

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 17 October 1995

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Peter Dunn)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

- Reports, 1994-95—
 - Economic Development Authority
 - MFP Development Corporation
 - State Clothing Corporation
- Charter for ETSA Corporation
- Response by Hon. J.W. Olsen, MP, Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development to Statutory Authorities Review Committee—Third Interim Report on the Review of the Electricity Trust of South Australia (Accounting Issues)

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

- Rules of Court—Environment, Resources and Development Court—Environment, Resources and Development Act—
 - Mining Applications
 - Native Title Rules
- Regulations under the following Acts—
 - Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993—Native Title Fees
 - Native Title (South Australia) Act 1994—Principle
 - Mining Act 1971—Native Title Amendments
 - Fisheries Act 1982—Fishery Management Committees
- Reports, 1994-95—
 - Attorney-General's Department
 - South Australian office of Financial Supervision
 - Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee
 - South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board
 - Industrial Relations Court—Industrial Relations Commission
 - Workers Compensation Review Panel

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

- Regulation under the following Act—
 - Land Acquisition Act 1969—Forms
- Reports, 1994-95—
 - History Trust of South Australia—Fifteenth Annual Report
 - State Opera of South Australia
 - State Theatre Company of South Australia
 - South Australian Museum Board
 - Adelaide Festival Centre
 - Department for the Arts and Cultural Development
 - SA Greyhound Racing Board
- Response by Hon. M.H. Armitage, MP, Minister for Health, to Report of the Economic and Finance Committee's Inquiry into the Disbursement of Grant Funds by South Australian Government Agencies.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The **PRESIDENT**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 4 and 25.

FISHING AND SEAFOOD INDUSTRY SKILLS CENTRE

4. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS**:

1. What funding was provided by the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments to establish the South Australian

Fishing and Seafood Industry Skills Centre at Fishing Industry House, Port Adelaide?

2. What recurrent or capital funding do both the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments provide to the Centre?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. The Fishing Industry Skills Centre was established in 1992 at Walkerville through a Commonwealth grant of \$153 000 which was used to purchase land.

DETAFE also contributed \$10 000 towards establishment.

In January 1994, the Skills Centre relocated to the Port Adelaide campus of the Regency Institute under a tenancy agreement to pay a peppercorn rent of \$1 per annum for 15 years.

DETAFE provided the Skills Centre with a loan of \$88 000 to facilitate refurbishment required at Port Adelaide prior to their relocation.

\$44 000 of the \$88 000 loan has been repaid with the balance due 7/7/96.

Apart from the loan provided by DETAFE, no funds were actually provided to the Skills Centre to facilitate relocation to Port Adelaide.

2. No recurrent funding is provided by DETAFE other than traineeship monies from ANTA via DETAFE, however considerable support is offered by way of the tenancy agreement whereby the Skills Centre pays \$1 per annum as rental for office space.

Subject to clarification on availability of funds, approval has been given for capital expenditure of approximately \$220 000 at Port Adelaide campus which will incorporate the expansion requirements of the Skills Centre.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

25. **The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS**: How many full time equivalent positions under the Government Management and Employment Act or other South Australian Acts which are the responsibility of the Minister for Tourism and Minister for Industrial Affairs and which are located outside of the Adelaide Statistical Division, have been lost in the period from 11 December 1993 until 31 January 1995?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:

AGENCY	FTE POSITIONS LOST
South Australian Tourism Commission	6.0 (Melbourne) 6.0 (Sydney)
Department for Industrial Affairs	5.5 (Transferred to Adelaide from outside of Adelaide Statistical Division)
Department for Building Management	1.0 6.5

HUS EPIDEMIC

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table a copy of a ministerial statement made today by the Premier in another place on the HUS epidemic.

Leave granted.

QUESTION TIME

BASIC SKILLS TESTING

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about remedial action following the basic skills test.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Now that the Government has skill tested children in years 3 and 5 at a cost exceeding \$500 000, it would be reasonable to expect the Minister to make a statement on the findings of the test and announce the steps that he intends to take to improve learning outcomes. In areas where children were shown to have

learning difficulties one might expect an announcement of additional resources and staffing formulas to be under review. Indeed, one could predict that some schools might need specialist teachers and that schools might need more, not 250 fewer, school support officers. However, there has been nothing from the Minister—just his claims that the tests were a great success because they took place. My questions to the Minister are:

1. What resources have been allocated to manage remedial programs identified as being necessary by skills testing?

2. How will resources be directed to assist children who have been identified by skills testing as having a learning difficulty, and what funds have been made available for this purpose?

The PRESIDENT: I remind the questioner that a lot of opinion was contained in that question.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am sure the honourable member would be delighted to know that the Government will be providing additional resources and it has already indicated how it will be doing so. In broad terms, as the Government has outlined—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have already indicated on a number of public occasions, but—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am sure that will occur. The Government has announced that its \$10 million funding for its Early Years strategy is designed solely to assist those students within the early years who have been identified as having learning difficulties. A range of programs have been implemented in the first year. This year has seen the introduction of the Cornerstone training and development program, the provision of extra speech pathologists and guidance officers, as well as extra reading recovery offerings for teachers and schools.

In 1996 there will be a continuation of the provision of extra speech pathologists and guidance officers, reading recovery programs, a range of other early intervention programs, and assistance being funded by the Early Years Strategy to assist children identified with learning difficulties.

The tragedy of the past 20 years has been that, for too long, the special needs of these children in their early years has been ignored by Labor Governments, sadly. For the first time children in South Australian schools will have their particular learning needs identified and tackled by a Government with a strategy which has been provided with additional resources to the tune of \$10 million. I have also—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That is exactly it. That is what we are talking about.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Leader of the Opposition is not happy with the response she is hearing because it indicates that this Government is not interested in being an educational voyeur about these sorts of issues; it is not interested in just looking at the problem and doing nothing about it, as previous Labor Governments have done. This Government is establishing the problems—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —and we are now interested in implementing and funding, with additional resources, programs to try to do something about it. We will not be able to correct overnight the problems within our South Australian

schools. For example, the Literacy Challenge by the Commonwealth Labor Government states that up to 20 per cent of our children leave primary schools with some form of literacy problem, and clearly that sort of circumstance cannot be resolved overnight by an incoming Government. For the first time, a Government has identified the problem and will target the additional resources for schools to try to assist.

In effect, we must ensure that we get the maximum benefit from the existing teaching and school support staff resources within our schools. That is why the cornerstones training and development program will, for the first time, train all 4 000 of our early childhood and junior primary teachers in techniques of identification of students with learning difficulties and, more importantly, what a classroom teacher can do for those 25 to 30 students in the classroom to assist them with learning difficulties. Therefore, we have a two-pronged response: there is the responsibility of the classroom teacher and the additional resource that the Government or the taxpayers can provide and will be providing to assist those children whom we identify with learning difficulties. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition will be delighted to know that the Government is providing that additional targeted resource to assist those students who have been identified.

GARIBALDI SMALLGOODS

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the basis of the Garibaldi affair.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I was going to direct this question to the Hon. Julian Stefani—however, he probably would not have answered it—and I believe the question has been answered somewhere else. Last week the member for Mitchell gave the member for Elizabeth some free legal advice relating to Food Act prosecutions arising from the HUS outbreak in Garibaldi Smallgoods. Section 26 of the Coroners Act states:

A coroner must not proceed with an inquest where a person has been charged in criminal proceedings with causing the event that is, or is to be, the subject of an inquest, unless the Attorney-General directs him to do so.

The member for Mitchell, in interpreting this section, said that the Coroners Act is quite specific that if criminal proceedings are commenced the coronial inquiry will have to stop. My question is: in the six months after the Health Commission became aware that there may have been breaches of the Food Act in relation to Garibaldi Smallgoods and the HUS outbreak earlier this year, was there any obstacle to the Attorney-General directing the Coroner to continue with his inquiry in the event that prosecutions had been initiated?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind members when asking questions not to give opinions or make hypothetical cases. At the beginning of that question there was a hypothetical case. That leads to inciting or exciting Ministers to make very long answers in response. Members should keep their questions to the point. The Attorney-General.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am very happy to become excitable. It happens on occasions, and if I feel strongly enough about an issue members opposite may well experience that level of excitement. I put this matter into context last week. In the normal course one would not proceed with

a coronial inquiry when there is a prosecution on foot. Even if the Attorney-General had given a direction to the Coroner that the inquiry should continue notwithstanding that prosecutions were on foot, in the hypothetical context to which the honourable member referred, the fact is that the directors would have been within their rights to refuse to answer questions.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: As the Hon. Angus Redford interposes, the criminal court might have decided to make some observation about that. I would think that in the normal course it would be improper for a coronial inquiry to continue and seek to coerce witnesses to give evidence when those witnesses might be the subject of criminal prosecution. That was the essence of it. I thought that last week I made it clear that that was the context in which this matter ought to be considered.

RABBITS

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Primary Industries, a question about rabbit calicivirus disease.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Last week I asked a question in anticipation of some problems that may occur with the spread of the rabbit calicivirus which was being introduced to Wardang Island as a field test. My worst fears—and I guess those of other people—appear to have been substantiated on the basis that the Minister's announcements indicated that the field test had spread from the rabbit warrens surrounded by fencing and wire. It has now moved outside that area on to the island and—if the indications are correct—on to the mainland. I guess other people made those predictions as well as I. It has almost reached *X-Files* proportions at this stage, for those members who are *X-Files* fans. The investigations are trying to eliminate the problems associated with the spread of the disease. For those who have not been watching the *X-Files*—and I guess that some amongst us are fans and others are not—it is an American produced program that has a lot of the believable mixed up with a lot of the unbelievable. It has wide cult following.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Hon. Mr Mr Lucas is a keen follower. The difference between the *X-Files* conspiracies and this episode is that the Minister has been keeping the public informed, and that is not the case with many of the *X-Files* programs. I thank the Minister and the Government for being open about it and for keeping the public up to date with what is going on. My questions are in relation to an article in the *Australian* today and are due to the statement made by the Director of the Australian Nature Conservation Agency (Dr Peter Bridgewater) who said that scientific opinions varied on the importance of controlling foxes at the same time as rabbits. In relation to a question I asked last week, I was concerned that, if foxes were not controlled at the same time as the rabbits were wiped out, they would start to pick off our native species. My questions are:

1. What are the variations in the scientific opinion being advanced?
2. What scientific evidence will the Minister be acting upon?

3. What compensation will be made to rabbit breeders in South Australia for the damage and inconvenience that may be caused by this outbreak?

4. Where is Scully, and where is Mulder?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the questions to my colleague in another place and bring back replies. My recollection of this is that it is essentially a matter that until now has been under the responsibility of the Commonwealth, through the CSIRO. But, quite obviously, the State needs to be conscious of the consequences of the action that has occurred, and for that reason the Minister for Primary Industries will continue, I am sure, to keep the Parliament and the people apprised of the situation as he sees it and as he is advised.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to ask a supplementary question about the rabbit calicivirus.

Leave granted

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I direct this question to the Attorney-General representing the Minister for Health, or whichever Minister is involved. Given that the CSIRO has stopped the export of rabbits in South Australia, what action will the Government take to ensure that the public is protected on the domestic market from rabbits being sold in South Australia?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: That will be a matter initially for the Minister for Primary Industries, and I will refer that question to him as well, and bring back a reply.

PATAWALONGA

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing both the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources and the Minister for Housing and Urban Development a question about the Patawalonga development.

Leave granted

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: A large proportion of public land that bounds the coastline and the Patawalonga could be impacted upon by the current development options proposed for Glenelg. It has been suggested that waterfrontage land on the Patawalonga and possibly the coastline may be handed over to private developers during the course of development of the area. It has also been put to me that the whole Patawalonga clean-up will create a significant private benefit. Private developers have been pushing for water in the Patawalonga to be of primary contact quality all the year round. Hence, the suggestion for a second mouth at West Beach to be carved through some of the last remaining coastal sand dunes in the area.

I have been approached by people who are keen to see that public access to the water remain. At the moment, you are able to walk the entire length of Glenelg beach and most of the Patawalonga. South Australia's colonial commissioners gave instructions to Surveyor-General Colonel William Light and his successors to reserve 150 links (about 30 metres) from the high water mark of our coasts and inland waterways for government purposes so that it would not be privately developed. This foresight offered us a rare opportunity to ensure public access to areas, something which many other countries have forsaken. In places such as the United States, public access has been for ever denied to coasts and waterways which have become cluttered with private developments.

It is recognised that there are limited areas which are alienated by public works and that this is unavoidable. However, in the case of the Patawalonga, it is solely private interests that would benefit from the alienation of waterfrontage land. Federal Better Cities money is being spent (I understand about \$11 million), but people have expressed concern to me as to whether or not that money will ultimately be spent for public benefit, which is the purpose of Better Cities money, or private benefit. My questions to the Minister are:

1. What justification is there for the transfer of public land to private interests?
2. What parts of waterfrontage land near the development site are being considered for transferral to private interests?
3. If such transfers do occur, what would be their value, and will they take into account the cost of improvements to the Patawalonga and surrounding areas?

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

GRANITE ISLAND

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (26 September).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources has provided the following information.

1. The Government has given several public assurances that it has no intention at present or for the immediate future to introduce an admission charge to Granite Island. However, there is a provision within the indenture agreement, signed by the Greater Granite Island Development Company, the District Council of Victor Harbor and the State Government, that the State at some future time 'may charge a nominal fee or levy for persons crossing the Causeway'. While it is reiterated that this Government has no intention of charging such a fee, the indenture gives scope to some future Government over the extended term of the indenture to consider such an option as a means to raising revenue for the repair and maintenance of public facilities associated with Granite Island.

2. At present the north shore, representing approximately only 14 per cent of the area of the island, is under a commercial lease agreement to the Greater Granite Island Development Company. There may be commercial leases or licences negotiated to provide visitor interpretation services in the greater portion of the island. This portion is managed co-operatively between the Ngarrindjeri community and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

3. Public access is available, and will continue to be available to the island. The lease agreement with the Greater Granite Island Development Company provides for public access through the leased area to public facilities, such as the Screwpile Jetty. Only commercial facilities within the leased portion of the island will have some level of restriction in the form of entry fees imposed by the lessee, for example, the proposed Penguin Interpretation Centre.

Some restrictions will be placed on the public areas during the construction phase or during major maintenance works as a matter of public safety. Such restrictions are likely to be of a temporary nature.

Other restrictions will be placed on the public areas of Aboriginal cultural significance or important penguin rookeries on the currently unleased portion of the island. This will be undertaken through the use of correctly placed boardwalks, redirection of footpaths and incorporated with the proposed trail network and interpretation.

MITCHAM COUNCIL PARKING PAMPHLET

In reply to **Hon. J.C. IRWIN** (4 April).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

1. I am aware of the pamphlet prepared by Mitcham City Council. The question of parking on footpaths and nature strips has been the subject of extensive community debate in a number of council areas, including Mitcham.

2. I understand the issue is currently being examined by the Local Government Parking Regulations Working Group of the Local Government Association, in cooperation with the Department of Transport. It is expected that the working group will subsequently

report to the Local Government Association and you may be assured that the Ministers involved will give serious consideration to any recommendations forthcoming from the association.

HOUSING TRUST TENANTS

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (26 September).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations has provided the following information.

1. The Housing Trust is not putting its tenants at financial risk, as the decision to purchase is theirs and contracts are 'subject to finance.' Trust tenants who express an interest to purchase their rental home, complete an Intention to Purchase form which is subject to valuation and the availability of finance.

The trust arranges an independent licensed valuation of the property and an offer is made to the tenant. The tenant has a thirty (30) day period to consider and accept the offer and to make financial arrangements with the lending authority of their choice. If the offer is not accepted, the trust cancels the sale without any further obligation or cost to the tenant.

2. Any anxiety which may be caused by the sale process would be dealt with by trust officers sympathetically. Housing Trust experience is that very little anxiety is caused, as the real estate agents appointed by the trust explain all aspects of purchase in detail before proceeding to valuation. Tenants are under no obligation to purchase their home and it is trust policy not to relocate a tenant just to effect a sale.

3. Most purchasers of real estate do so for reasons of security, stability and wanting an investment for the future. All tenants who express an interest and desire to purchase their homes will discuss purchase in detail with the real estate agent, including their ability to service a home loan and other responsibilities of home ownership. The final decision to purchase is ultimately the tenant's and feedback from most purchasers, indicates that they are very happy with their decision.

4. The trust's appointed real estate agents and Housing Trust officers continually reassure trust tenants that they are under no obligation to purchase their rental property, if they do not wish to.

ABORIGINAL ARTWORKS

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (26 July).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: An investigation was carried out by the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development's Senior Project Officer for Indigenous Arts, in collaboration with the Director of the National Aboriginal Cultural Institute.

The Director Mr Paul Canet-Senior is unaware of any arts and craft being purchased by Tandanya staff from non Aboriginal people, unless such persons are employed by an Aboriginal community from which purchases are made.

The following practices and guidelines relate to the purchasing of artworks and artefacts by Tandanya:

- Tandanya only deal directly with artists; or
- with agents and representatives employed by indigenous organisations.

Non Aboriginal art dealers—arts and craft purchasing is only agreed to if the artist and the community is known to Tandanya. Also only if the individual artist and or community is recognised by the payment of royalties on the contemporary or traditional design.

It has been widely argued for some time that Australian legislation provides insufficient protection for Aboriginal intellectual property.

This issue is the subject of a discussion paper sponsored by the various Ministers for Communications, the Arts and Aboriginal Affairs. The period for comment to the paper has recently concluded, and it is considered that given the sensitivity and complexity of issues associated with Aboriginal intellectual property, the paper is only first stage in dealing with these issues.

BEACH PROTECTION

In reply to **Hon. G. WEATHERILL** (26 September).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources has provided the following information.

The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources is not sure from the question whether the honourable member was referring to timber groynes or to sand drift fencing, which in some cases, used to be made of cut brush, or whether he is referring to both. The

Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources will deal first with the question of groynes.

Groynes can be a useful method of coast protection and have been used at some places in the State. They project into the surf zone and trap sand which waves move along the coast, building up sand on one side and usually causing erosion on the other. Their use depends on there being an adequate supply of sand and an expendable or non-erodable downdrift coast. Traditionally they have been built of timber, but rock is now a more common material. The groyne at the Patawalonga outlet at Glenelg and the smaller one at The Broadway, South Glenelg, are examples.

A groynefield has been considered for coast protection at Adelaide, but found to be more costly and a less attractive solution than the present strategy of beach replenishment. Because of the limited amount of sand on Adelaide beaches and the small natural supply from the south, groynes would need to be combined with a major beach replenishment. Without this they would merely redistribute sand, and beach improvements south of the groynes would be at the expense of serious erosion elsewhere. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources has been advised that groynes would need to be 200 to 250 metres long (about the size of the groyne at Glenelg) and built approximately one kilometre apart. They would have a significant impact on the beaches. Nevertheless, the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources has recently established an independent review under the chairmanship of Mr Malcolm Kinnaird. This review will be re-examining options for protection of the Adelaide coast, including use of groynes. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources expects the Committee to report back to him early in the new year.

Management of seafront sand dunes continues to be an important activity for the Adelaide coast. With encouragement and some State funding through the Coast Protection Board, local councils provide walkways and prevent inland sand drift using sand drift fencing and plantings.

As the honourable member notes, storms cut into the dunes, sometimes making it difficult for local councils, who provide this more direct kind of coastal management, to restore access to the beach. Temporary arrangements are sometimes needed until beach conditions improve, and it is not always safe to restore access immediately.

Dune erosion during storms is a natural process which cannot be avoided, even if there was more sand on the beach and the dunes were wider. Most of the sand eroded from the dunes will return under calmer conditions and the dune will re-form as dry sand is blown back toward it. It is often useful to assist this using sand drift fencing, though it is best to wait until after the winter before building the new fences. Drift fencing and planting has been used successfully at many places on the Adelaide coast. However, building sand dunes depends on there being enough sand on the beaches, so this tends to be a supplementary rather than a primary coast protection activity.

The condition of Adelaide beaches is kept under continuous review by regular measurement of beach and nearshore sand levels. This information is used to determine and monitor the Coast Protection Board's ongoing beach replenishment strategy. This year's program includes a major biennial replenishment at Brighton, using sand to be dredged from Port Stanvac; replenishment sand taken by truck to the eroding coast at Semaphore Park and Tennyson; and the trucking of sand past the Patawalonga and Torrens outlets. All work is to be undertaken by the coastal councils, except the major dredged sand replenishment. This work is to be undertaken by letting a contract and supervised by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

The Coast Protection Board and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources continue to encourage appropriate management of seafront sand dunes.

BLOOD ALCOHOL LEVELS

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about blood alcohol levels for drivers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Yesterday's *Advertiser* carried a front page story which quoted the former Director of Royal Adelaide Hospital's accident and emergency department, Dr Mervyn Allen, as saying that a zero blood alcohol level for drivers under 25 in South Australia might need to be con-

sidered. Dr Allen described drivers in this category as the main offenders. These drivers regarded themselves as indestructible. The article listed the number of random breath tests conducted in South Australia in the 14 years since testing was introduced in October 1981 together with the percentage of drivers with a blood alcohol level exceeding the permissible limit. What is disturbing about this table is the fact that the number of random breath tests conducted in South Australia in 1994-95 was the lowest for seven years. The number of tests was 226 319 compared with the record number of 294 111 tests conducted in 1990-91—a fall of some 23 per cent. However, the percentage of persons tested who exceeded the blood alcohol limit in 1994-95 was .73 per cent, which was the highest figure recorded since the limit was reduced from .08 to .05 in 1991-92.

As a member of the two select committees which recommended and investigated random breath testing, I am concerned at the fall in the number of random breath tests being conducted. The select committee strongly believed in the need for a visible presence of random breath test units on South Australian roads to act as a deterrent to drink driving and to force a change in the culture of drink driving. There is no question that the introduction of random breath testing in South Australia has saved countless lives. Random breath testing has the support of the three political Parties in the Legislative Council. Can the Minister explain why there has been a fall in the number of random breath tests being conducted in South Australia in each of the last five years? Will the Government investigate Dr Allen's suggestion of a zero blood alcohol level requirement for drivers under 25 years?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I, too, was interested to note from the article that the number of random breath tests conducted last year was the lowest on record and yet we recorded the highest number of incidents where people had been caught drink driving and that it does seem to be an alarming result. The area in terms of the conduct of random breath tests lies with the Minister for Emergency Services, and I will therefore refer that aspect of the honourable member's question to the Minister and bring back a reply. In the meantime, I accept the honourable member's assessment that a visible presence of random breath test facilities is highly desirable if we are to be successful in reducing the number of people who drink and drive. If there is not a perception that you will be caught there is very little deterrent value.

It is also true that young people generally feel indestructible, whether they are either drink driving or generally driving on the roads. We know from road crash statistics that people under 25 are the most vulnerable. The highest number/proportion per age group, however, is with probationary licence holders, and this is a disturbing feature of recent years. It is for that reason that the Government will introduce legislation shortly to make even more effective a driver intervention system that we put into practise in August last year, where probationary and learner drivers are challenged about their attitudes to drink and drug abuse and driving. That legislation, which will be introduced in the near future, will provide the Registrar of Motor Vehicles with the power to compel learner drivers or probationary drivers to attend a lecture where they have been disqualified from driving for various reasons, including drink driving. For probationary and learner drivers, zero is the current standard.

Under the national road laws there are to be new Australian road rule regulations, which are to be circulated late

this year. However, I understand that they will not include references to drink driving or blood alcohol limits. Certainly, the Government itself has no plans at this stage to reduce to zero blood alcohol levels for people in that age group. It may be something that the Road Safety Consultative Council would wish to explore. It can take up such references on its own initiative and does not require references from me as Minister.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I desire to ask a supplementary question. I am not sure if I missed it in the original explanation, but do these figures account for changes from .08 to .05?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes.

ROAD SIGNS

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and, perhaps, the Minister for Tourism, a question about road signs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: Some time ago I asked a question about road signs, and the Minister indicated that road signs had been erected on South Road. The signs there are quite good. I have driven along South Road and noted that the signs indicate exactly where one is and where the places one wants to visit are located. Such signs make it easy for tourists and people driving through the State. The Minister also said that she would contact local government and ascertain whether it would work with the Government to improve road signs in South Australia.

I refer also to the poor signage on North Terrace, because people have asked me there where the Museum and the Library are because there are no signs in the area. It is a ridiculous position facing anyone who is a tourist in South Australia. The same applies to someone on Burbridge Road or Tapleys Hill Road who is trying to find the airport, and this situation has to be fixed. We are getting complaints all the time about road signs and people not finding their way around this State. The situation should be improved. Has the Minister met with local government? What money has been put aside for this purpose?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: What was the attitude of local government on this issue?

The Hon. L.H. Davis: The Hon. Barbara Wiese promised—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: It is a matter not of blaming someone but of solving the problem. I ask the Council to bear with me for one moment, because I would like to give the Council some information. There were no losers at the ALP Convention—only the Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The honourable member seems to be seeking to justify media attention and attention in this place generally to all the carryings on at the Labor Party conference at the weekend. We are still trying to work out with which of the five or six factions in the Labor Party the honourable member is now associated. There has been speculation on this side that the Castro left, of which the honourable member may be faction leader—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: We are not sure if he is faction leader or just a member of the faction, but we believe that he has had some successes over the past week, because generally the Hon. Mr Weatherill does not get an opportunity to ask a question until way down the list. Now, straight after the convention, and after the front bench, the Hon. Mr Weatherill is right up there, and we are very pleased to see it, especially with such an excellent question such as this. The Hon. Mr Weatherill was quite a statesman in saying that we do not need to blame anyone about signs and that we should just get something done.

I am very keen to address this issue, as is the honourable member. I understand that there have been meetings with the Department of Transport and local government and also with the RAA, which is now fully on side in terms of improving signage. It was slow to be enthusiastic about this and has really led the campaign for the silly little signs that we have well in advance of a street. They are of little use to anyone when trying to find their way about Adelaide because they are not ready to look out for a street sign 100 metres before the street itself. Unless you are familiar with Adelaide, it is hard to get around.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I find them—

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The honourable member may find them useful, but she is an exception and certainly, for visitors to Adelaide about whom the Hon. Mr Weatherill was so concerned—and so he should be—it is extraordinarily difficult to get around. The big directional signs as on Main South Road have also been installed at Gepps Cross, Port Wakefield and Panatalinga Road, and they will be progressively introduced.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Barton Terrace!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: No, Barton Terrace remains closed. In terms of improving signage, the airport is a good idea. The Department of Transport is exploring with the RAA and, I think, local government the numbering of our roads. In Europe and possibly the United States each road—major or minor—has a number, and the numbers are easy to follow both on streets and on maps. The issue is being explored to further address the problems that the honourable member has raised.

As to North Terrace, in terms of the cultural institutions, they are discreetly marked. They are marked better than they were with upright signs. They used to be low, discreet, almost knee-level signs that one almost fell over and people were not actually able to read them. However, we now have upright signs. They are the province of the Adelaide City Council, and I share the honourable member's exasperation in trying to get the Adelaide City Council to get anything constructive done in this area. Some might say that it relates to a number of areas. In terms of signage in this city and the recording of heritage buildings, the council has talked for years and years (as long as I have been a resident, let alone a member of Parliament, and that is some 12 years) and has still done nothing. It is about time it did.

WILLS

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs a question about wills.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I recently heard a radio advertisement for something called the 'Australian Will Kit', a do-it-yourself will kit advertised at a very reasonable price of \$19.95.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: This advertisement has a rather melodramatic voice over, which says words to the effect, 'Do you know that if you die without having made a will the Government will determine who receives your property and your kids.' As the Minister would be well aware, will forms have been available from stationers for many years and, more recently, a number of do-it-yourself will kits have become available. So, the fact that such kits are being promoted is of no surprise. Does the Minister agree with the suggestion implicit in the advertisement, namely, that the Government will determine who receives a person's property and kids, is misleading and, if so, will the Minister investigate the advertisement with a view to taking appropriate action?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Any person who advertises a do-it-yourself will-making kit is probably doing a service to the legal profession because invariably people who make their own wills get something wrong. In my days of practice I encountered a number of people who either forgot to date or properly witness the form, or failed to fill out some of the blank spaces, and that inevitably incurred a significant cost in repairing it. Members would know that both the Law Society and Public Trustee, along with other trustee companies, give advice on the making of wills. It has always been my advice to people that they need to have some professional advice to ensure that the people whom they leave behind do not end up with a bigger mess than before a person dies.

Whilst, I suppose, some people would like to have the Government regarded as providing a service from the cradle to the grave, the fact is that, in this area of what people do with their property, the only involvement that Government has is through the parliamentary process, where provisions relating to intestacy have been designated by statute and, of course, provisions exist under the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act, which enable potential beneficiaries to challenge the validity of and provisions in a will.

As far as the Government is concerned, if no beneficiary or relative can be identified then proceeds from a deceased estate will go into consolidated revenue, but that is really as a matter of last resort. Executors and trustees generally try to find a surviving beneficiary, even if that person might be fairly remote from the deceased. If no beneficiary can be identified, proceeds from a deceased estate will ultimately end up with consolidated revenue. The advertisement to which the honourable member refers is, I think, misleading. If the honourable member can provide me with some more detail about the time and place I will undertake to have the matter examined.

INVESTMENT-LINKED SCHEME

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: 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 Investment-Linked Scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: On 1 August this year, the Government joined, reluctantly and belatedly in the view of

many, a national scheme known as the Investment-Linked Scheme, which is designed to attract business migrants to Australia based on investments ranging from a minimum of \$750 000 to a maximum of \$2 million, to be deposited in the coffers of the Treasury of the State of the investor's choice by means of a financial instrument, normally issued by the financial authority of the chosen State in the form of bonds, which are tied to a minimum of three years, during which time they cannot be sold, and various other mechanisms that make it fairly attractive for the States to induce as many business migrants as possible under this scheme.

I have come across a number of people in positions of assisting the process of attracting business migrants to Australia who are not yet aware of this scheme: people in regional development councils, financial institutions, people involved in the network of overseas chambers of commerce and business councils, and other interested parties. Will the Minister say what initiatives have been taken in order to ensure that all those who can assist in this process, which is manifestly beneficial to the State, are aware of the existence of the scheme; that South Australia now participates in the scheme; and, if nothing has been done, when any initiative is likely to take place in order to maximise the benefits to the State by attracting as many business migrants as possible and their moneys to this State?

