present at the opening function, if their spontaneous applause was anything to go by—will the Leader take up the issue with his colleagues the Minister for

Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and the Treasurer with a view to reintroducing a stamp duty rebate in South Australia?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to the Treasurer and bring back a reply.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, a question about the Beverage Container Act.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: The Beverage Container Act was introduced by a Labor Government in 1975. At the time when the Bill was being debated, intense lobbying by industry interests and widespread adverse publicity meant that the Bill had to be presented three times before it was eventually passed, with the cooperation of the Liberal Opposition. At that time, the Liberals found that they could not go against public support for the Bill and they reluctantly supported the legislation. In its 20 year history the legislation has been effective and recognised throughout Australia to be effective in the control of litter. It has stood the test of time. Over the weekend I attended a seminar on waste minimisation, container deposit legislation and curbside recycling. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources spoke at that seminar, as did I and the Hon. Mr Elliott. The Minister stated that he would listen to the views from industry and, if they could come up with a viable alternative to this legislation, he would listen to their views carefully and if he thought the legislation should be repealed he would do so.

This legislation has received support over the years and has stood the test of time. Some may think it is not perfect or needs to be amended but basically that it should remain. I am very confused by the Minister's statements because he seemed to say one thing in the seminar and another thing in the media. Is the Minister considering changes to the Beverage Container Act? If so, when will these changes be brought in? Is the Minister considering repealing the Act? If so, what are his reasons for doing so? How does the Minister intend to meet the targets set by ANZEC of a 50 per cent reduction of solid waste for disposal by the year 2000 if this Act is repealed?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and bring back a reply.

HINDMARSH ISLAND BRIDGE

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question in relation to Hindmarsh Island.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: This question might also need to be referred to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations and perhaps even the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. The Federal Government's decision to stop the development of the Hindmarsh Island bridge has raised the opportunity to revisit an alternative solution to the building of the bridge. This option was raised by me in this Council earlier in the year. In fact, I moved a private member's Bill to cover the

issue. In brief, the solution offered at that time was, first, to waive the present planning requirement that the bridge must be built before the future stages of the Binalong development can proceed. The planning requirement only allowed stage one, in the other event; secondly, that a second ferry should instead be installed at Hindmarsh Island to provide ready access to the island and to allow residents priority; thirdly, no other major developments should then be allowed on the island; and fourthly, a long overdue bridge should be built at Berri in the Riverland by the Hindmarsh Island bridge builders Built Environs subject to a reasonable price as compensation.

The effect of all of this would be that the value of the Binalong project would at least be maintained if not improved because it would be the island's only major development of that kind. The interests of the developers, the financiers and the bridge builders will be preserved, which of course reduces the prospects (a) of litigation and (b) that litigation would lead to substantial costs. This would also release two large ferries from Berri for use at Hindmarsh Island, which would substantially reduce the cost of installing a second ferry. The Minister is on record as saying:

An incoming Liberal Government will support Berri as a priority site for the construction of a bridge across the Murray River.

That was stated in a media statement by the shadow Minister for Transport in January 1992. I remind the Minister that in the same statement she stated:

... Liberal Party considers the Government's commitment of \$3 million of taxpayers' funds to the Hindmarsh Island project to be a dubious, unsound investment.

In the light of the Federal Minister's recent decision, will the Minister give further urgent consideration to the proposals that I floated earlier in the year?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Government is considering all our options following the decision by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs. It is a very complicated, complex and confused situation that we now face. We are waiting upon detailed advice from Mr Tickner about the reasons. A number of Ministers have written to Mr Tickner on various grounds seeking advice about implications. We have not received replies on those matters at this stage.

As to Berri, it has always been the Liberal Party's view, whether in Opposition or in Government, that priority be given for building a bridge across the Murray River at or near this site. It was a priority 15 years ago when we thought we had money at that stage and it was promised by the then Premier David Tonkin. With a change of Government there was a change of priorities. However, we inherited a situation involving the bridge at Hindmarsh Island that we are trying to sort out. I highlight that what appears to be clear from Mr Tickner's judgment is that he has banned the building of 'the bridge'—not 'a bridge'—but that is very confused with judgments about Aboriginal significance and spirituality across the whole region.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: It is a problem and we are trying to sort it out by seeking clarification from Mr Tickner first. We need that before we can look at other issues to improve access to Hindmarsh Island.

GAMING MACHINES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about gaming machine revenue for welfare agencies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: On 7 May 1992 the then shadow Minister of Transport moved an amendment to the gaming machines legislation that this Council was then considering. I will not read out the whole amendment that the honourable member moved, but she wished to insert a new clause as follows:

68a. (1) From the total amount paid to the Treasurer pursuant to section 68 in any financial year, an amount to be fixed by the Minister from time to time (but being not less than 1.5 per cent of the gross gaming turnover in that year of all businesses conducted pursuant to gaming machine licences) must be paid into a fund to be established at Treasury under the name 'Gaming Tax Fund'.

