

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 16 October 1996

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 Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin)—
Reports, 1995-96—
Attorney-General's Department.
Public Trustee.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The **Hon. R.D. LAWSON**: I bring up the second report of the committee, 1996-97.

NATIONAL SCHEMES OF LEGISLATION

The **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** laid on the table a position paper on the scrutiny of national schemes of legislation.

QUESTION TIME

FINDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

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 Findon Primary School.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES**: In August this year, the District Superintendent of the Central West Education District asked the Minister for approval to begin community consultation on the future of the Findon Primary School and approval to say that if the school were sold the proceeds would be spent on upgrading adjacent schools. In response to the request about community consultation, the Minister sought further information by asking:

The result of further public consultation will be obvious won't it, that is, support for option 2?

The Minister further said:

Can't a decision be made on the basis of the review recommendation?

In relation to the proceeds of the sale, the Minister wrote a minute in his own hand, dated 10 August 1996, stating that:

sale proceeds—some to any required upgrade annexed to adjacent schools within the Central West district.

Given the information revealed in these documents, does the Minister deny that he had decided to close the Findon Primary School before the public consultation meeting held on 21 August?

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: Absolutely.

The **Hon. Carolyn Pickles**: It is in your own handwriting.

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: It is not in my own handwriting: that is your interpretation. The simple answer to the question is 'Absolutely.' The document to which the honourable member refers was signed by me on 10 August 1996 and in that document is a request directed to me from the District Superintendent which reads:

During the broader community consultation process, the DSE [District Superintendent] would like to indicate that, if the closure

of Findon Primary School was approved, then funds from the sale of the property would be directed into the refurbishment of adjacent schools.

I stress that the document states, 'if the closure of Findon Primary School was approved'. What I have written at the bottom is, 'sale proceeds—some to any required upgrade and rest to 'adjacent' schools within the total central west review'. It is quite clear that what I wrote on 10 August indicated that, if Findon Primary School was to be closed, I would not agree to the funds of the sale of the property going into just the adjacent schools, which are Woodville Primary School, Seaton Park Primary School and Flinders Park Primary School, because we are already spending over \$1 million of taxpayers' money on a refurbishment of Seaton Park Primary School. I said that adjacent schools would include all schools within the total central west review.

The **Hon. Diana Laidlaw**: Very fair.

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: Very fair—

An honourable member: Balanced.

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: Yes, balanced as well. What I said was that all the money would go back into school redevelopment to the benefit of students and staff. We have to bear in mind that the facilities at Findon Primary School were so bad that the staff at that school put a default notice on the buildings under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act, refused to teach in them, and said that it was unsafe to have students in some parts of them.

The **Hon. J.F. Stefani**: All because the Labor Party didn't do anything.

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: Because for 20 years the Labor Party neglected it.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: Twenty years of unseemly neglect.

The **Hon. K.T. Griffin**: Safe seat.

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: A safe seat, I suppose. They forgot about the western suburbs.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: They just neglected it.

Members interjecting:

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! The Hon. Terry Cameron is after a long lunch.

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: This Government is putting the money into schools, whether they be in the western suburbs or the northern suburbs. We are putting over \$1 million into Seaton Park Primary School, and all the funds from the closure of Findon Primary School will go into western suburbs schools. What I said to the District Superintendent was that it would not be just the immediately adjacent schools—Seaton Park, Woodville and Flinders Park—necessarily. It would be to western suburbs within the central west review. It is as simple as that.

TELEPHONE TOWERS

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 a Federal Government decision.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES**: Yesterday the Minister told the Council that he had relied on the advice of health experts in making his decision to allow mobile phone towers to be located in schools. He said today that he would table that advice, and I hope that he will do so. The Minister

may by now have noticed a report in today's *Advertiser*, and he may have received a copy of a media release from the Hon. Senator Richard Alston, Minister for Communications and the Arts, in a joint release with the Minister for Health and Family Services, Dr Michael Wooldridge, part of which is as follows:

The Government will provide \$4.5 million over five years for research and public information into health issues associated with mobile phones, mobile phone towers and other communications devices and equipment.

The media release continues:

Dr Wooldridge said that while there is no substantiated evidence available to date of adverse health effects associated with RF EME exposure within the standards that apply in Australia and overseas, there is still a need for further research and to provide information to the public. 'An important part of this project will be the provision of factual information about the use of mobile phones and about exposure levels,' Dr Wooldridge said.

Dr Wooldridge continued as follows:

The committee of health, scientific and communications officials has already been established to examine and advise the Government on RF EME related matters, including national and international research findings and the potential for further research.

My question to the Minister is: in view of the announcement of a five year study, will the Minister now defer to the view of the Senate committee that his decision to allow mobile phone towers was astonishing and change his decision?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The answer is 'No.' If we are going to act in accordance with the honourable member's wishes (she is saying that because there is five year research into and public information on health issues associated with not just mobile phone towers but mobile phones themselves), I presume she is suggesting that we ban not only mobile phone towers but also mobile phones themselves. Is that what the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Exactly not. The Leader of the Opposition has to work out exactly what she is arguing for. Is the Leader saying that, because there is now a research study into mobile phones as well as mobile phone towers, we should ban the lot? Of course she is saying not.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Until the Leader of the Opposition can more adequately sort out what she is wanting to argue and upon what basis, the answer to the question obviously remains as it was yesterday and again today: we will rely on the very best advice of the Health Commission and the international array of health experts that they have and, as soon as they direct that we not proceed with mobile phone towers, or as soon as they say we should ban mobile phones from our schools and from the community, we will respond.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: As a supplementary question, will the leader of the Government in this place consider his Government's putting in a submission to the Federal inquiry recently announced as being set up by Senator Alston?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will discuss that with my colleague the Minister for Health. Given that in South Australia we have one of the most renowned international experts with an international reputation in this area, I would be—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, we have one in South Australia as well. I would be surprised if either individually or through the various hospitals or units there might not be

some involvement with this research study. Of course, I will defer to the Minister for Health on this issue and bring back considered advice to the honourable member following his question.

LION ARTS CENTRE

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yesterday during Question Time my reply to the question from the Hon. Anne Levy about the future of the Lion Arts Centre was necessarily cut short by the length of the honourable member's question and by the pressure of other Government business. Accordingly, I wish to add to my reply of yesterday, because it appears that the ALP is keen to create mischief by discrediting the work under way to investigate fully all future options for the Lion Arts Centre.

The Government's goal is to retain the centre as a complex for the arts, but there are increased costs for taxpayers associated with such a goal. Accordingly, first, with the Fringe keen to move to the East End at some considerable cost to taxpayers; secondly, with any new tenancy requiring the Government to upgrade the Lion Arts Theatre so that it is fully accessible; thirdly, with the Media Resource Unit wanting to divest itself of management of the Mercury Theatre; and, finally, with a number of existing tenants and others wishing to explore new opportunities on site, I maintain that the Government is obliged to investigate all issues in the best interests of the arts industry in this State and the public interest as a whole, and the Government is doing so.

The arts sector must appreciate that maintaining the Lion Arts Centre site for arts purposes comes at a cost to taxpayers, both in current book transactions and the future loss of rental income if the Lion theatre were leased to another operator. I repeat that the Government's preferred position is to retain the Lion Arts site for the arts. However, in order to make a responsible decision I must learn more about the initiatives that all proponents would be prepared to take to help develop the site for the arts both in the short term and beyond the year 2000. Such initiatives are important overall if the arts are to be regarded truly as an industry contributing to the prosperity of Adelaide creatively, culturally and financially in the next few years and beyond at the Lion Arts Centre and elsewhere.

WOODVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about Woodville Primary School.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: A minute to the Minister obtained under the Freedom of Information Act reveals that attendance at Woodville Primary School is already at the school maximum capacity of 600 children. The report says that the closure of Findon Primary School will require the equivalent of six portable classrooms to be moved to Woodville Primary School before the 1997 school year at a cost exceeding \$100 000 in order to provide temporary accommodation for the extra 100 students. The report also says that \$2 million is required to upgrade Woodville Primary

School to provide 600 quality education places. Will the upgrade of the Woodville Primary School commence this year and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The advice to which the honourable member refers demonstrates the importance of Ministers getting out and consulting with parents, with schools and with communities. Indeed, that is what I did during term 3 when I went to Findon Primary School and spoke personally with the parents, staff and students before I took the decision about the closure of Findon. The department's view, prior to my meeting with the school community, was that a majority of the students and families from Findon Primary School, if it were to close, would move to Woodville Primary School. That is logical, because Woodville is very close and enjoys a very good reputation.

As a result of the personal discussions that I had with parents at Findon Primary School, I informed the department that I suspected that that view probably was not going to be correct, because when I met with the parents a good percentage of them indicated that they would not be looking at Woodville Primary School but would rather look at schools such as Flinders Park Primary School, Seaton Park Primary School and, for some of them, Kilkenny and even farther afield, such as Grange and one or two other schools.

I have advised the department that it ought to reconsider that view that the overwhelming majority will end up going to Woodville. There will need to be close counselling and consultation with parents about their future movements, but as I met with Mr Doyle again today at an impromptu press conference he confirmed to me the discussions that I had with him before: that he is an example of a parent and family who will not be sending their children to Woodville Primary School. They are looking at another school, which I will not name because of privacy.

Therefore, the advice to which the honourable member refers is just another reason why there are occasions on which Ministers listen to the best advice from the department but they themselves consult with parents and teachers and then make their own judgment, independent of the advice that they might have received from the department. So, I have asked the department to reconsider that.

We will certainly spend all the money on the western suburbs schools; the priority will go to Woodville Primary School and Flinders Park Primary School and not Seaton Park as we are already spending more than \$1 million at that school. The priority will go to those two schools and, certainly, if we have to bring in new transportables or Demacs for the start of next year for either of those two schools, clearly we will do so.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Given that decisions have to be made as to where people send their children, obviously the condition of the Woodville Primary School would be a consideration. Will the upgrade of the Woodville Primary School commence this year and, if not, why not, as it may well affect the numbers directed to the Woodville Primary School next year?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As I indicated, and can only repeat, if we are required because of parent choice to move in additional transportables or Demacs to the Woodville Primary School site or any other site for the start of 1997, we will do so. It is obviously not possible, if there was a need at any of those school sites to build new construction, to have concluded that by January of next year.

BRIDGESTONE EDWARDSTOWN PLANT

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources, a question about the Environment Protection Agency.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Today's *Advertiser* carried a story entitled 'Factory's two year toxic leak'. Over the past 18 months I have had people coming to me regularly complaining about the standard of monitoring of the environment, both in anticipation of the EPA's formation last year and subsequent to it. Over the past couple of months the number of people coming to me has increased and the concern expressed has also greatly increased. It needs to be noted that this incident that has come to light is only the most recent in a series over the past couple of years. There have been a couple of prominent leaks in the South-East, particularly in relation to copper chrome arsenate, from at least two different timber mills and a number of others.