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

SEXIST LANGUAGE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make an explanation before directing a question to the Minister for the Status of Women a question about sexist language.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Liberal code of conduct states:

Ministers must accept the standards of conduct which are higher than those applying to others having office in the Parliament or the wider community.

Certainly, a number of individuals have commented to me that this is a very reasonable statement and would imply that domineering and dismissive behaviour is not acceptable by Ministers. The Minister for Health in another place has already been widely criticised a few months ago for his use of racist language in this Parliament. He has now used sexist and demeaning language by addressing the shadow Minister for Health as 'baby', saying, 'Just hang on, baby' to her in the course of debate, and this is recorded in *Hansard*. My questions to the Minister are—

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I rise on a point of order, Mr President. This question directly refers to a debate in the other place. It is therefore subject to a ruling of the Speaker in another place, and I would ask, Mr President, that you rule it out of order.

The PRESIDENT: I believe that the explanation is not the question. There is no point of order.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: My questions to the Minister are:

1. Does the Minister condone the use of sexist language, such as 'baby' to an adult woman by the Minister for Health?
2. Does the Minister for Health refer to the Minister for Transport (his sister-in-law) as 'baby' during Cabinet meetings or in other formal situations?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am sorry that the honourable member has not had an opportunity to speak with

her colleague in the other place because she would realise that the Minister for Health had taken the first opportunity—when he realised a private comment was in *Hansard*—to ring the shadow Minister for Health, explain that it was a private comment and apologise and that his apology was accepted.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

BLAIKIE, Dr D.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about *South Australian Superannuation Fund v. Blaikie*.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: In September 1995 the Supreme Court, under Justice Olsson, handed down a decision in respect of a claim by Dr Blaikie, the former Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission, for a retrenchment pension following the termination of his appointment. There was a flurry of misdirected comment about the case at the time and there was some suggestion that there might be an appeal against the decision. Has an appeal been instituted and, if not, why not?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Members will recall that this case involved an application by Dr Blaikie to the Superannuation Fund for the awarding of a retrenchment rather than a retirement pension. He argued that, as a result of negotiations by the Government with him, he had been retrenched for pension purposes rather than voluntarily agreeing to the termination of his contract and appointment as Chairman of the Health Commission. The Superannuation Fund Board decided that he was not entitled to a retrenchment pension, he took that matter to the Supreme Court, and that was the issue that was determined by that court. At the time of the decision, which was about mid-September, there had been some public discussion whether the matter should be the subject of an appeal. That is ultimately a matter for the Superannuation Fund Board, but it involved the Government because of the revenue impacts of the judgment made by Justice Olsson.

The negotiations were directed towards endeavouring to find a resolution of the issues, particularly in relation to the retrenchment pension. As a result of the various negotiations, a settlement was reached, and in consequence there has not been an appeal. The settlement has been satisfactorily resolved. There was no confidentiality agreement in place as a result of the negotiations, so I feel at liberty to tell the Council what the terms of the settlement were. That is to be contrasted with some of the previous Government's negotiations where commercial confidentiality or other arrangements for confidentiality were in place and which, in a sense, subverted the authority of the Parliament.

It should be said that the settlement represents a significant saving to the Government of the long-term cost of the judgment. The saving of that long-term cost is between \$268 000 and \$363 000. Both Treasury and the Crown Solicitor's office have confirmed the advantageous nature of the settlement. The terms of the settlement are that there is to be a payment by the State of \$450 000, which is in addition to the \$250 000 paid at the time of termination of the contract, a reduction of Dr Blaikie's pension entitlement from a retrenchment pension of \$70 698 per annum from the date of termination of his contract to age 55 or 60, which depends on his age of preserved retirement, to a retirement pension of

\$44 953 per annum, assuming preservation to age 55, or \$51 126 per annum, assuming preservation to age 60.

Under Justice Olsson's judgment, Dr Blaikie was retrenched, but the Government disputed that. The judge made that determination, and unless it was taken on appeal to test that point that position stood in relation to Dr Blaikie. In consequence of that decision by Justice Olsson, Dr Blaikie had a statutory right to a retrenchment pension from the date of termination of his employment. The \$250 000 paid to him at the time of termination does not affect his statutory right to a pension, and the payment is categorised as compensation for the termination of employment: for example, breach of contract, loss of reputation, loss of opportunity and other heads of compensation.

The judgment places Dr Blaikie in a position where he would have been double dipping and enjoying both the termination payment and the pension. The settlement means that there is a saving to the Government of between \$268 000 and \$363 000, that double dipping is avoided and thus the taxpayers get value for the original payment of \$250 000, and that the prospect of the judgment being used as a precedent is substantially reduced. Another potential consequence was that, in the event of any appeal, if there was a finding that he had not been effectively retrenched, the Government might have had him back as the CEO of the Health Commission, and that was not consistent with the Government's wishes.

Assuming preservation to age 55 and Dr Blaikie's becoming entitled to a retirement pension of \$44 935 per annum, the loss involved in paying the retrenchment pension after age 55 represents a continuing loss of \$25 763 per annum in today's figures. Assuming preservation to age 60—and we have to remember that there is a distinction to be made, depending on the age to which the pension might have been preserved by Dr Blaikie—and his becoming entitled to a retirement pension of \$51 126 per annum, the loss involved in paying the retrenchment pension after age 60 represents a continuing loss of \$19 569 per annum in today's figures. In achieving a satisfactory settlement of this matter, we have to weigh the advantages and disadvantages, but, on balance, there is a substantial saving to taxpayers on the long-term cost of the judgment by entering into the settlement which has been reached.

BANK SA BUILDING

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Treasurer, a question about the Bank SA building.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: In the *Advertiser* today there is an article about the value of the Bank SA building having plummeted to \$50 million. The article states:

SANTOS. . . has leased the top three floors of the building. . . and secured the naming rights in a deal brokered by the Government Asset Management Division. . . Mr Baker said he could not release financial details of the deal.

As SANTOS is one of the Liberal Party's biggest donors at State and Federal level and in order to avoid any accusations of favouritism to companies which donate to the Liberal Party, will the Treasurer provide this Council with the full financial details surrounding this transaction?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There was an apt description of the Centre Left and its membership in the *Advertiser* this morning, which my temperate nature prevents me from

repeating in the Legislative Council, but I would refer members to the report and its apt description of members of the Centre Left. I will refer that question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

AUDIT OVERVIEW

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (28 September).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Premier has provided the following information.

1. As indicated in the ministerial statement by the honourable the Premier on 27 September 1995, a group of senior executives comprising the chief executives of the Departments of Premier and Cabinet, Treasury and Finance and Attorney-General's, and the Director of the Office of Public Sector Reform, has been asked to provide advice to Cabinet on the policy issues which arise from the report of the Auditor-General. In particular, the group has been asked to develop a more precisely defined prudential management framework and function within the public sector to ensure probity and integrity matters continue to be given proper consideration. The need for a prudential management function arises because of the fundamental changes taking place in public administration with the increasing use of competitive tendering and contracting out of Government services. Prudential management will ensure effective coordination in the consideration of commercial, legal and financial issues involved negotiating processes and set clear rules to ensure the probity of the processes at all times.

2. While the Auditor-General did not question the legality of the transactions, he advised that the mechanism used is not considered to have been foreseen by, nor be in the spirit of, previous practices and existing legislation. The Government's wish to ensure full accountability to Parliament is reflected in the decision to reverse the transactions following advice to the Under Treasurer from the Auditor-General.

3. The Government will consider the adequacy of the existing legislative framework and the format of information provided to Parliament in respect of interest costs.

WOMEN, IMAGE

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the honourable member of the time.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister for Health a question about the Body Image and Eating Disorder Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Recently I attended a lunch-time seminar organised by the Women's Electoral Lobby on the topic 'Images of women.' We were addressed by the eating disorders project officer from the Eastern Community Health Service. Her presentation evaluated advertising aimed at women and, using an audio visual presentation, she was able to point out to us information about the anorexic states of many top fashion models, their consequent need for breast implants, as their bodies have no fat tissue, and how some models are even having their floating ribs surgically removed because they stick out as a result of being so painfully thin. I was so impressed by what I heard that, when the opportunity came to ask questions, I asked whether she was able to get out into schools to talk to adolescent and even pre-pubescent girls about the con-job being done on them by the advertising industry. Her response was that they would like to and they are trying to, but they are limited by funding. I quote from the 1993-94 annual report from the Eastern Community Health Service—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Time has expired.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport): Notwithstanding that the honourable member was alerted to little time being available, I move:

Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the honourable member to ask her question and for me to reply.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Mr President, does that allow me to continue the explanation?

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: No; ask the question.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I'll ask it tomorrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 10 October. Page 107.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. South Australia's first woman Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell, has brought to the Vice Regal Office great dignity and an awareness about issues facing all South Australians, regardless of their age or background. In particular, Dame Roma has a special interest and understanding of the important issues for Aboriginal people in our community. Dame Roma has a sense of duty admired by all South Australians, and a keen sense of history. It is this balance that would be so important if South Australia responds to the political and constitutional changes required to take Australia to full nationhood in the next century.

The programs outlined by the Government for the forthcoming period did not mention the most significant aspects of the Government's political, economic and social agenda. Accordingly, my address will be concerned with the things not mentioned in the Governor's speech: the decisions about which no mention was made before the last election or decisions that totally fly in the face of the promises made by the Liberals in opposition, and the decisions of Executive Government for which the Government has no mandate.

It is things that are not mentioned in the Governor's speech that are central to the political debate in this State, and central to the interests and welfare of ordinary South Australians—massive cuts to education, health and police, and secret deals to privatise the operation of our water supply. This is a Liberal Party which promised us from opposition to maintain existing standards and spend more on education and health, and to increase the number of police.

The Premier also promised 'to improve the representation of the people and to make Government more accountable to the people through Parliament'. So why is Parliament not allowed to debate any legislation on the privatisation of the management of South Australia's water? If the sell off and the management of control of our water is so much in the interests of South Australia, as the Premier and his Minister for Infrastructure maintain, why are they so frightened of bringing the contract before Parliament for consideration? If the case for privatisation really does make sense, why is the Government spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in slick, one-sided advertising rather than giving South Australians a real say. This Liberal Government behaves more like a secret service than a democratic Government. It is a Government that believes that, by throwing money at the media, through advertising and sponsorship, it will buy political support.

It involves not just the issue of water. There has been the failure to release documents requested in February relating to the Government's mishandling of the Garibaldi HUS crisis.

The Opposition has been questioning that in this place to no avail, because the Hon. Mr Julian Stefani does not see fit to answer any questions, despite his position. There has been the use of courts to deny the Opposition access to basic information relating to the contract, privatising, operation and management of the Modbury Hospital. When a community with legitimate interest was refused access to the SARDI-commissioned report on a draft management plan for a whale sanctuary zone at the head of the Great Australian Bight, the Ombudsmen finally forced the Primary Industries Minister to release a report, stating that there appeared to have been 'a misuse of the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act'. Even information about whales is suppressed by the Government!

The foundation for any successful economy is a first-class system of public education. The Premier talks about South Australia becoming internationally competitive. If so, it makes no sense to follow the example of countries that are the losers in the game of international competition by not investing in education. Targeting schools and TAFE for cuts makes no sense. Education is the engine room of our economy, the backbone of our society. I have a fundamental belief that a strong public education system is a pre-condition to a growing economy and a just and equal society—not a result of it. To be a successful country economically and socially, we need to invest in our intellectual infrastructure.

The Premier should have used his recent overseas tour to look at some of the successful economies and societies, because there is a direct link between the education and skills of a work force, and the standard of living of a nation. Enterprises go where the work force is the most highly skilled. This is not a matter of choice for them; it is a matter of being competitive. Very little patriotism is involved. Third-world skills demand third-world wages. The successful countries have known this for a long time. Only through education can we create true opportunities so that young people choose lives of promise over lives of personal and social destructiveness. Knowledge and work skills offer hope. They are only the source of economic mobility available to hundreds of thousands of South Australians.

At the last election, the Premier promised there would be no cuts to education and that spending would increase in 1994-95. The Government then broke this promise by budgeting for an annual cut of \$40 million by 1997. Class sizes were increased, and the numbers of teachers and support staff slashed. The 1994 budget required a cut of 372 full-time teaching positions, and a further reduction of 50 other teaching positions, a total of 422 staff. However, in just seven months to January 1995, the department approved 930 separation packages, and the total number of staff fell by 1 066.

In February, the Minister for Education announced that falling enrolments would result in cuts of up to another 200 jobs. Then again in June the Minister announced further cuts of 250 school service officers and another 100 teachers, a total of over 1 600 jobs in just one year. The latest decision to cut the equivalent of 250 full-time school service officers at the start of 1996 has been opposed by the entire education community.

Given that the Government promised to increase spending on education, why have these decisions been made? It is because this Government has reneged on all its major promises concerning education and has cut \$40 million from the budget to fund its other priorities. Millions of dollars are being spent on programs such as 'Going all the way',

changing logos on buses, and Government PR at the expense of our kids' education. Even worse has been the Government's total lack of vision in education and children's services. We are going backwards instead of protecting the position of South Australia as a national leader in education.

I particularly want to mention the need to accelerate the development of information technology programs in our schools. The Finn report, 'Young people's participation in post-compulsory education and training', concluded that there are certain essential things that all young people need to learn in their preparation for employment. These have been called 'the key competencies'. One of those competencies is the capacity to use technology. This is now an essential skill and a prerequisite learning tool for students. However, inequities are emerging as a result of different levels of access to and availability of programs in our schools. Some private schools are well ahead of public sector schools. There are now new divisions and inequities between students: those who have access to this technology and those who do not; those who are computer literate and those who are not. There is an urgent need for a comprehensive policy for information technology programs in South Australian schools.

While Premier Brown promised the development of technology based industries, the Government has failed to address the development of information technology in our education system to a satisfactory extent. Last year, the Minister even withheld the allocation to schools of \$360 000 under the computer grants scheme. If our children are to be equipped to fill the new jobs in information technology related industries, the Government must act now and provide adequate funding and resources for the introduction of IT curriculum across the system and the accompanying teacher training that will be required to fulfil this program.

There is also a crisis in the management of capital works expenditure on education facilities. In 1994-95, lack of coordination between programming and construction resulted in the budget being underspent by \$22 million. Actual expenditure was down \$10 million on the previous year and at least seven major school projects slipped a budget. The Minister's excuse was that these projects were delayed by planning and design considerations, but the fact remains that if projects were not cleared for construction the funds should have been used for other priorities: projects should have been substituted by other urgent works which had construction clearance, but instead the funds were returned to Treasury. It was a con, a sleight of hand to make the Government's program look good—hype versus reality.

The capital works shortfall also included \$9 million allocated for minor works and maintenance, and there can be no excuse for not achieving this urgently needed expenditure. Of even greater concern is the decision to make the program for the construction of new schools and the redevelopment of existing facilities dependent on funds from the sale of school property. The Minister says that the capital works budget is now conditional upon revenue from the sale of assets. His view is that his department is lucky to be able to keep these funds. This is simply unacceptable. It is little wonder that the capital works program is in a shambles.

I mentioned earlier that school enrolments have fallen. At the beginning of 1995, enrolments fell by 4 000, and the Minister seized on the moment to announce that up to a further 200 teachers could be cut from the system. This reduction in enrolments coupled with a serious decline in retention levels should have set the alarm bells ringing. Before gloating over how much money this would save, any

Minister with a genuine commitment to the education of our kids would have wanted to know where they had gone. Retention rates to year 12 fell from 93 per cent in 1993 to 76 per cent in 1994, and a further 4 000 students left the system in 1995. It is recognised that students who complete year 12 have a fundamental advantage in developing to their full potential through further full-time education or employment based development. It should be a matter of grave concern when one in four of our kids opt out and deny themselves these opportunities.

This Government seems more interested in spending money on other things. Let us look at the past 20 years. The full-time youth labour market employing 15 to 19-year-olds has fallen from 510 000 in 1975 to 260 000 this year. Full-time jobs for our young school leavers have been halved. There has been a revolution in our economy and our labour market. The gap brought about by the halving of full-time jobs for our young people over the past 20 years was filled by the conscious expansion of public education by governments and Ministers who over a decade ago showed a better understanding of what the 1990s would be like than this Minister shows today.

I would like to turn now to the area of health under this Government's regime. During the first 18 months of the Brown Liberal Government, there have been massive cuts to health services, huge cuts at a time when patient demand for health services is growing and has strained hospitals and other health services to the limit. Let us recall the promises. In its pre-election promise, the Government stated that a Liberal Government would encourage management efficiencies within the public hospital system which, according to union representatives and hospital administrators, would create savings of between \$40 million and \$50 million a year, which would then be returned to the health system to improve patient services. It went on to say that a Liberal Government would allocate an additional \$6 million annually to public hospitals to allow 2 700 additional operations to be performed, and that it would undertake a comprehensive capital works program to redress the deficiencies presently being identified in the system. These were just some of the promises, some of the undertakings given by this dishonest Government to the electors of South Australia.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: The honourable member may well laugh, but the people—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: We haven't lost \$6 billion. Just once, will you apologise for that?

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: —will recall what you have done in the areas of education and health when they go to the polls the next time around. They will remember. In its first budget the Brown Government cut \$33 million from the health budget and committed itself to slashing a further \$32 million over the next two years. It now appears that, in real terms, cuts to the health budget in 1995-96 will be more than \$40 million with the greatest burden of those cuts falling on our major hospitals. All these savings have been taken by the Government to spend elsewhere. Savings have not been returned to patient services. These cuts have occurred in spite of additional Commonwealth payments under the Medicare Agreement of over \$25 million in 1994-95 and an extra \$75 million in 1995-96. The \$6 million extra promised for waiting lists turned out to be a pea in a thimble trick: \$6 million was taken out of the allocation to hospitals and placed in a casemix bonus pool. Not surprisingly, the casemix pool was depleted in only three months.

The number of staff in public hospitals has fallen by over 1 000 since the last election with hundreds of nursing jobs having been lost. The Brown Government is not committed to a first class publicly run hospital system. The Chief Executive of the Health Commission told a national conference in Sydney earlier this year that the core business of the commission is not to operate hospitals and other health services. One wonders what it is. The Brown Government believes that private managers should run our public hospitals and health services. Following the privatisation of the management of Modbury Hospital in February, the Brown Government has announced a shortlist of tenderers for the Port Augusta Hospital and that a new private hospital will be built adjacent to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital may also be privatised. In order to justify the privatisation of health services, the Brown Government claims that its Modbury Hospital deal will save \$6 million per year.

However, the Government has strenuously refused to provide any details of the contract with Healthscope, and the claims of savings cannot be substantiated. Labor says, 'Hands off our fundamentals; hands off our hospitals.'

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Who said that?

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: The whole community is saying that now, Mr Lucas. There is a crisis in our hospitals and it is time for the Premier to intervene. When senior hospital medical staff, who have dedicated their lives to the care and well being of South Australians, say that people's lives are now at risk because of the Brown Government's budget cuts to hospitals, then the Government had better listen.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: If you are happy to have people die in public hospitals then go ahead.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: That is what your Government is doing. The Premier should visit the public hospitals and see what damage he has done. I have been in the public hospitals lately and I know just what the Government is doing. In Victoria, the Premier, Jeff Kennett, visited the hospitals in January this year before admitting that his Government's policies were wrong, and he immediately allocated an extra \$89 million in cash to bail-out the hospitals. At least he had the political sense and decency to recognise a crisis his Government had created. The Brown Liberal Government is now in its mid-term. Despite the media hype, it has presided over the worst economic growth rates in the nation and has consistently given us anaemic growth in jobs and an unemployment rate that has varied only between being the worst in the nation and the second worst in the nation. It has cut deep into the funding of our public schools and hospitals and into their ability to fully cater for the needs of students and patients. It has savaged vocational training and education. It has cut funding for police and reduced the personal security of the vulnerable.

It has distinguished itself as the Government most likely to persist in a politically lopsided waste of taxpayers' dollars on a royal commission into the beliefs of Aborigines, called on the basis of one interviewee who has since recanted his story. Last Friday, there was a demonstration about the Brown Government's actions in the royal commission. At that demonstration a statement was read to the people from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, Michael Dodson, and the Sex Discrimination

Commissioner, Sue Walpole. I would like to read that letter into *Hansard*:

We are sorry that we cannot be with you today. We are deeply saddened that the Hindmarsh Island Bridge Royal Commission continues. It continues despite all the opposition. It continues despite clear evidence of its inappropriateness and despite its attack on the fundamental human rights of Ngarrindjeri women. It continues to plough its destructive path through the lives of those women and the lives of all indigenous Australians. Let's not mince words about what is at the heart of this royal commission. Let's be clear that we won't be fooled by the rhetoric of the South Australian Government as it dresses up the crassness and social injustice of this royal commission in the finery of legal impartiality, openness and objectivity, in the guise of a quest for the 'truth'.

There is no need for a royal commission to discover the truth, we already know what it is. There are several blinding truths about the Hindmarsh Island Bridge Royal Commission. Truths that the media has given little air play and few soundbites. Truths the South Australian Government is aggressively trying to hide. These truths characterise the appalling experience of those of you who are fighting to keep your secrets and to protect your cultural and spiritual integrity from destruction. The first truth is that the royal commission is racist.

The royal commission is based on a long held belief that indigenous knowledge, indigenous culture and indigenous people are unworthy of recognition and protection by the legal system because of their race. It is based on the racist idea that the culture and secret business of indigenous peoples in this country should take second place to the economic and political interests of non-indigenous Australia.

It is based on the racist presumption that all indigenous people are untrustworthy and must have their religious beliefs and the legitimacy of their culture tested by a non-indigenous legal system that casts itself as the ultimate purveyor of truth.

The second terrible truth is that the Hindmarsh Island Bridge Royal Commission is sexist. It casts women as second rate citizens unworthy of protection and whose claims are illegitimate in the face of the legal system. The commission implicitly denies women a role as custodians of land, as managers of country with power and standing in the community. It denies the role of women as spiritual leaders with access to secret information. The commission paints women as liars, as witches who have fabricated secrets and shrouded the truth in mystery. It suggests that women are not credible witnesses and that they are obstructionist.

The third truth is that the royal commission reflects the complicated interplay between racism and sexism that has characterised the treatment of the Ngarrindjeri women throughout the whole sordid affair. The royal commission and the media deny the legitimacy of the knowledge of the Ngarrindjeri women in large part because it is based on secrets about reproduction and about country. In the non-indigenous community such knowledge and such ways of knowing are considered unworthy of protection and subservient to the knowledge and ways of white men.

The final, and perhaps the most damning of truths, is that the Hindmarsh Island Bridge Royal Commission is a mirror which reflects the ugly truth about non indigenous Australia. It reflects the total lack of commitment—

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Mr President, I rise on a point of order. This material being read into *Hansard* by the Leader is a direct reflection upon a royal commission which is presently sitting and is contrary to Standing Orders. This is an attack upon the royal commission.

The PRESIDENT: I have listened to the material and I did comment to the Leader of the Opposition that I thought it was bordering on being *sub judice*. I uphold the point of order that has been made, on the basis that the Leader of the Opposition is reading a letter into *Hansard* which reflects on the royal commission. I rule that it is *sub judice* and I ask that the Leader not continue to do that, or to comment on it.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Mr President, this letter is a matter of public knowledge. It has been circulated widely in this State. It has been discussed in the media. I fail to see that it is a matter *sub judice*. I am not commenting about the matters before the royal commission.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have ruled that you are reflecting on the royal commission and I ask you not to do that.

The Hon. Sandra Kanck: It needs reflecting on.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I take up the comments of the honourable member—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member's interjection is quite out of order and I ask her not to do it again.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Mr President, I think it is a pity that this letter cannot be read in its entirety; but for any reader of *Hansard* who does want a copy of it I will be only too happy to circulate it widely, to make sure that everybody in this State knows exactly what the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, Michael Dodson, and Sex Discrimination Commissioner, Sue Walpole, think about the royal commission in this State. They have every right to make those comments publicly. The fact that we cannot discuss it in this Parliament I consider to be rather a pity. However, Mr President, I will abide by your ruling. We have to understand that there are many issues—including the latest issue about water privatisation—which concern the electorate very much. I understand that the Government will announce very shortly the winner of the bid for the water privatisation—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: They just made it—United Water.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Right. I am sure that the people of South Australia—

The Hon. R.D. Lawson: You will rejoice.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Well, it has been done without any kind of parliamentary scrutiny, and this Government should be ashamed of that. Certainly, we will be attempting to ensure in any way we can that this shameful contract will come before the parliamentary committee so that that committee can scrutinise it.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Let us see; let us see.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Of course I haven't seen it, because it is a secret. Your Government has refused to let it come before the Parliament to be scrutinised. The combined effects of the Government's social neglect, its economic mismanagement and its decision to sell off our basic utilities will be fully felt within the coming years. Far from being the protector of the welfare and prosperity of its citizens, the Government will be seen as having generated new kinds and degrees of inequality. As has happened with all Liberal Governments since the 1970s, the political price will be very high. Unfortunately, the political price will be paid by the people of South Australia, and I am sure they will make known at the next election how they feel about this Government.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I support the motion. I noted in Her Excellency the Governor's Speech her reference to the Southern Expressway, the building of which was announced on 21 March this year by the Premier, Dean Brown. I do not understand why the Government calls it an expressway, rather than a freeway. Regardless of what it is called, the decision to build it was made with no opportunity for community—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: That is quite likely, too. It was done with no opportunity for community consultation

about the proposed route. There has been no serious discussion about whether or not a freeway is the best transport solution for southern Adelaide, and no proper environmental impact assessment has been carried out to guide the project. I believe that these issues must be debated openly and that alternative solutions are placed firmly on the public record.

However, the fact remains that the fundamental question about the most appropriate form of transport for the southern region has not been either posed or answered by the Government. I am alarmed at the short-sighted approaches of both the Government and the Opposition to this issue, because it was the ALP which originally promised a third arterial road to the south. The minimum \$112 million cost to taxpayers of the project can hardly be justified, given a time-saving during peak times of only four to seven minutes in the year 2001.

This is based on the most favourable projections for population growth in southern Adelaide and improved patronage for public transport. The reality is that it will be the least time saved, and I believe that in a short time the extra cars on the freeway will lose that four to seven minutes. To add insult to injury this \$112 million price tag does not include the extra cost to the community which will include ongoing and increasing road maintenance, particularly when the pressure comes on to build a parallel road to it, the allocation of more resources to our health system to deal with the extra pollution related and road accident related health costs and the increased transport costs associated with the longer distances travelled. It does not include the inevitable cost blowouts: \$112 million is the bare minimum price that we can expect. My prediction is that it will be much more than that.

Public money is being wasted to publicise the project, including the funding of an FM radio station. Money spent on this publicity is an abject waste of taxpayers' money. If South Australians are going to have this road foisted on us, whether we want it or not, there is no sense in wasting more taxpayers' money to communicate it to the public. It will happen without the promotion. The \$112 million represents only a part of what has become an ongoing revenue draining juggernaut. A publication of an oil industry and highway interest group, the *Asphalt Institute Quarterly*, from 1967 states:

Every new mile tacked onto the paved road and street system is accompanied by the consumption of about 50 000 additional gallons of motor fuel a year. . . In short we have a self perpetuating cycle, the key element of which is new paved roads. The new miles added to the road network each year accommodate automotive travel, generate fuel consumption and produce road-building revenue. Scratch the new roads and the cycle ceases to function.

In 1995 the road construction lobby would not dare to put that in print, but it remains on record from 1967. So, those with a vested interest in the construction of this road will know that they are being propped up by the taxpayer. Overseas experience, and indeed experience in Sydney, shows us that traffic expands to fill the available road space, and traffic bottlenecks are then created on associated roads. According to Professor Harry Owen from Flinders University of South Australia:

The Government's own analysis of the Southern Expressway is that it will create more pollution and more congestion but that the congestion can be accommodated by building more roads!

The increased exhaust emissions resulting from increased car use will lead to more reported cases of asthma and emphysema and other respiratory illnesses. A draft position paper from the South Australian Council of Churches states, in part:

A number of studies have been done which draw links between the impact of air pollution caused by transport and asthma. In the poorer western suburbs of Sydney one in four schoolchildren have smog-related asthma.

Professor Harry Owen, in another paper written on the Southern Expressway, refers to a report from the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) in 1992 on the subject of transport and health. The NHMRC observed that pollution from motor vehicles has serious adverse effects on health. The pollutants include benzene, which causes cancer; carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas; carbon monoxide, which causes headaches; noise, which causes stress; ozone and nitrogen oxides, which promote asthma; and lots and lots of particles such as asbestos, unburnt fuel and very small particles called PM10s, so-called because they are less than 10 micrometres in diameter. The PM10s are now the subject of much concern in the UK and the US, but for some reason or other are not of concern here, it seems.

In the US, PM10s have been investigated by the Environmental Protection Agency. Their data reveals that, for every increase of 10 milligrams per cubic metre of PM10s, death from heart attack increases by 1.4 per cent; death from bronchitis increases by 3.4 per cent; and reports of asthma attacks increased by 3 per cent. Professor Owen sought data from the South Australian Environmental Protection Agency and its monitoring station on South Road at Thebarton Primary School. He was given figures which show a concentration there of PM10s frequently over 40 milligrams per cubic metre. The NHMRC report states:

The air quality in Adelaide is already bad enough for us to calculate the extra illness from transport pollution. . . The EPA has the data that shows there will be more illness—even more asthma in the young and they will go to hospital more frequently—and the death rate from heart disease in the elderly will go up.

Professor Harry Owen goes on to cite recommendations of the NHMRC which have specific relevance to the Brown Government, as follows:

Australia's NHMRC is so concerned about the consequences of some developments on health and the environment that it has developed a National Framework for Environmental and Health Impact Assessment. Freeways are specifically mentioned as requiring an environmental and health impact assessment.

Obviously, South Australia's Government thinks it knows better than the NHMRC. More cars mean more oil drips, brake dust and tyre rubber onto the roads, so the expressway will also contribute to more polluted run-off into a number of creeks, including the Onkaparinga River and the Sturt Creek. How ironic that we are trying to clean up the Patawalonga! The extension of the freeway to the Onkaparinga River creates the opportunity to open up the Willunga Basin for housing development, and this would not only unnecessarily contribute to Adelaide's urban sprawl but also threaten the ecosystem of that area. This is in direct contradiction to the Government's policy promise to provide a 'green fields buffer to the north-south urban sprawl'.