(2) The Minister will from time to time apply the money in the Gaming Tax Fund as follows:

- (a) as to two-thirds—to such organisations as the Minister thinks appropriate being—
 - (i) organisations that assist persons addicted to gambling or that assist the families of such persons; and
 - (ii) organisations that have, in the opinion of the Minister, been adversely affected in their fundraising activities as a result of the operation of gaming machines;

That is part of the amendment that the honourable member moved. As members of the Council will recall, that amendment was not successful, though it was argued at considerable length. I do not know for how long, but the debate certainly covers many pages of *Hansard*. The motion was eventually defeated after I, as a Minister of the then Government, gave a commitment that at least \$2 million would be awarded from Government funds to purposes as indicated in the amendment from the Hon. Ms Laidlaw which I have just read out. Does the Minister still maintain the view that resources from the gaming tax, be it based on turnover or Government revenue, should be provided to welfare agencies that assist persons addicted to gambling, families of such persons or organisations whose fundraising activities have been affected by gambling? If the Minister no longer has that opinion, will she tell us why she has changed her opinion? If she still has the opinion that she expressed at great length, as reported in *Hansard* of 7 May 1992, will she argue that the Government should undertake such action?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: It is true that I expressed those views at great length. Clearly I was not persuasive enough at the time because I recall that the honourable member did not support me, and certainly I did not get the support of the majority of members. I tried my best at that time. I felt strongly about the issue, but I was obviously not persuasive enough and was not successful in what I sought to achieve. If the honourable member and others had helped me by voting for it, it would not be an issue today. You did not help me then and I lost, and that is a fact of life. I think that the community is the loser as a result. As the honourable member would know, the allocation of resources of the kind to which she now refers is a matter for, and will be considered by, the Government.

The Hon. Anne Levy: You are a member of the Government.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes, that is right. I understand that the offer made by the former Minister when

the Bill was being debated was \$2 million, but it was not an annual contribution. I understand that it was a one-off—

The Hon. Anne Levy: It was not a one-off.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I do not recall it being stated at the time that it was to be an annual contribution. However, I am aware that the Independent Gaming Machine Corporation has guaranteed, without any conditions attached, that \$1 million will be provided on an annual basis for people who may develop this addiction to gambling. That money will come from gaming machine revenue, just as the money that I was seeking 18 months ago would have come from gaming machine revenue.

PRIMARY INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Primary Industries, a question about primary industries personnel.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: During the run-up to the election the Liberal Party presented a comprehensive policy on rural matters, and primary industries in particular, and it has made various announcements about schemes to assist primary producers about four times since then. One of those was the young farmers' scheme. One of the questions that has continually arisen during debates on rural matters since the Liberal Government came to power has been the provision of services to farmers in country areas. Prior to the election there was some debate by a range of people as to what services ought to be maintained in country areas after a proposed rationalisation by the former Minister for Primary Industries, the Hon. Terry Groom, including the relocation of the grains research facility at Clare, which is an ongoing issue today. Concern has also been expressed to me about the provision of stock officers on Kangaroo Island. Great concern was expressed to me as recently as last week that five fish inspectors had been dropped out of the contingent of the inspectorate in South Australia. It begs the question by a whole range of people across the State, and I am persuaded to ask a series of questions of the Minister in respect of primary industries.

1. How many people have been shed from the Department of Primary Industries since the Liberal Government came to power?

2. How many are from rural areas and from what departments?

3. How many have been re-employed on contract?

4. What existing services will be lost locally to primary producers in consequence of those lost personnel in country areas? I would be pleased if the Minister could bring back replies as soon as possible.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

ENERGY DISPUTE

In reply to **Hon. T. CROTHERS** (3 May) and answered by letter dated 1 June.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Mines and Energy has provided the following response:

1&2 Answered by the Attorney-General on the day the question was asked.

3. The Government has in place a Utilities Liaison Group which is made up of representatives of the utilities and the energy industry and is chaired by the Office of Energy.

The Chairman of the group has the task of assessing and advising on the technical validity of any comparative advertising which is proposed by either of the utilities.

However, he has no authority to determine whether or not advertisements can be shown and does not arbitrate in disputes should they arise. Responsibility for running advertisements rests with the utility concerned.

Although the function is confined to an advisory role, its existence has always averted legal action in past disputes of this nature. The current legal proceedings, and this Government, will encourage this view that court action be avoided in future.

We do not propose to create a body that will tell independent agencies what they may say in advertisements.

BUILDING MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES** (11 May) and answered by letter dated 1 June.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Industrial Affairs has provided the following response:

1. It is agreed that SACON Heritage Unit has made a substantial contribution in the conservation and preservation of built heritage within South Australia and as a consequence, have contributed to tourism in so far as many examples of early architecture within the State are now some of the best maintained and presented exhibits available within Australia.