It appears from the report of the *Advertiser* and from what I have been told by others that this may not have come to light if it were not for the fact that Marion council is actively working in the Edwardstown area and has been attempting to carry out some sort of audit of operation in its area—a task most people in this place would have understood was the role of the Environment Protection Agency. I note in today's report that Bridgestone has certainly been aware for the leak for some years and I understand from a separate discussion that I have had that they reported it to the EWS some time ago because they sought permission to pump out groundwater to clean it and to put that water into the EWS waste water system. Certainly the EWS was aware of it some time ago, I understand. Today's *Advertiser* report suggests that the EPA had no knowledge of this leak.

One of the questions I put to the Minister is: how is it, if a report has been made to a Government instrumentality that a significant leakage has occurred—up to 15 000 litres of two chemicals—that that has not been registered in some way and that the EPA has not become aware of it? What is the EPA itself doing in a proactive sense to find out what the standard of maintenance, etc. on various plants is? Is the EPA doing spot checks to find out what sort of leakage is occurring, because it appears to have been a fairly regular occurrence at many sites? I also ask the Minister whether or not the EPA has made any submissions seeking additional resources, as I am told the EPA simply does not have the personnel nor the resources to carry out the task that the Act requires? In fact, people are saying to me that the Act has been made a farce due to the lack of resources.

Can the Minister provide answers on precisely when the EPA and its precursor became aware of the chemical leakage? Was a clean-up order issued and, if not, why not? Who should have known of the leak and when and, if they did not, why not? What action is the EPA now taking to monitor the situation? Once the EPA became aware, what action was taken to make sure the clean up was as rapid as possible?

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

LEIGH CREEK COAL RAIL FREIGHT SERVICE

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about the Leigh Creek coal rail freight service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: In a ministerial statement on 27 September 1995 the Minister for Infrastructure said that he favoured transfer of the Leigh Creek line to Port Augusta. He said:

... single customer line to South Australia, so that ETSA can get on with its job of providing the State with electricity at competitive rates.

The Brew report recommended that the Commonwealth Minister for Transport:

- (a) Negotiate the transferring to the South Australian Government or Electricity Trust of South Australia (ETSA) of the Leigh Creek to Port Augusta coal freight line in conjunction with the balance of the SA freight business, or if that is not achievable;
- (b) Negotiate the disposal of the Eyre Peninsula, Murray Lands and Mid North lines to the South Australian Grain Handling Cooperative, the South Australian Government or a number of short line operators and in the event that the South Australian Government or ETSA do not wish to acquire the Leigh Creek line for it also to be offered to commercial short line operators, or if this is not achievable;
- (c) Close all unprofitable lines.

Will the Minister confirm that ETSA wishes to buy the Leigh Creek coal rail freight service? Can she report on progress with the negotiations between the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments, and is she able to give a categorical assurance that the State Government will not allow this monopoly to be sold off to interests from outside South Australia?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The answer to the first question is 'No.' In terms of the Leigh Creek line, to the Federal Government, to any party that has expressed an interest in being involved in all or part of AN's business, to unions and to the work force generally, I have indicated that the South Australian Government's preferred position is not that recommended by John Brew in his report. I know that some time ago the Minister for Infrastructure, because of his responsibility for Leigh Creek, put out indications of expressions of interest, and many parties did express such an interest in operating the line. However, our preferred position is that any future operator, if they are to be introduced to the system, would not be encouraged to pick out the eyes of AN's business and, if the rest of the business is to be transferred back to the State, that the State be not left with only the major difficulties in the business other than the debt. That would mean all lines other than the Eyre Peninsula and Leigh Creek lines. That position, from the South Australian Government's perspective, has been put very clearly to all the parties I have mentioned, including the unions and the work force; and that has been supported by the parties to whom I have spoken to date with the exception of the Federal Government, which has received those views but has yet to determine its position on the Brew report.

With respect to the Federal Government's actions in this matter, the South Australian Government has again made it clear to the Minister for Transport and the Prime Minister that our preferred position is that expressions of interest be called if it is the Federal Government's view that it wishes to divest responsibility for AN as a monopoly business owned by the Federal Government. The honourable member would be

aware that AN, in its business plan, for some years has been establishing more business and profit centres and has been contracting in or out (whichever way one wishes to look at it) various aspects of the business. So, AN sees a very changed role and structure for itself—and has been going through such processes for some years—than it performs at the present time.

If the Federal Government determines that expressions of interest are to be called, we would be pleased with such a process because, particularly for Port Augusta, as my meetings with the unions and councils determined last week, generating interest in rail activities and general engineering activities in Port Augusta is absolutely critical for a number of players because the Brew report has recommended that AN essentially close most of its activities, particularly workshop activities at Port Augusta. That is a position that the South Australian Government totally rejects. As I indicated, the task force meeting there last week supported the call for expressions of interest because the activities of the councils, unions and work force identified that there are various levels of private interest in operating workshop facilities in Port Augusta.

It is no use being hypothetical about what will happen because the Federal Government has not determined the position it will take in terms of the Brew report's recommendations. I have already indicated our preferred position—the operation of the lines and the workshops. I am meeting with the Islington workshop representatives on Friday, as I met with representatives and went through the workshops last week in Port Augusta. Groups have come to me from both inside and outside the State. I have had no indication of international interest, although I understand that there may have been some expressed. I am particularly concerned to maintain a rail presence and strong rail future in this State—that is the top priority—and ensure that there are long-term secure jobs for the work force in this State. That is the base line for me, our top priority as a Government. Many considerations have to be taken into account to ensure that we secure a strong rail future and long-term secure jobs.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I thank the Minister for her exhaustive answer, but she did not really answer my questions. She answered 'No' to my first question: will the Minister confirm that ETSA wishes to buy the Leigh Creek coal rail line? Is the Minister saying, 'No, it does not wish to buy it'?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am saying, 'No, I cannot confirm whether or not ETSA wishes to buy it.'

PSYCHOPATHS

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Health, a question about psychopaths.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: An article published in the *Medical Observer* dated 11 October this year entitled 'Are polities really psychopaths?' states:

A leading British psychologist has claimed that politicians bear a remarkable resemblance to psychopaths.

This topic was discussed at an annual meeting of the British Psychological Society's criminological and legal division. The psychologist, Ms Marshall of the Caledonia University of Glasgow, researched 20 key characteristics that combine to produce a diagnosis of 'psychopath'. It was noted that

many of the indicators she listed applied to politicians, namely, selfish, callous, remorseless, use of others, failure to accept responsibility for actions, lying pathologically, glib and misleading, shallow, lacking in remorse, need for constant stimulation, having a parasitic lifestyle and unrealistic goals.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: That is Terry Cameron—unrealistic goals.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: Ms Marshall further states that politicians differed from defined psychopaths in that they did not display criminal intent and that their activities were socially acceptable.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Was this male and female or only males?

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: The gender was not specified. Since the Minister is a medical practitioner, could he please investigate further whether this group of characteristics has enough validity to provide a diagnosis and, if so, what is the treatment?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I assume my responsibility to represent the Minister for Health, and I also assume that this research by Ms Marshall in Glasgow was undertaken with jest and humour, and I am sure that the Minister will accept the question in the same vein.

CHEMICALS

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, a question about toxic chemical storage.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Hon. Mr Elliott asked a question at the commencement of Question Time in relation to the spill out of tanks at Bridgestone, and it is a topical question. The same problems that have been raised by the Hon. Mr Elliott are on the minds of members of the Labor Party Opposition. I am certainly interested in the answers to the Hon. Mr Elliott's questions, as it appears that self-regulation is the regulation under which the Government is operating in relation to the storage of toxic chemicals, but we will only know that from the answers that are supplied to the questions posed by the Hon. Mr Elliott. My questions relate to this spill and two other previous spills of a similar nature. Not until the damage had been assessed and cleaned up were lessons learnt that could have been put in place about prevention—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: That could have been learnt.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Yes, that could have been learnt in relation to prevention. I would have thought that, following this more serious spill, the Government might be in a frame of mind to start putting together some legislation relating to prevention methods rather than concentrating on the remedial action of clean ups. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Government confer with the Commonwealth and other States to establish a national and State toxic site register and site remediation strategy?

2. If the existing legislation is found to be inadequate to deal with site contamination and any other future environmental contamination problems with toxic chemicals, will the Government introduce appropriate amendments to the Act to come to terms with these problems?

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

STATE LIBRARY

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am sure that all members of Parliament would join with me in congratulating the State Library on being awarded a major honour at the national customer service awards last night in Melbourne. The State Government electronic information network, which is the backbone of the State's public library system, won joint honours with real estate firm Toop and Toop for the State customer service award and the national runner-up award in the small business section.

The public library automated information network, commonly called PLAIN, has been recognised nationally for its ability to provide a central service for acquisitions, cataloguing, processing and distribution of materials. These awards are a tribute to the manager of PLAIN, Ms Vanessa Little and her staff. They have listened intensely to the needs of their customers, have acted on the express wishes of their customers and have implemented this new customer service facility, which has not only been recognised with this national award last night in Melbourne but has also achieved a string of efficiencies within the organisation.

YATES, Mr B.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about Bruce Yates.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I refer to the ministerial statement made by the Attorney yesterday concerning the settlement of Mr Yates's case against the Government. I commend the Attorney and the Government for settling this case and thank the Attorney for his detailed ministerial statement on the subject. Although the amount of \$320 000 agreed to be paid to Mr Yates is a very substantial sum, there can be no doubt from the ministerial statement that the damage and harm done to Mr Yates over a long period of time has been considerable. This unhappy saga contains a catalogue of apparent errors by Government agencies and others for whom the Government is responsible, and I am sure that all members would hope that no citizen in the future would have to suffer what Mr Yates has suffered. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Will the Government give consideration to what measures can be adopted in future to ensure that, as far as possible, this unfortunate series of events will not be repeated?

2. Has any form of internal investigation or inquiry been undertaken within the Government to ascertain what lessons should be learnt from this episode?

3. If not, does the Attorney consider that some such inquiry—and I interpose that I do not have in mind a royal commission or any elaborate form of inquiry—should be undertaken?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is very difficult to say that these sorts of issues will not arise again. Each case is really different and has to be determined according to its own

circumstances. The statement which I made yesterday sought to put into an appropriate perspective the events over the last 10 years as they affected Mr Yates, the Department for Community Welfare and other State agencies. In some instances, there was a consequence that the State was required to pay legal costs, for example, where the Family Court decided that the State was at fault.