The Friends of the Willunga Basin wrote to me expressing their grave concerns. The letter states:

The provision of an expressway type road to the very edge of the city's present limits is a huge inducement for massive increases in housing in the margins of Adelaide. It will become virtually impossible to withstand pressure from the development industry to open up the Willunga Basin to broad acre housing development, despite the Government's promise to protect the area from such 'development'.

One of only two plots of the native grass *danthonia linkii var fulva* remaining on the Adelaide Plains has already been

destroyed as construction work begins on the new Darlington police station which is being built before the existing police station is demolished to make way for the freeway. This grass plot could have been saved had the Government not been hell bent on ramming through the Southern Expressway project, resulting in the speeding up of the construction of the police station. Local environmentalists were able to gather seeds from the grasses, which they will attempt to germinate and, with any luck, then plant the seedlings elsewhere. However, it is not the same as having the plants growing in their original, natural habitat.

At the site where the proposed expressway will intersect with Beach Road, with flyovers, underpasses, access ramps, etc., a number of native trees that predate European settlement, including some magnificent tea tree, grey box and native apricot specimens, as well as some native grasses, will also have to be destroyed to make way for the freeway. So, some of the very minimal remnant natural heritage on the Adelaide Plains has been or will be destroyed as a consequence of the construction of this freeway.

To his shame, the Premier, in correspondence with the Adelaide Plains Flora Association, agreed that there would be 'significant damage' to the vegetation on that site. The Premier's solution was for the association to gather seeds and propagate them to make up for what gets ripped up. In his response, the Premier has shown that he does not have the first clue about environmental values. How can a seedling begin to approximate a tree that is somewhere between 150 and 200 years old?

South Australia does not have a pleasing record when it comes to species preservation or the preservation of our natural heritage, and the environmental damage that will result from the expressway will do nothing to enhance the Brown Government's standing on environmental issues. The Government's timetable for the road includes the release of an 'environment report,' whatever that is, which is intended to be exhibited some time in November. This is a cynical exercise by the Government, as it allows very little time for public input before construction begins just a month later. There is no indication at all that the environmental report will be as rigorous as a proper environmental impact assessment—how can it be with that timetable? And there is no indication that the Government will alter the project in any way if any of the findings of the environmental report are adverse to the construction of the road.

A document produced by the Department of Transport entitled 'Southern Expressway Connecting the South—an SA Government project' has that timetable printed on the back. The timetable states:

August to October—environmental studies [but it does not say who will be consulted]; Exhibit environmental report—November 1995; Begin construction—December 1995.

Quite clearly, no provision has been made for any alteration to be made if the public sees things that are wrong. The increased health costs to South Australian taxpayers will be substantial, not to mention the increased contribution to the greenhouse effect. In fact, this one project will make it virtually impossible for South Australia to meet its share of national greenhouse gas emission reductions.

On its own, this freeway will cause the emission of greenhouse gases which will be above the total of the whole State's annual entitlement. A Federal Government document entitled 'Goals and targets for Australia's health in the year 2000 and beyond' shows that 26 per cent of all carbon dioxide produced in Australia in 1987-88 was generated by

domestic transport. The \$112 million price tag, for a road which will service only a few thousand people, is outrageous at a time when our health system has been virtually garrotted by funding cut-backs, and the greater traffic will place further burdens on the health system, as I have already mentioned.

Ironically, as it currently stands, most of the traffic congestion problems occur north of the proposed expressway route—on South Road between Darlington and the city. The new road proposal will only encourage more cars onto these roads and will make these current problems unbearable, hence the Democrat labelling of the project as the 'chokeway'. As well as the environmental, health and economic costs of this road, there is also the question of how the new road impacts on communities and families—communities and families that currently enjoy the reserves and open space along the proposed route of the road.

Although the Government promised before the last election to conduct a family impact statement with every major new project, these have remained the province of Cabinet. South Australians will never know the accuracy, extent or influence of family impact statements on the decisions made by Cabinet as they are not open to public scrutiny. I challenge the Government to prove its *bona fides* to South Australian families by making the family impact statement for the Southern Expressway project available to the public.

The Australian Council of Churches' draft paper, to which I referred earlier, also raised social equity concerns about the project. It states:

Access to cars is not equally distributed across the population. Women, older people and those with major or minor disabilities are more likely to rely on public transport. Adelaide already has the oldest population amongst the mainland capital cities. This is expected to rise with the population over 65 to increase from 11 per cent in 1986 to 20 per cent by the year 2031. In effect, this means the proportion of the population reliant on public transport is set to increase.

It is also an interesting observation that the cities in the world where the private car is the dominant mode of personal transport also tend to have the worst street culture with its associated crime and social problems. It seems to me to be an act of plain stupidity to press ahead with the road, not only because of the health and environmental problems it will create but also because it still does not meet the transport needs of those living further south of Noarlunga Downs. The Southern Expressway project, it seems, has more to do with marginal seats in the southern metropolitan electorates than with any coherent attempt to deal with transport problems in Adelaide.

The traffic problems of the southern suburbs can be solved in the longer term only through a drastic improvement in public transport services and the location of new industries in the area, so that people who live south of O'Halloran Hill are not having to travel out of the area in the morning and in again in the evening to get to and from their jobs. This is where part of the \$112 million could have been better spent.

In Britain, a study conducted by J. Whitehead in 1993 on the M58 and M68 motorways came to this conclusion:

There is simply no evidence of the claimed link between access and employment or economic prosperity. The Emperor has no clothes.

That is something I have been known to say on numerous occasions about the policies of this Government. Whitehead points out that places such as York and Covent Garden, which have very poor access, are actually thriving, so why

does this Government not learn from the international experience? Instead, the Australian Democrats propose an ecologically sustainable alternative to the chokeway—an alternative which meets the needs of current generations without squandering resources or passing on a more degraded environment to future generations. It is a solution proved around the world and is based on the simple aim of getting people out of their cars and on to public transport.

The Democrats propose a light rail system which would run from Tonsley railway station to Darlington and then follow the proposed third road route to the old Willunga rail line to Reynella and Morphett Vale and then through to Seaford. For less than the cost of the proposed freeway, a second light rail system connecting the southern suburbs with the city could be built starting, say, at the Tonsley railway station and proceeding by a number of possible routes to Darlington where it could follow the proposed third arterial road route.

In car-dominated Los Angeles, the Government has recently decided to build a new light rail system to address its massive congestion problems. The opening of the Century freeway there in 1993 (which, by the way, cost \$US200 million per kilometre), saw the end of freeway construction there. Despite the massive freeway network that already exists in Los Angeles, there are huge traffic problems. If it is good enough for LA to opt for light rail, why not for Adelaide?

In Paris, the bureaucrats have found measurable increases in illness as a result of transport pollution, and they are casting around to find a solution. In the daily papers recently members may have seen a photograph of the British Prime Minister, John Major, cycling with a smog mask to cover his mouth and nose. Singapore and Hong Kong have recently opted for rapid transit systems. Toronto decided in the 1950s to move to a rapid transit system when its population was about what Adelaide's is now. By contrast, Toronto's neighbour, just 100 kilometres away, Detroit, is almost entirely car dependent, with only 1 per cent of journeys made on public transport. In consequence, the inner city population continues to drop, whereas Toronto's is thriving.

Light rail would provide much cheaper transport for commuters as well as taxpayers and do far more towards solving southern Adelaide's traffic congestion problem in the long term, not to mention the additional benefits of reduced greenhouse gas emissions, smog and road accidents. It is unfortunate that this Government has chosen to ignore the lessons of Los Angeles, Toronto and other cities, but has instead pushed ahead with this road project to the detriment of our health, our environment and our State's budget. Rather than show some creative vision for the future, it has chosen a 1960s solution, a future which does not take into account the shortages of transport fuels. In fact, the whole concept of freeways is based on using a non-renewable resource and to hell with the future.

Last year, a Royal Commission on Transport and the Environment, established by the British Government, concluded that the health and environmental consequences of private car use were so dire that there should be a halt to all major road building. The royal commission also recommended that fuel tax in Britain be increased progressively to reflect the true cost of what economic rationalists call 'externalities' and that the extra revenue raised be spent on public transport and better urban planning. A paper published in the *British Medical Journal* this year showed an increased death rate among people living close to freeways.

One has to ask whether the Premier, his Cabinet, the road planners and the shareholders of the companies which want to build the freeway will be living near it and, if not, why not. Their responses would be very revealing, I expect. The Darlington chokeway is an outmoded and disproved solution to the problem of moving people—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: That's right. This is an outmoded and disproved solution to the problem of moving people, and it will create more problems than it will solve.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I support the motion and thank Her Excellency for the delivery of her address to this Parliament. Whilst I am a republican, I must say that having a Governor such as the one we have now makes the present situation just about bearable.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Make her President.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I would be quite happy for Dame Roma to be President. She would be an excellent choice. I make the point that, for so long as we have Governors, if we have people such as Dame Roma I am grateful for that much.

I want to touch on a couple of issues today. The first relates to poker machines. Members who were in this place when the legislation first went through are aware that I was vigorously opposed to the introduction of gaming machines in South Australia. I foresaw the difficulties. I think that my record on issues such as drugs shows a generally libertarian approach. I argued at the time that it was not as if people did not have ample opportunities to gamble or that we had a problem that needed resolution which required bringing gaming machines in. It was simply that clubs and hotels saw gaming machines as an additional source of funds—nothing more or less. I think that certain politicians also saw them as a potential source of funds. They probably judged that they were unlikely to make a contribution, but they did not mind if others did. I do not think many people who supported them did so for libertarian reasons, because some of those supporters are opposed to other changes that libertarians have called for.

Unfortunately, the problems that we predicted with poker machines are coming to pass. In recent times a number of people known personally to me have mentioned close relatives who have lost significant sums of money through poker machines. One is a close relative of mine. I will not say any more than that because I do not want to identify that person. That person has lost \$30 000 on poker machines in four months, and the family is about to sell a significant asset to pay the debts that have accrued. When I was first alerted to this person's problems, I rang the Australian Hotels Association. I was hoping that it might have been prepared to intervene in some way, because I noted in the legislation that it was possible for a hotelier or club owner to ban a person. Therefore, I was hoping that the AHA would say, 'We will look into this. We will talk to the people who run the hotels and perhaps persuade them to use their powers.' This person went to two particular hotels all the time. Instead, the AHA said, 'They can go to Lifeline, which is being funded to work with people who are addicted.' The problem is that this person is not admitting to addiction; this person still does not admit that they have a problem. This is true of addicts of many sorts: they do not admit that they have a problem, despite the clear and obvious losses that they are suffering. The attitude of the Australian Hotels Association was to wipe its hands of the problem.

What I found particularly objectionable was that the hotels involved were giving this person birthday presents, inviting them in for dinner, giving them flowers and other sorts of things. They knew where the money was coming from; they knew that they were getting tens of thousands of dollars straight out of this person's bank account—nothing more, nothing less—and they were giving gifts and being very generous in a superficial manner.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: Are you going to name the hotels?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I think that I should; I have been giving it earnest consideration. I have not named anybody at this stage, including the person at the AHA to whom I spoke, but I believe that such behaviour is nothing less than immoral. I believe the time will come when clubs and hotels which have addicts and which continue to prey upon their addiction deserve to be named in this place.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: They deserve to be outed.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: They deserve to be outed. Within a week of my being involved in this case, another person whom I know well came to see me. This case also involved a close relative, a mother-in-law, who was losing \$1 000 a week in poker machines and had clocked up losses again in the tens of thousands of dollars.

As I understand it, the family home may have been at risk in this case. Cases are coming up that are close to me involving people I know well. How many cases are out there, I do not know. In the second case, I heard exactly the same sorts of stories. What are the hotels and the clubs doing? They are giving gifts to these people and all sorts of things to encourage them back. Blow me down, if I was not doing a media interview, when a person from the media, part of the crew that was talking to me, said how they had been having problems themselves. They knew they had a problem in the Casino. They asked the Casino to no longer allow them to use EFTPOS at the Casino, and the Casino refused. The Casino would not do it. This person did not want the EFTPOS facility to be used, and the Casino said 'No'. Here was a person desperate to help themselves who, even on request, was denied that possibility.

I have received further information about hotels in which people are using EFTPOS for betting (and EFTPOS facilities are now available in most places, so the cash is readily available). I understand hotels are cashing cheques, which I believe they are not supposed to do. I have had reports of people getting cash from their credit card but doing a deal with the hotel such that it gets written down as a meal, so their family does not know that they are getting money to use on poker machines. The hotels are entering into a conspiracy with the people who have a problem, and enabling that problem to continue. There is a huge immorality of behaviour by people with regard to this issue.

I have listened with some interest to, first, groups from the community service sector saying, 'We want a super tax so that we can help these people who have problems.' I rang up SACOSS and spoke to people there, and argued with them that a super tax will not help the people with the problems. I note that, at its convention recently, the Labor Party supported it, and I know some Government members have supported it. I would like to put an argument to members in this place, which I hope they will consider: if people are losing sums of money at the levels I am talking about, and if they do not go to agencies which offer help—and these people are not doing so—how will any super tax help them? How will you ever identify people with problems and assist

them? How can you target it, in any fair and reasonable manner, and all the shades of grey that occur in this issue? I simply do not think you can. It is not efficient. What you are saying is, 'Let's make money out of all this pain and then try to use the money you've made to try to address the pain in a way that you know will be totally inadequate.'

We must look at the way poker machines themselves operate. I have always had the preference that we not have them. But we could keep them and ameliorate the pain quite significantly. That is the proposition I want to put to members for consideration. The major reason people are losing so much on poker machines is that you can insidiously lose money at quite rapid rates: every time you press a button, on average, you will lose 12.7 per cent. At this stage, about half will go to the hotels and half to the Government. I do not know the exact figures, but that is not too important now. Every time you make a bet, it is about 12.7 per cent. I have done an estimation, based on the fact that the largest machine is a \$1 machine: you could bet about \$20 a minute, using \$1 coins, and you could place multiple bets; you could bet \$10 a time. So, even feeding in the coins and pressing the button, you could get through about \$20 a minute, which means you could bet \$1 200 an hour on a poker machine. At 12.7 per cent, on average, you could lose \$150 an hour. At three hours a night, five nights a week, 50 weeks a year, you could lose \$100 000 a year, and that is at average rates of loss. I do not think any of my figures are unreasonable; they help to understand how those people lose those sorts of sums of money.

I ask the hypothetical question: what if you remove the dollar machines and go back to 50¢ machines, and if you do not allow multiple betting and reduce the 12.7 per cent back to 6.3 per cent? If you do those three things, that is, reduce the maximum coinage, do not allow multiple betting, and halve that 12.7 per cent back to 6.3 per cent, and someone plays the same number of hours per night, nights of the week, weeks of the year, the average loss will be \$5 000 a year—\$5 000 a year as against \$100 000. Any one of those things will change it. If you get rid of multiple betting, you will immediately reduce the maximum possible loss to 10 per cent of what it is. If you halve the maximum coins, you immediately halve the potential loss and, if you halve the tax and the hotel's take, again you will halve the loss. If you compound those three together, you will reduce it to 5 per cent of what it is.

If the argument of hotels is that they just want to provide entertainment and get people through their doors, that argument will continue to stand. If in reality it is a way of making money for jam, let us be honest about it. I ask members to consider any one of those three options as a genuine way of reducing the pain that is being caused to people. They could go and play poker machines to their heart's content, because they simply will not have enough hours in the day or weeks in the year to lose the money they are losing. If we put a super tax on—and I presume that that is not an extra on top of the 12.7 per cent, because if it is extra on 12.7 per cent, it means they will lose money even faster; I presume it is taking money away from the hotels and giving it to the Government—it would still mean that people will lose at 12.7 per cent of every bet they have.

You have to reduce the loss per push of the button because, on average, every time you push the button you are losing. That is where we should be intervening. If people are genuinely trying to stop those serious cases of the effects of poker machines but want to keep poker machines as a form

of entertainment, then they can do it that way. It could become a relatively cheap form of entertainment and do no great harm. It still could cost \$5 000 a year, but I suspect that people who are addicted to tobacco would spend such amounts of money, too. At present, this addiction is doing far more damage to people than any other addiction of which I know.

Of course, there are two other things we should be doing at the same time: perhaps we should be looking at prescribing the number of machines that they have which may be of different denominations and insisting that a large percentage of the machines be lower denominations. Many people want those. Finally, we should make a requirement of hotels and clubs that, if they know they have an addict—and they do know, in at least the worst examples—then they should be required to do something mandatorily. That is not an unreasonable request. If they have a person who is under the influence of alcohol, the law requires them now not to serve such people drinks. If they can have that requirement put on them, they can also have a requirement put on them such that, if they know a person is losing large sums of money in their hotel, they should be required to ban them and use the power which is there under the Act.

The Hon. G. Weatherill interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: That is exactly the point I was making. They have had to exercise that requirement relating to drinking for some years, and they can exercise the other. We should be doing a range of things, but the super tax will not solve the problem.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: It will solve the Government's problem of finance.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: That's right. The Government will get more money: I can see it jumping at it. If the Hotels Association hears my proposal, I should imagine it would prefer the super tax, because my proposal would not let them milk out of people the money they are milking out of some people now. There is a suggestion already that there are machines to take \$5 and \$10 notes. You pay as well put a direct electronic link into the person's bank account, in some cases, because that is effectively what we are doing. We have EFTPOS sitting in there; they go back to the poker machines and lose heaps.

The next issue I want to touch on is that of water. The Government has been making some noises about the Murray-Darling system saying that it wishes to do something to protect it. I note that even the Prime Minister has recently taken some interest in this issue. An article in the *Advertiser* of 16 October entitled 'Keating warns on water use', states:

Population growth and modern lifestyles were placing increasing demands on water resources, the Prime Minister, Mr Keating, said yesterday. Although the agricultural sector accounted for most water usage, domestic consumption was up to 650 litres per person a day in some urban areas.

The article concludes:

Australians had to reduce water usage and protect valuable waterways to ensure the quality of the limited resource was maintained. 'I urge every Australian to use water more wisely, to save water, save money and save the environment', Mr Keating said.

Having read that, I also read an article in the *Financial Review* of the same day entitled '\$1 million for Murray River water', which states:

Prices for Murray River water reached record levels of \$650 a megalitre last week in the latest water auction conducted by the Sunraysia Rural Water Authority.

Without going through the whole of the article, it states that the Victorians have been installing more efficient systems of irrigation—particularly getting rid of open irrigation channels, some of which lose up to 95 per cent of the water that flows through them—and, having saved that water, they are now selling it again. I will not go further into that at this stage, but—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: \$650?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: They paid \$650 per megalitre to get the licence right. I think there would still be a charge on top of that. They note that the average price is \$400 a megalitre. The highest price at auction, I think 12 months ago, was about \$500 a megalitre, and they say how wonderful this is because the State will make a lot more money. An article in the *Mount Barker Courier* entitled 'Turning water into wine' refers to the Langhorne Creek area, which has just had a private system installed. It states that water is being pumped from Lake Alexandrina to 42 farms and that it appears that there is a suggestion that this pipeline will supply more farmers in the future.

That is all a little *ad hoc*, and I have grave concerns because neither the Federal Government nor the State Government have yet put together a comprehensive view of what we are trying to achieve in the Murray-Darling system. I think we should set a target of the total amount of water that we will use from the Murray-Darling system, so that the long-term health of the river is guaranteed. There is no doubt that already the Murray-Darling is being over-used, particularly the Darling section. However, overall, the Murray-Darling system is already having too much water taken out of it. The first thing that we should do is set a sustainable use target from the system. Only then should we start to grant new licences in relation to water that we have perhaps saved as a result of efficiencies. At this stage, the basic question of how much water can sustainably be used has not been answered, yet Mr Brown has given water to people in Strathalbyn—I am not saying that giving water to these people is not a good thing in the long term, but it should be part of a long-term plan—and the Victorians are happily selling off licences for new water usage.

We go from there to look at what the cotton growers in the Cooper system want to do. The point I make about both these matters is that there is a need for a whole of catchment management plan—something that the Government is supporting and talking about—and on the basis of that, decisions should be made. I call on the Government to grant no further licences and give no further water to anyone until a whole of catchment management plan exists, particularly in terms of the total quantity of water that will be used, and that should be subjected to the greatest amount of scientific scrutiny possible. The economists should be kept out until the scientists are finished. Let the agricultural economists argue about how the water can best be used after we have decided what a sustainable yield from the river system will be.

As someone who lived at Renmark for six years and before that at Swan Reach for two years, I recall when the Darling still had water coming down it. The growers used to comment about the Darling water being sweet water. It was certainly very white, full of clay, but that was just its source. That water was always low in salt and always improved the quality of the soil. Farmers were happy to use it for irrigation and saw it as a benefit. The fact is that the Darling is hardly ever flowing. People upstream, particularly cotton growers but also rice growers, put in high flow dams. They see any water that goes past their place as being wasted, and flood

waters are a particular waste. They install high flow dams and pump water into them flat out while the river is flowing high. They sit there for years and use this so-called high flow water. I recall last year an article in the *Financial Review* when the drought was still on in which a farmer was left standing at the bottom of his dam lamenting the drought and what it was doing to his cotton crop. This one farm dam, which the farmer called his main dam, contained enough water when full to supply the whole of metropolitan Adelaide with four days of average consumption.

The quantities of water used by cotton farmers, in particular, and also by rice farmers, are unjustifiable. The profits per hectare and the profits per megalitre of water are unjustifiable. There are some interesting statistics in the *Financial Review* article of 16 October. With reference to the economic return from various forms of growing, it states that for every \$100 of profit in rice growing you need two megalitres of water; in dairying, for a profit of \$100 you need one megalitre; and for horticulture, you need .2 of a megalitre. So, not only are these characters with rice and cotton farms—I think cotton farms are more comparable to rice farms than to any other types of farm—using incredibly high quantities of water, but we are not even maximising the economic return from it. If Australia were sensible, we would buy all that water from the rice and cotton growers, sell half of it, keep the other half, and actually have a Darling River that is flowing again.

What are these characters up to? The cotton growers, not being happy with having destroyed the Darling system—and there is no other word for it—are now moving into the Eyre Basin and wanting to attack the Cooper Creek. We have a system that is even more fragile with far less reliable rains than the Murray-Darling system, and they want to intervene, saying that they want to use only 1.5 per cent. An amount of 1.5 per cent means nothing when you have rivers which vary as considerably as do the waterways in the Eyre Basin.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: So, 1.5 per cent would be 100 per cent?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: That's right. Clearly, they are going to use the high flow system that is used in the Darling, which means that many of the flushing flows that you get in the better years will be reduced to a dribble and, in the years when there is a dribble, there will be nothing. The whole thing is quite off the planet. If the State Government stands by quietly while this proceeds, it will be condemned for ever more, probably condemned as much as in the early 1980s—and I think it was a Liberal Government then—when the high flow licences were being granted in northern New South Wales. Robin Millhouse (now Justice Millhouse) said, at that stage, that we had the power to intervene in the courts, if necessary, to insist that those licences should not be granted. There are international precedents of such things occurring where downstream water users exercised their rights against new upstream users. This has happened internationally in relation to the Colorado between Mexico and the United States, and I believe that under Common Law similar rights can be exercised. I think that, from the beginning, the State Government should insist that there be a whole of catchment approach to the Eyre Basin in a way which unfortunately we are only just starting to think about in relation to the Murray-Darling Basin.

I refer to education and to what has happened in this State. I will not go into the numbers game with the old lies, damn lies and statistics. The Minister is very good with the statistics. From time to time I get some amusement when the

Leader of the Opposition seeks to raise a few numbers with the Minister, the Minister quotes a few numbers back and, at the end of the day, we have not progressed very far. The Leader of the Opposition is right in her basic assessment that the education system is being put under severe and unnecessary stress by decisions of the Government. The Minister demonstrates a very good knowledge of the numbers but not a very good knowledge of education, and that is very unfortunate. We have a Minister who probably knows his portfolio better than any other Minister, who can quote numbers until some people give up and walk away, and who manages to fudge his way through many things; but, at the end of the day, absolutely indefensible damage is being done to our education system by this Government. I say that as a person who has studied, who has taught and who has children within that system.

I personally considered that it was a privilege to have been educated in the public education system. I had the welcome opportunity to attend the Reidy Park Primary School (now called the Mount Gambier Primary School) and the Mount Gambier High School. I thought it was very important to have an education system in which I could mix with all the children of what was even then a good sized city, a cross-section of the community. Regardless of background, we were together. One's religion, Mum and Dad's pay packet or your ethnic origins did not matter because everybody mixed extremely well. I believe that it was the basis of a good understanding of society and that it was a very healthy thing for us to have been together at that school. It is something that I resolved that my children should have as well, because I believe that, from the beginning, it gives them a very healthy outlook as to the society that they live in, rather than people who are cosseted away from some sections of our society.

I had a very good education in the public education system. I recall that at least 22 students who matriculated with me went to the University of Adelaide, and another 20 or so went to other universities. So, the vast majority of the children from a country high school, with the disadvantages that that can imply, went on very successfully. I then had the opportunity to teach in the public system for some nine years in country schools in Whyalla, Mount Barker (which was more country then than it is now), Swan Reach and Renmark. I appreciated teaching in the system as much as I appreciated being a student within it.

At the time I was elected to Parliament some signs of stress were already developing in the system because of what was perceived to be fading support, even from the then Labor Government. I had not been a member of the Institute of Teachers, the teachers union, until about two years before the end of my teaching career, because it was only in the last two years that I could see some problems starting to develop in which teachers would need to be involved. Yet, what I thought were problems in 1985 were nothing compared to what has been inflicted in the last two years. I will not get into an argument about numbers, but the Minister is damaging the education system. He is damaging a system that has been doing a damn good job.

In Question Time last week I reflected on the music performances that I attended for the third consecutive year this year. I did not appreciate them just because my children were singing in the choir: I found the quality of performance of the music students from public schools absolutely stunning—not just those students from secondary schools but from primary schools as well. The level of achievement by

these children is great. Might I add that the private schools are busy offering scholarships to the best of them and then claiming them as their own. The Minister, in what he has done, has guaranteed that that level of performance will have to be reduced.

Education is more than the three Rs. I believe that schools are achieving well in the three Rs area—despite the prejudices of those who are largely ignorant in some areas—and are achieving a great deal elsewhere, under a great deal of stress. Schools are being asked to do far more than they were in our time. In my time as a student you arrived, sat down, were quiet—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: In our class we did, except for the chemistry class, where we had a particular teacher—but that was just an aberration. I will not comment on which teacher, because I had some very good chemistry teachers, too. What is being asked of teachers is far greater than was ever asked before. The social problems that they are being asked to handle are huge. They should not need to handle such problems but in all conscience they have no choice but to handle them. The concept of having to provide breakfast to children in the morning was absolutely unheard of. There are children who arrive at school and who suffer significant abuse of various sorts. We can quote all the numbers we like about how many teachers we have in South Australia versus other States, but we need all the teachers we had before. Work is not being done.

I suspect that the basic education work—the very narrow education work—will continue but our society will pay in other ways, because those kids who were getting all sorts of different, additional assistance will have that removed. Some of the special opportunities such as music that they are being offered will be removed. The public education system will be taken back to a base three Rs. That will not disadvantage my children too much because I can afford to give them private music lessons. I do not think they are taking any disadvantage to school; in fact, the school they attend does not have a lot of children—although it certainly has a number—who have a disadvantage of one sort or another. However, those children are being abandoned and it will damage our society, and no numbers will account for that.

Without giving arguments about numbers, I can only say to the Minister that he is doing damage, severe damage. The fact that it is being done for no good reason appals me. The Minister, like so many Ministers, says, 'The previous Government made a mess; we have a responsibility to clean it up and, therefore, we are justified in doing that.' I remind the Government that this State does not have the largest per capita debt in Australia. There are several States (such as Victoria and Tasmania) with larger per capita debt. We are reducing our debt faster than any State, including Victoria. This is despite the reputation that Jeff Kennett has, which I think was largely earned because of the way he goes around beating his chest all the time.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I am right: the speed is not justified. There is no question that the debt needs to be reduced, but when it has to be reduced at such a speed that it damages the education system—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: You can play all the games you want with words. The fact is that the justification for the cuts in education have all been blamed on the State Bank, etc. The point I make is that the cuts, while you may be able to

justify some, were never justified to the depth at which the Government attempted to justify them. What is most unfortunate is that the cuts have occurred in a grossly inefficient way, and the Auditor-General has already reflected on that. It has been done incompetently. Nobody took Baker seriously when he was in Opposition, and just because his Party has been elected to government does not make him any smarter a Treasurer than he was a shadow Treasurer. He is immensely damaging this State. The fact that Ministers around him are standing by, letting it happen and accepting the justifications reflects very poorly on them. I conclude my remarks and again thank the Governor for her opening of this Parliament.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I have pleasure in supporting the motion. I reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Australia. At the outset, let me congratulate our Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell. Dame Roma is a truly great South Australian who has served South Australia in a public capacity for nearly 30 years. It is a record of which all South Australians are proud, and I reiterate my pride in having such a great South Australian in our midst and, indeed, the pleasure I had in listening to her again presenting her speech on behalf of the Government.

A number of issues were raised by Her Excellency in her speech. Certainly, South Australia is headed for some interesting times with some important challenges. Let me briefly touch on just a few of the challenges which were set out in Her Excellency's speech. First, we have the challenge of local government reform. In that regard there is a real challenge to improve the delivery of Government services to ordinary South Australians. It is part of a wide ranging package implemented by this Government in terms of micro-economic reform.

It is also important to note that previous Ministers, including the Hon. Anne Levy, and previous Governments have attempted on a number of occasions to implement local government reform. I am optimistic when I deal with many local government people, members from the ALP in some instances and members of the community that on this occasion we will be successful in leading to some true efficiencies and some significant local government reform.

I also note that in her speech Her Excellency referred to the ETSA corporation. As a member of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee I know that we have been looking into the performance of ETSA, and I would have to say, without pre-empting anything that might come from the committee, that ETSA is well deserving of congratulations in terms of its performance. I acknowledge that the reform of ETSA commenced with the previous Government. It demonstrates the importance of a cooperative work force, and it is important to note that without their cooperation the advantages and benefits that South Australians now enjoy from the performance of ETSA would not have occurred.

I also await with some interest developments that are likely to occur in the area of information technology. I note that Her Excellency indicated that there would be an announcement prior to the end of this year, and I am sure that it will be met with a great deal of discussion and debate.