In addition to the contributions throughout South Australia, SACON Heritage Unit is gaining recognition in areas of South East Asia as experts in the arena of heritage conservation, with one current project being the preservation and upgrade of 'Suffolk House', the home of the father of our own Colonel William Light in Penang. Expressions of interest have also been sought by Heritage Trusts of Hanoi, Taiwan, Singapore and Malaysia.

2. Currently, there is one stonemason employed by the Department for Building Management and he has neither sought nor been offered a separation package.

Of the two plasterers experienced in heritage work, one has sought a separation package which is currently being evaluated.

The Government has no intention of destroying the SACON Heritage Unit, more the opposite by encouraging the unit by implementing a program to ensure that historic building conservation continues over at least the next four years, together with the preparation of a historic building conservation guide for Government Departments and Agencies.

SAGASCO

In reply to **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (21 April) and answered by letter dated 1 June.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: On several occasions throughout 1993 the then Commissioner for Consumer Affairs met with representatives of the Gas Company to discuss complaints received about the company's practices.

Of particular concern was the practice of cutting off the gas supply to a house for non-payment for items supplied, such as stoves, heaters, etc., even where the gas bill was fully paid up.

It was considered by the then Commissioner and Minister that this practice was unfair to the Gas Company's competitors, who did not have this avenue of redress. Consumers were also being disadvantaged.

The last meeting took place on 9 June 1993 in the office of the then Minister for Consumer Affairs, Hon. Anne Levy, MLC.

Over the series of meetings the Gas Company agreed to vary some of its practices. It agreed not to disconnect a client's gas supply for non-payment on electrical items purchased, and further agreed to review and change documents which were potentially in breach of the Trade Practices and Fair Trading Acts.

These changes were carried out by the Gas Company.

Despite pressure exerted by the then Commissioner and a press release by the then Minister, the Gas Company was not willing to alter its documents to remove its right to cut off gas supply for non-payment of gas items. At the June meeting, the Gas Company agreed to review its policy on cutting off gas supplies to ensure that it was an action of last resort.

While, in June 1993, the Gas Company held a licence as a credit provider under the Consumer Credit Act 1972, it advised that it had not supplied credit in its own right for some time. Credit was supplied through AGC Credit Line. Given this factor, it was considered that it would be difficult to discipline the Gas Company

in the Commercial Tribunal on grounds associated with the holding of the licence.

The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs has not received any recent complaints on this issue, but the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is continuing to monitor the situation and should there be an influx of complaints he will take up the matter with the Gas Company.

PUBLIC SECTOR STRESS CLAIMS

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (12 May).

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Industrial Affairs has provided the following response:

1. The issue of stress and all other aspects of occupational health and safety in Government employment is of prime concern to this Government and especially to me as Minister for Occupational Health and Safety.

The previous Government has allowed the performance of the public sector in the overall workers compensation area to be well below that of private industry exempt employers. I intend to change this deplorable situation. I have already written to many CEOs of departments and agencies with below average performance to tell them what is required of them in improved performance.

However, a number of large Government departments have improved markedly in the latest evaluations undertaken by WorkCover and I intend to ensure that the experience of those departments is passed on to the poor performing departments. I have requested WorkCover to arrange an occupational health and safety seminar for CEOs of all Government departments and authorities to get this process started.

On the advice of WorkCover and other parties, a number of different approaches are being considered to upgrade the consciousness of public sector employers in the area of occupational health and safety and reduce the alarming level of workers compensation costs. A joint project is being developed by the Education Department and WorkCover to address the issue of stress and the provision of safe work environments to teaching staff employed in priority schools. This project called 'Managing Stress in Schools' is to be conducted from June and involves initial expenditure of \$80 000 to define the problem and possible solutions. This is a major initiative which shows just how serious this Government is about addressing occupational health and safety in Government departments, something that the previous Government ignored for 10 years. The cost to South Australia of this culpable neglect was highlighted in the recent Audit Commission report.

The Commission of Audit has recommended the Government change the deemed exempt status of Government departments and I am having that recommendation investigated at this time.

2. Private companies seeking exempt status are required to have reached a high standard of performance in prevention (Occupational Health and Safety) as prescribed in WorkCover Corporation's exempt employer performance standards.

The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act, 1986 allowed existing private exempt employers under the old (1971) Act a simple transition to exempt employer status under the new (1986) Act. The level of performance now required for new private exempt applicants is the top level (Level 3). As at 31 December 1993, less than 20 per cent of private exempt employers had achieved that level of performance.

Based on the latest assessment (December 1993), the Education Department would also not meet this entry requirement and would not be granted exempt status by WorkCover if it were a new applicant as a private employer.

SHELTER

In reply to **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (11 May).

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The project whereby Shelter SA is undertaking a study to establish whether there is a need for a tenants' advocacy group is continuing. The project has four stages, as follows:

1. (a) Establish reference group.
- (b) Select worker.
- (c) Worker orientation.
- (d) Develop questionnaires.

2. Research.

3. Analysis.

4. Interpretation. I am advised that the project is currently in stage 2 and the expected completion date is September 1994.