The difficulty is that the whole saga is somewhat complex and certainly confused. Whilst one can identify that there were problems in some areas, and I would like to think that some lessons have been learnt from that, I do not know that one can say that particular measures ought to be put in place to ensure that this will never happen again. In fact, I think that it will be impossible to do that.

There has been no formal internal investigation over the whole 10 years, but there were examinations of the events. The Crown Solicitor's Office was involved and advice was sought on numerous occasions from the Crown Solicitor in relation to the operation of particular processes and decisions taken within Government.

I do not think that an internal investigation of any substance would necessarily discover anything that has not already been brought to the surface by work which we have undertaken over the past couple of years to try to get this resolved. There are lessons to be learnt, but all that I can hope is that the sort of saga that has occurred over the last 10 years will not happen again, but, having been in government for a number of years and also in Opposition, one has to be cautious about making any bold pronouncement that this will never happen again.

The fact is that we deal with human beings. Many circumstances are different. While we should have in place processes that endeavour to prevent these sorts of events occurring, I do not think I can give a guarantee that they will not happen again in the future. I hope they will not but, human nature being what it is, it would be foolish of me to give any categorical guarantee that it will not happen again. As I have said, I hope that it will not.

I was pleased that the Yates issue has been satisfactorily settled, but I do not think it is appropriate for me to explore in public a lot of the other issues that arose during the course of the consideration of the matter and the way in which we managed to reach a satisfactory settlement from the Government's perspective and also from the perspective of Mr Yates.

INTERPRETER CARD

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 Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, a question about the Interpreter Card.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. NOCELLA: About a year ago I asked a series of questions about the introduction of the Interpreter Card, which as members probably know, is designed to facilitate access to the services of interpreters at the counter of Government departments and agencies for people in our community who are not fluent in English. The card does not confer any additional rights or privileges. It simply makes it easier for people who require the services of an interpreter to receive such services.

My questions at the time were prompted by the concerns of many people who are not entitled to receive a card because

it was introduced on a restricted basis. In other words, eligibility was limited to recent arrivals, generally those who have lived here for no more than two years. Unfortunately, in our community there are a number of people, who for a variety of reasons, having resided in this country, have not managed to achieve fluency in English and could benefit from the use of such card.

The reply that I received eventually addressed only the first of my three questions, that is, how many cards had been distributed. To some extent it was also inaccurate because it provided some information under the heading 'Czechoslovakian', which is old nomenclature that refers to ancient systems, and provided other details under the heading 'Slovak', which seems to suggest that there was a bit of confusion on the part of whoever prepared the reply.

Therefore, I should like to pose the same questions again. In view of the fact that a review of this initiative following the first year's experience of its use was forthcoming, the Minister indicated that, upon receiving the outcome of such review, he would revisit the eligibility criteria and consider whether the issues could be extended. My questions are again:

1. How many cards have been distributed since their introduction?

2. What use has been made of the cards and in which languages?

3. At this stage, are there any plans to extend the eligibility for the Interpreter Card to those who would benefit from the card, regardless of their length of stay in this State and country?

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

TELEPHONE TOWERS

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (31 July).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Government has not passed the legal responsibility for mobile telephone towers to school councils. Whilst I support the position of local decision making on this matter, based on community consultation at the site level with access to expert advice from the South Australian Health Commission, any proposal which proceeds will have to be the subject of a formal legal agreement between the Minister for Education and Children's Services and the provider.

I am advised that all Government departments, non exempt statutory authorities and other boards, trusts and committees are covered by the South Australian Captive Insurance Corporation (SAICORP), which has as one of its primary functions, the obligation to insure the risks of the Crown.

I am advised any legal action would be against the State of South Australia and not against the school council or individual members of the school council. In any event bona fide activities of school councils, which include acting in accordance with a departmental policy, are within the ambit of the indemnity through SAICORP.

SCHOOL COMPUTING EQUIPMENT

In reply to **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES** (30 July).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The EDS contract takes in-scope only parts of the administrative networks in schools, and no parts of the curriculum networks, which are far greater in number and value. In early 1995, administrative networks were provided and installed in 450 schools from central funds. The remaining 215 schools were provided with stand-alone PCs for administrative purposes. These are out-of-scope of the EDS contract.

Prior to the signing of the contract with EDS, and as part of the due diligence process, DECS provided information about all known assets which would be in-scope of the contract. At this time there was anecdotal evidence that some of the 450 schools with administrative networks had extended them by purchasing additional hubs or an Uninterruptible Power Supply device (UPS) with locally raised funds. The exact purchase cost of such additional items was not

known. It was decided to include such items in the transfer process to EDS to ensure that all of the relevant computing equipment in schools would become the responsibility of EDS for provision of service, maintenance and upgrade as required by the contract for the next nine years.

To ascertain the exact extent of the additional equipment in schools, DECS conducted a survey of schools in March this year. As expected, the number of schools which had purchased additional items was small. DECS advised schools that on receipt of invoices proving date and cost of purchase it would reimburse them the book value of these items, in order that they could henceforth be supported by EDS. For this exercise, depreciation over four years has been applied, (rather than over three years, as is applying in the contract calculations) to recognise that most schools keep their computing equipment for at least four years. This means that schools will receive slightly more in reimbursements than the government will receive in contract calculations. Reimbursements will be calculated as 100 per cent of purchase cost for items up to one year of age, 75 per cent for items of one to two years of age, 50 per cent for items of two to three years of age, 25 per cent for items of three to four years of age. All of the 47 schools affected will receive 100 per cent or 75 per cent of purchase cost. Payment of these reimbursements to schools is currently being processed.

The effect of including these additional items in the EDS contract as transferred assets, is that for the next nine years the equipment will be serviced and replaced by EDS and not by the parents and others who raised the funds for the original purchases. Rather than school communities being out of pocket, they will receive reimbursements according to accrual accounting practice, and they will not need to raise money to maintain, repair or replace them in the future. The current value of these items will be acknowledged in calculation of DECS assumed costs, and so the regular payments made to EDS from central funds will cover the provision of services to these locally funded items as well as to centrally-funded transferred assets.

I am aware of the purchase cost of these locally funded items, and of their current, depreciated value which will be reimbursed to schools, but I am advised that it is inappropriate to release the specific amount as it relates to commercial-in-confidence aspects of the contract.

ARTS LAW CENTRE

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (1 October).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The South Australian Government, through the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development, provides assistance of \$8 000 per annum to the Arts Law Centre of Australia. The Centre also receives assistance from the Australia Council, the Australian Film Commission and other states and territories.

The Arts Law Centre of Australia provides legal and accounting advice to South Australian artists and organisations in a number of ways. Its national telephone advice service (a toll free number and e-mail) is available to all. However, for ongoing advice, artists and organisations are encouraged to subscribe. Subscribers are also entitled to access to the Centre's Adelaide Legal Advice Night service, free information sheets, discounts on all Centre publications and a quarterly newsletter dealing with arts law issues.

In addition, the Arts Law Centre and the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development have recently presented an Arts Law Week in Adelaide. This was a series of lectures, fora and seminars on legal issues, for artists and arts organisations and tertiary students, in the areas of performing arts, visual arts and crafts, multimedia and film. These were attended by more than 100 people.

Subscriptions to the Arts Law Centre of Australia are \$50 for individuals, \$100 for non-profit organisations and \$175 for businesses.

There are currently 15 South Australian lawyers and one accountant listed on the Arts Law Centre's referral panels. I will not name them here as they are best contacted through the centre. They are used by the centre in a number of ways.

These lawyers principally volunteer their time to the centre's monthly Legal Advice Night service in Adelaide. This service, available to subscribers, offers a free, initial two hour consultation with an experienced arts lawyer, who will advise on contracts, copyright, business structures and other legal matters. In the first six months of 1996, eleven consultations were provided. The Adelaide Legal Advice Nights are held on the first Monday of each month at the Crafts Council of South Australia. Bookings must be made through the centre.

If further advice is required, the Centre will refer subscribers to lawyers or accountants on the Panel who will often provide their services free or at reduced cost.

South Australia is well represented on the national referral panel. However, during Arts Law Week a function was held to introduce lawyers to the operations of the centre and a number have expressed interest in joining the panel.

ENTERPRISE INCENTIVE SCHEME

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (25 July).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My colleague, the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education has provided the following responses:

1. The Commonwealth Government outlined a 17 per cent reduction in funds and a 30 per cent reduction in places for participants over 1996-97. It appears that the number of NEIS places in South Australia have been reduced in line with these national cuts.

2. In 1995-96 NEIS assisted some 900 businesses to begin operation in South Australia, not 200 as was stated in the preamble to this question. In 1996-97 this is likely to be reduced to about 630. The effect of this on South Australia's unemployment rate will be marginal.

The cut of 270 NEIS positions will be partly offset by the 103 young people to be assisted through the State Government's Self Starter program, a small business start up program for young people.

3. The Commonwealth is embarking on a fundamental reform of labour market programs and assistance to the unemployed. This includes the replacement of almost all existing labour market programs by December 1997 with Employment Placement Enterprises which will be funded to achieve specified employment outcomes. The EPE's will operate in a competitive employment placement market and will be funded through a competitive tendering process. The CES and the DSS will be amalgamated into one Service Delivery Agency.

NEIS is one of the few labour market programs to survive the greatest shakeup of Australia's approach to assisting the unemployed since the establishment of the CES in 50 years.

The balance of Commonwealth and State funding should be viewed in terms of the total mix of Commonwealth and State programs rather than on the basis of a single program. The Department for Employment, Training and Further Education is currently looking at how to maximise the amount and effectiveness of Commonwealth funds under the new arrangements.

4. There is ongoing contact at Ministerial, staffer and officer level about changes to employment and training programs. The Commonwealth Government is also conducting a series of consultations on the implementation of these reforms.

OVERSEAS QUALIFICATIONS BOARD

In reply to **Hon. P. NOCELLA** (1 October).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My colleague, the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education has provided the following information in response to the question raised:

- In March 1996 Mr Nocella asked questions of this House relating to establishment of the Overseas Qualifications Board.
- Noting that the House did not sit between 11 April and 28 May 1996, *Hansard* records that on 29 May the House was informed that the Overseas Qualifications Board had been established with members being invited to take up their positions for a period of two years.
- Mr Lyall Fricker, a previous Chief Executive of the Department for Employment and Training, has been the Chair of the Board since April, 1996.
- Executive and clerical support for the operations of the Board, prior to August, 1996 support was provided from within the Department of Employment Training & Further Education.
- The dedicated position of Executive Officer to the Board was advertised across the public sector in late July and the position filled in mid-August, 1996.
- The Overseas Qualifications Board receives strong support from the Department for Employment, Training and Further Education and is adequately resourced in both human and financial terms, to operate effectively.