It is also important to note that significant changes are occurring in the area of passenger transport. I note that in the area of contracting out in the southern suburbs TransAdelaide was successful, and in that regard I join with the Minister for Transport in congratulating TransAdelaide in presenting what must have been the most efficient and best tender. It is

evident that if the public sector is willing to embrace micro-economic and other reform it can meet the private sector head on and, on many occasions, win.

It is also exciting to note the development in conjunction with the Federal Government of the extension of the Adelaide Airport runway and the upgrading of the road from Adelaide to Crafers. Those micro-economic reforms are important for the future economic benefit of this State. It is also pleasing to see the improvements that are taking place in the Art Gallery on North Terrace. I know that on previous occasions in this place the Hon. Legh Davis has lamented about the tiredness of Adelaide and, in particular, has made a number of comments about the tiredness of North Terrace. I join with the Hon. Legh Davis and hope that the Government will look at various means by which North Terrace, which is after all our premier boulevard in this town, can be improved.

It is also interesting to note that the Government is not afraid of tackling the hard issues. In that regard I refer the Council to the police and the restructure of the Police Force. I look forward to the report of the independent committee that is looking into the current police structure and seeing its recommendations in relation to the improvement in efficiency and accountability in terms of police management.

Also, I note that there has been a significant improvement in the cost of administration of our prisons. To that extent the Minister for Emergency Services, who has substantially driven prison reform in South Australia, ought to be congratulated for what he has achieved.

I also want to touch on some other significant issues during the course of my contribution. First, I refer to the area of aquaculture. I note that the Hon. Michael Elliott touched on that in his Address in Reply speech and that he has a motion before this place concerning the referral to a standing committee of issues relating to aquaculture. Notwithstanding that, last long weekend I had the opportunity to attend the annual Ceduna Oysterfest. One could not help but admire the results of the pioneering work of the oyster industry, which started seven short years ago and which currently generates about \$87 million per annum. I understand it is anticipated that this will grow to about \$280 million per annum within five years. That is a proud achievement, and the West Coast oyster industry deserves every bit of congratulation and support that we here can give them.

During that visit, and accompanied by the member for Mitchell, I had an opportunity of inspecting an oyster lease in Smoky Bay. The owner of that oyster lease, Mr Gary Zippel, kindly took us over the lease and explained a number of issues with which he had had to deal over the four or five year period since he entered the industry. He explained the benefits to the community through the development of that industry.

Mr Zippel comes from a family of four who in turn have had families and who, about five or six years ago, were wholly reliant on the family farm. It was clear even in that economic downturn that the farm was not sufficient to support all those families. As a consequence, Mr Zippel and his family decided to embark on what can only be described as an extraordinarily risky venture, and they entered the oyster business. He was confronted by a number of different difficulties, and he explained that at one stage it came close to the Zippel family having to pull out from the business, as a result of which there would have been drastic financial consequences to him and his brothers and their respective families.

However, unlike a lot of cases, this story looks like it will have a happy ending. This real entrepreneurial activity is doing so well that it now supports two of the four families, enabling two families to be properly placed on the family farm, so minimising some of the environmental pressures that might have been brought to bear on the farm. At the same time, the oyster farm supports two of the Zippel families and they now have three full-time employees. I do not take into account the amount of money that is spent in the local Smoky Bay and Ceduna communities, but it must be significant. Certainly, it is entrepreneurial activity such as this that will provide the future for this State.

One aspect that really impressed me was the care with which Mr Zippel treated the environment where his oyster farm is placed. It is absolutely vital that oysters do not contain impurities because they are not then able to be exported. As was explained to me, oyster farmers must test the water for five years to ensure that there is proper environmental control, and they are now in their fourth year in the five-year process. I understand that the project is going well, and I was very impressed with the extraordinary concern and care that Mr Zippel was adopting in terms of his environment.

That makes me wonder about some of the comments, particularly from the Hon. Michael Elliott, that we must have inquiries into these sorts of issues. One would have thought that where the interests of the farmers, whether they be oyster farmers or other sorts of farmers, are aimed at enhancing, improving and maintaining a proper environmental status Government ought to stay out of it and let them get on with their job.

Also, I was informed that there has been a ban on netting at Smoky Bay since 1966. I was told that that small bay was supporting some six to eight professional fishermen, as well as quite a number of amateur fishermen who were taking large catches. One would have thought—and certainly this sentiment was conveyed to me by a number of people—that the absence of amateur netting in that bay has played a significant part in maintaining that resource. I am, therefore, somewhat surprised at the motion moved by the Hon. Ron Roberts to disallow regulations for banning of netting generally, with some few exceptions, in South Australia. The lessons that have been learnt from places such as Smoky Bay are significant and should be taken up by all of us in this place, and more particularly the Hon. Ron Roberts.

The second issue to which Her Excellency referred was that the Government has noted significant interest in the development of an iron ore, coal and smelting industry in northern South Australia. I await that development with real interest. I am told anecdotally that the sort of investment being looked at in the northern part of South Australia is \$400 million to \$600 million, and in anyone's language that is a huge investment. Whilst it is early days, this sort of development would provide a fillip to this Government and to those members opposite who have supported the viewpoint that it is absolutely vital for the development of this country, and more particularly this State, for the Darwin-Alice Springs railway line to be built.

This iron ore, coal and smelting project, together with the Darwin-Alice Springs railway line, is terribly exciting, and one project which I hope all members confront with a great deal of optimism. However, I would sound one note of caution with respect to the issue of Mabo and native title. I do not wish to return to the general arguments surrounding the native title/Mabo issue, but it has been pointed out to me that since the promulgation of the various native title

tribunals by the Federal Government not one decision has been made, despite assurances given by the Prime Minister and Senator Evans (who led the debate in the Senate) that there would not be significant delays and that the issues of native title would be dealt with expeditiously and efficiently.

One hopes that an investment of \$400 million to \$600 million will not be put in jeopardy simply because the Prime Minister and Senator Evans have jammed legislation through the Federal Parliament making it impossible for native title commissioners to deal with these matters appropriately and expeditiously. That is a very serious concern that I and, indeed, members in this and the other place have raised from time to time.

Her Excellency also mentioned issues relating to the environment. This Government has a proud record in relation to the environment, although the rather mean-minded attitude of the Hon. Michael Elliott would not seem to acknowledge that. I have yet to hear one word of congratulation on his part in relation to this Government's tackling some of the most difficult environmental issues with which this city and State is confronted. Substantial efforts are being made, and I would hope at least that members opposite acknowledge that we are taking positive steps in that area and that, albeit in a healthy spirit of debate, we are headed in the right direction. One would hope also that criticism, where necessary, in relation to this Government's record in terms of environment, rather than being subjected to the negative carping of the Michael Elliotts, was constructive. I have yet to see any evidence of that, but optimism springs eternal. I point out to members that—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: At least we are tackling the issue of the Patawalonga. We are attempting to tackle the issues of the Torrens.

The Hon. P. Holloway: You might make it worse.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The Hon. Mr Holloway interjects and says that we may make it worse. I am sure that, within the next two or three weeks, the Hon. Mr Holloway will come up with a better and more constructive suggestion that we can present to the residents of the western suburbs as to how we can deal with this issue. If he has the ability to receive acclamation, I am sure this Government will look at it very closely. In any event, I await his suggestion with some interest.

Other interesting developments include the announcement in relation to marine waters and the announcement and suggestions made by the Premier regarding the Murray River. I know that the Hon. Michael Elliott touched on his experiences of the Murray River and the damage done to the Darling. I hope that, rather than just sitting back and criticising, he will enter into some constructive discussion and encourage his Senate colleague, Senator Kernot, to appeal to the Federal Government to support the initiative led by the Premier. The issue of the environment still has a long way to go, and sometimes it is not the big ticket items but the little ticket items that are important and add up to a great improvement in the environment. I commend every member in this place to read the annual report of KESAB, which perhaps does not attract the same political notice as some of its more high profile compatriots but which, nevertheless, has over the years achieved, and is still achieving, an enormous amount in terms of improving our environment, and it should be proud of its record.

In any event, I commend its annual report to members of this place. I was provided with a copy of a submission made

to the Minister by KESAB regarding some of the issues that the Government ought to be confronting in terms of litter, and I believe some of those suggestions ought to be seriously considered. It is important that I place on the record some of its suggestions and comments. First, it has acknowledged that a real change has taken place in community behaviour towards the issue of litter. It also comments quite critically about the lack of local government action in relation to litter control. Quite clearly, it is of the same mind as this Government that, because of its current structures, local government is having difficulty in carrying out its broader responsibilities to its local communities.

KESAB is critical of Government restrictions imposed by the Department for Correctional Services and the policy of KESAB paying for the supervision of community offenders in relation to KESAB related activities. One would hope that the Government would look at that issue and note that KESAB, as a community service organisation, should not be required to pay for that supervision. In an environmental sense KESAB's objective and the objective of this Government ought to be one and the same, and one would hope that the Government could look at that. KESAB is also of the view that, particularly in the local government area, there is a lack of regulation, a lack of control and a lack of enforcement by councils in various environmental issues which impinges upon the KESAB objectives. KESAB has indicated that there should be amendments to the Local Government Act to beef up council responsibilities to enable them to properly supervise regulations, to promulgate regulations which are necessary for their own local areas and to properly control local environments. I would hope that these amalgamations would put councils in a position to achieve that properly. I am disappointed at the Hon. Michael Elliott's knee jerk objection to council amalgamations, particularly given the rhetoric that we hear on a constant basis concerning his commitment to the improvement of the environment.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: That was a long time ago.

The Hon. P. Holloway: Not that long.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Let me put it this way: it was well before the blow up of the State Bank, something from which you have been busily distancing yourself for some time. The Queensland Litter Act, which was passed in 1987, would provide a good model for local government to adopt, in terms of managing the local environment. KESAB has suggested higher fines for littering. One of the reasons that councils do not seem to enforce or follow up littering is that the cost of prosecutions is much higher than the types of fines and costs they are likely to recover. It has been suggested that there be a wider allocation of powers. For example, parking inspectors, health inspectors and animal control inspectors should be given powers to enforce litter laws; there should be severe fines on trucks when material is blown out of them; builders and other businesses should be responsible for any litter that moves from properties upon which they operate out onto the road; evidentiary aids should be put in place putting the onus on those people to prove that the litter that is found did not come from premises that they occupy; and controllers or organisers of public events should have fairly and squarely placed upon them the responsibility to ensure that sufficient bins are provided and that they are wholly and solely responsible for clean-up costs.

I refer to a letter I received from KESAB which points out the poor performance of local government in this area. The letter states:

In surveys several years ago metropolitan councils had enforced anti-litter penalties only four times in the respective 12 month period. This I suspect could also be applied to many other facets of their operations and responsibilities.

That sums up the position and the importance of the forthcoming local government reform. The other issue which KESAB has suggested ought to be looked at is not a legislative response, but a response in worker management. In a paper submitted to the Minister KESAB suggested that the worker attitude, and particularly local government worker attitude and training, be improved substantially. We have all been confronted with an overflowing bin which is surrounded by rubbish. Far too often we see council workers empty a bin without picking up the surrounding rubbish. A more aggressive training approach and attitude on the part of local government is perhaps another option that this Government and local government ought to look at in dealing with our environmental problems. In any event, in the nearly two years that this Government has been in office, it has cause to be proud of its environmental record.

I also note that Her Excellency referred to the introduction of racial vilification legislation in this session of Parliament. I have a real concern that such legislation should not impinge upon freedom of speech. In saying that, I in no way condone the activities of various extremist groups in this community. However, I believe that pushing these people underground is not the way to go. I am a strong adherent to the principle of Voltaire, who said:

I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

A large number of offences can cover the sorts of activities embarked upon by the thugs who are associated with these extremist groups: threat to life, unlawful stalking, common assault, aggravated assault, damage to property and offensive behaviour. There are also various offences in the postal and telecommunications areas. I suspect that each of those offences would cover the sorts of activities that are sought to be covered by the racial vilification legislation that was introduced by the Hon. Mario Feleppa before his retirement. However, I agree that there is a problem and that it ought to be tackled.

One suggestion that I and members on both sides ask the Attorney-General to consider seriously is amendment of the sentencing legislation. In my view, rather than create new offences, we can easily deal with the evil of racial vilification by asking the courts to impose higher penalties within their discretionary range if there is a racial component to the commission of an offence. Such an approach will allow people to express themselves freely without the fear or risk of being subjected to prosecution. However, if such conduct leads to what one would term as a normal offence, they would be subjected to greater penalty. For example, if a couple of kids damaged a gravestone, they would be treated within the normal range of criminal penalties. However, if there were a racial element to it, they would be dealt with more severely. There are a number of other advantages, not the least being that the burden of proof in establishing a fact for the purpose of sentencing is not as great as the burden of proof in establishing a fact in the creation of the offence. I invite members opposite to consider seriously that, whilst not as spectacular in its promulgation, it might achieve a greater result.

Her Excellency also referred to the reform of friendly societies' legislation. I congratulate the Government on acknowledging a need for reform in the supervision and

administration of friendly societies in South Australia. I am currently involved in a case (it started a number of years before I was elected to this place) in which 350 to 400 South Australians invested in a friendly society in Queensland known as the Family Security Friendly Society. The regulation of friendly societies in that State was probably exceeded in laxity only by the regulation of friendly societies and building societies by the Cain Labor Government in Victoria which led to the Pyramid collapse. I have first-hand experience of people who have suffered the loss of money, particularly elderly people who spent their whole lives saving money, trusting investment advisers and then having that trust broken as a consequence of an investment adviser's attitude of maximising commissions and putting their own interests ahead of those of their customers. This sort of legislation will go some way towards redressing some of the difficulties that arise in that regard.

The other issue that I wish to touch on is tourism. I congratulate the Government on its initiative in relation to Wirrina, but it is quite clear that we have a long way to go. I know that the Hon. Ron Roberts has endeavoured to get his name in the paper by having a crack at the 'Going all the way' supplement to the *Australian* but, if one wants to assess the usual approach of a national paper to South Australia, one need only look at last Saturday's *Weekend Australian*. The magazine supplement to that paper included 44 pages covering the Australian Tourism Awards of 1995, setting out 40 national awards for tourism in Australia. South Australia managed to win only one award and, in that regard, I congratulate the winner of the Industry Training Private Sector Award, namely, the Hyatt Regency Hotel.

Page 8 of the magazine lists the main attractions for international visitors to Australia as surveyed by the Bureau of Tourism Research. New South Wales has the first eight main attractions. One attraction in Victoria—Melbourne shopping—is listed in ninth place and another New South Wales attraction comes in tenth. So Victoria and New South Wales share the first 10 places, of which New South Wales has nine. The first entry from another State is Seaworld from Queensland, and it is not until number 17 that Western Australia gets a mention. The disappointing thing is that the Northern Territory, South Australia and Tasmania are not mentioned at all as being main attractions in this visitor survey. That indicates that, whilst it is not peculiar, South Australia shares a common problem with the Northern Territory and Tasmania, and that is that we have a very low profile in international terms. I believe that we have a long way to go and that we need to be new and innovative in the delivery of our tourism services.

Like many members opposite and many of my colleagues, I believe that tourism is a substantial industry in this State and has the capacity and potential to be one of our biggest export earners, but I am not confident at the moment that anything is happening in any substantial way to improve that. I went through this magazine about the Australian Tourism awards very carefully and, in case I had missed something, I invited the Hon. Terry Roberts to go through the same magazine to see whether there was any reference to South Australia. I am grateful to the honourable member for pointing out to me that, apart from the award to the Hyatt, there is one—and only one—reference to South Australia, and that appears on page 6. I will read it out because I am sure that the Hon. Leigh Davis will be interested to see it. Usually when he gets publicity he is the first to tell me, but he has not told me about this one. The article states:

The country-house hotels of South Australia's aspic-set Barossa and golden Clare valleys rank alongside the frontrunners of this genre on both sides of the English Channel. Even our humble B&Bs and farm-stays, most of which boast record repeat-guest levels, compete on an international level with the added bonus of dinkum Down Under hospitality.

That is the only reference in this whole magazine to South Australia. When it comes to budget time next year, I certainly will be watching with a great deal of interest precisely how much this State puts into the national body because, if one looks at this magazine, one sees that we get very little value for our contribution to the national body.

I hope that this session of Parliament will bring in a new era in terms of governance. So far, in the 20 months I have been a member of this place, I have seen little evidence of any real, positive, constructive or effective opposition. Indeed, it has been left to the Liberal backbench to keep the Cabinet on its toes, and I am sure that the Liberal backbench, given the talent it has, will continue to do that. For the sake of good government, I hope that Australian Labor Party members can put aside their differences, get rid of their factional disputes, look closely in a constructive manner at the performance of this Government, and ensure that South Australians get the best possible Government.

One would hope that, when the knives are withdrawn from each other's backs, members opposite could look at us and provide us with guidance and with suggestions as to how we can better deliver government and services to the people of South Australia. I am not optimistic that that will happen in the short term. There does not seem to be any evidence that that is occurring. But, if they do need any advice, I am sure that our Leader would be prepared to give it to them.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: The damage is done.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: If you need any assistance in repairing the damage—and I notice you have a bit of a bounce in your step after the weekend—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: You've got a bounce in your step because you think that the Government has been damaging the State? I would't think that you would even countenance such a thought. Certainly, the rise of the Left, if that does mean unity in the Australian Labor Party, might be welcomed in some quarters. I hope that the new found power of the Left within the Australian Labor Party will be exercised wisely and will ensure that this Government, at least from time to time, faces a seasoned, inquiring and constructive Opposition.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I thank Her Excellency the Governor for the speech with which she opened this Parliament and again pay tribute to the dedication, enthusiasm and great accomplishment with which Dame Roma Mitchell is discharging her functions for the benefit of the whole of the South Australian community. I join Her Excellency in expressing regret at the deaths, since the last session, of the Hon. Gordon Bruce, Mr Jack Jennings and Mr Howard Venning. I join with all members in expressing appreciation for the service of those former members to the Parliament and to the community, and I extend my sympathy to their families.

The program outlined in Her Excellency's speech demonstrates the commitment of the Brown Government to adopting a sensible and responsible approach to the rebuilding of the State for the benefit of all South Australians, and especially for coming generations of our citizens.

Government Ministers are attacked for what the propaganda is pleased to describe as 'cuts' in spending. They can be less emotively and more accurately described as adjustments to spending priorities. Not surprisingly, the most vociferous critics are found among the leadership of labor unions whose members are employed in the public sector. I am sure that Ministers would like nothing better than to announce ever increasing expenditure in relation to their portfolios. That course of action would be likely to be popular. Such announcements would ensure good press and might silence the unions. This strategy would be the easy option, but it would be the wrong option to follow. It would be irresponsible, short-sighted and contrary to the long term welfare of the community.

The second largest single area of spending in the State budget for 1995-96 is the \$1 140 million for primary and secondary education and children's services. As the Leader of the Government in this place is the Minister for Education and Children's Services, we hear quite a bit from the Opposition on that subject. We frequently hear complaints in this place about the budget adjustments that have been made in this area. But, despite those budget adjustments, the most recently published Australian Bureau of Statistics data indicates that this State still has the lowest pupil to teacher ratio of all the States in both primary and secondary education. Despite all the claims of the South Australian Institute of Teachers about reductions in the number of school services officers, the level of school administrative support staff continues to exceed the national average. To listen to the union supporters in this place, one would think that this Government did not appreciate school services officers. The Government does; that is why it is maintaining them at levels that are higher than the national average.

As other speakers on this side of the House have mentioned, it should never be forgotten that, under the previous Labor administration, public sector debt as a proportion of this State's gross product was almost 28 per cent. As the Treasurer graphically described it in his budget speech, this State has a level of debt which, in his words, 'not only paralysed but threatened to kill the State'. The State was spending \$300 million a year more than it was earning. Decisive action was necessary; decisive and bold action was taken; and the Treasurer and the Government ought to be congratulated for it.

I do not propose to go through many of the matters mentioned in Her Excellency's speech; they have been dealt with adequately by other speakers. There are, however, a couple of matters which I should mention. The first is the subject of racial vilification. I do welcome the announcement that legislation on racial vilification will be introduced in this session of Parliament. There is presently no South Australian law dealing with racial vilification. The Equal Opportunity Act prohibits discrimination on the ground of race in certain areas, but it does not deal with racial vilification. It is concerned with discrimination in this area. This means that, although the Equal Opportunity Act prohibits a person from refusing to serve another person a drink or give him or her a hotel bed or employ such a person on the grounds of race, it does not prohibit a person from inciting others to racial hatred by threats, etc.

It is certainly true, as the Hon. Angus Redford mentioned in his speech earlier, that certain manifestations of racial vilification would be caught as general offences under the criminal law and also under the Summary Offences Act. For example, offensive conduct, assault, unlawful threats,

damaging property, offensive behaviour, threatening behaviour at a public meeting and the like are all specifically dealt with in the Summary Offences Act and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Of course, it is a common law offence to incite a person to commit an offence.

Over the years in South Australia a number of reports have recommended action in this area, and I mention three of them briefly. In 1991 the report of the Community Relations Advisory Committee recommended that the Equal Opportunity Act be amended to outlaw racial vilification. However, that committee believed that there should be no criminal sanctions and that the emphasis should be on conciliation and education. In 1993, in her report the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity recommended that the Equal Opportunity Act be amended to include a general provision prohibiting racial vilification. The Commissioner noted in that report that a number of complaints are made to the commission each year concerning racial vilification, but she mentioned that action could not be taken because the acts in question were not covered by the Equal Opportunity Act.

In October 1994, Mr Brian Martin, QC, undertook a review of the Equal Opportunity Act. He analysed the background, but he avoided reaching a firm conclusion on the matter, and recommended that no change to the Equal Opportunity Act be made until after the enactment of the then pending Federal legislation. Well, the Federal legislation is still pending. Only recently, it was heavily amended in the Senate by the deletion of the criminal sanctions, and it has now been returned to the House of Representatives for further consideration. I will mention that matter in due course.

There is a problem with racial vilification in this State. One only need note the experience of Julie Greig (the member for Reynell) who has encountered significant racial vilification in her electorate. In January this year, a racist group calling itself National Action began a concerted recruitment drive in the Noarlunga area plastering its stickers and anti-Asian posters around the district. It decided to target Julie Greig whose anti-racist views were well known in the area because of her previous local government involvement. On 28 January this year, National Action held a well publicised rally outside Julie Greig's office.

There had been a good deal of newspaper and television coverage of racist campaigns by fringe groups and neo-Nazis. I refer members to the full page Insight article in the *Advertiser* in April this year. Subsequently, in July, there was widespread outrage at the desecration of Jewish graves in the West Terrace Cemetery, which was widely portrayed in the media as a manifestation of racial vilification. Whether or not the incident was, in fact, racially motivated has not, as far as I am aware, been established. However, the public outrage which that incident engendered shows the depth of feeling in the community against racist acts by a significant section of thinking people.

So, we in South Australia cannot claim to be free of all incidents of racial vilification. As I mentioned, there have been three reports over a number of years recommending some form of legislative action in this State. Elsewhere in Australia there have been developments in this area. A number of reports have been published recommending action regarding racial vilification. The Human Rights Commission published a report in 1983; the Western Australian Law Reform Commission published a report in 1989; and the Victorian Racial Vilification Committee published a report in 1992.

Those committees all recommended legislation which created criminal offences in this area. Next, in 1991, there was the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, a Federal royal commission with complementary State commissions, and that commission recommended laws against racial vilification. Its recommendations focused upon conciliation and education, but did not favour the creation of criminal offences. This applied also to the report published in 1992 of the Australian Law Reform Commission. Finally, I mention the report of the National Inquiry into Racist Violence in 1991. Again, that was a report which, unlike the two I have just mentioned, did recommend legislation creating criminal offences.

As is well known, in 1989 in New South Wales legislation was passed dealing with racial vilification. In that year, the Anti-discrimination Racial Vilification Amendment Act came into effect. That Act provides for criminal sanctions as well as certain civil redress.

In Western Australia in 1990, the Parliament of that State enacted offences relating to racial vilification in its criminal code. The four offences which were created there may be summarised as follows: first, possession of material that is threatening or abusive with intent to publish or display, and intent that hatred of any racial group be created or increased; secondly, publication of threatening or abusive material with intent that hatred of any racial group be created or increased; thirdly, possession of threatening or abusive material with intent that the material be displayed, and with intent that a racial group will be harassed by the display; and, finally, displaying of threatening or abusive material with intent that that material would be displayed and that a racial group would be harassed by it.

The New South Wales provisions in particular do have protections for freedom of expression. Federally, of course, there is also a Racial Hatred Bill which I have mentioned previously. The Keating Government introduced its Racial Hatred Bill in 1992. The Bill lapsed because of the 1993 election. It was reintroduced in November 1994 but has not yet passed. In August, I think it was, the Federal Opposition and the Green Party combined to amend the Bill by removing the criminal sanctions, and the matter is now before the House of Representatives. Whether or not that House and the Government will accept the amendments remains to be seen. The Federal Government has not shown much enthusiasm for rapid passage of that measure, and there has been ongoing political debate and divisiveness concerning it, which I hope will be avoided in this State.

One issue which has to be addressed at the threshold is: should we have State legislation on this subject? I would argue that the South Australian Parliament should express a strong view on this issue by enacting its own legislation. If States do not have legislation on this matter, the Federal Government's claim that it has some justification for imposing national legislation pursuant to the foreign affairs power is enhanced.

In my view, it is undesirable for States to abdicate responsibility in this or any other area to the Federal Parliament. We do not want a case in this State similar to that of Rodney King in Los Angeles. In that case, Los Angeles police officers engaged in some truncheon practise at the expense of Mr King. Unfortunately for them, a passer-by using a new video camera filmed them in action, and widespread and horrific film of their conduct was shown continuously around the world for months thereafter. The police concerned were charged with assault and other

offences under Californian law but were acquitted by a jury—an event which is said to have given rise to the race riots in Los Angeles. Subsequently, those same police officers who had been acquitted were charged under a Federal law—I understand the Federal civil rights legislation—with different Federal offences. We do not want to have that type of situation in Australia. Matters of racial vilification, racial harassment and the like are essentially State matters to be dealt with locally. It is inappropriate for this Parliament to provide any Federal Parliament with an excuse to legislate in an area which is essentially a State area.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: They will have almost identical legislation.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The New South Wales legislation, which is the basis of the Bill introduced into this place by the Hon. Mario Feleppa on the last day of his parliamentary career, and subsequently introduced in another place by the Leader of the Opposition, is quite different to that which applies in Western Australia.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Uniformity is not necessarily the appropriate way to go in this area. We want legislation—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: It is the same everywhere.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: It might be the same problem but is the solution always the same? Is it necessarily true that uniform solutions are better than creative solutions?

Of course, there is an even more basic threshold question of whether there is a need for any legislation at all. I argue that there is in this area, because surveys show that the community does not believe that people should be entitled to incite racial hatred or to incite contempt for others on grounds of race or nationality. I make that statement subject always to the proviso that reasonable discussion of any social or political issue, including immigration, multiculturalism and the like, is protected. There are serious concerns expressed by people on both the right and the left of politics in this country about the preservation of free speech. One question which is posed in relation to this proposal to have legislation is whether or not it is worth having legislation at all—whether or not legislation will solve the problem. A short answer, of course, is that legislation by itself will not stamp out racism or racial vilification. The law against shoplifting has not stamped out shoplifting, but no-one suggests that it should be repealed on that ground.

Enactment of some legislation will be a statement by this Parliament about its abhorrence of certain practices, and I trust that we will not get into an unseemly political auction between political Parties in which the holier than thou attitude is adopted by any side in this House. I commend the Government's proposal for racial vilification legislation and I look forward to the debate in this Chamber on the subject.

I next turn to the royal commission into matters pertaining to the Hindmarsh Island bridge. The Leader of the Opposition in this place made some comment about this matter, and I wish to say something on the subject of the Government's decision to establish the royal commission. I do not comment on its proceedings at all. I make absolutely no assumption in relation to the result of the commission. I will await its report with interest. I do not know whether those whose allegations have prompted the commission will be accepted or not.

However, I do wish to comment on what I regard as misguided criticism of the Government's decision to establish the commission in the first place. A number of church groups and Aboriginal groups have alleged that the commission itself is an assault upon religious freedom. For example, the

Solidarity and Justice Unit of the Uniting Church and the Justice and Peace Commission of the Catholic Church have issued statements critical of the State Government. They are misguided in my view. The essence of their criticism can be encapsulated in the following passage which I read from a communication issued on 20 June by the Uniting Church. I quote, omitting some unnecessary words, as follows:

Jesus . . . suffered the full force of political and religious persecution [they say]. In our tradition there would have been times when political leaders have sought to wield control over spiritual belief. . . . We will stand against any Government of any persuasion which seeks to do so. We believe that this State Government has stepped beyond its powers in calling a royal commission into Ngarrindjeri spiritual beliefs.

This criticism is unfair and misguided. The criticism might have been valid if—and I say 'if'—the royal commission was required to examine the validity of the spiritual beliefs of the Ngarrindjeri or any other people. I do agree that it is no function of the Government to be the arbiter of religious beliefs.

The terms of this royal commission do not require it to examine the underlying truth or validity of any spiritual beliefs. The Commissioner is not examining the truth or validity of spiritual beliefs. The commission is required to determine whether or not certain claimed beliefs were a fabrication, that is, whether or not they were devised or concocted for a particular purpose. The inquiry upon which the royal commission is embarking is not an unusual one. It is not uncommon in our society for individuals or groups to claim to be exempt from some law or policy because of the claim that they have some religious belief. For example, someone might be charged with holding pornographic material, and he or she might claim that that material had some religious or spiritual significance for that person and they were therefore exempt from prosecution.

Someone might receive a rate notice from a council and claim that his house is now a temple and is now used for religious purposes and that accordingly he is not required to pay rates. The authorities, on behalf of the community, must make a judgment whether or not that individual genuinely entertains the religious beliefs or whether what is being put forward as a religious belief is a concoction and is merely devised for the purpose of avoiding some unnecessary or unwanted consequence. Those cases do not involve the State in passing judgment on the validity or truth of spiritual beliefs. They do not represent religious persecution. The terms of reference of the present royal commission do not require it to embark upon a determination of the validity of the spiritual beliefs.

I can quite understand why conscientious people from many sections of the community wish to express solidarity with Aboriginal people in responding to perceived assaults upon their beliefs. However, I do not believe that the interests of Aboriginal people or the process of reconciliation is advanced by precluding any Government on behalf of the community from examining the circumstances in which claims of spiritual significance arose in this matter. After all, these claims of fabrication were not made by the Government or some section of the white community or by some rabid right wing organisation: they came from within the Aboriginal community itself.