The arrangement with Shelter SA provides that the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs retains the right to forward the report to me. Therefore, when I receive the report, I will consider whether it should be released.

DETENTION FACILITIES

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (5 May).

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I refer to your parliamentary question of 5 May 1994 relating to detention facilities. The Minister for Emergency Services has provided the following response:

1. No police resources are used unnecessarily to supervise holding facilities. Persons arrested and detained in police detention facilities are not under the control of Department for Correctional Services personnel until after they have appeared in court and have been remanded in custody.

The Government does not consider the long term confinement of correctional services prisoners at the City Watch House, or any other police facility, to be appropriate as it is contrary to the accommodation design of those facilities. Some prisoners are being temporarily accommodated in police facilities until bed space at the Adelaide Remand Centre becomes available. This is a short term situation as the provision of accommodation for an additional 90 remand prisoners at the Adelaide Remand Centre is being undertaken.

2. At the end of April there were 69 prisoners with a communicable disease accommodated at Yatala Labour Prison and 45 at the Adelaide Remand Centre.

All persons remanded in custody for a period exceeding seven days are screened for communicable diseases by staff of the Prison Medical Service. The initial results are available within five to seven working days. However, the period of time required to confirm a person's communicable disease status may be considerable (for example, three months in the case of HIV). Therefore, prisoners who may have a communicable disease do come in contact with staff and other prisoners prior to confirmation of a disease.

3. An HIV positive prisoner threatened other remand prisoners in December 1993 and, so, was separated under Section 36 of the Correctional Services Act 1982. The prisoner remains in separation although it is understood that the original incident resulted from threats from other prisoners.

The Department for Correctional Services operates within the provisions of the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act and recognises a duty of care towards both staff and prisoners. All staff practise universal precautions in the handling of prisoners. They also carry a first-aid kit which contains disposable gloves, bleach, clean water, resuscitation face shield, cleansing wipes, bandaids and dressings. In addition, the department has developed a comprehensive communicable disease procedure manual which is distributed to all staff locations. Programs of immunisation against Hepatitis B are also available to staff and prisoners.

The main transmission methods of HIV and Hepatitis B are through sexual intercourse and intravenous drug needle sharing. Both activities are illegal within prisons. Further, all prisoners are provided with information from the Prison Medical Services on disease transmission.

4. The Minister for Emergency Services stands by his comments quoted in the *Advertiser* on 5 May 1994 regarding the security at the Adelaide Remand Centre.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Premier, a question on the Public Service exodus.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: A report in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 30 July stated that there was a 7 000 Public Service job exodus until the end of the financial year. I think that the end of the financial year date had something to do with the accelerated rate at which people applied for the various forms of redundancy that were on offer. The problem that most people had in making the adjustment with regard to how the Public Service was going to cope with that was that the specialist services being provided by those public servants did

not seem to be a consideration, and the general move by public servants out of the Public Service and possibly out of this State was one of almost general panic. It appears that the targeting of the services being provided by skilled, educated, trained and in many cases dedicated public servants was not being adequately monitored in respect of the way in which the Public Service was going to operate across all departments. It appears that the Government had a fixed figure in its mind in relation to restructuring the Public Service and it had only a monetary base to it.

In many of the promises made prior to the election the Liberal Party said that it would be monitoring the restructuring that was to take place in the Public Service, that the Public Service restructuring would be based on a more effective and efficient delivery process, that Ministers would be making the assessment as to those public servants who would restructure the departments to ensure that their efficiency and effectiveness was such that the State of South Australia would be the beneficiary of that restructuring and that the taxpayers' dollar would be well spent in any public sector restructuring programs in which the Liberal Government would be involved.

From talking to public servants who have taken part in the exodus and taken the packages, it appears to me that we will lose many skilled services and expertise and that we will have a very narrow base within the State on which to rebuild industry, commerce and education services that will need to be provided to support those structures. It appears to me that the Government's targeting fell well astray of its promise prior to the election.

Why did the Premier announce to the nation, rather than to the State, the massive job loss exodus of the public servants and not explain the exodus and the impact thereof to the people of South Australia before so doing?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I would be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and bring back a reply, but I want to make some general comments. It is not correct to say that the Premier and the Government did not have an overall plan within which they were operating in relation to the gradual wind-back of the State public sector. This certainly has been a coherent strategy. It was outlined first last year prior to the election in the overall economic statement and the various policy documents released by the then Leader of the Opposition in the Liberal Party, which outlined the strategy for action that the Premier had in mind.

Through the first six months of this year that strategy has been fleshed out by the Government, culminating in the release in June of the Financial Statement, which obviously indicated the overall financial targets that needed to be met. At the same time within Cabinet and various public sector departments and agencies, Ministers were made aware of the detail to that overall coherent strategy as to what needed to be done over the coming three to four years of this parliamentary session.