THEATRE 62

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, who is also Minister for the Arts, a question about Theatre 62.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Theatre 62, as its name implies, has existed for a total of 34 years and has provided an incredibly valuable service to the arts in South Australia throughout that time. It has had extremely efficient management and has presented many and varied productions, and I am sure that it would be a highly regarded and well loved place by all those connected with the arts in South Australia.

Theatre 62 is on Burbridge Road, which is in the process of being widened, and I keep hearing rumours that, because under the aegis of the Minister for Transport Burbridge Road is being widened, Theatre 62 will have to disappear. It is so close to the road that widening cannot occur without destroying the theatre, and this would be an incredible loss to the arts in South Australia. I ask the Minister: is there any danger that, because of the widening of Burbridge Road, Theatre 62 will be lost to South Australia?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Advice that I have received to my own questions on this matter suggests that there is no danger to Theatre 62, which is an important theatre venue for the arts community in South Australia. There may have to be a change to the entrance but I am told that, beyond that, it will not lead to the loss of the theatre. Just in the past week, Barbara Messenger told me that they are looking at a new entrance arrangement, but not that there was any thought of closing the theatre.

RIGHT TO SILENCE AND PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the right to silence and the presumption of innocence.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Last week I was fortunate to attend the International Congress on Criminal Law. During the course of that conference his Honour Justice Pincus, the President of the Queensland Court of Appeal, suggested that there has been significant pressure from the community on the topic of the right to silence. He suggested that the right to silence perhaps cannot be justified and that Governments ought to be looking at it in the light of community pressure.

The right to silence is part of the concept of the presumption of innocence where ordinary citizens can go about their daily lives on the assumption, and the presumption, that they are innocent of any criminal charges that might be laid and are presumed to be so innocent until such time as they are found guilty by a court. Indeed, the right to silence is an intrinsic part of that, in that people ought to be allowed to go about their daily business without the risk of being interfered with and required in an arbitrary manner to answer questions or justify their positions.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The Hon. Robert Lawson adds that it is also part of the concept of the right of a person not to incriminate themselves. The Attorney-General of Victoria, the Hon. Jan Wade, also addressed the conference and, in response to a question, indicated that she had not been aware of any great community pressure to remove the right to silence other than from a select few—and she emphasised

the ‘few’—judges who have made submissions to that effect. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Has the Attorney received any submissions or been placed under any pressure to look at the right to silence and review its availability and, if so, from whom and in what circumstances?

2. Have any suggestions or any submissions been put to the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General to alter or affect this fundamental right of all citizens in this community?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: We still hold very strongly to the view that the very essence of the criminal law is that you are innocent until proven guilty, with the onus being upon the Crown or the Director of Public Prosecutions to prove the case beyond reasonable doubt. There are of course in the law—and it has been happening over a long period of time—some reverse onuses of proof that presume guilt with an opportunity for the defendant to provide a defence on the balance of probabilities. So, over the years there has already been an erosion of the presumption of innocence. There has not been any pressure on me or on the Government to make any wholesale change to that principle of the criminal law but, quite obviously, there are pressures, particularly when it gets close to election time, when people always want to do things such as ramping up penalties and introducing minimum penalties regardless of the circumstances of the case.

In those circumstances, quite obviously, there is a great deal of emotion and superficial support for what may appear, at least, to be a good idea. There is always that pressure to modify the criminal law and the rights that any citizen is entitled to, whether it be in relation to the presumption of innocence or to deal with tougher penalties or minimum penalties. I have not had any pressure brought to bear in relation to reducing the right to silence. Quite obviously, again, there are variations in the law. The corporations law, for example, requires any person to answer a question and, if they take an objection on the ground that the answer might tend to incriminate them, they still have to give the answer but the answer will not then be used in evidence against them except in relation to a false statement but, of course, may be used in relation to other people.

You will find in the statute law that this Parliament has passed similar sorts of provisions that reduce the protection against self-incrimination and also reduce the scope of that right to silence. I am not aware of any submissions that have come into my office in relation to those two issues. If anything is discovered I will bring back some additional information for the honourable member.

HEALTH FUNDS

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 payment by health funds for services not provided.

Leave granted.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Yes, rorting. I refer to a matter in which a local day surgery doctor charged a patient for a service that he did not provide. The service that was provided was the excision of two skin lesions, and there was no complaint about that. But a charge was levied for the use of a recovery bed. The woman concerned did not set foot inside the recovery room. She simply retrieved her coat and left the surgery, because the operation had been done under

a local anaesthetic, but she was billed \$210 for the use of the recovery bed. She took up the matter with her local MP and received from the Minister a response which was most unsatisfactory. When the patient in turn referred the matter to her health fund she was told that there was an agreement between the health fund and the medical profession whereby 100 per cent of the claim would be met. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Does the Minister believe that the current arrangement is satisfactory, where full payment is paid to a doctor irrespective of whether or not a service is provided?

2. Given the current concern of the Federal Government to keep health costs down, why did Minister Armitage not at least bring the matter to the attention of the Federal Health Minister for him to investigate?

3. Would it be appropriate for this woman to contact the State health ombudsman?

4. Does the Minister consider that the setting up of a doctors' complaint system would be appropriate for cases such as this where doctors blatantly charge for services not provided?

5. As the doctor would be registered to practise under the Medical Practitioners Act, what action could be taken against him under South Australian legislation?

6. Is the Minister satisfied that he gave adequate advice via the local MP to the woman concerned?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will refer that question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

MATTERS OF INTEREST

RURAL NEWSLETTER

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: Today I had the pleasure of attending the launch of the South Australian Rural Network newsletter entitled *The Paperbark*. The beginnings of the idea for this newsletter were in 1992 when a group known as Women in Horticulture, from the River Murray, successfully applied for and received funding to do a feasibility study into the formation of a Rural Women's Network in South Australia. Although I attended one of its seminars, I was not involved at that stage. However, considerably more interest was generated by those who attended the inaugural international rural women's conference in Melbourne in July 1994, and shortly thereafter a steering committee was set up to try to form some sort of communications network for rural people in South Australia, particularly in a format that was acceptable to women in this State.

After many discussions by the initial informal group that was formed, the *Farmer and Stockowner* paper was approached and a small column published there for a few months. However, it was found that the amount of material contributed for this publication was greater than the amount of space that we had, and it began to take a more chatty form, almost like a letter between friends, and perhaps did not lend itself to the United Farmers and Stock Owners publication. In June 1995 the network, as it then was, found that voluntarily editing and coordinating this column became too much for it, and it was agreed that it could use the Department of Primary Industries' rural affairs unit as a base and contact

point, and from there on the South Australian Rural Network has grown to the much more professional base from which it operates now.

At the beginning of the discussions it was agreed that in South Australia the women who had initially formed this group did not want the communications network to be gender specific, and I would like to thank Mr Don Molineux from the South Australian Agricultural Bureau, because he hung in there over all those months, despite extreme gender imbalance, to represent the point of view of his gender. The group is very broadly based. As well as a number of individuals it has representation from the Women's Advisory Council; the South Australian Farmers Federation; Australian Women in Agriculture; the Australian Farm Management Society; the Women's Agricultural Bureau of South Australia; the Country Women's Association; Mallee Women on the Move; the Rural Youth Movement; Women in Horticulture; the South Australian Rural Counselling Service; the Agricultural Bureau and TAFE.

There is no doubt that it is broadly based and represents a wide variety of viewpoints across rural South Australia. A newsletter is only part of a network. It is the publicity arm of a communications link which I hope will grow between groups and individuals, Government departments and, hopefully, between city and country. *The Paperbark* already has 800 subscribers, which represents 11.5 per cent of all farm women. It desperately needs funding. I thank the Department for Environment and Natural Resources for its contribution as well as the Department for Primary Industries and in kind the Minister's Office of the Status of Women.

GOVERNANCE

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I refer to an article that appeared in the *Public Service Review*—a paper put out by the Public Service Association—by Hugh Stretton entitled 'The Road to Anarchy'. I link that with the current program of economic rationalism and privatisation, and so does he. In the article he links the changing nature of government to the headline piece, which was probably put together by the sub-editor. I link it to an invitation I received from the Institute of Public Administration of Australia to a cocktail party to discuss the very important issue of governing without government: 'Where to for the Westminster System?' It lists a series of speakers. The set piece that goes with the explanation says that:

Parliamentary governments assume a strong executive—that is, the current parliamentary governments, I assume—with a capacity to steer the country. The Westminster model presents the image of a unitary government, controlling parties and directing activities of an extensive bureaucracy, but in practice the capacity of government is changing. There is a new institutional setting for government which may lead to a reduction in the capacity of political leadership. Prime Ministers and Cabinet require new types of governing strategies and new modes of accountability. This challenges any comfortable notions about a continuity of a governing process in Westminster systems and questions the shape of future governments.

It goes on to give an explanation about not missing it. The linkage that I see is that certainly economic rationalism and privatisation can and probably will lead to the change in nature of the debate on how the Westminster system in future will operate. Since 1986 we have a growing influence of right-wing groups that have emanated mainly out of the United States, starting with the Heritage Foundation and its influences back into Australia through a number of organisa-

tions—the H.R. Nicholls Society and other influential bodies—that influence not just public opinion through daily newspapers but also a number of members of Parliament through direct contact and correspondence.

I do not rail against any organisation in a democracy being able to influence outcomes or viewpoints, but would like to bring to the attention of the public (I am not sure how many will read *Hansard* and my contribution) the fact that the debate is not evenly weighted and that the avenues for discussion and debate and the control of forums for discussing a much under-discussed subject leads me to believe that the weight of the democratic processes leans to the conservative forces being able to get their arguments into the public arena and does not allow those people from the left side of the political argument to put evenly weighted force to those arguments.

I am sending a message to those people who believe that, if there is to be a debate about the changing nature of government, it needs to be held in a fair and equal forum and now is the time to start to influence outcomes about where and how that debate ought to take place. Hugh Stretton's position sends a message to people to look at what will be some of the outcomes after the deliberations of the private sector has influenced market forces, thereby influencing outcomes and the political system.

I do not have time to put my position, but I am sure I will be able to weave it into my Address in Reply contribution when I will have more time to examine some of the issues in the changing nature of government and the changing nature of the press in trying to influence outcomes in the way in which the Westminster system is to be structured. The Legislative Council is certainly under attack in relation to its role and existence in being part of a democratic process to be included in a Westminster system to the year 2000. The *Advertiser* has run a campaign of education—or a propaganda exercise some would call it—to undermine the role of the Council and for people to look at the total way in which government is to be structured in the year 2000. I hope that we can even up the balance through contributions here.

DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Political pragmatism is not always a pretty sight. Members would recall that at the end of the last session on the last day amendments to the Development Act were passed by this Chamber. Members may recall that the debate had been completed the previous evening, except that an undertaking that the Labor Party was looking for could not be given by the Minister for Transport. The debate was held over to the Friday morning until she could get that guarantee from the Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Mr Ashenden, and put it on the record.

Despite a great deal of disquiet being expressed about this Act and the amendments to it—disquiet expressed by local government, the conservation movement and the Urban Development Institute—all of the amendments were passed. Some allegations have been made along the way that a deal was done between the Opposition and the Government. I do not know if a deal was done. I do not understand why the Opposition supported these amendments in the end. Some of the amendments were very strange indeed, including the one I have entitled the 'save Ralph Clarke amendment' regarding the Collex Waste proposal. He sat in the gallery behind us for most of the evening when the Bill was going through

Committee, along with the Opposition's urban development spokesperson Annette Hurley.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: That is very committed. In case members have any doubt about motivation, I put on record an incident that I observed that Friday morning in the passage at the back of this Chamber. For members of the public who are not aware, there is a passage at the back of the Chamber and it has swinging doors on either side of it. I was coming through one set of doors at the time the Bill was being completed and I saw the Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Mr Scott Ashenden, standing outside the door at the rear of the Chamber. I said 'Hello' to him and he said 'Hello' back—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: A very affable man, and the affability continues. As I proceeded to walk further along the passageway the swing doors on the other side opened and who should come through but Ms Annette Hurley and Mr Ralph Clarke together.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I went to say 'Hello' to the two of them and, instead, Ms Hurley's face lit up as she saw Mr Ashenden. She looked at him and said, 'Congratulations, we've got it through.' I do not know what the 'we' meant—it was certainly a plural. I do not think she was meaning a royal 'we'. I do not think that she was talking about herself and Mr Clarke. I do not know quite what she was talking about, but she was obviously very delighted to see Mr Ashenden and the word that preceded it all was 'congratulations'. It does not surprise me to see this sort of thing, but it distresses me. You only have to look at how the Opposition performed on the water contract. When it first became apparent that that was to be given to an international company back in December of 1994 I came out and made a statement on the very day and put it on the record that the Democrats would be opposing it. It took the Opposition five months to work out how it would vote on this issue.

What we see with the ALP is not leadership but poll-driven leadership where polls are taken, they find out what the public is thinking and then statements are made that make it sound as though they are leading public opinion when in fact they are merely reflecting it. Most political commentators have suggested that the Labor Opposition will take at least two elections to get back into Government. My prediction, given the level of pragmatism that we have been shown—and the Development Act is a very good indication of this—is that it will take Labor at least three elections.

ADELAIDE CITY COUNCIL

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I refer to the City of Adelaide in that I recently received a letter from the Local Government Association concerning a recent Government decision to put before this Parliament legislation concerning the future governance of the City of Adelaide. I have also received correspondence from Alderman O'Connor and others concerning that issue. In the few minutes available it is opportune to put my point of view of the Government's actions and to make some observations generally on this topic. In that regard I acknowledge the role and responsibility of the LGA in relation to local government in South Australia. First, in announcing the introduction of legislation, the Premier said:

This action has been taken to breathe new life and vitality into the City of Adelaide. . . . These measures were necessary because the council had not adequately reflected the broad interests of the key stakeholders in the city.

Indeed, the state of paralysis surrounding the city's governance was becoming detrimental to the whole of the State. Not unexpectedly, the LGA and certain members of the City of Adelaide opposed the Government's move to introduce this legislation. Principally, the LGA objected on the grounds that a duly elected council should not be removed by this Parliament. Indeed, the City of Adelaide proceeded upon a dishonest—and I do not resile from that—campaign in putting out a brochure entitled: 'Don't Let the State Government Sack Democracy'. It is important that everyone in this place acknowledges that the State Government does not have any power to sack the Adelaide City Council. Indeed, the Government's role has only been simply to put legislation before this Parliament, and it will be this Parliament that makes the decision.

The Constitution Act in relation to local government provides that it shall continue in South Australia but that the manner, constitution, nature and extent of local government's powers, functions and responsibilities be determined by this Parliament. When one looks at the Constitution it seems very clear that this Parliament has a responsibility and, indeed, a duty, to ensure that there be proper governance of the City of Adelaide. The Adelaide City Council's response to the *Adelaide 21* report published in May 1996 has been absolutely lamentable. In the preamble, Michael Lennon acknowledges 'the important part to play in the economic and social development of South Australia of the city centre'.

The report identified weaknesses and said 'Adelaide is the last of the major Australian cities to address the strategic importance of the city centre and its role in the emerging economy'. Faint praise indeed. It goes on to say that Adelaide at times is inward looking, parochial, short-term, self-interested and that that perspective appears to predominate. In fact, the report is a damning indictment of the existing governance of the city and points to how all South Australians are the losers.

The city's response has been deathly silence. The members have been too busy travelling, fighting and resigning to deal appropriately with the issues raised. They belatedly decided to set up their own committee in competition with the State, and then revoked it. The letter from Alderman O'Connor was disappointing. In fact, the only response from the city since the announcement has been resignations, a survey and a promise from the Mayor to keep quiet and take no part in any review regarding the council. If ever there was an indication on the part of a council of guilty conscience, it was the silence or the promise of silence from the Mayor. Why is it that it was not until October 1996, five months after the *Adelaide 21* report, that the LGA and the city decided to take the *Adelaide 21* report seriously?

I remind members that the *Adelaide 21* report suggested that we should bring city stakeholders to the table, that we should structure the city council for the twenty-first century and that we should engage the city council with its regional neighbours. It also suggested defining how the City of Adelaide and South Australia can best be involved in the city's management; giving clearer definition to the role and function of the council; reducing the number of members; widening the boundaries; extending the Mayor's franchise; and redefining the State and city roles. We have seen no evidence whatsoever that the current City of Adelaide and its

selected members are prepared to embrace the important recommendations in that report.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I refer to the Adelaide City Council as well and, in particular, some entirely predictable comments made in this morning's *Advertiser*. Before the Soviet Union collapsed it had two papers called *Pravda* and *Izvestia*. Generally, they were regarded as two of the world's worst newspapers. Certainly, there are a few other newspapers which so dutifully follow the Party line. But since the collapse of the Soviet Union our own version of *Izvestia*, the *Advertiser*, has taken over that role. It must surely be the world's worst newspaper. Consequently, its editorial this morning was entirely predictable when it attacked members of the Opposition about their position on the City Council. Of course, the one thing that the Adelaide *Izvestia* never does is initiate any genuine discussion on the issues before our Parliament.

How long is it since the Adelaide *Izvestia* reported some detailed discussion and initiated some genuine debate on the real issues facing the city and what its Editor believes are the problems? It has not done so. Instead, a couple of weeks ago it launched a campaign against Henry Ninio and his visits with Mr Abdo Nassar. Of course, that paper very selectively, as only the *Advertiser* can, muted the references to Ted Chapman and—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I do not think it would really affect me much as it never reports what I say. In fact, when I have asked questions in this place it has reported them without even mentioning me, so I do not think it can do much more damage. But, of course, the *Advertiser* selectively omitted to point out how the Premier of this State, in his role as Minister for Ethnic Affairs, appointed Mr Nassar to the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, although, of course, that was for a very brief period. The point I make about the *Advertiser* is that it is itself one of the greatest impediments to growth that this State faces. This morning's editorial stated:

Faced with this bunyip myopia we are almost tempted to plead with them [that is, members of the Opposition and the Democrats] to go interstate (on a bus, preferably) and to look at what is happening in Melbourne, in Sydney, in Brisbane, to see what can be done when—

listen to this—

an enlightened community is gingered, when someone has a vision and someone else has a will to see it come to pass.

Of course, the first question is: who will enlighten the people of Adelaide? It will certainly not be the Adelaide *Advertiser*. So, if the people in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane are enlightened I suspect it is because those communities have a genuinely competitive media, particularly a news print media. That is the one thing that Melbourne and Sydney have. You do not need a bus to go there to know how bad our media is. The *Advertiser* editorial also states:

The city council is unworkable.

Of course, it does not tell us how. It continues:

As a consequence, Adelaide has 'To Let' signs. Melbourne and Sydney have 'Sold' signs. The easterners boast of their capitals. South Australians sheepishly apologise for theirs.

The one thing that I find when I meet people from other States is how they laugh at the newspaper—if you can call it that—that we have in this State. It is a disgrace, and it is recognised nationally as one of the worst papers in the world.

But the point I make is that the Adelaide *Advertiser* is itself one of the great problems that this State faces, because I believe that Adelaide is being intellectually strangled and that the *Advertiser* is largely responsible for this. There is a deep-seated malaise in the city at the moment because of the very limited and restricted public debate on all issues for which the *Advertiser* is in large part responsible.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Have you run out of criticisms?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: No, I haven't run out of criticisms, don't worry; there are plenty. For example, one could name some of the famous u-turns that the Adelaide *Advertiser* editorial has done when the Liberal Party has changed policy. The classic was on the Grand Prix: three weeks apart the *Advertiser* editorial completely changed its tune. It did so with regard to the Hindmarsh Island bridge over a period of a few months, of course following the Government's policies. The thing that really concerns me is the lack of concern that the *Advertiser* has for basic principles. In spite of the *Advertiser*, there are some questions of principle.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T. Crothers): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I want to speak on a matter of importance, namely, the multifunction polis (MFP). It is with regret that I note an article in the magazine *Search* dated July 1996 entitled 'Dream Almost Over for MFP'. I also note that the Chair, Sir Llew Edwards, has a concern that senior bureaucrats are sabotaging the MFP.

The MFP started as a joint Commonwealth and State initiative. It is a long-term national and international economic, social and environmental development project for Australia focused in Adelaide but linked to activities elsewhere in Australia and overseas. Its main objective, in part, is as follows:

...to create a community which will be internationally recognised as a model with a global rather than a local orientation and based upon the implementation of advanced information technology and telecommunications.

The visionary project began in 1987. I have a particular interest in the MFP as I worked in the Port Adelaide area, in particular in Gillman, where the concept of the MFP was first mooted. However, the MFP has so far cost \$100 million of taxpayers' money. Of the \$80 million spent in the last three years, \$26 million has been Commonwealth money while \$54 million has come from South Australia.