In this connection it is worth noting that there has already been one Federal inquiry into this matter by Professor Cheryl Saunders. On the evidence presented to her, Professor Saunders accepted certain claims. She could as easily have

rejected them but she accepted them. No similar objection was made to her inquiry by those people who are now so vociferous in their opposition.

Similarly, Mr Tickner has announced that there will be a further judicial inquiry into this matter. Again, no criticism is being voiced about that inquiry, either by the Aboriginal people whom we heard spoken of by the Leader of the Opposition or by the churches. It would appear that the charges of Government interference in spiritual beliefs are highly selective, and they clearly invite the suspicion of partisanship. These people are happy enough to participate in Mr Tickner's inquiry but they refuse to participate in an inquiry conducted about a State issue—about a State project in South Australia.

There are other criticisms. It is said that this inquiry is costing too much, and the figure of \$2 million has been mentioned. I accept that that is a substantial amount of money, but South Australia stands to lose far more than \$2 million if the issues involved in this royal commission are not resolved. If public works such as the Southern Expressway, development and mining projects are to be delayed or frustrated by possibly fabricated claims of Aboriginal heritage, the costs to this State as a whole in the future will be many millions of dollars in lost revenue, jobs and opportunities. While \$2 million is a substantial sum, this inquiry is far less expensive than many others. The Easton inquiry in Western Australia is costing far more and its results will not affect the economy of Western Australia at all.

Inquiries in recent years have cost many millions of dollars: the Aboriginal deaths in custody inquiry, for example, cost tens of millions of dollars. It is a fact of life that, if Governments seek to determine the true facts of any complex matter, substantial costs will be involved, especially where there are strong interests opposed to the inquiry itself.

Calls for the inquiry to be abandoned have been made at various times and by various parties. This refrain is heard every time an inquiry or a royal commission is set up. Those who feel threatened by the outcome of the inquiry will claim that it is a waste of time and that it is politically motivated and, invariably, will demand that it be abandoned. We saw this phenomenon during the State Bank royal commission.

After that inquiry got under way and the evidence began to hurt the Government, its supporters started to say, 'This inquiry is costing too much. It will not save one cent of the money that has been lost. We know where the money's gone. We know what happened, so there's no point to this inquiry. Why have it? Call it off.' Of course, they said then as they say now, 'This inquiry is simply a lawyers' picnic.' The same thing happened with the Fitzgerald inquiry in Queensland, with the WA Inc. inquiry in Perth and with the Costigan inquiry into the painters and dockers.

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: It will happen before long. The Hon. Trevor Crothers mentions the current inquiry into police corruption in New South Wales. That will go on for months and eventually people will say, 'We've heard all this before; let's call off the inquiry. This is costing too much,' etc. It happens to most inquiries. When the thing starts heating up, those who fear the result will call for it to be abandoned. We saw precisely the same thing the other week with Prime Minister Keating in relation to the Easton inquiry in Perth: he called for it to be abandoned. It is my view that the Government should not weaken its resolve to ascertain the facts of this matter. It should not give in to the pessimists but should allow the commissioner to get on with the job.

It is also said, and I interpreted this in one of the interjections of the Hon. Terry Roberts, 'Where is it all going?' No-one can say for sure where this inquiry is heading, because we do not know what the commissioner will ultimately find. But one result will be certain: the very process of having an inquiry demonstrates that the Government in this State is prepared to demand integrity in the process of approval for developments. At present the public is very sceptical of Aboriginal heritage claims, especially those that appear to materialise at the last minute, and this scepticism is likely to jeopardise genuine claims by Aboriginal people, and it will deter investors. In other words, no-one benefits if there is no confidence in the process. The Government has to restore confidence in the process, and that is why the royal commission cannot be abandoned. Whatever the result of the inquiry, those who wish to create jobs and economic development in this State by making investments will be reassured that heritage claims in this State will be closely scrutinised.

Even if the commissioner were to find, as is quite possible, that the secret women's business was not fabricated, the very fact that the Government was prepared fully to investigate the claims of those Aboriginal people who said that it was a fabrication indicates the determination of the Brown Government to test claims rigorously. It was also said, 'I didn't think you wanted the bridge', or words to that effect. People claimed that the Government was acting inconsistently because it did not want a bridge at Hindmarsh Island in the first place. They have said, 'If it is found that the claims were fabricated, the inquiry will open the door for the bridge to go ahead'.

That attitude is the height of cynicism and hypocrisy. It suggests that, because we on this side of the Council did not want the bridge, we should sit back and allow it to be banned on possibly specious grounds which were concocted for the purpose. Although the Liberal Party made it clear before the last election that it considered that a bridge to Hindmarsh Island was a misallocation of resources at that stage, in my view it would be dishonourable and cynical for the Government to support a ban of the bridge on grounds that were fabricated. This inquiry was not called for the purpose of assisting the developers: it was called because of the widespread and public demand, from both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, that the facts of the matter be determined.

The Leader read into the transcript part of a communication from Mr Dodson and Ms Walpole, who take up criticism of the commission and of the Government for calling it. They accuse the commission of being racist. This issue was determined by the Full Court of the Supreme Court, which held that the establishment of this commission was not racist and did not offend any principle of constitutional or other law. It is no more racist for the Government to be conducting this inquiry than it was of Mr Tickner to commission Professor Saunders to inquire into the claims in the first place. Will Mr Dodson and Ms Walpole be saying that it is racist of Mr Tickner to commission Justice Mathews to conduct her judicial inquiry?

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: It depends upon the terms of reference, doesn't it?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: If the terms of reference preclude Justice Mathews from examining whether or not these claims are a fabrication, that will be a disgrace. If Justice Mathews is required to accept and not examine all claims made in relation to the so-called 'sacred women's business', it will be a disgrace. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SA WATER

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development on the water contract.

Leave granted.

[Sitting suspended from 6.3 to 7.45 p.m.]

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion)

(Continued from page 208).

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I commend the Government for establishing the South Australian Constitutional Advisory Council. This council was established in September 1995. It has not, I understand, yet met. The terms of reference of the Constitutional Advisory Council were published in the *Gazette* of 28 September. The council is to investigate and report on effective constitutional arrangements in Government structures which will sustain national unity and regional diversity into the twenty-first century, with particular respect to South Australia in relation to a number of matters.

First, if the Commonwealth were to cease to be a constitutional monarchy, how would South Australia be affected? Secondly, how should a Head of State for the Commonwealth be appointed and what should the powers and duties of that Head of State be? Thirdly, would it be a realistic option for South Australia to retain its formal association with the monarchy? Fourthly, how should a Head of State for South Australia be appointed in the event that it severed its association with the monarchy?

The second term of reference deals with the democratic and constitutional processes which might be necessary for effecting such a change if it were to occur. Then, the advisory council is to consider and report upon the adequacy of the current distribution of power between the Commonwealth, States, territories, local governments and so on. It is to have regard to a number of matters, including what consultation should occur with respect to entering into treaties. Lastly, the advisory council is examining ways of ensuring adequate consultation with the people and their participation in decision making in the matters just mentioned.

Her Excellency has appointed Associate Professor Peter Howell of Flinders University to be the Chair of the advisory committee. Professor Peter Howell is a well known constitutional historian, most experienced in this field, and has written extensively in it. I am sure he will make an admirable Chair of the committee. The Director of the State Library (Ms Fran Alcock) is a member. A number of eminent citizens have been appointed to the committee. There are representatives of the three major political Parties on it.

I have high hopes for this advisory council. Its terms of reference are not terribly dissimilar to terms which were given to a constitutional committee in Western Australia. That committee was chaired by Malcolm McCusker, QC, and had a number of eminent citizens on it. That committee reported in January 1995 and produced a most interesting, informative and helpful report. It was interesting to see that

in Western Australia the committee came up with sensible findings and recommendations. In particular, the committee concluded that there was strong support in the Western Australian community for retaining and strengthening the Federal system. It was the conclusion of a substantial majority of those people who spoke to that committee and who provided research material to it that the Federal system was preferable to a centralised system of Government and that the preservation of the Federal system was of far greater moment to the community than the so-called republican issue.

The committee identified a number of advantages of a Federal system over a central system, especially for smaller States such as Western Australia—and I suspect South Australia as well. The committee commented upon the erosion of the Federal concept in our constitution, which erosion was being caused by the centralisation of power to a greater extent in Australia than has occurred in major federations elsewhere in the world. The committee noted the phenomenon of financial control by central Government, which is increasing, and noted that the Federal system is being weakened as a result. The committee identified certain constitutional amendments which, in its view, were appropriate if our Federal system is to thrive in the future. In that connection it was particularly concerned to ascertain means of restoring fiscal responsibility and independence to the States, and noted that this objective would require a concerted effort by the States.

The committee in Western Australia, like our South Australian advisory council, was not asked to report upon the issue of whether or not the Commonwealth is to become a republic. Rather, the advisory council is really examining what the implications are for South Australia if the nation, as a whole, does decide to cease to be a constitutional monarchy. In Western Australia it was interesting to note that in the community the issue of a sustainable and vibrant Federal system was more important than changing the Head of State because, as the committee there noted (and as I am sure our advisory council will note as well, and as I think, from a reported statement of the Chair, Professor Howell, has stated) Australia is, in effect, a *de facto* constitutional republic at this time.

In Western Australia it was noted that the republican debate in the community does provide an opportunity to seek a better Federal system and, as this advisory council in South Australia gets under way, I look forward to its report with great interest because it can focus the attention of South Australians on the advantages of the present Federal system, provided it can be strengthened, and it will focus the attention of South Australians on the desirability of having an effective State Government which does not have its powers and its responsibilities diluted by a centralised power. The Government is to be commended for setting up, appointing and funding the advisory council.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: It's stacked with monarchists.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The Hon. Roberts says that it is stacked with monarchists. He is obviously thinking of Mr Patrick Conlon.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: Tell me which ones are not monarchists.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I would not want to hold her to it, but I understand from a reported comment of Michelle Fielke, who I am glad is a member of the committee, that she is not a dedicated monarchist by any means. It is unfortunate that the Hon. Ron Roberts should seek to stick—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: You say that Mr Conlon is a monarchist, do you?

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I have not asked them.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Whether or not they are monarchists—and I am not suggesting for a moment that they are—they are not being called upon to make any recommendations as to whether Australia should continue as a constitutional monarchy.

The only other matter to which I wish to refer is rather more general and it should be of interest to all members. I refer to the lack of esteem in which politicians generally appear to be held in our community. There is a general disdain for the process of politics. It is well documented. Young people, like the Hon. Legh Davis especially, have become alienated from the political processes, and politics is seen as sleazy, squalid, contemptible and tawdry.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: If the cap fits, Hon. Ron Roberts, those are the words I was thinking of. As members will appreciate, there is a similar disdain for political practitioners as well as the process itself. One never hears members of Parliament being described in terms of their community spiritedness, industriousness, conscientiousness, trustworthiness, reliability or genuineness. These words seem to be reserved for valedictory speeches in Parliament when we describe each other's attributes.

It would be easy to become despondent, but we can take some comfort from the fact that many other once revered callings have suffered a similar fate. Only a few years ago one never heard disparaging remarks about judges. If they were spoken of at all, it was in reverential terms. That is not so now. They are freely castigated in the media as being overpaid, out of touch, prejudiced, old fashioned and, some of them, incompetent. These descriptions are grossly unfair, and they would have been unthinkable a few years ago. So judges as a group have suffered.

Similarly, doctors as a group have suffered. Once they were portrayed as dedicated, conscientious and driven by the Hippocratic oath. Now they are portrayed as self-seeking, overpaid and driven by greed. These impressions are largely driven by the members of the mass media who increasingly see themselves as part of the entertainment rather than the information industry.

We can take some comfort from the fact that surveys tend to show a marked difference between the perception of respondents of a politician, a doctor or a judge who is known to the individual, where that perception is seen to be, on the whole, favourable. The same respondents' answers in questionnaires of politicians, doctors and judges generally is much lower. Only this year in the United Kingdom, a committee appointed by the Prime Minister and chaired by Lord Nolan delivered a report entitled 'Standards in Public Life'. This committee was established following allegations that members of the House of Commons were receiving fees to ask questions in Parliament. There was also disquiet about the longstanding practice of permitting members to act as consultants for outsiders. In its report, the Nolan committee enunciated seven principles of public life, namely, selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership, all qualities seen in ample evidence in this Chamber.

One interesting sidelight of the report was the result of a survey entitled 'Public Standing of Occupational Groups'. In

this survey, people were asked whether members of various occupational groups were likely to tell the truth. Predictably, over 80 per cent of respondents said that clergymen and priests were the groups whose members were most likely to tell the truth. Not surprisingly, politicians as a class were seen at the lower end of the scale. Indeed, politicians were second lowest on the index of trustworthiness. Only 14 per cent of those surveyed considered that politicians in general are likely to tell the truth. However, there is a delicious irony in this survey. Whilst politicians generally were second to bottom on the scale, the least trustworthy group of all was found to be Government Ministers. Only 11 per cent of them were seen as trustworthy. Of course, this is in the United Kingdom, not South Australia. One would not imagine that similar survey results would be obtained in South Australia.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: What did lawyers get?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Lawyers were well ahead of politicians. One might say in passing that these survey results raised some interesting ethical implications. Why do those in the lowest group, namely Ministers, expend so much of their effort to make sure that they stay there and why do those in the second lowest group of trustworthiness expend so much effort in trying to get themselves into the least trustworthy group? It is easy to become despondent when one reads such surveys. However, we can take some comfort from the fact that the low esteem in which politicians are held is not unique to present times. If one reads contemporary accounts, one is inclined to think that this is a relatively recent phenomenon. However, if one examines history, one sees that is not the case.

Political processes in nineteenth century Australia were fairly rough and ready and historical accounts show that the integrity of some members of Parliament in the days of land jobbing and the like was highly dubious. The behaviour of many of them was appalling and it attracted the contempt of the media and the public more than a hundred years ago. One hears a lot of complaints about the media nowadays, and I have made some myself. However, the efforts of journalists of today might be regarded as quite restrained when compared with the contributions of some of their forefathers. As an example, I saw an account of Sir George Reid, who was one of the founding fathers of the Commonwealth, Premier of New South Wales, the first Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament and Australia's fourth Prime Minister. This eminent personage was described by the *Truth* as a cheapjack charlatan, and the writer went on to say, 'This fat, flautent and frothy fellow deserves the degrading name of Reid the Wiggler.'

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: Reid the Wiggler?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Reid the Wiggler.

I was inclined to think that this Australian disrespect for persons in authority was the product of our democratic heritage. But if we examine the history of Australia since European settlement, we see that this attitude of disrespect pre-dates parliaments and politicians. South Australia's first Governor, Governor Hindmarsh, was recalled after only 14 months in office as a result of back-biting and self-interested attacks upon his integrity by the first colonists. Governor La Trobe, the first Governor of Victoria, suffered a similar fate. The first Governors of New South Wales suffered similar indignities. The phenomenon of seeking to abuse and knock political representatives in this country is not a new one; it pre-dates elected parliaments. It is not related to the fact that we are elected. It seems to me that the only solution to this problem lies in the personal conduct of

members, not only within the four walls of this Parliament but in their dealings with people outside, and in their conduct generally in the community. Gladiatorial behaviour is obviously attractive to the media. The great success of the television program of that very name proves the point. However, the community is entitled to expect that members of Parliament resist the temptation to be gladiators and concentrate on the business at hand in the interests of all of the community. I commend the motion.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I thank Her Excellency the Governor for her speech, and I am pleased to support the motion. I join with my other colleagues in expressing my condolences to those who lost loved ones during the recess.

The country of South Africa has undergone a traumatic change since 27 April 1994, when Nelson Mandela became President of South Africa. South Africa became a country which again traded with the world—trade sanctions were removed, sporting ties were re-established and cultural barriers were dropped. South Africa, a country of 42 million people, 11 languages and many provinces, rejoined the world community.

Many lessons can be learnt profitably by South Australia—indeed, Australia—from what has happened and what is happening in that country. Recently, I visited South Africa, and I looked at the wine industry, which is providing increasingly strong competition to the Australian wine industry, together with tourism, and initiatives in small business.

I want to commence by talking about the interesting initiative that South Africa put in place in 1981 when it established the Small Business Development Corporation. It is structured in a quite exciting and different fashion.

Whereas traditionally in Australia small business development corporations, at both Federal and State levels, are creatures of Government, that is not the case in South Africa. In the United States of America small business initiatives are driven mostly at a Federal level, and that is certainly the case in South Africa, but with an extraordinary difference, that is, the corporation is a joint venture between the private and public sectors. Some 150 private sector shareholders have committed over R142 million (rand), which is equivalent to about \$A53 million, in share capital. Indeed, 12 private sector shareholders—and they are private sector companies—have each invested more than \$A1 million.

In other words, they are stakeholders in the Small Business Development Corporation in partnership with government, and some of those stakeholders are directors of the board, which guides the direction of the Small Business Development Corporation. The corporation is indeed profitable, and in 1994 it recorded a profit of R19.7 million, or some \$A7.5 million. For the first time in 1994 the assets exceeded R1 billion, which is \$A360 million. The brief of the corporation is to assist small and medium enterprises (the acronym S&MEs) in four key areas: the provision of finance; the provision of affordable business premises; the provision of information, training and other advisory services; and, lastly, with special projects and promotions, to stimulate entrepreneurship. The 1994 Annual Report states under 'Management Review':

Continued support for market-driven economic system in general, and micro, small and medium enterprise creation in particular, remains the most important element of any strategy aimed at stimulating economic growth, job creation and socioeconomic empowerment.

It also states:

Unemployment, along with homelessness and poverty, affects a large part of the South African population. Under these conditions, the role of micro, small and medium enterprise in generating employment-creating wealth cannot be questioned. Hence, the role of the SBDC as facilitator of SME development has acquired an added importance.

As members would no doubt know, the level of unemployment in South Africa is extraordinarily high amongst the blacks: we are talking about 50 and 60 per cent in some areas.

An honourable member: More, in some areas.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Indeed. So, President Mandela has an enormous challenge both in meeting the very high expectations of those blacks who are now empowered by the new Government with the breakdown of the wretched regime of apartheid and also in jumping this unemployment hurdle. The Small Business Development Corporation has a very exciting and quite clearly key role in seeking to meet this challenge. In 1994, 8 000 loans were granted, totalling about \$A130 million—R360 million. The important thing is to recognise that, whilst the loans are made at market interest rates, in 80 per cent of cases it believed the loans would not have been made by banks. In other words, the corporation is moving into a vacuum created by the reluctance of banks to lend. Certainly, some of these loans are high risk and certainly, as you would expect in taking this entrepreneurial approach, some bad and doubtful debts have been incurred.

The loans generally range between R5 000 and R1 million, remembering that one Australian dollar is currently about 2.7 rand. Generally, working capital loans will be up for to three years, loans for equipment from five to seven years and up to 10 years for property loans. Loans are provided not only to establish business but also to entrepreneurs seeking to start up small businesses or expand into a new product or service. The Small Business Development Corporation also has a subcontracting program, which promotes the purchase of goods and services of small firms by large companies.

There are 70 business service centres which maintain an information bank providing specialist advice, a range of journals, file material, research papers, statistical data and case studies, as one would expect of a business centre. One of the programs which I found very attractive—it is certainly used in Canada and America and I suspect that more use of it could be made in Australia—is the mentor advisory program (MAP). The mentor advisory program involves the use of over 300 retired business people recruited by the Small Business Development Corporation to assist in follow-through of small businesses that have been granted a loan. It is a very active program not only processing loans and making an assessment of the risk and a judgment as to whether loans should be granted but most importantly providing follow-through and a mentor program to assist small businesses.

The Small Business Development Corporation also has consultancy programs which provide specialist advice to assist small businesses. Interestingly, these mentors are paid only 20 rand an hour, which is about \$7.50 Australian, but one should remember in making that judgment that, although this represents only \$300 a week in Australian terms, in South Africa a 24 or 25 year old qualified policeman would earn between \$A400 and \$A500—salaries are on the low side. The Small Business Development Corporation also networks with the South African Government to maximise export development in small business enterprises.

The other facet which makes the Small Business Development Corporation quite unique and distinctive from its Australian counterparts is that it has purchased and built shopping centres, particularly in locations where the private sector has been reluctant to invest: in disadvantaged areas, particularly black settlements. Some of those centres have been a great success; some, as you would perhaps not be surprised to hear, have not been so successful on a commercial basis. The Small Business Development Corporation is an interesting and innovative corporation, and I was most impressed with the quality of its programs and the professionalism of its people whom I met in Cape Town.

When Sir Francis Drake sailed around the Cape of Good Hope for the first time in 1577, he was bowled over by its beauty. He described it as 'the fairest Cape I have seen in the whole circumference of the earth'. It is interesting to note that it was within 100 years of Sir Francis Drake's making that quote that there was settlement in South Africa when the Dutch East India Company established a victualling station at the Cape of Good Hope in 1652 to service the many ships in its fleet sailing through to India and the East. Fresh food, particularly fruit and vegetables, was provided through this victualling station. The first vineyards were planted in South Africa shortly afterwards in 1655. Indeed, the first wine was made in 1659. So, the South African wine industry is over 300 years old. Simon van der Stel, the second Governor of the Cape, was a keen viticulturalist and enthusiastic about winemaking. In 1679, he planted a vineyard on his farm at Constantia, which today is just 15 to 20 minutes away from the heart of the very beautiful city of Cape Town. Although the Dutch did not have a tradition in wine making, Groot Constantia wines enjoyed a worldwide reputation.

Today, that original manor house still stands and is a cultural history museum. To me, it was a grim and sad reminder of the fact that South Australia lost an opportunity, some 15 years ago, when the historic Penfold Grange vineyard was butchered by subdivision. That magnificent space, just four miles directly to the east of Adelaide, had an ambience, a history, a space, and a view of the city of Adelaide which would have made it the ideal place for a national wine museum. I have been in this Chamber long enough to remember having a resolution carried in this place condemning the Government of the day for not taking action to prevent that from happening. Of course, it was not solely the Government's fault, because Adelaide Steamship Company, as the owner of Penfolds, was the owner of that land. It took the mercenary view and decided to take some money out of the system by subdividing the land. The Government would have needed to buy the land from the company to preserve that historic Grange vineyard. But that is the sadness I have in Adelaide—namely that we have so few opportunities to do something at an international level. Invariably, when we have the opportunity, we fluff and fumble it.

So, Groot Constantia is still a site for vineyards, in a most magnificent setting, unlike the Penfold vineyard area which has been destroyed and compromised by the band of housing which surrounds the site.

The Cape of Good Hope has not dissimilar weather to the weather experienced in South Australian vineyards, in the Napa and the Sonoma in California, and in the Margaret River; mediterranean climates—micro climates—varying quite dramatically in their style. The cooling breezes of the Indian and Atlantic oceans bring many variations into those climates in that region where an area of some 100 000

hectares is under vine. But, curiously, very little of it finds its way into the bottle. Much of it goes in table grapes and grapejuice, and far too much of it goes into bulk wine.

But back to the history. In 1685, as I have mentioned, the Constantia Valley was planted out with grapes. This is a delightful area nestled alongside the slopes of the Table Mountains, with wet winters and long cool summers.

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: No, this is another area, not far away, that we will talk about in a minute. So, Groot Constantia now is a national monument controlled by a trust. Its place in history has been properly recognised. Not far away is Stellenbosch, a university town settled in 1685, which acts as headquarters for many wine companies. Then there is the unique town of Franschhoek where 200 French Huguenot families, escaping religious persecution in Europe, brought their knowledge and tradition in agriculture and wine making and settled on land granted them by Governor van der Stel.

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: That is right. The valley of Franschhoek, which is a little more than three quarters of an hour away from the original vineyards of Constantia, proudly reflects the tradition of wine making developed over 300 years. That village has French cuisine, Cape cooking, splendid red and white wines, a wide range of arts and craft and wine estates with wine tasting. I have mentioned Stellenbosch, settled in 1679, which plays host to a large range of visitors who enjoy the hospitality and the charm of the guesthouses, country inns and cottages in that region.

Further, closer to the coast, there are splendid vineyards not far from Hermanus, which is arguably the best place in the world to watch whales from the land. In my view, the vineyards of Hamilton Russell and Bouchard Finlayson produce world class white wines.

The South African wine industry, although 300 years old, had, I suspect, been on a plateau for a long time, cut off from the rest of the world because of Apartheid and limited in its trading opportunities. The passing of that regime has provided a wonderful opportunity for an industry operating in a vacuum for so long. The gateways to the world have been opened and the industry is burgeoning. For example, exports of South African wine to England in 1994 increased by 110 per cent. To quote from John Platter's *New South African Wine Guide*, Jancis Robinson from the *Financial Times* states as follows:

If I were a wine producer in Australia or France, I'd be quivering with fright at some of the South African combinations of quality and price that have been hitting British wine retailers' shelves in the last year or so. As a mere parasite on the business of making and selling wine, I am delighted to record the exuberance evident in these bottles—and can't wait to see it all for myself.

Frank Prial, writing in the *New York Times*, states as follows:

Cape wines are back. The dark years of apartheid have ended and South Africa has joyfully rejoined the family of nations. What better way to celebrate these stirring events than with fine South African wines.

There is no doubt that the wines of that region have improved very quickly, and there is a general agreement amongst people in the wine industry in Australia and, indeed, in Europe to whom I have spoken that South African wines have been the great improver on the world scene in the last two years. In fact, 400 new wines came on in the 1994-95 season alone—an extraordinary explosion of interest, professionalism and commitment.

In world terms, the industry is still small. It ranks about nineteenth and has only about 1 per cent of world acreage, but it accounts for about 3.3 per cent of international wine production. As I said, far too much of it is in bulk wines. Interestingly, cooperatives produce about 85 per cent of the crop, but 75 per cent of their production winds up as grape juice, distilling wine or industrial alcohol, with just 25 per cent as wine. There is a realisation that the grapes should be used more and more for wine, and as the replanting goes on and the quality of the fruit improves, offering fuller, richer, riper fruit, much more quality wine will come from South Africa.

The other exciting thing about South African wine, from the point of view of the buyer in Europe or Australia, is that the price is so cheap. The weakness of the rand has meant that an equivalent bottle of wine that may cost \$10 in Australia would sell in South Africa for \$5 or \$6. There is a huge difference in price.

In 1918 a cooperative called KWV was formed, and that began as an association representing various growers and today represents something like 5 000 wine farms. It is a commercial organisation which markets internationally, acts as administrator of the wine industry at producer level and provides a wide range of services to wine farmers and the public. As a producers' organisation it has a democratically elected board with wine farmers as directors, and KWV is the major exporter of South African wine.

One aspect of the wine industry with which I am always impressed is that in 1973 a system of wine of origin was introduced, similar to that experienced in Europe. The Wine and Spirit Board issues an official numbered seal which is affixed to the neck of the bottle which certifies that the wine comes from a particular region, in much the same way as the AOC certificate in France or the DOC certificate in Italy certifying that the wine complies with certain qualities and standards. That system will stand South Africa in good stead as increasingly it moves away from using its bulk wines in France—I understand some of it goes into cask wine in Australia—and produces more and more premium wine for world markets.

KWV is the major driving force in developing South Africa as a producer of wine. It is the biggest exporter of wine and boasts not only a wide range of whites and reds which are all exported from its headquarters in Paarl, north of Capetown, but also makes brandy and sherries. It has won an award for its KWV Van der Hum, which has been judged the best liqueur in the world over two consecutive years at the International Wine and Spirit Competition.

I met with Dr James Retief, the KWV marketing chief, who is quoted in the 1995 John Platter's book as follows:

When will we ever get an export opportunity like we have had this year? Everybody loves South Africa at the moment. If we continue down the bulk wine road we will squander it all. It would take years to recover and rebuild an image. As it is we now have to depend on a declining rand to sustain our export and that is not good news.

South Africa is well aware of the opportunity it has in the market. They are well aware of the Australian example. It admires and is very envious of the way in which Australia has so quickly established an important niche in the wine markets of the world, particularly in the United Kingdom, where we have established 20 per cent of a share of the £6 and more per bottle market. The challenge that lies ahead for South Africa is to follow the route that Australia has taken.

The other area which is increasingly earning dollars for South Africa is tourism. Like the wine industry, where there has been an explosion in the export of wine, so, too, it is true to say that South African tourism has enjoyed a boom. The liberation of the country from the yoke of apartheid has brought many benefits to a country rich in both natural assets and minerals; with excellent agricultural and pastoral lands; an extraordinary range of wild animals; and scenic attractions, ranging from the game reserves such as the stark beauty of Kruger National Park to the Garden Route from Capetown to Plettenburg which Bryce Courtenay, famous as the author of *The Power of One*, said was to him was the most beautiful motorway in the world.

The garden route from Cape Town through to Plettenburg, a distance of some 450 kilometres, is adjacent to a mountain range topped by cloud and beside the Indian Ocean. There are many attractions for tourists in this region. One of the most extraordinary attractions is whaling because, from June to December, southern right whales and other species of whale come into areas such as Plettenburg Bay or Hermanus where they can be seen every day. Dolphins can also be seen every day. We get excited about one whale in Victor Harbor and it becomes a page one newspaper story or a television item, but in Hermanus, which is about 120 kilometres from Cape Town in what is spectacular scenery with rugged mountains behind and beautiful vineyards nearby, people can see up to 80 whales gathered in the bay. It is claimed to be the best whale viewing in the world. There is a 12 kilometre cliff path that provides enthusiastic whale watchers with endless opportunities to see whales coming within 20 metres of those paths as they cruise in the coves.

Hermanus has its own whale crier, with a kelp horn. It has a whale watching hotline. It is a huge industry. On a special weekend they attracted 60 000 visitors to a town which normally has a population of 2 000 or 3 000 people. On that garden route are forests such as Knysna and Tsitsikama, magnificent indigenous forests with beautiful birds, flora and fauna, as well as lagoons and lakes which provide a paradise for water birds.

As an Australian it seems to me that South Africa has not only an enormous amount to offer tourists but also an enormous amount to teach Australia about the way that tourism is presented. For example, something that I had never seen before in any Australian State was the idea of promoting South Africa as a place to visit for flowers.