I would certainly reject the honourable member's inference that in some way this has been going on around the Premier or the Government in any way without any coherent strategy. It might not be a strategy that the honourable member and members of the Labor Party who created this problem in the first place might like but nevertheless it exists. It is a clear indication and expression of intent from the Premier and the Government as to the direction in which the Government will be heading over the coming four years.

Secondly, the targeted separation packages up to and including 31 July this year could only be issued on the basis

of an identified area of surplus. The Commissioner for Public Employment made it quite clear that very strict guidelines existed as to who could or could not receive targeted separation packages. One guideline was that it had to be in an identified area of surplus. The new Government or Minister might decide that a function or functions will no longer be delivered by a Government department or agency and is therefore surplus for those reasons, or it may be that the function continues to be delivered but that more than enough required members of the Public Service are employed to deliver that function. A variety of explanations can be given but the overall guideline remains the same: it has to be an identified area of surplus and a net reduction in some way in numbers within the public sector.

The third and final point is that the honourable member undersells the level of expertise and capacity existing within middle management and middle sections of the State public sector. The honourable member's view of the public sector is a pessimist's view of the expertise existing within the public sector. He understates and undersells the level of expertise within the public sector.

Someone might wish to move on because their heart is not in it. They might want to retire or move somewhere else, bearing in mind, of course, that these are voluntary decisions taken by public servants to seek other challenges or to retire. Once those opportunities open up then, in my view, many capable members of the State Public Service are ready, willing and able to assume those positions of leadership—whether they be at the upper levels of the Public Service or middle management—and perform those tasks admirably. I believe that the honourable member undersells the capacity and expertise existing within the public sector.

Public servants are waiting to meet these challenges and to demonstrate their capabilities by filling those vacancies in various departments and agencies resulting from the targeted reductions.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development, a question about the levels of unemployment and employment in South Australia over the past six months.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Much has been said about what the then Brown-led Opposition would do relative to the number of new jobs it would create in its first 12 months of office. I do not wish to expand on that. Those statements were made. I would rather leave, as events unfold, the correctness or otherwise of those statements to other people to formulate an opinion. However, in the meantime, I direct the following questions to the Minister:

1. What were the total levels of unemployed persons in the State of South Australia as at 31 December 1993?
2. What was the total number of South Australians in employment in the State of South Australia as at 31 December 1993?
3. What were the total levels of unemployed persons in the State of South Australia as at 30 June 1994?
4. What were the total number of South Australians in employment in the State of South Australia as at 30 June 1994?

5. If the answer to my first four questions is in the negative, will the Minister then inform me how he can answer the question regarding how many new jobs have been created in a given period of time within South Australia?'

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On behalf of the Minister and the Government I am delighted to do the honourable member's research for him and produce—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I start this session with goodwill to all members of this Chamber. I said that on behalf of the Minister I will be delighted to undertake that research for the honourable member and bring back some response.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: If there are any tricky bits you can explain them to me and I shall warn the Minister. First, the honourable member says that he will not make any comment in relation to the current situation but will leave that to others. I think that is very wise. Certainly in relation to the monthly figures—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I know: it is the spirit of goodwill. Certainly the monthly employment and unemployment figures released are notoriously—I will not say unreliable—up and down. Every month there seems to be a differing version of what the trend line might be. It would be much more sensible for the honourable member—if he wants to judge the adequacy or not of the Government's performance in relation to its commitment on jobs—to wait for that 12 month period. Then, the honourable member, and indeed everybody else, will be in a position to judge one way or another. I will certainly place on the public record the accurate figures if my recollections are not accurate.

I do recall seeing the Premier, I think at the end of last month, commenting on the most recent monthly figures indicating there has been a growth of some 7 000 jobs in employment between January or December and the most recent figures which would have been May or June. I am not sure which month was being used as the base. I will therefore check that for the honourable member.

Whilst I indicated that the figures on the numbers of persons in full time employment had grown, there had also conversely been an increase in the percentage rate of unemployment because the participation rate within the South Australian labour force had increased over the same period. So, there were more people looking for jobs, there were more people unemployed, and there were also more people employed during that period. As I indicated, I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and have an early response brought back.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health, a question regarding the Whyalla Hospital and casemix funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: The Whyalla Hospital averages 81 patients per day and with day surgery it adds up to approximately 100 patients per day. A total of 25 per cent of the patients comes from outside Whyalla. There are 50 000 outpatients and 500 births per annum. The users of the services of the hospital are predominantly elderly people and young families. The hospital provides for mainly public

patients with private patients making up only 8 per cent of total patients.

Over the past three or four years, Whyalla Hospital has received successive funding cutbacks, and now under case-mix it must find \$2.4 million in savings this year, \$1.2 million next year and \$1.2 million the year after that. Whilst the hospital management has found the required savings thus far, savings for the ensuing years are expected to be even more difficult to find. As to the expected savings that the Minister wants from early discharges under casemix, Whyalla Hospital already discharges patients at the earliest possible time. This has been possible because the local doctors know their patients' families and thus are aware whether or not there is appropriate care at home.