So, when 'the Federal Government unplugged its cash supply', South Australia gave the MFP a 12 month time limit. The decision made by the Federal Government was in line with a report from the Bureau of Industry Economics (BIE). The BIE recommended that the MFP be a Commonwealth-endorsed State project, which means, in simple terms, that the Federal Government will phase out its financial contribution and South Australia should take over. We now have a limited timeframe for the three projects to continue under this renegotiated situation.

First, there is the Virginia pipeline project, which is a Malaysian-Australian consortium project to construct a \$29 million pipeline to distribute water to the Virginia horticultural region. This project is expected to double the irrigation area, with a potential increase of \$50 million a year in production and up to 1 300 extra jobs. The second project is the Garden Island rehabilitation scheme, which will

rehabilitate landfill areas. This will improve recreational fishing and boating facilities and protect the sensitive mangrove trees in that area.

The third project is the project I am most interested in, that is, the Australia-Asia Business Consortium (AABC). The consortium is made up of approximately 20 leading big businesses, the smallest being the Bakrie Group of Indonesia, employing approximately 2 000 people with a revenue of \$14.2 billion. The largest corporation in that consortium is the Ford Motor Company, employing 300 000 people with a revenue of \$132 billion, a USA company.

I have spoken about this consortium before but would like to reiterate its importance. Its vision is to be the most effective and powerful instrument for continuous executive development in the Asia-Pacific region. The AABC must lead strategic consultants, must have members of corporate boards, must engage in applied research that promotes positive business results and must rate as highly effective teachers of executives. To all these three projects that our State has refocused upon, but especially the last, I wish them every success.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: For more than two years now the Premier has been urging South Australia to become the information technology centre of the Southern Hemisphere.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: He is to be congratulated on this proposal as it will ultimately lead to benefits for South Australia as a whole. I am pleased that the Hon. Robert Lawson agrees with me. We live in an increasingly sophisticated and rapidly changing world.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It should be remembered that many of the children who are beginning their school lives today will be working in technological jobs that are yet to be created. The Hon. Angus Redford ought to listen to this: he might have some children one day. In the highly technological world of tomorrow there will be two types of societies: the technologically rich and the technologically poor. It is encouraging to see South Australian industry in its educational and public sectors becoming involved with the information technology drive. However, it is disappointing that the Parliament is sadly lagging behind. Informed decision-making is reliant on having all the facts. It is imperative that Parliament, as the State's highest decision-making body, be able to make decisions based on the best information available. In fact, not to do so, should be seen as negligent.

Other Parliaments around Australia already have and have made good use of information technology. For example, in New South Wales computers are linked to a parliamentary network to facilitate communication between members, their staff and Parliament House. It is possible to access *Hansard* transcripts, business papers, statutes and regulations, daily programs, committee information and parliamentary library electronic material. Updating the IT capacity of the South Australian Parliament makes good sense, because it will give members and their staff the capability to be more efficient and effective.

If parliamentary officers had access to the Internet, they would be able to access the latest information from around the nation and the world. It might be prudent, however, based

on our experience with 0055 numbers, to place a restriction on certain information on the network if we are to keep costs down. The provision of electronic bulletin boards and mail boxes would also improve the democratic process by enabling parliamentarians and the proceedings of Parliament to be more accessible to the public.

Internally it would be far more efficient if our computer systems were networked. Savings could be made through the sharing of printing facilities, and *Hansard* would be available to members and their staff on-line, saving vast amounts of paper. The Government has recently undertaken a long overdue refurbishing of the Parliament itself—

The Hon. J.F. Stefani interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It is interesting that the Hon. Julian Stefani is interjecting: I have not heard him speak for three months. As the next step, however, I suggest that information technology be made available to members and parliamentary staff. We have replaced the 1970s carpet and wallpaper; is it not time we had access to 1990s technology? I am informed that the Management Advisory Committee has established an Information Technology Committee to consider this matter. The IT Committee will be examining a number of issues, including: what information do we need to exchange within Parliament House; what information do we wish to access from outside of Parliament House; what level and type of IT system support is necessary or desirable within the Parliament; what security controls will be necessary or desirable for the protection of network-shared data and to ensure the protection of networks; and that it shall make any other inquiries which it considers necessary in relation to information technology within Parliament House. Overall, this committee and its terms of reference will make a valuable contribution to the IT debate. It is certainly a step in the right direction. Although the committee—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: I bought my own—

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Well, you can afford to: you are worth millions. Although the committee has my support—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The D.H. Laidlaw Trust might buy you some!

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: You're ill informed.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I'd like to be worth \$30 million. Although the committee has my support, it does concern me that there are no members of Parliament on it, especially when you consider its IT recommendations will affect not only parliamentary support services but members of Parliament and their staff as well.

To ensure that the needs of members of Parliament and their staff are taken into account from the very beginning, the MAC should consider adding a member from each of the three Parties to the committee. Nevertheless, I believe that the committee is worthy of tripartisan support, not only for the benefits it will bring to MPs, their staff and the Parliament, but also to South Australia. I wish the Information Technology Committee best success and speedy deliberations, and I look forward to reading its recommendations in the near future.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I move:

That the report of the Legislative Review Committee 1995-96 be noted.

I commend to members and to the Council the annual report of the Legislative Review Committee for the year ended 30 June 1996. This is the third annual report of the Legislative Review Committee published since the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 but, of course, the Legislative Review Committee has a far longer lineage than that. This committee was the successor to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, which functioned with distinction from 1938 until the new Act came into force in 1992.

The work of the Legislative Review Committee is often not widely understood, either in the wider community or within this Parliament. One does not see the committee promoting itself as a powerful or influential committee, as one often sees some other committees referred to in the press. However, it is my belief that the Legislative Review Committee serves a very real and useful function for the Parliament and for the effective government of the State.

The diversity of the work undertaken by the committee and its members is illustrated quite graphically in the annual report. Matters as diverse as regulations under the Fisheries Act were reported upon, and the small-wheeled vehicles subordinate legislation dealing with rollerblades, and the like, was an important and pathfinding report of the committee on the response of local government to new legislative measures.

Regulations under the Veterinary Surgeons Act were considered and ultimately disallowed by this Parliament on recommendation of the Legislative Review Committee, and a wide variety of local government by-laws were considered. Some by-laws were considered in detail and some were disallowed, once again on the recommendations of the Legislative Review Committee, and I here speak principally of those relating to the control of animals and moveable signs.

In moving the motion for the noting of this report, I wish to mention a couple of additional matters. It is not often understood to what the Legislative Review Committee has regard when examining subordinate legislation. The criteria by which such legislation is reviewed is not widely appreciated, and there is no statutory requirement for the committee to consider any particular matters.

The Subordinate Legislation Act 1978 provides that every regulation—and that includes by-laws, and the like—that is required to be laid before Parliament is referred by force of that Act to the Legislative Review Committee, which must inquire into and consider all regulations referred to it. However, as I just mentioned, no formal criteria are laid down.

The old Joint Standing Order 26 provided four matters to which the former committee was required to have regard. That Joint Standing Order is still in force, but the committee takes the view that, as it specifically refers to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, it does not apply by direct force to it. However, the committee does have regard, as a matter of general practice, to the four matters referred to in Joint Standing Order 26, and they are, briefly, whether the regulations were made in accord with the general objects of the Act pursuant to which they were made; whether they unduly trespass upon rights previously established by law;

whether the regulations unduly make rights dependent upon administrative and other non-judicial decisions; and whether the regulations contain matters which, in the opinion of the committee, should properly be dealt with in an Act of Parliament rather than by subordinate legislation.

In addition to those matters, the committee does always endeavour to give consideration to matters such as the following: whether subordinate legislation is in accordance with the spirit, as opposed to the letter, of the enabling legislation; matters such as whether legislative or administrative functions are inappropriately delegated; and whether the subordinate legislation will have unintended or unforeseen consequences. They are some of the matters to which the committee seeks to have regard.

I do not suggest for a moment that, on every occasion, the committee goes through those matters treating them, as it were, as a check list, but one hopes that the members of the committee have those matters in the back of their minds when deciding upon the fate of subordinate legislation.

Notwithstanding the wide ranging extent of its deliberations, the Legislative Review Committee does not involve itself in an examination of a policy underlying regulations. Accordingly, a resolution of the Legislative Review Committee that no action be taken in relation to particular by-laws or regulations does not indicate necessarily that the committee is unanimous in agreeing with the particular policy underlying the regulations. Indeed, no such inference can be drawn.

The committee is able to function effectively and in a non-partisan way by reason of the fact that it does eschew an examination of policy issues. However, the Legislative Review Committee always considers that its primary responsibility is to ensure that, when Government policy—whatever that policy might be—is implemented, the power to make regulations is properly exercised in accordance with established criteria.

In its report the committee once again complains of the fact that it has become an almost invariable practice, not only under the present but under previous Governments, for regulations to be accompanied by certificates for early commencement. The provisions of the Subordinate Legislation Act provide that all regulations come into force four months after they are made. However, the regulations these days are invariably accompanied by a certificate, which a Minister is entitled to give certifying that, in his or her opinion, earlier commencement is necessary or appropriate for particular regulations. The committee frankly doubts the efficacy of that provision in the way in which it is being applied.

The Legislative Review Committee seems to suffer from a problem of identity. That arises because it is an inaptly named committee. It is not a committee of legislative review, and many people believe that it is a committee that has some responsibility to scrutinise legislation generally. It does not have that function: it never has. Only a couple of Parliaments in Australia have committees that are vested with that responsibility.

I commend the work of the Legislative Review Committee over the year under review. The membership of that committee comprises, from this Chamber, the Hon. Paul Holloway and the Hon. Paolo Nocella. The Hon. Barbara Wiese was, for a time before her resignation from Parliament, a member of the committee. From the other place, the member for Colton (Mr Condous), the member for Norwood (Mr Cummins), and the member for Torrens (Mrs Geraghty) have been members of the committee throughout the period under

review. All members have contributed to the deliberations and the successful operation of the committee, and I thank them for that cooperation.

There is one further member of the committee, who resigned in October 1995 and of whom mention should be made: the Hon. Mario Feleppa. Mario Feleppa had a distinguished career on the Legislative Review Committee and was a former Presiding Member of it, and a very enthusiastic member and Presiding Member he was. He served almost 10 years as a member of the committee, four years as Presiding Member. As is noted in the report, he served the committee with integrity and a principled and bipartisan approach. He was always assiduous in ensuring that appropriate consideration was given to the interests of working people and members of the migrant community. The committee took the somewhat unusual step, as I understand it, on his retirement of passing a special resolution of its appreciation for his great contribution and a minute of appreciation was duly passed and presented.