We hear a lot about the wild flowers in the Flinders Ranges and we have a modest tourist trade in that area. Western Australia certainly has a very active season for wild flowers, running through September and October. However, in Cape Town they promote the concept of a flower line, which is a seven day a week, eight hour a day hotline providing details of where the best flowers are to be seen on that day, ideas for accommodation for tours and special attractions to flower regions, and viewing tips are provided for the flowers. The best regions are identified on a particular day, and people are told of what can be seen, what is the best time to see it, what the other attractions are in the region, and a contact person in the region is provided. It is a terrific idea; and, in fact, it is a sensible and sophisticated idea.

In Plettenburg Bay, which is an extraordinary place, Jacques Costeau's son was in his famous boat monitoring the whales. Plettenburg Bay has made locals aware of the importance of tourism.

In South Australia we can still find many country towns that are actively hostile to tourism. I can name one big town

in South Australia, which should know better, which within the past month actually had a meeting of locals to protest about the amount of money the council was spending on the promotion of tourism. Yet, if they did their sums they would realise that the town has been largely kept alive by the activities of tourism.

Just to give an example of the sort of initiative and professionalism that goes into the promotion of Plettenburg Bay, the marketing director there said that one of the ideas to be considered in the next 12 months to project Plettenburg Bay as a friendly town was to print a certain amount of pink leaflets resembling traffic violation tickets and, during December, in the lead up to Christmas, motorists guilty of minor offences such as overstaying parking time would have the tickets attached to their cars, but the wording of the ticket would read something to the effect of:

Welcome to Plettenburg Bay, the friendly town. You have committed a traffic violation. However, in the spirit of Christmas we're not giving you a fine, but would rather wish you a happy stay in our town and safe motoring home. We would like to invite you to visit our tourism centre. Bring this ticket along with you and you could be in line to win a free meal. You'd also have the opportunity to make a small donation towards making Christmas a happy event for some less privileged child. Wishing you a Merry Christmas and safe driving in 1996. Signed, Plettenburg Bay Traffic Department.

That is a nice idea, and many members would think that perhaps that could be done closer to home.

Something that is undoubtedly important is the recognition of tourism as a business that can bring enormous benefits. South Africa, as it rejoins the world and promotes tourism in a very sophisticated way (on which I will elaborate in a minute), has made several succinct points through South African Tourism (SATOUR) about the benefits of tourism. It says that, for every 30 new tourists, one direct and two indirect job opportunities are created. That is accompanied by the development of infrastructure, it generates investment, earns foreign exchange, promotes mutual understanding and goodwill and provides valuable funds for environmental conservation.

In 1994 South Africa had an increase of nearly 20 per cent in incoming visitors to the country, both from Africa and from other overseas countries. Its aim is to almost triple the number of foreign tourists to its shores through to the year 2000. One of the problems that South Africa has, of course, is a lack of money. It has been hamstrung in the marketplace by the lack of advertising dollars, but the natural attractions of South Africa are winning out. The country is being promoted as being in the same time zone as Europe.

If there is one tendency around the world in tourism it is for people to take more short breaks rather than one long break. It is a pattern that is common in Australia and around the world, particularly in countries where people do not enjoy a four week annual holiday as is the case in Australia.

That has been reflected in information I have received from airlines and from other tourist operators in Australia. Increasingly people will take a four or five day break, fly from Adelaide to Melbourne, Sydney or Brisbane at the top end of the market and perhaps do that two or three times a year. That benefits South Africa as it attracts people from Switzerland and Germany, those two countries especially having inveterate and very adventurous travellers, as well as from England, France and a range of other European countries.

South Africa is also attracting an increasing number of Asian tourists. The international marketing of South Africa will provide very direct and stiff competition, I would submit,

to the marketing of Australia because South Africa is a novel experience. Not many people from Australia and Europe have travelled to South Africa as visitors. In a three year international marketing plan South Africa has described 1995 as the year to explore South Africa; 1996 as the year of nature-based tourism and adventure; and 1997 as the year of sport and cultural experiences. Obviously, South Africa has benefited from the rugby union world cup and also the re-introduction of test cricket, which attracted many Australians and people from Europe.

South Africa, of course, is very aware of the opportunities to promote its natural and cultural attractions, in particular, ecotourism, which was defined by the Ecotourism Society in 1990 to include:

... purposeful travel to natural areas to understand the cultural and natural history of the environment, taking care not to alter the integrity of the ecosystem while producing economic opportunities that make the conservation of natural resources beneficial to local people.

South Africans argue that ecotourism is not a buzz word, but refers to the interaction between three integrated components: the ecotourism industry, the natural and cultural environment, and the people inhabiting that environment, culminating in the tourism experience.

South Africa is very aware of the problems it has in its transition from an apartheid regime to a united country with its high levels of unemployment, as we have said, approaching 60 to 70 per cent in some regions, in a country where gross domestic product actually declined by nearly 6 per cent during 1992, with the annual population in that same year increasing by 2.6 per cent, and where only six million of the 13 million economically active people in the country are employed, with 70 per cent of people living below the minimum subsistence level. An extraordinarily difficult balancing act has been given to President Mandela and his Government and the provincial Governments in South Africa.

Tourism is one of the big areas of opportunity in providing employment on a part-time or full-time basis for black people, particularly in the areas of arts and craft, the game reserves, and also in environmental management and planning. South Africa has put together a deliberate package to encourage ecotourists, and some valuable lessons are to be learnt from Australia's point of view and particularly from South Australia's point of view. All of us here would be aware of the burgeoning growth in tourism, particularly to the northern regions of Australia from Monkey Mia, Broome in north-west Western Australia, through Kakadu and other scenic attractions in the Northern Territory, such as Ayers Rock, through to Cape York and Cairns in Queensland.

Growth in tourism in Australia has occurred in the top half of the continent. The bottom half of the continent has been losing out in terms of its share of international visitors, interstate visitations, as well as, arguably, domestic visitation. One reason for this, I would suggest, is that people are increasingly wanting to escape the traditional hotel and motel package; they want to get away from the crowded cities and to have a novel tourist experience.

Ecotourism provides opportunities for rural communities to use otherwise non-viable land for commercial purposes, thereby becoming important shareholders in ecotourism ventures. This is the view of South African Tourism. Tourism creates job opportunities for the people living in the surrounding areas. Tourists enjoying an ecotourism experience also significantly contribute to the general uplifting of communi-

ties, bringing money into an area and buying local wares such as crafts and curios unique to a particular area.

This is where it becomes very relevant for South Australia. In order to support ecotourism areas, infrastructural development takes place, such as the building and maintenance of roads to ecotourism destinations, and the establishment of water, electricity and banking facilities to supply these areas, all of which enhance the area and create job opportunities.

South Africa has these ingredients to become a leading ecotourism destination. It has magnificent natural resources, spectacular scenery and a rich cultural heritage. To make for successful ecotourism we need the natural and cultural attractions of the environment, the professionalism of the tourism operator, the resources and hospitality of the local community and the responsible and conducive behaviour of the ecotourist. That is what South Africa is setting itself. In particular, it has the unique wildlife reserves, notably the Kruger National Park, amongst many others. It has focused attention on promoting these reserves to tourists.

One of the companies that has taken a special and leading role in the promotion of ecotourism in South Africa is a company called, appropriately, the Conservation Corporation, which has been established only a few years. Its operating ethic is to develop the wilderness in South Africa but at the same time to give emphasis to the participation of local communities so that they can share in the economic benefits of tourism. The Conservation Corporation manages four of South Africa's leading private game reserves, namely, Londolozi, Singita, Ngala and Phinda, names that may well be known to some members. They have lodges which are small and designed to harmonise with the surrounding habitat of bushveldt or tall forest. They have extraordinary standards of excellence; they are unashamedly five star quality. With the rand being weak, the prices are extraordinarily reasonable for what you get.

Ngala is the only reserve in South Africa that is within a national park. Ngala represents the first contract reserve established between Kruger National Park and private enterprise, namely, the Conservation Corporation. This partnership agreement allows a private company to operate a lodge—a reserve—within 15 000 hectares of land in the national park.

Some members will recall the debate that took place in this Chamber some years ago about whether a tourism development should be allowed within a national park in the Flinders Ranges. It was a non-debate in the sense that the Labor Government of the day had enlarged the national park quite deliberately to give it control of that area, so it was a rather academic argument in my view because I supported the Government in its proposal to develop the Flinders Ranges Lodge which was, sadly, an ill-fated proposal. It was inappropriately large and the financial constraints of the time conspired to prevent the project going ahead.

However, in Ngala we have an internationally recognised game reserve operating within the two million hectare Kruger National Park. The Conservation Corporation operating for only five years is helping to unlock South Africa's enormous ecotourism potential by developing these internationally renowned tourism resorts through local investment. They commit themselves to giving employment to local people as rangers, guides and staff. An article about the company states:

The Conservation Corporation 'aims to create a model in wise land use management, using the multi-disciplines of natural systems by integrating tourism and rural communities to their mutual benefit.

Our primary objective is to demonstrate that wildlife can be used on a sustainable basis by all'.

Each of those reserves has been developed with its own character to fit in with the topography of the land and the nature of the setting. It has been driven by the ethic of care of land, care of wildlife and care of people. That is a very exciting initiative to see in operation. It really does bring home to roost the challenges facing South Australia. Whilst, in many ways, we have provided a model of what is best in ecotourism, we have been very good on the theory but fairly weak in practice.

When one looks at the opportunities for ecotourism in South Australia, one sees Warrawong—a botanical and zoological sanctuary established by the controversial and colourful Dr John Wamsley—which provides formal guided tours with night and dawn walks, just as in those game reserves there are tours in a landrover with a spotter who has been trained in terms of communication and, through his or her background, can spot the wild animals and birds, observe the flora and comment upon it. Warrawong provides not only botanical and zoological sanctuary but also modest accommodation. Cleland reserve is an adornment to Adelaide's tourism assets and provides night walks to see wildlife, in particular nocturnal animals, but there is no accommodation on the site. Yookamurra at Swan Reach provides guided walks with overnight accommodation.

We have a whale centre at Victor Harbor with three floors of interpretive display and we have the Ceduna whale watch, which has enormous potential, particularly if it can be developed to include some of the land flora and fauna that may be observed. One of the points South Australia has been slow to recognise is that international visitors at the top of the market are prepared to fly distances in light aircraft to see something worthwhile. Of course, the plan in the Flinders Ranges was to upgrade the airstrip at Hawker. The Heysen Trail has exciting potential and at Chookarloo—part of the Heysen Trail through the Kuitpo Forest—guided tours are available through private operators. There are animal and reptile parks at Naracoorte and Renmark. Arkaroola in the Flinders Ranges, together with the Rasheeds at Wilpena, offers tours.

However, I would argue that Kangaroo Island, with the Flinders Chase National Park, is probably our most internationally accredited ecotourism opportunity.

We have the *Sealink* day tour, on which the bus driver gives a commentary, accommodation packages and *Super Flyte* tours to Seal Bay and Flinders Chase National Park. At present there is no five-star accommodation on Kangaroo Island, although there is some three-star accommodation available. If South Australia is serious about developing tourism—and we are talking about caravan parks up to the very top level—we have to bolster our accommodation outside the metropolitan area. South Australia is the only State in Australia where there is no three-and-a-half or four-star accommodation outside the capital of Adelaide. That is an enormous gap in the tourism sector in this State. There have been plans and discussions in the Barossa Valley and currently there are discussions about developing a resort on Kangaroo Island, and there are opportunities we must seize. Of course, it is all about economics and promotion.

The South African lesson is very valuable. South Africa has wildlife with which we cannot compete, but our kangaroos, emus, koalas, bird life, fauna and scenic attractions are quite magnificent. As the world increasingly looks to

experiencing something different, natural and environmental, South Australia, with niche marketing, can promote Kangaroo Island, the Flinders Ranges, the Far North and Whalewatch in Ceduna and grab more of the tourism market than it is currently earning.

Closer to home there are the more traditional pursuits for tourists. We have the wine regions surrounding Adelaide ranging from McLaren Vale in the south through the Adelaide Hills to the Barossa Valley and the Clare Valley, and further away we have the famous Coonawarra District and the Riverland. South Australia is not very good at lateral thinking. I have never seen a pamphlet which joins the Barossa and Clare Valleys together and promotes a package of those two areas. They are only 30 minutes apart. Although the Napa and Sonoma Valleys in the United States are fiercely competitive and have friendly rivalries, they unite to form packages and to share. They will exchange advice on the best accommodation and restaurants in their respective valleys. However, I have never seen a pamphlet which joins the Barossa and Clare Valleys together so that one can have a mining, wining and dining experience taking in all that is best in the Barossa with its traditional German heritage and unique food, wine, lifestyle and architecture moving through Kapunda and Burra to enjoy the history of the mining experience before rejoining the wine district through the beautiful Clare Valley region. I should declare that I am about to have an interest no longer, so I can talk dispassionately about these matters.

In summary, it is pleasing to see that South Africa has rejoined the world in a very lively fashion. Its wine exports are burgeoning and its tourism trade is expanding quickly. In a very real sense, Australia should be aware of the challenge and the competition that it will face from South Africa in both tourism and wine. South Australia could learn a lot from some of the good things that are happening in those two industries in South Africa. In particular, we should be seeking to gain more of the people from South Africa who are migrating to Australia. Some 3 000 South Africans migrate to Australia each year, which is roughly 60 a week. South Australia is getting only 1 or 2 per cent of them. They are generally professional, well-qualified people who, for a variety of reasons, decide to start a new life in Australia. Obviously, the uncertainty about the economic and political instability in South Africa is a factor that is influencing people who migrate to Australia. South Australia should be much more proactive in its contacts with South Africa.

I am pleased to say that my colleague the Hon. Dale Baker, Minister for Primary Industries and Minister for Mines and Energy, has been aware of the possible mutual benefits that can exist between exchanges and recently visited that country. I support the motion.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: In rising to support the motion thanking Her Excellency Dame Roma Mitchell for opening this Parliament, I want to change the subject from wine to water, so to speak. A good friend of mine, a carpenter by trade, once changed water into wine. After today's decision by the Government, if that carpenter friend of mine ever comes back to South Australia, that may well be the only way that we get our water back again, given the impost that is about to be placed on it.

It is worth noting that today, on Maggie Thatcher's birthday, this bunch of economic rationalists over there have chosen to send South Australian water down the gurgler to English and French companies and to burden South

Australians with all the imposts that English and French water consumers have been suffering since Margaret Thatcher and her bunch of troglodytes decided to go down the track of flogging off the assets of their people.

Today it has been announced that one of the resources that South Australians always say the Government should be responsible for is to be sold. South Australians always say that health, education, water, police, electricity, gas and an independent judiciary are the core functions of Government. Today we have seen the start of flogging off the silver of South Australia. Let it be made very clear: the Labor Party is totally opposed to this sell off. We are appalled that there has been no parliamentary scrutiny and that they have hidden themselves away like thieves in the night and flogged off our assets.

The track record of the privatisation of water and the behaviour of some of these overseas companies have been appalling. It has been a story of huge price hikes along with increased disconnections and the incidence of preventable disease. It has been a story in which water quality and environmental standards have dropped in spite of consumers paying higher prices and, while the majority suffers, executive salaries and perks have gone through the roof.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: This is the experience of people in the countries to which your Government has flogged off our water. The Government claims that country people will still be looked after by SA Water and that prices for country services will not increase. That is not true. Quite clearly, country people will have to pay more for their water, there is no doubt about it, but I pause at this juncture to pay tribute to Mr Jeremy Moore, a colleague of mine from Strathalbyn, who is one of the members of the rural advisory committee and who has done a lot of work on this subject and has produced some facts of which the people of South Australia ought to be made aware.

The Brown Government has called for and received tenders from various companies to operate the Adelaide water and sewage services, and today it has announced a consortium of both—we will not just get one of these people with a bad record. The terms of the tender documents are not available for inspection—not even the Hon. Legh Davis's committee has had a look at them. We are taking away a statutory authority in the EWS. Anyone would think that this matter should be the subject of parliamentary scrutiny, because it might be worth looking at. They might think that a bit of transparency in government is worthwhile and that the Parliament ought to look at it. They could even have come in here or in the other place and allowed the Parliament to be involved in the matter of whether it is a good idea to flog off South Australia's assets. Members opposite do not want to hear; they do not like the truth.

As I understand it, one of the contractors will end up with the opportunity to operate the Adelaide metropolitan water and sewage services, involving approximately \$1.5 billion in water rates from each consumer to the South Australian Government during the life of the contract. I refer to South Australian Water (formerly the EWS) figures—and these figures have been produced by the independent Audit Commission's report.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: It is in country areas, where the greatest suffering will take place, in the honourable member's natural constituency, where they will be hit with extra prices. This is the impost that these people, the bastions

of those country constituents, will impose—and it is coming, as sure as night follows day. It cost \$1.20 per litre in 1993 and \$1.05 per kilolitre in 1993-94 to supply water to the users in the Murray-Mallee. There goes the Mallee constituents. In 1992-93 it cost \$5.04 per kilolitre and in 1993-94 it cost \$1.23 per kilolitre to supply water to those users in the northern region. It cost \$3.42 per kilolitre in 1992-93 and \$1.77 per kilolitre in 1993-94 to supply water to the users on Eyre Peninsula. So much for all the Hon. Carolyn Schaefer's constituents who have been looking to this Government to save them. The Federal Government, which has saved the farmers on the East Coast, will not be able to step in on this occasion and save them. After this contract goes through, they will not even get relief from the State Government because they have flogged off responsibility.

It cost \$2.34 per kilolitre in 1992-93 and 90¢ per kilolitre in 1993-94 to supply water to the South-Eastern region. So it looks as though poor old Harold Alison's constituents will go crazy. It cost \$1.24 per kilolitre in 1992-93, and 81¢ per kilolitre in 1993-94 to supply water to the Riverland users. That is on the bank of the river! Next year they will have to ask the French whether they can go for a swim. It cost 92¢ per kilolitre to supply water to the Adelaide metropolitan area.

There is also a story on sewerage. For sewerage services, it costs South Australian Water \$215 per year to provide those services to the Adelaide people, and \$384 *per annum* for country people using the service. For some years, the city dwellers have been providing substantial cross-subsidy to country people for both water and sewerage services. There is a social justice aspect to that which I believe is being well received and which is fair and equitable, taking South Australia as a whole and given the contribution everybody makes to the overall economy. Metropolitan users actually subsidise the bush. The cost of the subsidy in 1993-94 was \$62 million. At current prices country water and sewerage are not profitable, and only about 48 per cent of country water costs are recovered by revenues from country users. A consultant commissioned by the Brown Government estimated that, to achieve a 4 per cent target rate of return from country water, the average annual water rate for people in the bush would have to rise by about 380 per cent.

Obviously, if the Brown Government proceeds with this user pays system, country people will have to pay more. The Brown Government may say that it will provide substantial grants to SA Water so that it can provide cheap water to country areas, initially. It is unrealistic to expect that those grants will be made, even though country people provide a substantial amount of rural income for the State from primary industries. Country people will end up paying more than their city cousins. It is inevitable, because private companies are there to make profits.

The Brown Government insists that South Australians face a crippling burden of debt impacting heavily on every citizen. The Brown Government has also said that it is important that assets be sold off to reduce the huge debt. The Brown Government's own budget papers have revealed that in real terms in 1950, under Sir Thomas Playford, public debt was \$6 345 *per capita*. In 1960, still under Playford, it was \$7 072. In 1970, under the Hall and Dunstan Governments, it was \$8 219. By 1980, under the Dunstan, Corcoran and Tonkin Governments, as a result of prudent Labor management, it had been reduced to \$3 915. Under John Bannon in 1990 it was \$3 496 and in 1991 it had risen again to \$5 150. Under Dean Brown's Government in 1994 it was \$5 814.

It has been constantly implied to the public that the debt has to be repaid within the lifetime of present citizens. This is a complete nonsense; it certainly does not. Public borrowings for capital or public works have always been regarded as investments, which would be paid for over generations. It has always been the policy of all Governments in this country that succeeding generations should also contribute to the costs of major public assets of which they make use.

The almost exclusive focus on commercial performance may well result in failure to deliver a wide range of public goods, such as environmental services that are difficult or impossible to commercialise. A policy of some debt reduction is wise, simply because less interest on repayment of capital in the budget makes more money available for expenditure on services. But, quite clearly, South Australia is not in the dire position of needing to slash services radically. In fact, after the State Bank crisis, the debt *per capita* under John Bannon returned to only marginally higher than it was when he took over from Tonkin, and to very much less than it had been under Sir Thomas Playford, Walsh, Hall and Dunstan after the sale of the railways.

If the Brown Government proceeds with selling off Adelaide's water and the sewerage management service, people in the country will be left without the cross subsidisation that currently applies. There is no evidence that contracting out water and sewerage management services will reduce our debt level at all. Thames Water and North West Water are two of the water companies that have been bidding (and I see that Thames is one of the successful partners) to run the South Australian metropolitan water and sewerage services. Thames Water and Mid North Water have been attacked in England over water cuts, excessive profits and their executives' large pay increases.

The prospect of widespread rationing has disgusted British consumers who have accused the companies of failing to invest huge profits in repairs of the now notorious leaks in the British supply system. A recent report by the University of New South Wales claims that since the UK privatised water services in 1989 domestic water charges have increased by an average of 67 per cent with increases of up to 108 per cent for water and 122 per cent for sewerage. This is what South Australians can expect as a result of this abominable decision which those people opposite have made—as I said, without any scrutiny by this Parliament.

UK consumers have also experienced disconnection because people cannot pay their bills, which have increased by 50 per cent. Infrastructure investment levels have failed to keep pace with agreed schedules, and they have also experienced poor environmental performances. Reports have shown that one-fifth of the water running through mains in England and Wales is being lost because of leaks in the infrastructure. North West Water has the largest daily losses, with enough water leaking from supply pipes to meet the needs of 5.5 million people.

Mr President, you can imagine in the driest State in the driest continent what the effect of such large scale, albeit proportionate, leakages in South Australia would mean to the economy of this State. Investment in leak detection and repair is one of the most effective conservation measures that water suppliers can take; yet, the concern is that the consumer will pay for both the cost of the water lost and the capital cost to eliminate leakages. This is what we are looking forward to. In France, there are reports that 40 per cent of water pumped through its pipes is being lost because of leaks—a bit like the Liberal Party's Caucus. The French people have been told to

expect a 50 per cent increase in current rates to cover the cost of fixing pipes. Currently, they pay 250 per cent more for water than South Australian consumers pay.

There will be no impetus for the contractor to prevent leakage. Once the contract period is finished, all South Australians will be left with the mess. The contractor will operate under a corporate structure where its only objective will be to provide profits to its shareholders—and that is par for the course. Of course, the Government acts in the public interest only—and this is why we have had a very successful EWS in South Australia in the past. SA Water is the second largest company to have its head office in South Australia. Members opposite have been trotting around the country bragging about getting head offices set up in South Australia. They have not actually revealed what the cost to the taxpayers has been to get that head office here, but what we see here is gross hypocrisy: on the one hand, they spend taxpayers' money to get head offices here while, on the other hand, they flog off a corporation which has the second largest office in the State. Its work force has been reduced from approximately 8 000 to approximately 2 000, and no greater suffering has occurred because of those reductions in the EWS than in country areas.

I remember during the last election campaign concerns being expressed that this incoming Government would slash and burn and close down Government offices in country areas, and we were met with vehement denials. I remember giving assurances to people who lived at Crystal Brook that whilst there was a Labor Government these things would not be closed. There were mouthings of support by people who have now been elected into Parliament. Within months, they withdrew that support and decimated country communities in South Australia in respect of not only the EWS but also highways, with competitive pricing and the loss of hundreds of jobs, and that is having a devastating effect on communities in country South Australia whose infrastructure is being ripped out from underneath them causing mass unemployment.

When I say 'mass unemployment', it is not the sort of mass unemployment in sheer numbers that one would expect in Adelaide, but I can assure this Council that those job losses is having a devastating effect on those communities. The loss of school teachers and curriculum choice for kids living in South Australia is putting enormous pressure on local government in those areas that is trying to supply the basic services that metropolitan South Australians expect. To provide the basic services in country South Australia is becoming harder and harder.

Last year, SA Water paid \$60 million in profit to the State Government. SA Water, by all accounts, has been an outstanding public water utility; there is no question about that. Despite South Australia's being the driest State in the driest continent in the world, the people of Adelaide have not experienced water restrictions for decades. SA Water has billions of dollars worth of infrastructure that has been built up over 66 years by the taxpayer. We all know there will not be a second set of taps for consumers in the metropolitan area to purchase water from another company should they find the performance of the contractor unsatisfactory. There will be no competition. The competition will be gone.

Of course, Dean Brown says that his Government will subsidise SA Water's country operation to ensure that prices in the bush are kept under control after the sell-off. The reality is that such a subsidy will come under pressure every budget time. Just as funding for schools, hospitals and police

have been cut under this Government, one can expect the same to happen with water. Do not think that Dean Brown's promises to keep his subsidies for the bush will fare any better than his pre-election promises to spend more on schools, hospitals and police. The Government believes in the user-pays philosophy. It has espoused that. It is a philosophy that would see country residents, particularly those in the more remote areas of the drier regions of the Upper Spencer Gulf and Eyre Peninsula, pay much more for their water. Never mind the fact that it is much harder for people in these areas to conserve water.

The Brown Government wants us to believe that privatisation of Adelaide's water will allow the Government to make savings while the private operator makes an internal profit, maintains present concessions and subsidies to disadvantaged groups and keeps price increases to within the CPI without compromising water quality. This is unbelievable. I will just get some of this cheap South Australian water into me, Mr President; I will not be able to afford it tomorrow!

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Well, it will be better than French wine when we have to drink that. The system guarantees that prices will rise and that people in country areas are likely to bear the brunt of those rises. Dean Brown has no mandate to sell off our water—none whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: There was no mention at the last election of privatising water.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: You kept that right under your shirt. You never came clean. In fact, the issue will not even come before the State Parliament for debate. This is the nub of it. Here we have a major decision, namely, to flog off the control of our water, and it never came to the Parliament. There was no scrutiny.

Today, the Minister for Infrastructure threw out a press release. This is a classic. The press release talks about all the consultation that took place with private companies. The Government maintains that it has had wide consultation. The only people with whom the Government will not consult are the elected representatives of the people of South Australia. The people, not the Government, own the water, and the Government is being derelict in its responsibility to the people of South Australia by selling their water. The press release states as follows:

The Auditor-General has been informed of the procedures which were implemented throughout the negotiation process. . .

The Government never let the Auditor-General have a look at the contract or the contractor. And why not? It is because he has already looked at some of the things the Government did in the past 12 months and has condemned them roundly. The Government did not want to show the Auditor-General the contract because he might have revealed what the Government had been up to. The press release continued:

In addition, [the private consultant] conducted a full probity audit throughout the process and concluded that 'the processes conducted by the South Australian Water Corporation through to and including the evaluation proposals for the Adelaide outsourcing contractor have been conducted in a fair and equitable manner'.

It does not say whether they are good; it does not comment on the price; it does not comment on the conditions—it merely states that they have been conducted 'equitably'. I can accept, reluctantly, that the Government has made the decision. However, I cannot accept that it would make such a major decision, which will affect every South Australian,

especially those living in country areas, without having the decency—

The Hon. J.C. Irwin interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Well, your mob in the South-East will be nice and dark on you, I can tell you.

The Hon. J.C. Irwin: Why?

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Because you left, for a start. You took off, and now—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Because you left the taps running.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: The honourable member took off and left the taps running, but it will not be for long because soon the honourable member will not be able to afford to do so. The Government has not had the common decency to come to the Parliament and to debate this massive decision before all the elected representatives of the people of South Australia. One wonders what other horrors the Government has in store, because it is up at Leigh Creek and looking at privatising electricity as well.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: There will be more jobs.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: The honourable Minister refers to new jobs. I will tell her what the Government has done about new jobs in this State. It has ripped 8 000 jobs out of the EWS and flogged off the water; it has flogged off the asset. The Government has done this for the despicable reason of making it look attractive so that when the contractors come in they will not have to sack all these workers. The Government will then be able to stand up and piously say that nobody has lost their job. How can they lose their jobs if the Government has already sacked them? They will not lose their jobs because the contractor sacks them: they will lose their jobs because this Government will do something similar to what it has done at TransAdelaide.

Members of the Government carped for years about the cost of transport, saying that they would fix it up, but what have they done? The Government came in, immediately put all the prices up and then said that it would contract out. This is a pea and thimble trick because, whilst it then becomes more acceptable for the contractor to buy it, the Government will say that the contractor did not put the price up very much. Of course the contractor did not put the price up: the Government did it for them. That is what the Government is on about with water and that is what it is on about with electricity.

Members of this Government ought to be condemned, first, for selling the water and, more importantly, for behaving like thieves. They have done all the deals in the shadows of darkness and will leave the people of South Australia in a situation where their water, that basic ingredient of life, will become almost out of their reach.

In closing my contribution I pay tribute to all those people who for 66 years have served this State very well and provided one of the best water systems, at least in South Australia. They worked diligently and provided good service. It is interesting to watch past engineers, some of whom have given 50 years of a life's work to SA Water—or the EWS as it then was—and see the expressions of sadness on their face as they watch what they have worked for all their life going down the gurgler as a consequence of the actions of this Government on the birthday of Margaret Thatcher. Mr President, I ask you to join with me and drink a toast with this clean, pure South Australian water to all those EWS workers who have worked so hard. It will become a rare commodity. In the future we will not be able to afford the water, so we will have to drink cheap French wine. Mr President, in

concluding my contribution I propose a toast to all those workers who toiled so hard for South Australia to produce this water. We will finish up with a brown murky muck.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I would like to thank Her Excellency for the speech that she made when opening the Parliament. In my reply I will concentrate on what I know as the Engineering and Water Supply Department, now called SA Water.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Do you want a glass of water, too?

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I propose to provide some history about the department. In 1961 I began working in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. At that time it was a very big employer in South Australia. Most of the people who worked in the department in those days were from non-English speaking countries. After working with them for a short time you admired those people for travelling from one side of the world to the other, bringing their families to a country where a language foreign to them is spoken. These people were not just labourers who worked in these departments; they were very skilled workers in their own country but their skills were not recognised in South Australia.

In those days there were gangs of 30, 50, 70 and in some cases 100 people. The reason for the large gangs was that during the Playford days they had little or no machinery, so everything was done by pick and shovel and crowbars. When laying a water main, these people would extend all the way along the track digging up the ground. There were no safety guidelines whatsoever and people felt that they ought to dig these trenches three to five feet deep for the water supply, and between 22 and 26 feet deep for the sewerage department, with one set of planking every 10 feet. Due to their lack of experience—which you only gain by working in these areas over the years—these people were not aware whether the ground was built up or not. Therefore, there were deaths and accidents because there were no safety provisions.