I am also informed by Whyalla health providers that the Flinders Medical Centre is being used as a bench mark for casemix and all other hospitals are expected to achieve the same standards of efficiency and costings as Flinders Medical Centre. My questions are:

1. On what basis is the Flinders Medical Centre a bench mark for the Whyalla Hospital, given that it is impossible for country hospitals to achieve the same economies of scale, and given that the Flinders Medical Centre is a training hospital?

2. Is the Minister aware of the already short hospital stay record of Whyalla patients and was this record taken into account when casemix targets were set for Whyalla? If the Minister was not aware of this positive record, and it was not taken into account in setting casemix targets, will he now consider lowering the savings required of the Whyalla Hospital?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Health and bring back a reply.

JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the independence of the judiciary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: On 11 July this year it was reported in the *Advertiser* that judges induced by the Government to retire may be used to overcome a backlog of court cases. The re-employment of such judges will be on a temporary basis and those chosen could most likely be those who are known to favour the intentions, policies and will of the Government. The fact that the Government can be selective in making the temporary re-appointments strikes at the independence of the judiciary. The independence of the judiciary is a fundamental principle in the separation of powers in a democratic system. This situation is almost identical with the objection made by the Chief Justice to section 18 of the Industrial and Employees Relations Bill when the Bill was being debated during the last session of the Parliament. It is appalling that the Government has again used the same defective approach which strikes at the independence of the judiciary.

The *Advertiser* report of 11 July 1994, headed 'Government to use retired judges for court backlogs', states:

The Government offered the separation packages, which it says are in line with a scheme approved by the Chief Justice, Justice King, to four District Court judges.

Further, it is a reported view of the Law Society as follows:

The Law Society said the offering of the packages was depleting judicial numbers and would create a backlog in hearings. It claimed

it was counterproductive for the Government to be approaching judges with attractive retirement packages just when the District Court had made major progress in cutting waiting lists.

Further, the *Sunday Mail* reports:

In a letter to Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, Chief Justice King expressed 'deep disappointment' with the Government's decision to strip the District Court of four judges.

My questions are as follows:

1. Will the Government table all correspondence between the Chief Justice and the Government on this matter?

2. Has the Chief Justice complained to the Government about the tampering with the independence of the judiciary by the Government's being selective as to which judges may be re-employed?

3. What measures are proposed by the Government to safeguard the independence of the judiciary when re-employing judges?

4. Does the Government intend to appoint more judges to replace those who have been induced to resign and, if so, what was the benefit to the State of inducing experienced and competent judges to vacate the bench?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The answer to the first question is 'No'. The second relates, as I understand it, to the Chief Justice being in disagreement with the way in which the Government approached the separation packages for judges. As I indicated in the ministerial statement, we did have a number of consultations with the Chief Justice and, whilst he did not necessarily support the reduction in the numbers of the judiciary, he made no criticism of the way in which we were going about it once we determined that there was a surplus of District Court judges. In fact, we were meticulous in following the procedure which the Supreme Court judges, including the Chief Justice, resolved should be followed if a Government was to issue separation packages to any judge. I just reiterate what I said in the ministerial statement, that the Supreme Court judges resolved:

... where there is a genuine need to reduce the numbers of judges on a particular court, a separation package would be proper if offered in accordance with the published scheme which made the package available to the judges of the court in order of length of service beginning with the longest serving judge.

That is actually what happened. We made the decision for the redundancy of four, the details of the package were published and they were offered in order of seniority. Some of the more senior judges declined and then the offers flowed down until the fourth District Court judge had indicated that he was proposing to accept the offer. The Hon. Mr Feleppa has referred to a newspaper story which stated that I had indicated that we would be using retired judges to catch up on backlog. That was really taken out of context. The point that I recollect I was endeavouring to make was that there is already a panel of auxiliary judges who can take up the shortfall in judges if required from time to time. At the moment for example, Mr Justice Cox is engaged on the Electoral Boundaries Commission and Judge Boehm has filled in as an auxiliary judge to take up the workload which would otherwise not be met as a result of Justice Cox's—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Judge who?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Judge Boehm. Masters are now described as judges. At Supreme Court level they have the status of District Court judges. So, Judge Boehm is on the auxiliary list of judges. It was certainly an express provision of any taxation benefits that might have been available to anyone taking a targeted or voluntary separation package that the office did in fact genuinely have to be redundant. So,

there has not been any intention to appoint any new District Court judges to fill the positions of those four who have retired. That would serve no useful purpose. As I have indicated, we determined that four positions were surplus to requirements. That was also reflected in the figures of the Courts Administration Authority and of the previous Government in relation to the Court Services Department in that \$457 000 of savings was taken into account in the budget, and they were not available to us when we were working out the savings that might accrue as a result of four judges accepting the packages. So there is certainly no intention to fill those positions which have now been resolved.