I also place on record the committee's appreciation of the dedicated and efficient work of David Pegram, its Secretary, and I also thank Peter Blencowe, who has taken over as research officer from Linda Graham, who resigned during the year to take up another position within Government. Ms Graham served the committee as its research officer for a number of years with great efficiency and distinction. I commend the report to the Council.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I move:

That the regulations under the Daylight Saving Act 1971 concerning dates in 1996, made on 11 July 1996 and laid on the table of this Council on 23 July 1996, be disallowed.

I do this with some disappointment, not because, once again, it is left to the Labor Party to look after country constituents, as has been our wont for many years, but because someone like the Hon. Caroline Schaefer has not moved such a motion. These regulations were made in July, and I have sat here with some anticipation of a move by those members of the Liberal Party who claim to represent country constituencies in South Australia to provide some of the relief for which country members have been crying out for some time.

The last time we visited this matter, we were facing two things. First, we were coming into the celebrations that take place every couple of years in respect of the Festival of Arts. It was argued strongly and passionately by some people that a three week extension was necessary to the regulations to the 1971 Act, which was brought in following a referendum of all South Australians, in which they agreed with daylight saving for a prescribed period. However, once again this year, with no Festival of Arts, there has been a move to extend daylight saving.

The second issue before us was the proposition that a select committee into daylight hours ought to be established, and, as I say, I am disappointed that the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, who was the Chairperson of that committee, has not moved this motion. It was during the deliberations of that committee and the collection of evidence that it became very clear to me that people living in country South Australia were not enamoured with extensions to daylight saving. In fact, they are not enamoured with daylight saving at all. However,

given the results of the referendum in 1971, they were prepared to put up with daylight saving for those periods prescribed within the Act that followed.

The three week extension for the Festival of Arts has been accepted by most people, but this year I note that the Minister for Tourism has once again called for an extension—but for the Moomba Festival. I do not believe that anyone on the West Coast or in country South Australia cares a fig about the Moomba Festival. The people of South Australia, country members and, indeed, members of the Labor Party are not intimidated by Jeff Kennett, even if Dean Brown is. There is no support from anyone in the country areas for an extension of daylight saving this year.

We have received a whole range of correspondence on this issue, and on a number of occasions my colleague in another place the member for Giles (Hon. Frank Blevins) has called on the Liberal Government to stop the extension of daylight saving. He did not do this on a whim. He did it in response to correspondence from his constituents on the West Coast. He has called on country members of the Liberal Party to get behind their constituents.

One might think that Dean Brown has got the whip out on this matter because he favours Eastern Standard Time. He put that case, but it was not the collective view of the select committee. Indeed, after the hard work done by the Hon. Sandra Kanck, my colleague the Hon. George Weatherill, the Hon. Mrs Schaefer, the Hon. Mr Redford, who also comes from the country, and me, it was concluded on the balance of the evidence that we ought to move to Central Standard Time. That report has been buried: it will not see the light of day. There will be no experimentation. Indeed, the die has been cast, and there will be no change. All the evidence that the in-depth select committee received pointed out very clearly that there was no support for extensions of daylight saving.

It is disappointing that the Hon. Caroline Schaefer is not here. I invited her to second my motion on this occasion because of her passionate belief in the need for changes to daylight saving. I am assuming that the Whip is out—but I am certain that the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, in her heart of hearts, supports me 100 per cent. It is disappointing that the Whip will go unheard. However, all is not lost, because we have other country members here, and I will be watching closely to see how they vote. The Hon. Angus Redford claims to come from the South-East. Indeed, Mr Lucas is a Mount Gambier boy. Jamie Irwin is there. So given the commitment to country people that has been exhibited by me, my Party, my colleague the Hon. George Weatherill and by the Hon. Sandra Kanck, and given that there are four members of the Opposition who are country members, I feel quite confident that we will win the vote on this occasion.

I give notice now that it will be my intention, when this matter is put to the vote, to call 'Divide!', because I think that those four brave Liberal members ought to show that they stick by the code that the Liberal Party has that they are free to vote. If that principle is true, they will vote with us. I am fairly confident that the Hon. Sandra Kanck probably would have moved this motion herself. She has been very busy in the last few weeks observing who is doing what in the lobbies at the back of the Chamber and that is probably the only reason why she has not moved this motion: but I am confident that we will have her support. What that should mean is that at last, due to the efforts once again of the Australian Labor Party on behalf of country constituents, those small children who will start school in February next year will not be going to sleep when travelling for hundreds of kilometres

on buses. They will have three weeks less to acclimatise to the rigours of going to school.

I thank the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, because it was due to her in-depth explanation during the sittings of the select committee on how daylight saving really does affect the fading of curtains on the West Coast that I was absolutely convinced that I had to move this motion on behalf of those people on the West Coast and those people in the South-East.

This motion is being moved in the Lower House, and we will see how good some of these other independent Liberals are, like the member for Custance, Ivan Venning, and the member for Frome. The member for Goyder has made passionate speeches about the opposition on the peninsula to daylight saving. Indeed, once more we will be looking at Harold Allison, who was a faithful servant of the South-East in opposition but who has done nothing for the people in the South-East since he has been in Government. He can now demonstrate that independence and do what the *Border Watch* has been screaming for, which is to stop this nonsense about the extensions to daylight saving. People in country areas do not really see that the Adelaide Festival is a South Australian festival, but they are parochial enough and supportive enough to support the extension on that basis. They see nothing in extending this with the Moomba festival.

This is clearly a situation where Jeff Kennett has intimidated Dean Brown. The Labor Party is not going to be intimidated. We are going to vote against this extension. We are very confident of at least the Hon. Sandra Kanck's vote and that of at least four members of the other side. It will be a proud day when this vote is taken and we can say that the Legislative Council, despite what happens in the Lower House, has stood up for those people living in country South Australia. I call on all members to support this proposition.

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

FOOD (LABELLING) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Food Act 1985. Read a first time.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is to ensure that food that has been either genetically modified or irradiated is labelled accordingly. I introduced the exact same Bill on 10 July during the last session, and I refer members to the speech I made at that time, in which I gave examples to show the reasons why many consumers are concerned about the eating of foods that have been irradiated or genetically modified. Those examples stand. I have since come across an article simply titled 'Food Irradiation' by Heimen Julius in *Wellbeing* magazine (issue No. 65), and this article adds further to my concerns. Mr Julius refers to research done in India on the effect of irradiated food on mould toxins. Assorted grains and vegetables were irradiated then exposed to toxin producing moulds, and I quote from the article as follows:

They found that toxin production on irradiated commodities was much higher than on unirradiated commodities. There was 45.7 per cent more aflatoxin in irradiated wheat; 31.4 per cent more toxin in irradiated maize; 80.8 per cent more toxin in irradiated sorghum; 66 per cent more toxin in irradiated pearl millet; 74.4 per cent more toxin in potatoes; and 84 per cent more toxin in irradiated onions than was found in unirradiated commodities, subject to the same infection of mould spores.

The implications are rather obvious: where cereals and vegetables which have been irradiated are stored in moist conditions there will be a much higher risk of food poisoning and, in third world countries, even death. In order to keep the moulds at bay on citrus fruits, high doses of irradiation are required of up to one kilogray, but at this rate of exposure lemons have developed cavities, oranges have tasted 'off' within a week and some oranges and lemons have developed brown blemishes. It is often argued by the proponents of irradiation that its use could control fruit fly, but at what cost? The minimum dose would range between .3 and .65 kilograys, but it could require up to .8 kilograys, which could damage many types of fruit. Irradiation proponents also suggest that the technique can be used to delay ripening of some fruits, but the dose required for bananas, pears and apples is likely to damage these fruits.

One of the effects of irradiation is to kill the *pseudomonas* bacteria, the type that gives rotting food its bad smell. The net effect of this is that irradiated food can be breaking down, yet one of the principal indicators of rotting food, the bad smell, will not be present. This increases the risk of people eating food with, for instance, dangerous *salmonella* levels, without any outward warning signs that things are not good. Labelling of irradiated foods is necessary to ensure that when nature's warning signs are not there, the information on the label of that product will allow the buyer to beware.

In the last week of the last session of this Parliament, a forum was held in Canberra to discuss issues about genetically engineered food. Unfortunately, because of the pressure of legislation here, I was unable to attend that forum, which was conducted by the Australian New Zealand Food Authority (ANZFA). The list of conference delegates ranged from strong opponents to strong proponents of the use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), so I imagine it might have been difficult to reach consensus, but consensus was indeed reached.

On the first day the workshop participants answered the question, 'For Australia and New Zealand in 2005, what are the characteristics of an ideal system to manage the use of food derived from gene technologies?' amongst other questions. The answers given were not necessarily a consensus but included a belief that it should be an open system trusted by all, and it should ensure that consumers will be able to make an informed decision, which I think is one of the really important aspects of having labelling on food. On the second day, discussion took place with a much smaller group about possible regulatory standards, and points raised included whether labelling of food produced with an involvement of gene technology should be universal or be decided on a case by case basis, and whether labelling requirements for food or food products included in the standard should be subject to a sunset clause.

As I observed earlier, it might have been difficult to reach agreements, but there was agreement reached that:

... in assessing an application for a GMO food or food ingredient to be added to the standard, ANZFA should assess the safety of the food, determine the consumer information required, include labelling requirements and expiry date, if any, for a labelling requirement.

The working party on day 2 was made up of 21 individuals ranging from the ACF Gen-Ethics Network to the Marketing Manager of Southern Cross Biotech Pty Limited. They drafted a set of six guiding principles. The first one reads:

Gene technology is a global technology and Australia and New Zealand will not be quarantined from it.

This is roughly what I had said back in July when I introduced this Bill. When so much effort has been put by the scientists and so much money by their companies into developing this technology, they are not going to let their products just slip out of view. That is why I introduced my Bill. I and others recognise that enormous pressure, knowing that it will be extremely hard to resist, but believing that by putting in place a requirement for labelling of such foods the consumer will at least be in a position to choose which product to buy. The working party agreed on the need for the development of a standard for assessing food and that, in particular, 'this would include provisions to ensure labelling as appropriate'. It strikes me that there is some hedging of bets in this wording, but it is an improvement on the position taken by the National Food Authority, which has steadfastly refused to make any recommendations to the Federal Government regarding these foods. It has been less than helpful to consumers in the past, so this is a step forward, and these principles give reassurance to the Government and the Opposition that it is safe to vote for my Bill. I commend the Bill to the Council.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI secured the adjournment of the debate.

OUTSOURCING

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I move:

That the Legislative Council requests that the South Australian Government supplies to each of the following Select Committees on—

1. Contracting out of State Government Information Technology;
2. Tendering Process and Contractual Arrangements for the Operation of the New Mount Gambier Prison;
3. The Proposed Privatisation of Modbury Hospital; and
4. Outsourcing Functions undertaken by the E&WS Department an authentic summary, according to the protocol negotiated by the Liberal Party and Australian Labor Party, of the relevant outsourcing contracts.