The good part about those days was that there was a pyramid in the Engineering and Water Supply Department—the director, the assistant director and one or two engineers. All work was monitored by supervisors. In the late 1960s and early 1970s they moved in with machinery. There was plenty of work then, but the department was not employing any more people. It decided not to replace those workers who retired. This practice went on for some time until the early 1970s and the advent of the Dunstan Government. I think it was Des Corcoran who was the Minister responsible for the EWS, and he approached the trade unions and suggested that, because there was plenty of work, because the department was engaged at Taperoo and Elizabeth laying mains and services, they bring in private contractors mainly for the machinery in order to take care of the peaks facing the department. That practice continued until 1979 and the advent of the then Tonkin Government.

The person who learnt all his skills in the industrial area in those days was a young man called Dean Brown. He learnt those skills at Trades Hall, which he frequently visited in order to talk to trade unionists to learn what industrial relations was all about. He learnt quickly because within the first few months of his taking over as Minister of Industrial Affairs he got rid of 1 180 workers. He gave them a targeted package. Dean Brown wanted to do then what he has done today, that is, turn the department completely over to private contractors. In November 1979 we saw the biggest rally ever held in South Australia outside Parliament House, attracting

about 12 000 people who made it clear that they were not going to cop this situation. As members know, the then Tonkin Government was voted out of office and that practice stopped. Since then the department has continued to provide the best service ever to the people of South Australia. Unfortunately, after today's statement about getting rid of contractors, that service is finished.

In New South Wales Bob Carr is aware that we live on the driest continent in the world. Prior to losing the last election the then New South Wales Liberal Government was going to put water servicing out to private contract, but Bob Carr reversed that decision, saying that it was ridiculous to have overseas companies looking after our water. What is the situation in South Australia? In South Australia we have decided to allow private contractors to take over. Indeed, to convince the people of South Australia about this move we saw in the *Advertiser* on 11 October 'The Facts', where all the pertinent facts are listed. That is great! I believe each of those facts, and I hope the Government sticks to them. That advertisement also appeared in the *Sunday Mail*. There are facts about pricing, ownership, management, water quality, waste water quality and employment. Certainly, the facts about employment are important.

Since this Government came to office in 1993 it has set rumours around the EWS, and people have been breaking their neck to get packages in order to leave the department. They knew what was going to happen. First, the department left the most skilled people, the ones they call the district water men. These are the people who do the work out in the field. These people used to look after one district, which was quite enough work one day for every day. Those people used to have a district, and there used to be approximately 14 of them. Now we would be lucky to see six. What happens at the present time is that these people get work slips every day from the department about leaks at stopcocks, leaks on services, leaks at metres, choked metres, etc. These district water men get so many of them that sometimes it takes two to three weeks to get to them at the present time. Never in the 19 years I worked in the department did I see anything like that: they were cleaned up each day and every day. They had to be cleaned up.

But these people are busy on burst water mains and running round after these contractors, trying to show them what they should and should not do, because they just do not have a clue. A classic recent example was in Brighton, when the water main was shut off for about 11 hours. I think it was even longer than that but the news report stated 11 hours. That was only the start of this. I have never seen a main shut off for 11 hours. When I worked at the department, if there was a burst main the commonsense thing to do was lay off the area where the burst has taken place, open up the farthest valve from there, crack that valve and close off the rest of the valves, and that supplies water for toilets, taps, etc. It is not a great flow, but at least it gives people water for the next morning instead of having it off for 11 hours.

What about old folks and people with children? What about a person who was on dialysis? We always made sure that those people were on water, and they were spread throughout South Australia. These are things this Government does not seem to have grasped: and this will continue. It will get much worse. Then we talk about the contractors. By the way, this 'Facts' article that was put in the *Advertiser* and the *Sunday Mail* has a telephone number, which is 1-800-634119. They tell me that you cannot get through to that, because the

Auditor-General and his staff have been trying to get through to find out whether this is right.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: The Auditor-General must be trying. Just take a look at his report on page 264 and go through the pages. He is asking all these questions. He is asking questions about this land that the Government is selling. Where is the money going? He does not know anything about that, and he is saying that in his report. This is the worst thing that ever happened to South Australia. Another classic example is when you send out a choke truck to a gang and that gang goes and lifts up the check point, and a person finds that the main is not blocked from that boundary to the main. Normally, he would clean out inside the boundary. There was never a charge for that: it was just a service that we gave these people to help them out, because we did not want to see them stuck.

Ever since I can remember the EWS would do these things for people. What will happen now is that you will pay for that, and you will have to employ a plumber to do it. And it is so wrong. Many other things will happen. For instance, if you get a leak inside your house and your meter will not shut off, how do you get that releathered? How does someone come along and do that for you? They just do not have the time at present. We will have mains shut off in this State, I will guarantee, not for 11 hours, not for one day; it may be for two days. It will happen as sure as day is day and night is night. That will happen in this State. The worse thing we could ever do in South Australia is to put our water under contract.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I support the motion. I would like to thank Her Excellency the Governor for her speech in opening Parliament and outlining the Government's forthcoming program. I join with our Leader in congratulating the Auditor-General for his report. South Australia is, indeed, fortunate in having an Auditor-General with an abiding commitment to accountability in Government and with the wit and the will to stand up for that principle. The Auditor-General's Report has raised important issues about the management of the State's finances by this Government. The Opposition considers the Auditor-General's Report to have confirmed the concerns and issues it has raised time and again in this place.

The Auditor-General has also given expression to many concerns felt in the broader community, such as why the people in the Parliament are not being asked about the sell off of public assets, particularly the water and sewerage system. The Government has not listened to the Opposition, and it has dismissed the rights of Parliament and the people to have a say in the privatisation of their water and sewerage systems. Given the seriousness of the Auditor-General's concerns and findings, we can only hope that the Government will at last pay attention. I hope that the Treasurer is paying particular heed because it is the Deputy Premier and Treasurer who most needs to heed the Auditor's message. It is the Treasurer who, when confronted with a problem of his own making, is most likely to go on the hunt for someone else to blame.

What is the Auditor-General's message to the Treasurer? It is to start telling the truth about our financial position. It is also to start honouring promises and commitments made on disclosure of our financial position and the selling off of public assets to Parliament. The Treasurer should also start practising what he has been preaching on expenditure restraint, starting with some control on executive pay and

perks. The Treasurer lays claim to having got South Australia back on track, yet the Auditor-General shows an increase in our total liabilities of over \$1 billion over the period 1993-94 to 1995-96, and that is incontrovertible.

The Treasurer will claim this is due to increased borrowings to fund TSPs. Eventually, so the argument goes, our debt and other liabilities will fall towards the end of the decade. We can only hope so, but the Opposition remains to be convinced. From the Auditor-General we know, for example, that the deficit on the non-commercial sector continues to grow during the rest of the decade and, were it not for a massive payment of \$165 million from a commercial Government enterprise (ETSA), the non-commercial sector deficit would have been \$240 million this year, rather than \$49 million.

This does not seem to have anything to do with the grandiose claims of the Treasurer to have reined in spending on the non-commercial sector. It has all the hallmarks of a fiddle. In fact, the Auditor-General finds that, after adjustment for abnormal influences, non-commercial sector current expenditures actually rose by 4 per cent in real terms over the two years to 1995-96. For the whole non-commercial sector, including capital expenditure, there has been a rise rather than a fall of only 9 per cent in the two years to 1995-96.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: So we haven't cut education expenditure?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I will come to that.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: We're actually spending more.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I will come to that. The Auditor-General is forced to criticise the presentation of figures in this Government's budget as 'misleading'. The Auditor-General in Part A page 23 of his report says that the presentation by this Treasurer of this issue of non-commercial sector outlays and the massive shifting of money from Government trading enterprises into the non-commercial sector had 'the effect of overstating the degree of expenditure restraint which has been achieved over this period'. We also know that, in spite of all the Treasurer's overblown rhetoric about funding future superannuation liabilities, there will be an increase of 10.3 per cent in such liabilities over the six years to 1999, and I refer members to Part A page 20 of the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Hon. Mr Davis should take the time to read the report. Read Part A, page 20, and you will find out that what I am saying is correct. Once again the Treasurer is found to be less than honest. The Auditor-General shows that the shift of funding of superannuation benefits from the non-commercial sector to SASFIT and the subsequent presentation of this data had—and I quote the Auditor-General, so the Hon. Mr Davis should look it up—'the effect of artificially depressing the increase in outlays from 1993-94 to the later years'. The reference is in Part A, page 23.

Finally, we have seen this Government's rush to off balance sheet transactions with the private sector to make the books look good. We know that, although these deals do not involve the incurring of debt and interest repayments, they certainly do lead to obligations in the form of rent or lease payments, which are just the same for ordinary South Australians as is debt. Indeed, they can often be worse than debt raised by the public sector simply because the inducement of private sector investors to public infrastructure can be a good deal more expensive.

The Opposition supports the Auditor-General's call for such transactions to be carefully scrutinised by Parliament. The Treasurer has made much of the Government's supposed success in achieving efficiencies and reducing spending. That has been proved by the Auditor-General to be a myth—so much a myth in fact that certain Treasury officers had to invent a graph showing how much non-commercial sector outlays were falling under the stewardship of this Premier and his Treasurer, a graph which the Auditor-General found had no factual basis at all. After half a dozen requests to Treasury for the information upon which the graph was based, the Auditor-General was finally able to establish just how misleading the graph really was.

Although it purported to show the difference between the declining non-commercial sector outlays under the previous Government's policy and the policy of the present Government, the graph casually left out expenditure increases worth at least \$130 million under the Liberal Government as well as discounting certain savings that were part of the previous Government's policy. This was patently dishonest, but the public is not that easy to dupe. It shows the politicisation of Treasury under this Government and its disregard for the principle of an impartial bureaucracy.

Again the public of South Australia owes a debt of gratitude to the Auditor-General for his determination and tenacity to find out the truth and ensure that attempts at disinformation cannot succeed. Perhaps the Treasurer will be a bit more careful the next time around.

I want to talk about how liabilities are being managed by the Treasurer and by this Government. The Treasurer has got himself into a mad scramble to make his performance look good—from concocting graphs to running up liabilities that cost the public more but do not appear as debt, to claiming to be paying for future superannuation liabilities while in fact reducing provision for them. If he cannot get down our debt, the Treasurer at least wants to look as though he is getting it down, but the reality is, as the Auditor-General points out, our debt at 1996-97 will be over \$7.9 billion. Yet this was the Liberal Party that was going to do so much better than Labor ever could, by bringing down debt to \$6 billion by 1997. The Treasurer wants to look good and who can blame him when one looks at his performance half way through his first term? He wants things at least to look as though the debt is coming down. That is the impression he is trying to create and members do not like the fact that they have been sprung by the Auditor-General.

It is not just the size of our debt and liabilities that matters but how well they are managed. Without proper management, too much of Government money will be wasted in interest payments. The Auditor-General makes clear that the Treasurer could have done better—much better—in his first 18 months. The Auditor-General shows that, as a result of decisions that the Treasurer made, South Australians coughed up at least \$160 million more than they would have had they kept in place the policy of the previous Government.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I will repeat that, because obviously the Hon. Legh Davis did not hear it: he has trouble talking and listening at the same time. The Auditor-General shows that as a result of decisions he made South Australians coughed up at least \$160 million more than if they had kept the policy of the previous Government in place. That is more than all this Government's cuts to schools, hospitals and community services combined. South Australians are entitled to ask where the gain has been from the pain inflicted by this

Government and this Treasurer. The Treasurer's defence will be that this is all with the benefit of hindsight. He did not refrain from the use of 20-20 hindsight when he was criticising our Government. This Government would do far better to cut back on some of its own waste and extravagance than cutting deep into schools and hospitals. The priorities of this Government are all wrong.

Ordinary South Australians would like to know how it was that this Government spent \$50 million on highly paid consultants last year alone. Why is it that since the last budget spending in the Premier's Department has increased by 34 per cent in nominal terms? We know the answer to that—it was partly to finance his competition in economic development with John Olsen. Why is it that spending in the Treasurer's Department has increased by a whopping 45 per cent in nominal terms since the last Labor budget? Or why, when the Government is getting rid of so many public sector employees, has the number of South Australian Government commercial properties increased to the point where the proportion of property leased is now less than 50 per cent? Why has the Government acquired more commercial property, which is not being let, in the midst of a commercial property glut? Why has there been an explosion in the number of directors of the MFP earning between \$100 000 and \$340 000 (Part B, Vol. 1, page 411)?

These are just a few of the issues and questions that matter to real South Australians who are seeing their hospitals cracking under the strain of under-funding and the standard of their kids' education falling and who are asking themselves why. The Auditor-General has criticised the repeated failure of this Treasurer to provide a comprehensive valuation of State assets and a comprehensive State balance sheet of our assets and liabilities. The Opposition agrees. When we were in Government, we published such information. The reason is quite simply that this information is critical to assessing our financial position. The Treasurer seems to think that the debt reduction alone is enough to improve our financial position. He is wrong.

As the Auditor-General has pointed out, this needs to be understood in the context of our asset base. This is just another broken promise. On 3 December 1993 in the Liberal Party's SA Recovery Program (page 4) it was promised:

Require deficiencies in asset registers to be remedied by 30 June 1994.

On 8 March this year the Treasurer again promised that the forthcoming budget would include this information. Where was it? It certainly was not there. The latest report of the Auditor-General represents the second year running that he has stated his acute concerns about this issue. In last year's report (30 June 1994, Part A, page 25) he stated:

In my opinion urgent attention needs to be given to resolution of the issues that are seen to be a barrier to reporting the position of all the State's assets and liabilities. Resolution of the matters discussed will be necessary for the preparation of future information.

In other words, without this information we cannot know whether we are making progress on our financial problems. We have nothing more than the Treasurer's assurances. I for one will not be accepting those. This issue is of particular concern since the Treasurer is racking up off balance sheet liabilities in his attempts to get the private sector into provision of public infrastructure. But even if these deals do not add up to debt on the balance sheet, they certainly add to the State's ongoing obligations and liabilities and are the equivalent of debt—no less than \$240 million in extra liabilities in this form. The Auditor-General believes it

essential that there be proper scrutiny of these deals which, as experience shows, can be a lot more expensive than direct Government financing. The Opposition will not support some pea and thimble trick on the people of South Australia. The Opposition supports rational and equitable policies for debt reduction. Where the Government's policies for debt reduction meet these criteria, the Opposition will be in support.

It is clear, after the Auditor-General's Report, that we are not doing as well as the Treasurer would have us believe. Looking further ahead, it is also clear that the Government is making massive assumptions about the future that verge on dreaming. For there to be real hope of the Government reaching its debt targets by the end of the decade, we would need to see economic growth running at levels far exceeding those of 1994 and 1995. In the first disastrous year of the Liberal Government we grew by .1 per cent compared with 5.5 per cent nationally compared with a South Australian budget prediction of 3.75 per cent for 1994-95. In the year to March 1995 our economic performance worsened further. Imagine, it grew by only .1 per cent the year before compared with 5.5 per cent nationally, and it is getting worse.

While Australia settled down to a growth rate of 3.8 per cent, South Australia went backwards with an awful minus 1.5 per cent for the year. We would also need to see actual savings from privatisation and outsourcing, where much of the international evidence is that costs rise under privatisation; that interest rates remain stable; and that the process of sacking public sector workers has been done efficiently and will not therefore require expensive additional recruiting and expenditure in later years. Already we are seeing a wave of expensive consultants being hired by the Government to perform the tasks traditionally performed by much cheaper public servants. As I have said, these are massive assumptions, but we do not need to speculate about the future to see that all is not as the Treasurer has claimed. We have only to read the Auditor-General's Report for confirmation. I support the motion.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I support the adoption of the Address in Reply. I thank the Governor for her presentation and would like to express my appreciation to her for the job that she has done over the years. Given her difficult job of presenting the Government's position in relation to the framing of legislation for the next year, I thought she did it quite well. I should also like to congratulate and thank my colleagues for their support in the demonstrations that I attended, particularly those Federal and State parliamentary colleagues who formed the International Members of Parliament for Peace and Against Nuclear Weapons.

The issues that I wish to raise relate to placing South Australia in a position to advance in the next half of the Government's term in office and compete with the growth factors that are continuing in the other States. If South Australia cannot move forward in a time when the Commonwealth Government has been able to put together economic packages which have advanced the nation by over 5 per cent, I have some doubts whether this State can improve in the next two years leading up to the election. The economy is in a wheelbrace ready to be carted away. Unless there is a changed attitude to stimulating the private sector—not just selling off large chunks of the public sector—I have grave concerns about the future directions in which this State is developing. The Government made a huge mistake in trying to tackle State debt by outsourcing, privatisation and

introducing large-scale international capital ventures at the expense of local capital.

The Hon. Mr Davis's speech was basically about small business and the ecotourism industry, which is largely small and medium sized business, and that is the area that should have been stimulated by any major economic changes that the Government considered. Instead, the Government has put large chunks of the public sector out to auction to the highest bidder and, unfortunately, the amount of capital that needs to be raised for participation in a lot of these projects is out of reach of local investment. What we now have to address is that, in relation to the privatisation of the management of the water resource in this State, small and medium sized private sector participation is encouraged because, if it is not, there could be a further drift of investment out of this State into other States and with it will go a lot of our trained and skilled work force. I suspect that is already happening, because the latest figures show a net loss of over 2 000 people from South Australia in the last financial year.

The public sector in South Australia has evolved to a point at which it has become the engine room of development in this State. It has pump-primed the local economy to the point it has reached at this stage and, if the overall economy cannot grow at any more than .1 per cent while the Government is downsizing the public sector, unless there is a large injection of investment funds into this economy in the next 12 months, we will have a drift away from this State of those people whom we have been training over the years to fill the complement of what would be regarded as a developing and clever State.

Through its university institutions, South Australia has prided itself on its ability to provide graduates and undergraduates for the public sector and, in a lot of cases, for crossover work into the private sector and to maintain the balance that is required for an economy to tick over. South Australia does not have a lot of the natural advantages that the other States enjoy, such as a large population base. Unfortunately, the economic rationalism that has developed at Commonwealth and State level does not augur well for those States that are not able to tap into the benefits that have been put together by Commonwealth growth policy, which benefits the hot spots in the economy and which, in the main, are centred on the Eastern States. Western Australia's economy is isolated to some degree from the rest of the nation but, in its isolation it has become self-sufficient.

The Hon. P. Holloway: It was certainly isolated today.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Yes, it certainly was isolated today, for reasons that I will outline shortly. The Western Australian economy has had to learn to stand on its own feet and, over recent years, it has not had a history of cross-subsidisation.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Of recent years. The point at which Western Australia got on its feet and was not drawing on the Commonwealth was when it started looking at independence as a way to go. Western Australia has developed a self-sustaining economy in the primary, mining and retail-commercial sectors, but it suffered from a wave of vagabonds in the 1980s that asset-stripped their way through the other States and were caught in an under-developing economy in the late 1980s, and that has led to a lot of those entrepreneurs being charged or put in gaol.

So, South Australia has a separate case to manage as to how its economy should develop. Referring to the radical conservative solution supplied by the Liberals, it was

Ms Kennedy who said in an article that, with a rush of blood, the idea of the sale of the water management services was developed over a quiet drink.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: One day she loves it, and the next day she doesn't.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: That involved her earlier statements, possibly in the *Business Review Weekly*. One of her statements was that the proposal to privatise the management services of the EWS was a casual conversation over a quiet cup of tea.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Between whom?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: You're stretching my memory. I may have to seek leave to conclude and go and get the paper. I will put it on the record that it is my recollection that she said that it was a casual approach to a proposition that had not been fleshed out and that, after people sitting around a table decided it was a good idea, the idea was put to those people who were drawing up the economic strategy for development for the Liberals; that it was sold as an idea that ought to be preserved and was actually sold as a world first, along with all the other benefits that were going to flow from that.

'Charting the Way Forward', Volume 2, is basically the blueprint for the economic strategy being developed for the Government on entry. I have no argument with the concept of a 'Charting the Way Forward', because the Labor Government had one in its last 12 months, on its way out. It had an Economic Statement that was prepared to try to overcome the problems associated with debt servicing. Lynn Arnold put together a package that had general acceptance, within both the business community and the halls of academia in relation to expunging debt and trying to get growth at the same time. Unfortunately, when the Government changed there was a rush of blood.

As I have said before in this House, had the Liberal Party decided to go for a small 'l' liberal position on debt servicing and growth, I am sure that the situation in which we now find ourselves would be a lot different. A small 'l' liberal approach would have been more like the New South Wales position, where there would have been some selling of public assets, some debt servicing or lowering of overheads through outsourcing. A combination of asset sales and growth would have seen the economy turn around and come back into surplus over time. Unfortunately, as other speakers have said, we have had a rush of blood by the Government to privatise and sell off a large section of our public estate, with no real commitment from the private sector to participate in any meaningful way.

The honey pot that we have had to use to attract the bees has changed, altered and moved about. I can remember a private conversation I had with the Leader of this House at the President's dinner about the problems that would emanate out of the EDS contract, and about the fact that it would not be as easy to put together as had been sold in the first instance because of the changing nature of the components that international capital requires of some of the guaranteees that would come from projected growth, not just from that single project but from an integrated line of projects that would be called upon to be made available over a period.

In that case, Governments start to lose their ability to call in competitive tenderers in the marketplace, because the dominant companies in the field tend to stand aside for each other, or they collude in working out pricing arrangements that give advantages in one country or one State against those contracts that have been negotiated. A good instance is the

Galaxy contract or the changing nature of Galaxy that is being negotiated at the moment. When speaking on the Auditor-General's review I speculated that there would be some changes to the nature of Galaxy's operations in this State if there was a takeover by either Foxtel or Australis and that we could not afford the incentives that we as a small State were offering to prise some of those large operators away from New South Wales or Victoria.

I do not have any ideas about how to attract them without incentives, because it appears to me that that is how they operate: they get on the auction block. That is one of the problems of a federation of States competing with international capital. We have not yet come to terms with that. Japan certainly would not allow its four main islands to go around negotiating contracts with large international monopolies on their own, to advantage the Japanese economy. It would have Miti or its manufacturing arm negotiating those arrangements in conjunction with its Government servicing sector. It certainly would not sign any agreements that were not to the distinct advantage of that nation, because it does its business differently. Obviously, as a small nation Australia does not have the same clout as has the Japanese economy, but the principles should remain the same.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The honourable member interjects and gives a good illustration of one State splitting off and doing a deal with those people who approached it through the Stock Exchange's network to introduce a taxing arrangement which, if adopted by a single State, would disadvantage the other States, because most of their business would be transferred to the State where less tax would be payable on those transactions. Until there is a maturity among the States that rises above individual States' interests in relation to how we develop the national economy, we will always have those problems. I cannot see that maturity developing within the next half decade, gloomy as that prospect may be, because of the intransigence of some people in Government trying, for good political reasons, to attract growth to their own States—but at whose expense? Generally, you will find that it will be at the expense of the smaller States that do not have the population base, the attraction of economic growth nor the natural economic climate to suit those projects, and those States will be the losers.

They will be particularly those southern States such as South Australia and Tasmania which have distinct disadvantages in relation to transport, distances from larger markets and, of course, their population bases. Our infrastructure costs are markedly higher, having a smaller population and larger State to support. This is where the Government will come unstuck in relation to its developed policies of privatising not only management structures but also continuing outsourcing arrangements. Our regional areas are in decline, and have been for a long time. The areas of Whyalla, Port Augusta, to some extent Port Pirie, and all our northern and north-western areas that have grown through an economic period until about the mid-1970s are all in decline and are not growing at all.

The current nature of developed capitalism will not advantage those regions because, in the main, the financial packages that will be required for the investment for which those regions will be looking in the developed mining industry—and that is mainly where their advantages lie—will involve high investment with very little or no growth in jobs. What we now have in South Australia is a Government that is trumpeting job growth, but it is doing so in the area of outsourcing and its associated infrastructure or clusters (as

they are now called), and that will be at the expense of jobs that now exist in traditional areas. So, jobs will be transferred from the public to the private sector. In the main, they will be not full-time but part-time or casual, and in many cases they will be deskilled. With that will come the dissatisfaction of the people employed in those sorts of enterprises. Of course, they will look at the sunshine, the lollipops and the rainbows that appear in brochures from New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria, etc., they will then examine their options, and South Australia's population will continue to decline.

'Charting the Way Forward' (Vol. 2) spells out the brief, if you like, of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I will read it into *Hansard*, because one of the problems that I have relating to the proposal put forward by the Government—as I said, it was a casual expression of an idea turned into a reality—concerns the description of the Engineering and Water Supply Department's program, which leads me to believe that the privatisation of the management resource was never a consideration when the package was put together. The brief states:

EWS has improved its operational and financial performance over the last 2½ years. However, further wide-ranging changes are required to improve performance to best practice levels.

No-one would disagree with that. It continues:

The principal means of improving performance will be through the development of a more commercial approach to business. Development of such an approach will require quantum changes from the current management arrangements that are employed by both the Government and EWS in the South Australian water industry. EWS currently operates as a department of the State. This institutional form does not provide an appropriate environment for EWS to operate in a commercial manner. EWS will need to be corporatised.

This was all done under a previous Government. It states further:

A board of directors should be appointed to govern EWS. The board will need to negotiate a performance agreement with the Government specifying activities to be performed, including an agreed rate of return on assets and details of any community service obligations.

This is all good stuff. It goes on to say:

Pricing reform will be essential to achieve an efficient utilisation of water and sewerage services and to guide future investment decisions. The establishment of an independent pricing review mechanism would provide a framework that would facilitate genuine price reform. Improvements in the operational efficiency of EWS will be facilitated through exposing EWS activities to competition. Competition can be introduced through outsourcing, franchising and increased involvement of the private sector in capital works.

There is still no mention of privatisation of management services. It continues:

Where competition cannot be introduced directly, benchmarking can act as a partial substitute.

Current work force arrangements and employment conditions in EWS are based on public sector norms.

Still no mention of it. Further, it states:

They are not specific to the water industry. EWS will need greater flexibility to negotiate awards and procedures that are consistent with the adoption of a more commercial approach.

So, we then get into the meat of the description of the department, and it goes on to describe where the department was at the time the Government took over. Inside 'Charting the Way Forward' there are references to performance criteria and objectives, and I guess in broad terms one may be able to read into that reference that they would be the indications by the Government for private ownership of the management services.

Table 14.8, on page 250, under 'Opportunities for outsourcing', includes maintenance of mains, mains renewal, maintenance of water supply headworks, maintenance of water treatment plants, maintenance of waste water treatment plants, meter reading, operation of water supply etc., through to catering and payroll printing. It means that basically everything was up for grabs in relation to what the Government saw as a fair way in which to outsource the stable or core management structures and services within EWS. But there is no indication that all that would be managed by a privately operated management service.

In terms of economic rationalism, it is by degree what becomes acceptable. Other speakers have paid tribute to the history, development and service performance of the EWS as a publicly owned Government statutory authority that serviced South Australia quite well. In fact, one of the reasons given by the Government for the sale of the management services is that it will present international opportunities for the sale of services into Malaysia, Indonesia, China, Korea, the Philippines, etc. I do not want to be a negative knocker, but it appears to me—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You are!

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I haven't started yet! It appears to me that if we are to have an international consortium that is to manage South Australia's water system and to manage the opportunities for outsourcing, and, if they are to have an international arm that is to sell the resources and intellectual property to other parts of our near neighbours, it appears to me they have left it a little too late.

I just cannot understand why we would take on board British, French or any other nationality—I do not want to be racist in relation to the French in this matter. It appears to me that Australia's reputation in terms of its ability to carry out its own business in Asia is as good as anybody's in the world. In fact, our business people are being used by agents of international capital to buy into all sorts of major programs within the Asia-Pacific regions. The Americans use a lot of our consultants. The British, French and probably other European nations that are not familiar with the geography or culture of the territory are using Australians to prepare their consultancies. In many cases, they are expatriate Australians, some of whom are resident in both Australia and other Asian territories.

Vietnam is a good example of where Australians are probably No. 1 in terms of a western nation which has supported Vietnamese struggles over the past 30 years or so. Members would be aware that we would probably get to first base before any French negotiating team in terms of selling wares in the current climate. I believe the American business sector still has an international financial boycott on Vietnam, but if that is not the case it probably still has an unofficial slow down of movement of capital into Vietnam. It has been using Australians to break the ice, and I have no problem with that. The statement that the EWS will outsource services by using our international consortia as a front line for negotiating the cluster development that will come from those sales does not appear to make too much sense.

If they are to have new methods of developing contacts within the Asian-Pacific rim, and if they are to have some new form of dynamic management style and structure that makes gains over and above what I would anticipate they will make, so be it. I predict that the new consortia will not make too many inroads over and above the inroads that have already been made by other Australian companies that represent other water servicing companies operating in other

States. I think that they will start off behind the eight ball rather than in front of it. From my days on public works, I understand that New South Wales has already had public works representatives interested in selling public housing and public works associated with bridges, roads, railways, and so on in Asia over quite a period. Western Australia has links not only into Asia but into Africa. In conjunction with a public sector/private sector arrangement they are selling their services quite successfully.

I do not think that a public enterprise working with private enterprise would be any disadvantage. However, we are being told that the only way it can be put together is by joining an international consortia which has the respect of the World Bank, can raise the international capital as required and has a record of delivery of service into Asia. I will rest my case in relation to privatisation outsourcing. The struggle for the Government will be a long, hard one. The orthodox argument is that in times of boom the public sector should lower its investment levels and get out of the way of private capital and allow private capital to open up opportunities with which the public sector is incapable of dealing.

If I thought that that was the current climate, I would not have my present reserve position. Unfortunately, I do not see that happening. I see a shrinking private sector living alongside a privatised outsourced public sector. If the formula is to work, the national growth for this State—if we are growing at an average of 1.5 per cent over the two years that we have had over 5 per cent growth nationally—would need to be about 12 or 13 per cent just for us to grow at 4 per cent. This would create economic opportunities to provide immediate employment for school leavers coming onto the market.

Our educated elite will work their way through the universities in South Australia and then onto the buses, trains and aeroplanes and find their way into the job market in Melbourne, Sydney, Queensland or outside of Australia. I have some personal experience of international projects and how they are put together. Generally, within those contracts provision is made for a certain number of international skilled people and professionals to be part of the development project. In some cases that means business migration and skills migration. I certainly have no problem with a balanced view on skills migration, but I am concerned when skills migration freezes out opportunities for local graduates or opportunities for local employees. Some companies write fairly hard negotiated positions into these contracts.