The Government has not made any final decision on what will happen in relation to two District Court judges, Judges Rogerson and Boylan, who are retiring in 1995. However, the Government will assess the workload at the time and then make a judgment as to whether or not their positions should be filled. So it is of an open mind in respect of that matter.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have a supplementary question. Will the Attorney-General provide to the House full details of the separation packages offered to and accepted by the judges to which he has referred, and also full details of any other separation packages offered to and accepted by other members of the judiciary in other courts since the election?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will take that question on notice. It is quite a reasonable question, but I would need to just check what arrangements were made at the request of the particular judicial officers. The information ought to be—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: No, come on. I certainly have no difficulty in making the information available but I would like to check that there is no other difficulty in making the information available. At the worst that is information that will come out in the course of the Estimates Committee. In my view it ought to be made available and I will take the question on notice and bring back a considered reply.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: And a general policy document or a general statement on the standards of separation packages?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have no difficulty with disclosing the general policy and, as the Leader of the Opposition has requested, in relation to what the packages were with respect to specific judges. There is no problem in terms of the general policy and I will make sure there is a detailed statement about that made available. In terms of the specific instances of the offers made I will take that on notice and in the context of my response bring back a considered reply on that.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government in this Chamber a question about unemployment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: During the last session of Parliament I asked a question about what the Leader thought were the growth areas for employment in South Australia. Since that time all we have seen in South Australia is people getting their separation packages. Nobody seems to know the actual figure of the separation packages which are offered in South Australia. After watching the Premier on television the other day I worked out that 6 500 people had gone from one

area, 3 000 from another, 4 000 from another and 1 500 from another. What the press and a lot of people did not pick up is that what you do is subtract the first figure you thought of and it leaves you 7 000 people. My questions are:

1. How many people are targeted? Who are they and what are the departments involved?

2. How does this action provide work for young people?

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: We are not targeting individuals.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: The Government is targeting individuals. A classic example is what is happening at the present time in the EWS. The Government has allowed all these people to go and then it has cut the amount of money they are going to get in separation packages so it can keep them there to show the contractors how to do the ruddy jobs. What are the areas that have been targeted? How many people are actually going to be given separation packages? How does that help the young people of South Australia? There is quite a number of young people who feel devastated every day of the week when they go to the dole offices and the CES trying to find positions and they finish up having to go interstate to find jobs because they cannot get them in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: Never mind about Mr Keating. Mr Keating is at least paying them the dole.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is fine for the honourable member to get angry in this Chamber about the issue. Indeed members of the Government are angry about the situation, too. But the simple facts of life are that the mess South Australia is in was created by the honourable member's own colleagues and leadership in South Australia over 10 or 11 years.

The Hon. G. Weatherill: You were going to fix that.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Government intends to. However, 11 years of mess created by the Hon. Mr Weatherill's colleagues and leadership in Cabinet cannot be fixed in six months. We would like to be miracle workers but we are not. It is going to take a lot of long and hard work, not only from the Government and the Premier but also from the State public sector and from the business leaders in South Australia, to resolve the situation. We would love to solve, in six months, the mess that Labor has created over the past 11 years, but it is much more difficult than that. You and the people of South Australia will have to make judgments as we set in place our economic recovery plan as we try to resolve, over the four years of this Parliament, the over expenditure within the State public sector.

There are already some encouraging signs on the economic horizon with significant investments from Motorola and Australis, significant new investment from Mitsubishi—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: If the honourable member wants to oppose the new jobs created by those investments let him stand up in the Chamber and do so. However, this Government is committed to turning the South Australian economy around, and we will not be able to achieve that economic recovery in six months, after 11 years of mess created by his former leadership and the Cabinet which he supported. You can make your judgments, and the people of South Australia can make their judgments over the four year parliamentary term of this Government. At the end of the parliamentary term, the people of South Australia can make a judgment as to whether they like what they have seen. Tough decisions will have to be taken. This Government and the Premier will not resile from taking those tough decisions, and one of them

is a continuation of the cut-back in the public sector. The Hon. Mr Weatherill gets excited and angry about the cut-backs in the public sector, but his own Government and Premier were committed to a program to 30 June this year of having to cut the State public sector by some 4 000 members of the Public Service. He supported that policy.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It was 3 900—close to 4 000—by 30 June of this year. That is a policy he supported in his Caucus, and there is no doubting that whichever Government won the last State election there would have to have been further cut-backs in the public sector, because of the fact that we were spending \$300 million or \$350 million a year more than we were earning. It does not matter whether you are running your own family budget, a business or a farm, or, in our case, the State budget, you cannot go on spending more than you are earning each and every year. The State Government has had to take the tough decisions to bring our expenditure back into an order where it matches our revenue expectations.

We have outlined the target for these 12 months. In the financial statement the Premier has outlined the expenditure cut-backs in the key portfolio areas. The detail of those cut-backs will be released in some two or three weeks, on 25 August, when the State budget is released. Yes; there have been cut-backs in the EWS, as there have been in a number of other areas as well. I repeat the point I made in answer to an earlier question: the separation packages offered so far have been voluntary packages; the members of the Public Service have accepted them voluntarily. They have been offered, and some members of the Public Service who have been offered a public sector targeted separation package have refused to take them.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is far too much noise on my left.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: They remain within the State public sector and have not been compelled to leave it. The only other point is I would make is that it is not correct to assume that every member of the public sector who has taken a TSP automatically joins the unemployment queue, because a number of people are just retiring. They are taking their packages and they are retiring. A number of them are investing their retirement package here in South Australia—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Elliott indicates that some might be going elsewhere, but a number of them are investing in South Australia in a small business, a taxicab licence or something else. If they are investing in small business, they are seeking to employ further South Australians as a result of that ongoing investment. So, it is not correct just to assume that whatever number of persons who take a TSP are the next day automatically being added to the State unemployment queues, as some commentators and some others have tried to lead the public of South Australia to believe. As I said in relation to employment and unemployment, I do not have the figures showing the comparison between December and July at my fingertips. I indicated earlier that I will check. I have some recollection of a statement that the Premier made about 7 000 jobs, but I will need to check that and bring back a more accurate reply than my hazy recollection of statements the Premier has made.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As a supplementary question: in light of the Leader's emphasis on the fact that the separation packages offered to date have been voluntary, can the

Leader indicate whether in future the Government intends to keep its election commitments not to abolish permanency of employment in the Public Service? Does the Government intend to keep its commitment in this area?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is interesting to see the GME Act (and I remind the honourable member of amendments introduced by the former Government and supported by him) providing flexibility in relation to some elements of the Public Service. I would well advise him to look at the provisions of the GME Act, as introduced and supported by his Government and supported by him, I presume, in the Caucus. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and the appropriate Minister and bring back a response. I understand that the statements made by the Premier and the responsible Ministers have been that the Government believes that we can achieve our planned reductions in the public sector through targeted separation packages and that therefore any exploration of hypothetical situations might need to go no further than that. My judgment in relation to the Education Department is that, whatever number is eventually targeted by the Government for reduction, we will more than comfortably achieve it through voluntary expressions of interest from the staff of the Department for Education and Children's Services. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and bring back a reply.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Has the Government received advice from Crown Law officers involving the memorandum of understanding signed between the then Opposition Leader, Mr Brown, and IBM relating to the provision of information technology in South Australia and, if so, does that advice express concern about that memorandum of understanding and/or the implications for Government in making decisions in the future relating to information technology? If the advice does not cover those issues, what issues does it cover?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: My recollection is that there has been no advice in relation to that, but I will have the matter checked. My understanding is that in any event that memorandum of understanding has no legal validity, because it was an understanding and not a binding contract. The Leader of the Opposition ought to know that to have a binding contract you must have consideration and if you are not in Government you can give no consideration.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The point of it was that at least there would be some understanding about the way in which the State could be assisted to develop in the future after the election, but it is certainly not a legally binding document, and I would defy anyone to come to a conclusion that it was binding.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You gave the impression that it was.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Certainly, we were endeavouring to show that there were people who were prepared to get South Australia moving again, but they needed a change of Government to ensure that the right environment was in place to get the State moving again. There is plenty of support for that. I will have inquiries made in relation to the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition and bring back a reply.

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN
PARLIAMENT AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON
LIVING RESOURCES**

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and
Children's Services):** I move:

That the members of this Council appointed to the joint committees have power to act on those joint committees during the present session.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE REDEVELOP-
MENT OF THE MARINELAND COMPLEX AND
RELATED MATTERS**

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and
Children's Services):** I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Wednesday 16 November 1994.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CIRCUM-
STANCES RELATED TO THE STIRLING
COUNCIL PERTAINING TO AND ARISING FROM
THE ASH WEDNESDAY 1980 BUSHFIRES AND
RELATED MATTERS**

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session and that time for bringing up the report be extended until Wednesday 16 November 1994.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CONTROL AND
ILLEGAL USE OF DRUGS OF DEPENDENCE**

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I move:

That the select committee have power to sit during the present session and that the time for bringing up the report be extended until Wednesday 16 November 1994.

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The President and the Hons K.T. Griffin, R.I. Lucas, C.J. Sumner and G. Weatherill.

Library: For this session, a committee not appointed.

Printing: The Hons M.S. Feleppa, J.C. Irwin, Bernice Pfitzner, A.J. Redford and T.G. Roberts.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The PRESIDENT having laid on the table a copy of the Governor's Opening Speech, the Hon. R.I. Lucas (Minister for Education and Children's Services) moved:

That a committee consisting of the Hons M.S. Feleppa, R.D. Lawson, R.I. Lucas, T.G. Roberts and Caroline Schaefer be appointed to prepare a draft Address in Reply to the speech delivered this day by Her Excellency the Governor and to report on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 3 August at 2.15 p.m.