I am aware, from personal experience, that the Koreans certainly try to write in a very hard line professional and skills based component that they require in relation to their development projects. In some cases the Japanese, through business migration and transfer skills, write in—sometimes unofficially and sometimes officially—business skill development programs that require that their executives be in charge of certain projects. I do not have any argument with that. If it is a large investment by a foreign company, it would want its key people to ensure that a project is kept on track. In a small State like South Australia, when writing contracts with international operators—EDS or the consortia for the water contract—business migration programs may be written into those contracts, and that may displace or remove opportunities for both skilled and potential trainees to enter the job market.

We have to grow, we have to take the best opportunities that may be presented, but the challenge that the Hon. Mr Redford threw out in his Address in Reply speech was for us

all to work together, for members on this side to form a credible Opposition, and for us all to present our arguments in such a way that ensures a bipartisan approach on how we proceed. I am afraid the horses have already bolted. Not only are we not allowed to have a bipartisan approach on how we put our packages together but we are not able to see the packages inside this Parliament. We have to wait until the packages are drawn and then presented—if they are presented—to a select committee. I expect that in most cases the representatives from the consortia involved in the outsourcing programs, the sale of management services and the sale of public assets will appear before us and say, 'I am afraid we cannot give you that information. It is commercially confidential and it would disadvantage us in the finance business sector if those figures were made available.'

In that climate how can you have a bipartisan approach to such major issues as privatisation of hospitals, privatisation of the water supply, privatisation of the power supply and privatisation of the infrastructure? It is a good theory and I thank the honourable member for the invitation. As a member of this Parliament I would like to debate the issues associated with the packages that have been developed. I am not sure how we would have handled EDS; we would have debated that for 18 months and considered three or four different packages, hoping that the Government was able to put together one that was acceptable. I expect that an announcement will be made in the next couple of months about EDS—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Her Excellency said 1995.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: An announcement will probably be made before Christmas, but I am sure that we will not be able to weigh up the benefits and comparisons of the contract and how the contract has changed. I would like to comment on not only how the Government has put its program together in relation to privatisation, outsourcing and the sale of its management services, but I also refer to the way in which the *Advertiser* and the major outlets have given the Government probably the best honeymoon that any Government could wish to have, including—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Including the ABC—

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I did not see the ABC tonight. It has enabled the Government to get its packages together and sell its arguments out into the community.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: The Opposition has given us a good honeymoon, too.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Have you seen the latest poll? The media climate in this State has given the Government probably the best armchair ride I have seen for a long time. Unfortunately for the Government it appears that there is now a changed position, that those people who have been watching and waiting for the delivery process to occur over the past two years are now starting to get a bit nervous. With the latest flights and the way in which Mr Murdoch came through the other day, he is signalling a change in attitude toward the State Government and it may find itself under a bit more pressure in the next 12 to 18 months than it has encountered over the previous two years. It will be interesting to see how the delivery process goes while hopefully under pressure and attack from a changed media outlet.

I am not saying that the game plan is going to benefit the Opposition at all: I would say the opposite. I do not think the game plan is to present us as a credible Government alternative: it will present us as a credible Opposition up to and past the next election date. Also, the State Government will have to manage to work within a media campaign that will be trying to denigrate the Federal Government and put the blame

on it for a lot of the failed economic strategies of this State. At least in the lead up to the election, anyway, we will have a transfer of responsibility for failure. The State Government will try to hang that failure around Keating's neck when, in fact, it will be the result of the dismal performance of the current Government in failing to stitch up the deals required to get this State moving.

So, I watch with interest the changed editorial roles of the media in this town, but I suspect that nothing will change for us. The Government may come under a bit more scrutiny to perform and get results on the ground and, unfortunately for the Federal Government, the failure of the South Australian Government to deliver jobs in this State will start to be hung around the Commonwealth's neck and there will not be too much it can do because the major controlling interests who have taken responsibility for industry and job development in this State will have taken the running and anything the Commonwealth can do will not be able to influence outcomes. I support the motion.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

PAY-ROLL TAX (EXEMPTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill seeks to amend the *Pay-Roll Tax Act* to exempt from pay-roll tax wages paid or payable by a motion picture production company.

The exemption is to apply where the motion picture production company satisfies the Treasurer that wages were paid or payable for the production of a feature film wholly or substantially within the State, and which will result in the employment of South Australian residents and will bring economic benefits to the State.

The amendment will provide an incentive to encourage motion picture production companies to view South Australia as a financially and geographically attractive location to establish a base from which to undertake feature film production.

This exemption will result in enhanced employment opportunities being established for the State.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 12—Exemptions

Section 12 provides for various exemptions under the Act. It is intended to include an exemption from pay-roll tax in respect of wages paid by a motion picture production company where the wages are paid to a person involved in the production of a feature film where the Treasurer is satisfied (a) that the film will be produced wholly or substantially within the State; (b) that the film will result in the employment of South Australians; and (c) that economic benefits will accrue to the State on account of the production of the film.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate.

**LAND TAX (HOME UNIT COMPANIES)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Prior to the commencement in February 1968 of strata title provisions in the *Real Property Act* it was not possible to obtain separate titles where multiple dwellings were constructed as a single building complex on a single land parcel.

Home Unit Company Schemes provided for the acquisition of interests in individual home units through the purchase of a company share which entitled that person as the shareholder to the exclusive use and occupation of a defined home unit.

There has been considerable dissatisfaction with the assessment of land tax in relation to Home Unit Companies.

The nature of land ownership under these arrangements results in a degree of uncertainty and inequity in the assessment of land tax under the current provisions of the Act.

Land tax is currently assessed on the basis that the Home Unit Company is the legal owner of the property on which the units are built with land tax being assessed on the total taxable value of the property.

Whilst exemption is provided in respect of those units which are occupied by shareholders as their principal place of residence and the total taxable value of the land reduced accordingly, the Home Unit Company is only entitled to one concessional threshold thus resulting in individual shareholders who do not occupy their units frequently paying more land tax than would be the case if their interests were separately assessed.

Since the introduction in 1968 of strata title provisions under the *Real Property Act* the preferred mode of home unit ownership is on a strata title basis rather than through a Home Unit Company structure.

The current provisions of the *Land Tax Act* recognises individual unit owners under strata title ownerships but does not recognise shareholders of a home unit company as if they are owners for land tax assessment purposes other than for the purposes of principal place of residence exemption.

Clearly equity would be served if the individual shareholders were consistently treated as if they were owners for land tax purposes.

It is proposed by this Bill to amend the provisions of the *Land Tax Act* to provide for the recognition of shareholders in a Home Unit Company in existence in February 1968 as if they are the owners of the respective units to which their shareholding relates.

This change will allow for the continuation of principal place of residence exemption for Home Unit Scheme occupiers but will permit assessment of land tax on an individual basis where units are not occupied by their 'owners'.

The Government has consulted with relevant industry on the measures contained in this Bill and has appreciated their contribution.

The Bill contains one other minor amendment. Sections 73 and 74 of the Act provide for the inspection of documents in the course of a search of premises and the court's power to require the production of documents. The Bill seeks to insert a definition of the term 'document' to make it clear that this would include information stored electronically.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides that the measure will be taken to have come into operation at midnight on 30 June 1995.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

This clause amends section 4 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of 'document' which includes information stored electronically, and by inserting a new subsection (2) dealing with Home Unit Companies.

New subsection (2) sets out a number of criteria which are the defining characteristics of Home Unit Companies, and then provides

that where a scheme satisfies the criteria outlined, each dwelling in the scheme will be taken to be a separate parcel of land and, despite the definition of 'owner', the shareholder who is entitled to occupy the dwelling (rather than the company) will be taken to be the legal owner of the land on which the dwelling is situated.

This provision will only apply to schemes established before 22 February 1968, which is the date on which the Strata Titles provisions commenced.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 10A—Exemption of certain residential land from land tax

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 10A of the principal Act to remove those subsections which currently provide an exemption in relation to Home Unit Companies.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 73—Powers of inspection and inquiry
This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 73 of the principal Act so that it refers only to 'document', in keeping with the proposed new definition.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 74—Commissioner may cause a person to be examined before a local court

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 74 of the principal Act so that it refers only to 'document', in keeping with the proposed new definition.

Clause 7: Insertion of s. 74A

This clause is consequential to the proposed new definition of 'document' and provides that, in relation to information stored on computer or some other device, a power to inspect or require production includes the power to produce or require production of the information in an understandable form through the use of that computer or other device.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate:

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.I. Lucas:

That the report of the Auditor-General and the Treasurer's Financial Statements 1994-95 be noted.

(Continued from 12 October. Page 181.)

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The Public Finance and Audit Act 1987 regulates the receipt and expenditure of public money. Most importantly, it provides for the auditing of the receipt and expenditure of public money and for the examination of the efficiency and economy with which public resources are used. Under that Act, money cannot be applied from the Consolidated Account unless there is an Act of Parliament. This means that the supervision of the State's public financial performance is fairly and squarely placed within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. That is as it should be.

The Act limits the amount that may be appropriated by the Executive arm of Government without approval of this Parliament. The Executive is also limited to the amount that it can borrow unless approved or prescribed pursuant to an Act of Parliament. That necessarily means that this Parliament again supervises the performance of the Executive in terms of State finances. Section 22 of the Public Finance and Audit Act sets out the Treasurer's responsibilities to the Auditor-General. In brief, the Treasurer has to deliver to the Auditor-General, prior to 31 August in each year, a statement of the estimated and actual receipts and payments.

He must also deliver a statement of the sources and application of money, a statement of the payments of a recurrent nature, a statement naming organisations with which the Treasurer has invested funds, a statement of the balances at the end of the financial year, a statement of the total indebtedness of the State, and the financial statements of SAFA. Similar provisions apply also to the chief executive officers of public authorities, which includes all Government departments, Ministers, statutory authorities and prescribed

bodies. The position of the Auditor-General is such that, whilst he is appointed by the Executive arm of Government, he cannot effectively be dismissed unless there is a resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

As such, his primary responsibility is to this Parliament. His responsibility is to audit and examine the accounts of Government. He has extensive powers to obtain information. Pursuant to section 36 of the Act, the Auditor-General must prepare an annual report encompassing a number of things, including any matter that should, in the opinion of the Auditor-General, be brought to the attention of the Parliament and of the Government. There is absolutely no doubt that the Auditor-General plays a pivotal role in ensuring that Executive Government is held accountable to this Parliament.

There is no doubt that individual members of Parliament have neither the resources nor the background or the powers to ensure that the Executive arm of Government is acting responsibly and within the law. As a member of Parliament, I am grateful for the resources of the Auditor-General. There are, no doubt, many occasions when Auditors-General become a source of annoyance to the Executive arm of Government. That is as it should be. The Auditor-General played a pivotal role in identifying some of the problems which arose out of the State Bank disaster caused by the former Labor Government.

It is also important to point out that the Auditor-General is not infallible. Occasionally he can criticise and those criticisms are fairly and squarely met by the Executive arm of Government. Indeed, in this report certain criticisms have been made by the Auditor-General of the Treasury Department. However, it is important to note the extraordinary distance this Government has travelled in the area of financial accountability in such a short time: the Government has gone a long way towards adopting accrual accounting and has gone a long way in properly dealing with the distinction between Government capital and Government income.

Certainly, the criticism by the Auditor-General of the Treasurer in relation to issues, such as the investment of funds for the longer term as opposed to the shorter term, has been met by the Treasurer, and this Parliament ought to congratulate the Treasurer for his response. However, I await with some interest the Treasurer's response to the Auditor-General's criticism regarding the absence of a State balance sheet. I note that the Hon. Ron Roberts was critical of this Government in relation to the new process, particularly in relation to the budget cycle. Prior to the election of this Government, both the budget and the tabling of the Auditor-General's Report was dealt with simultaneously with the delivery of the budget.

That occurred sometime into the financial year in which it was to be promulgated. The Hon. Ron Roberts gives the impression that the Government has been underhand in adopting this process. I would suggest that the Hon. Ron Roberts and his colleagues draw a very long bow indeed. I remind members that the Auditor-General said:

There was a major change in the timing of the budget cycle in 1995 for the 1995-96 financial year. . . . The change to an early budget has advantages. In my opinion there is an urgent need to address related matters such as the adequacy and timing of information available for the budget process to complement the early budget. Not to do so would, in my view, detract from the ability of the Parliament, particularly through its Estimates Committees, to give adequate scrutiny to the budget.

The Hon. Ron Roberts, in making an observation on the Auditor-General's comments from which I just quoted, said:

What normally happened with the Auditor-General's Report was the province of the Estimates Committee whereby the Auditor-General would be in the House, would be subjected to questions, would be in a position to respond, consequential questions could be asked, issues could be explored and detail could be obtained so the system which is supposed to be transparent for all South Australians would indeed be seen to be transparent and accountability would be created.

Noble words indeed! The Auditor-General has indicated that he will provide assistance to members in the Estimates Committees by the provision of half yearly information. I have no doubt, knowing the Treasurer as I do and in recalling conversations that I have had with him on previous occasions, that he is aware of the difficulties created by the change to an early budget. It is important, however, to note that the Auditor-General stated that this process has advantages. He also pointed out the disadvantages and it is to be hoped that the Government will address them.

I point out, however, that there is one reform which needs to be carefully considered and which has not been touched upon by any of the previous speakers, namely, the question of this Chamber's role in the supervision of the State's finances. Prior to the Government's changes, the only opportunity members in this place had to speak on the issue of finance was through the Appropriation Bills or, perhaps, through an Address in Reply. The position of members in this place has been improved substantially by the Government's decision to bring forward the budget. The Hon. Ron Roberts is rather mean in not acknowledging that advantage, despite my interjections to that effect.

I go on record as congratulating the Treasurer for these changes and I am sure that he will review them and that appropriate improvements will be made in due course. Certainly, the position is far better than that which existed under the previous Government. If it is not, then woe betide us. The old process allowed Tim Marcus Clark and his cowboys, together with the close supervision of John Bannon and his band of 'yes' men, otherwise known as the Labor backbench, to create havoc with the State's finances.

I have now had the opportunity to consider the report in detail and I have a number of questions. The Labor Party in this and the other place has shown its great lack of ability. It has, with few exceptions, filled this place with humbug and rhetoric. Its members have not asked the hard and important questions. Apart from the contribution of the Hon. Mr Holloway, there is little evidence that members opposite have read the full report. In light of that, I have a number of questions to be directed at the Executive arm of Government in relation to a number of issues that have been raised in this very important report.

The first issue arises at page 45 of the report in relation to the Asset Management Task Force. On that page a list of consultants is set out. A number of them received sums of between nought and \$50 000. At page 46 a number of consultants are outlined, they having also received sums in excess of \$50 000. My question to the Treasurer is: will the Treasurer list the amounts paid to the respective consultants listed on page 46 of the Auditor-General's Report in the category of \$50 000 plus? I note that those consultants were paid a total of \$7.3 million, which averages out at about \$430 000 per consultant. I will be grateful if I could be advised of the general nature of the work performed by the consultants listed on that page.

I turn now to the Attorneys-General's Department, in particular page 48 of the Auditor-General's Report. The Auditor-General expressed concern about the use of corporate

credit cards, particularly in relation to the absence of documentation concerning travel, accommodation and entertainment-hospitality. I understand that the department has indicated that issues concerning the amalgamation of the former Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs caused a number of problems. In light of that, I would be grateful if the Attorney could advise this place of the precise nature of the use of credit cards. My questions to the Attorney-General regarding the use of the corporate credit cards are as follows:

1. In relation to travel, what documentation was absent, how much was spent on travel, by whom, upon what dates and for what purposes was such expenditure incurred? What were the destinations?

2. In relation to accommodation, what documentation was absent, how much was spent on accommodation, by whom, on what dates and for what purpose was such expenditure incurred? Where was such accommodation?

3. In relation to entertainment/hospitality, what documentation was absent? How much was spent on entertainment/hospitality and who authorised such expenditure? What dates and for what purpose was such expenditure incurred? Who were the payees of these amounts?

4. How many conferences did staff attend, for what purpose, for what cost and when did the conferences occur?

5. What were the incidental costs of the conferences, including the cost of the guests/consultants, and who were the consultants?

At page 56 the Auditor-General refers to the administration of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund. I draw members' attention to the fact that an increasing sum has been called to be transferred from the Consolidated Account to cover the cost of compensation payments under the criminal injuries compensation regime. In that context I ask the Attorney-General whether he is giving consideration to increasing the levies on persons convicted of offences in order to reduce the impact to the general revenue of criminal injuries compensation claims. I turn now to matters pertaining to the Commissioner for Public Employment, and in particular to page 122. I note that there is an officer who is on an income of approximately \$140 000 to \$150 000 per year. That officer has been declared excess and placed within the office pending suitable alternative employment. I would be grateful if the Treasurer would advise as to what use is being made of such a person and whether or not the Government is receiving any productive work from that person.

One sits here and admires the performance of the Leader of the Government in the Council and the Minister for Education and Children's Services in the difficult portfolio of education. From time to time we hear questions from members opposite and the banal interjections of the Hon. Michael Elliott. They seem to have quickly forgotten that this State faced a massive financial crisis following the previous Government's negligent financial performance. We have been confronted with a difficult job and we have seen some fine performances.

A good example is the reduction in workers compensation claims, which have decreased by 3.8 million to 14.6 million. In that regard I draw members' attention to the figures at page 185. I have, however, noted that the Auditor-General indicates that there have been some problems with the financial controls within the Education Department. In that context, I draw the honourable Minister's attention to pages 186 and 187 of the report where there are some comments by the Auditor-General concerning certain travel claims and

certain accommodation expenditure. The questions I ask are as follows:

1. What travel claims were not checked for compliance with the Commissioner's Determination No. 9, and has that occurred since the tabling of the report? If not, when is it likely to occur?

2. What excess expenditure on accommodation has not been authorised and have checks been implemented to ensure that the expenditure would have been authorised if such authorisation had been sought?

3. What substantial telephone expenditure has not been subsequently authorised and has the Minister taken steps to ensure that they have since been checked?

I now turn to page 249 of the report which refers to the Department of Employment, Training and Further Education. I note at page 249 a further comment is made in relation to the Department of Employment, Training and Further Education concerning the use of corporate credit cards. The Auditor-General refers to instances of non-compliance with the Treasurer's and departmental instructions. He says that the main issues related to payments that were not supported by an appropriate level of documentation and, in particular, for entertainment and travelling expenses. In light of that, would the Minister advise whether or not he has made inquiries as to those claims? I would be grateful if the Minister would advise this Parliament whether or not documentation can be obtained and whether or not the entertainment and travelling expenses were carried out in accordance with ordinary departmental guidelines.

Of more serious concern, I draw the attention of members to pages 290 and 291 of the report relating to the Department for Family and Community Services. The Auditor-General has raised concerns regarding the reconciliation of Disbursement Account No. 9 and the Advance Account No. 1 over a period of two years. He indicates that the matters still remain unresolved and, as a consequence, he has qualified his Audit Report. In the light of that, my questions to the Minister are:

1. Have steps been taken to ensure that there is a proper reconciliation of the two relevant accounts?

2. Have those inquiries revealed any concerns on the part of the Minister?

3. Has the Minister any explanation as to why the department did not comply with the concerns expressed by the Auditor-General last year?

I now refer members to page 315 of the report regarding Flinders University. The question that I ask of the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education relates to the note which states:

During the reporting period the university acquired the remaining 50 per cent of the net assets relating to Flinders Technologies Pty Ltd. Details of the acquisition are as follows. . .

He then sets out the details of the acquisition. I should be grateful if the Minister could provide this Parliament with details of the purpose of such transaction and whether proper supervision mechanisms are in place for the taxpayer.

The Foundation SA part of the report is interesting. I see in the report that there has been a decline in tobacco licensing fees of about \$28 000. Whilst I am a smoker, I hope this means that there is a decline in the smoking of cigarettes in South Australia. In any event, I would be grateful if the Minister could arrange for Foundation SA to provide me with information on the amounts of money paid to each of the sponsorship areas referred to at the bottom of page 317 of the Auditor-General's Report. I should also be grateful to receive information as to precisely who received those moneys. For

the benefit of members who do not have the report, these are the actual grants made to various sporting and arts bodies. I also note on page 320 that moneys were spent on market research and general consulting services. In that regard, I ask the Treasurer to provide me with details of the nature and purpose of the market research.

I turn now to the Department for Industrial Affairs. Prior to the election of this Government great publicity was generated in the area of payments to high level public servants. Looking through the Auditor-General's Report, there is consistency in the payment of remuneration to senior executives within each Government department. On the whole, it would appear that this Government has reined in some of the excesses of the previous Government. However, I noticed in the report of the Department for Industrial Affairs, page 348, that three employees receive in excess of \$180 000. I would be grateful if the Minister for Industrial Affairs could identify, by office, the positions held by each of those public servants and their general responsibilities. I would also be grateful if he could explain why they receive about \$30 000 to \$40 000 more than the average senior public servant. I note that a further comment was made by the Auditor-General at page 345 about the use of corporate credit cards. The department has indicated that all areas of concern have been addressed. Will the Minister outline what steps were taken to address the areas of concern?

When the Audit Commission report was released, there was a great deal of criticism of the management of the Government Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Fund. It is pleasing to see that the Auditor-General has not repeated those criticisms, so we must assume that steps have been taken to address the Audit Commission's concerns. However, the Auditor-General did say that a number of concerns raised in the 1993-94 report have not all been addressed. I would be grateful if the Minister would identify which areas have not been addressed and say why they have not been addressed.

I also draw members' attention to the figures at page 351. Indeed, if one looks at the claims paid by the department in relation to Education and Children's Services, one notes an immense improvement of nearly \$4 million dollars over a two-year period. As I said earlier, that indicates a great improvement in the management of Education and Children's Services by the Leader of the Government in this place. On the other hand I note that transport claims increased by \$2.5 million and police claims increased by \$1.2 million. I should be grateful if the respective Ministers or the Minister for Industrial Affairs could provide an explanation as to why there have been those increases in workers' compensation payments and in particular to what areas they relate.

I draw members' attention to the report on the Lotteries Commission concerning the remuneration of employees, which appears at page 400 of volume 1. One employee appears to have received somewhere in the vicinity of \$370 000 to \$380 000 by way of remuneration. That is more than the most senior public servant in the Premier's Department receives. I should be grateful if the Treasurer would indicate why a person would receive that amount of remuneration and what that person's qualifications and responsibilities are.

The police accounts provide some interesting reading. I do not need to remind members of the current pay dispute with the police. Over the past few weeks, there has been much debate in the public arena and in the media as to whether or not police have received pay rises. However, one would have thought that, if a police officer receives an

increase in his pay packet, that is a pay increase. Notwithstanding that, the Secretary of the Police Association claims that they are not pay rises. One can only be bemused by that analysis. In any event, it would appear from the financial statement printed at page 446 that salaries have increased by somewhere in the vicinity of \$15 million. I should be grateful if the Minister for Emergency Services could advise why payments have increased by that amount in the area of salaries.

I turn now to the accounts of the Senior Secondary Assessment Board, which show a reduction of \$32 000 in relation to candidates' fees. These are fees collected from students in South-East Asia. Can the Minister advise whether or not this indicates a drop in the number of overseas students attending South Australian schools? Does this indicate any problem in terms of marketing our school services?

I turn now to the South Australian TAB, referred to at page 695. Over the past 18 months, there has been significant debate about the TAB. Some of it has been useful and some of it has not. It is quite clear that an adverse effect on lotteries and gaming and on the TAB has been caused by the introduction of poker machines. As a consequence, the State dividend has been reduced by some \$3 million and the racing revenue has been reduced by \$800 000. In the coming months one would hope that, when the review into poker machine revenue is completed, a number of issues can be taken into account. First, we ought to look at the net take to the Government having regard to the losses in revenue from the TAB and from lotteries and gaming. The current debate concerning pokies must be considered in the context that the net gain to revenue after considering lotteries and TAB losses is \$58 million, which does not take into account the cost of the Gambling Rehabilitation Fund. So the figure that has been bandied about—as I recollect, about \$87 million—is not strictly correct.

Secondly, one should not rush in too quickly in relation to poker machine net revenues to the Government and to the poker machine licensees. One cannot be confident that the amounts received are not part of an initial fad and are not likely to be reduced. One does not have to think very far back to when scratchy tickets were first introduced in the Lotteries and Gaming Commission. At that time serious concerns were expressed about the use of those tickets. Notwithstanding that, after an initial demand or fad period, the turnover dropped significantly. Obviously, close scrutiny will have to be paid to the operation of the TAB in the light of the developments of gambling in other areas. However, I suggest that the subsidisation of one gambling industry by another, as was suggested in some quarters, is not the way to go.

I draw members' attention to the figures at page 741 of the report in relation to the State Electoral Office, where we see a breakdown of the cost for various by-elections caused by the untimely resignations of a series of Labor Party members, and this has cost the State dearly. The figures indicate that non-voter follow-up from the December 1993 State election cost the taxpayer \$54 000, and the three by-elections cost a total of \$126 000. I note that the Australian Labor Party has made a great deal of the fact that it has increased the representation of women in the Lower House. But at what cost? The three by-elections have cost South Australian taxpayers \$126 000. One would have thought that, if it waited until the next election, we could have had those women and at the same time saved that significant sum of money. It is all well and good for the Australian Labor Party to sit back and say that it has achieved its so-called quota and for the South

Australian division of the ALP to claim that it is the first in Australia to do so. However, it is typical of the ALP—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: That you have achieved your quota, the one that you had sent down to you by your Federal bosses. You did it at the expense of the South Australian taxpayer. It does not matter whether members opposite are in Government or sitting opposite, all they do is cost us money, for no apparent reason. Not one of the by-elections was created through ill health or for any reason other than members opposite running around in their factional disputes, shoving knives into each other and telling each other when they should or should not go. Sitting here, I await with great interest to see whom the Hon. Terry Cameron will push out of this place next. In any event, members opposite have had no regard for the public purse in causing these by-elections: all they have done is claim this quota at the expense of the South Australian taxpayer, and sat back and thought that no-one would notice that it was costing the taxpayer of South Australia for their short-term, small electoral gain, to get rid of some of their dead wood they should not have had in the other House in the first place.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: What is the record of their candidates for the next Federal election?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: That is amazing. I digress a bit, but I will only do so for a moment. All we have seen in Queensland and Western Australia is the shifting of women into marginal or unwinnable seats, given the Keating Government's record, and the protection of the male of the species by shifting them into the safer seats.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member to keep to his speech.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: In any event—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: —in South Australia, particularly with our Federal candidates, we have achieved all the quotas that the ALP achieved, without any cost to the Australian or the South Australian taxpayer. So, when members hear the members opposite go out and wave the flag that they have their 35 per cent quota, they should just remember that they did it through the use of the knife, the push and, most importantly, other people's—namely, the taxpayers'—money. The Opposition is unnecessarily costing the taxpayers of this State money.

I turn now to the State Opera. I ask whether the Minister for the Arts can indicate what instances of non-compliance with the Treasurer's instructions occurred in relation to the use of credit cards and why there was not proper maintenance of the required records. I would also be grateful if the Minister would indicate what steps are taken to ensure that there will be compliance so that we do not receive the same comment next year. I would also ask the same question of the Minister for the Arts in relation to the State Theatre Company, particularly in relation to the comments made by the Auditor-General appearing at page 805.

To a lesser extent, the rest of the Government departments have been covered by the members opposite, but I believe that as a member of Parliament I have a duty to ask those questions, and certainly those questions override any other duty that I have.

In concluding, I commend the Auditor-General for his work. No Government department is perfect, and I believe that the Auditor-General has a very important role in ensuring

that there is an improvement in the standard and quality of service provided by Government to the taxpayers of South Australia. I do not think that in every case a criticism—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The Hon. Ron Roberts interjects. If the Auditor-General adopted the same standard in presenting a report during the Bannon years, there would not have been enough wheelbarrows and semitrailers to enable us to wheel the documents into this place, so let us get this into the proper context.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Lindsay Fox would have had to buy more trucks.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The Hon. Legh Davis says that Lindsay Fox would have had to buy more trucks. As wealthy as he is, Alan Scott would have increased his wealth if he had had reports of this quality when members opposite were in Government. As a Government backbencher I will not sit back as Government backbenchers did during the Bannon years while they lost \$8 billion or \$9 billion and allow that sort of thing to happen.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The Hon. Terry Cameron interjects, but he was not there. He was in the back room trying to get that mob of crooks votes. However, the Hon. Paul Holloway was one of their principal advisers.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: In any event, I do not believe that the sorts of comments made by the Auditor-General should attract the level of hysterical comment made by members opposite. Indeed, one should consider their performance in the light of the extraordinary financial mismanagement of the previous Government. I am not sure that the hard questions were asked either in the Party room or in this place, and I make that comment in the context of the previous Government. The one thing that distinguishes this current Government from the previous Bannon Labor Government is the quality of the back bench.

The Liberal Party in this State is an inquiring Party and its members will not simply accept the word of their Leaders, unlike the Bannon Government back bench. This is not to say that the Leaders in both this and the other place do not have the full confidence of all the members comprising the Liberal Party. However, in this State we have a vigorous democracy, and certainly this Government came to office seeking to restore that paramountcy of Parliament.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The Hon. Paul Holloway interjects. I invite him to stand up and tell us exactly when he said to the Bannon Government, with Arnold and the rest of his cohorts, 'Oy! The State Bank is out of control.' When did he stand up when questions were being asked in the other place and say, 'Look, Mr Bannon, you had better go and ask these State Bank directors, because there is some merit in some of the questions being asked by Dale Baker, Leader of the Opposition.'? He sat back there and bathed in the glory of John Bannon's reassurances, and then has the gall to come in here and be critical of this Government, based upon a few minor administrative criticisms made by the Auditor-General.

It is all well and good for the Hon. Paul Holloway to sit there smugly just as he did during the Bannon years. I would be most interested to hear from him what we could call 'a maiden contribution' with some sort of constructive substance to it. In any event, the grandstanding of Opposition members, particularly those in another place, regarding this

report does not give me any confidence that they are mature, knowledgeable or inquiring enough to be able to scrutinise properly the Government's performance. All I can say is that the South Australian public can rest easy because the Liberal Government has an inquiring back bench which will ensure that the Executive arm of government and the public sector are kept on their toes in a proper and reasonable fashion.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.31 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 18 October at 2.15 p.m.