I am a member of one of the four select committees mentioned, the Select Committee on State Government Information Technology. I am on record in this place and outside as saying that I am extremely keen to see the contracts in their entirety and that continues to be my personal position. I also note that the Legislative Council on a previous occasion passed a motion requiring and requesting that both the Government and EDS supply the full contract to the select committee and note that that never occurred. Speaking in a grievance debate only in the last sitting week I made some comment on that and noted that the Hon. John Olsen, in documentation that he released publicly soon after the Government came to office—documentation that was sent to companies which may be interested in being involved in outsourcing—made plain that he anticipated that it was quite likely that the Parliament (or at the very least committees) may request to see full contracts.

He anticipated that and in advice he provided at that time made plain that for constitutional and legal reasons it would be expected that they may have to be provided in those circumstances. Despite the advice that the Hon. John Olsen provided to businesses at that time, the Government more recently has taken the view that the contracts not only should not be provided but would not be provided to committees. I was extremely surprised and very disappointed that the Opposition did a remarkable back down on this issue. It

seemed to be as keen as the Democrats to see the full contracts—

The Hon. Anne Levy: You want our support, don't you?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I am putting things on the record. You can support it or not.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: They are generally nice.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I will not be nice; I will be honest, instead.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Is it impossible to be both at once?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Not in this case.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: You are being sexist now. Mr Acting President, I seek your protection. The Opposition did a remarkable reverse twist with a pike as well, faced the other way, decided that it no longer wanted to see the full contracts—

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: The Opposition, after a considerable period—a process that began some time in February—reached an agreement in August. The Hon. Anne Levy interjected that they just wanted this as a start. Yet, it took from February to August to reach an agreement on what she considered to be a start.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I was not part of the negotiations.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: We know who was on the negotiating team—that is well known. That is a problem for the Labor Party and probably a problem for South Australia. At the last election, this Government did promise accountability. The term 'accountability' was used repeatedly during both the election speech and on other occasions, but accountability means accountability on its terms because with these contracts, in the agreement it has reached with the Labor Party, it will supply a summary—a summary determined by the Government.

The Hon. Anne Levy: No, by the Auditor-General.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: No, a summary determined by the Government, and signed off by the Auditor-General, to say that what is there is accurate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: If members do not mind my finishing, the Auditor-General can easily say that what is being presented is accurate, but what has been omitted may be extremely important.

The Hon. Anne Levy: He signs off that what is not there is commercial in confidence. The Government cannot decide that—the Auditor-General will decide that.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: The Government will decide that. The agreement was reached back in August. It was not until last Friday that the Attorney-General circulated, I understand to all members of Parliament, a press release issued by him on 18 August and at the same time a copy of a letter that the Hon. Mike Rann and John Quirke had sent to him on 9 August and a copy of a letter sent by the Hon. Trevor Griffin to Mr John Quirke on 8 August, which contained the agreed protocols. That exchange of letters put things in place.

It has been public knowledge for some time that there would be an agreement between the Government and the Opposition and that there would be some sort of summary contracts. What I found intriguing when I read the press release was that in the second sentence in the first paragraph Mr Griffin said:

After six months of discussion between the Government and the Opposition Parties agreement has been reached and letters exchanged.

I refer to the statement about six months of discussion between the Government and opposition Parties. In February of this year he wrote a letter to me, I spoke with him and said that I wanted to see the full contract. There was no further discussion between us and the Government at all. That was a misrepresentation. Letters were exchanged between the Labor and Liberal Parties. In essence he also said in the press release that the summaries would be prepared without delay. I found that interesting when I got to read the agreement itself because point 4 of the agreement says:

The trigger for the operation of this arrangement may be a resolution of a House of Parliament or a requirement of a select or standing committee.

I had never been informed that there would be a requirement for some form of trigger for the summaries to be produced. I had assumed that, since there had been agreement between the Government and the Opposition, that the agreement meant that the summaries would be available as soon as possible. Since some two months had lapsed between the time of the agreement and now, I assumed that those summaries would be close to ready. We have never been given any information one way or another.

Since the agreement makes it plain, now that I have had a chance to read it, that a trigger is necessary, I am moving this motion. The motion is to provide the trigger so that the Government will now prepare the summary documents and they will be forwarded to the committees. I hope that this will be not be a long and protracted process, although I would predict that even if the motion is passed it will take some months before the summaries are produced and we will get them some time after Parliament has risen. Parliament may not sit again until after the election. If the summaries prove to be of little value, as I suspect, the accountability we were hoping we would get from the process will be absolutely zero.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I am prejudging, but the Government has been in no hurry to provide the summaries. This farce has been going on now for at least nine months. It took from February to August to reach agreement that there would be summaries and another two months has passed. Now that I have had a chance to see what the agreement said I find that we need a trigger for the summaries to be produced.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: You must have come in part way through. This motion is a trigger. The agreement says:

The trigger for the operation of this arrangement may be a resolution of a House of Parliament or a requirement of a select or standing committee.

Rather than waiting until the next time some of these committees meet, which I understand is not too damn often—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Having been a member of one of these committees, I have found the absence of the contracts has been enormously frustrating. We have had a chance to talk to witnesses from a couple of departments and it is evident that they have not seen the contracts and any information they are giving us about the long-term cost implications are judged upon advice they are being given. They have no real knowledge about what the long-term implications will be. That is simply not good enough. It

appears that the senior public servants in the various departments do not really know what the long-term cost implications will be. To this point—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Overseas consultants know.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Overseas consultants might. To this point, none of the committees do. There is a very real chance that cost structures may be considered to be commercial in confidence. So, on the basis of these summary documents, the committees still will be none the wiser. If that is accountability after several years of outsourcing it is a very strange notion of accountability. We have learnt that this comes from a Party which gives promises and then rephrases them. Some are core promises and some are not. It keeps reworking the language to suit its purposes.

There is no doubt that the committee process in Parliament is an important part of accountability. It is capable of getting to the bottom of things through detailed analysis in a way that the individual Houses cannot. Committees are becoming an increasingly important part of the process—and that is a good thing. It is certainly important in terms of accountability working. I refer to the committees looking at outsourcing. Whether outsourcing proves at the end of the day to be a good thing and whether it proves to be of economic benefit or not are issues to be raised. But regardless of who was right and who was wrong, it is important that proper scrutiny occur, because the outsourcing process will continue. The sooner Governments, Opposition Parties and the public have a firm handle on what the likely long-term implications are, the better.

One can only say that it is a great pity the long-term implications of the actions of SGIC, State Bank and others were not realised a lot sooner. If we are to learn from the past then it is that, if there are reasons for doubt, there should be proper and thorough analysis. But that is a lesson that should have been learnt. Having on many occasions argued for the release of the full contracts I in no way pull back from that position, but at the very least I am prepared to trigger the process that the summary documents are prepared and given to committees. I hope that that sets the full accountability process in train.

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

WAITE TRUST (MISCELLANEOUS VARIATIONS) BILL

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to allow vocational agricultural training and certain other appropriate activities on land that is subject to the terms of the Peter Waite Trust for the establishment of an agricultural high school; to free from that trust the land occupied by Unley High School; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a Bill to make variations to the terms of the Peter Waite Trust for the establishment of an agricultural high school. In 1913 Mr Peter Waite offered a piece of land comprising about 114 acres to the State for the purposes of the establishment of an agricultural high school. This offer was accepted by the then Premier on behalf of the State, and the land was transferred to King George V. As a result of this transaction the land was impressed with a common law charitable trust. The land involved forms part of what is the

Urrbrae Agricultural High School. Subsequently, a piece of land of about 20 acres, abutting the original trust land (this is the land on the corner of Cross and Fullarton Roads), was purchased by the State from one Susan Dridan (the Dridan land).

The Dridan land was also used for the purposes of the agricultural high school. In 1952, part of the original Waite trust land was used for the establishment of Unley High School, and the boundaries of the Urrbrae land were changed to accommodate this use. At that time, some 20 acres of land for Unley High School were excised from the trust lands (the validity of such action is doubtful, although it appears that the objective was to free the Unley High School land from the trust in exchange for subjecting the Dridan land to the trust and adding it to the Waite lands). The end result was that the land subject to the trust remained at approximately 114 acres. At this time the whole of the land (the remaining Waite land and the Dridan land) was made subject to a statutory trust under the Crown Lands Act to be used at all times as an Agricultural High School reserve.

At various stages over the years, pieces of the trust land have been taken for road purposes, and a strip of land has been dedicated to the local council as a reserve. Currently, approximately 10 acres of the Urrbrae land is being used for the development of a wetlands area. This development will be used by students at the school for the teaching of biology, aquaculture, and wetlands management. When complete, the wetlands will utilise drainage/run-off water from the local area, and the council is involved in this development. Given the educational value of the wetlands to the school, it is a permitted use of the land.

Following a review of horticulture and rural vocational training in South Australia, it was determined that the existing Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE facilities for the School of Horticulture at Brookway Park were in need of upgrading and expansion. Site limitations at Brookway Park led to the consideration of other options. During recent times there has been considerable change in the approach to vocational education and training. Part of these changes has been the development of an integrated training system which offers a broad range of pathways leading to qualification offered by secondary schools, TAFE and industry. In this regard, a proposal to establish TAFE educational programs in horticulture on a site where secondary agricultural and horticultural programs are conducted was considered and developed. The Urrbrae Agricultural High School is a special interest school of agriculture, horticulture, technology and the environment. The addition of TAFE facilities would offer students pathways into vocational programs as an integral part of the schools curriculum. An expanded and enhanced curriculum for secondary and TAFE students would also be developed in a collocated environment.

The end result is the proposal to establish an integrated educational centre of excellence focused on agricultural and horticultural education, with links between the educational institutions involved, at the Urrbrae Agricultural High School. New facilities are planned which will be for the shared use of TAFE and Urrbrae Agricultural High School. The upgrading of the Urrbrae School site has commenced.

Legal advice has been sought as to whether the co-siting of the TAFE facilities with Urrbrae Agricultural High School may be lawfully undertaken given the terms of the trust. Although it is the general view that the use of the land for TAFE purposes would probably be within the spirit of

Mr Waite's gift, this is not legally sufficient to render the proposal within the terms of the trust.

The legal advice is to the effect that the use of the land for TAFE purposes, as proposed, would not be considered to be incidental to, and would be inconsistent with, the purposes of the trust and would therefore be unlawful. The law is that, where land is held on trust for a specific purpose, the trustee (in this case the Minister for Education) must abide by that purpose and it will be a breach of trust to deviate from that purpose by using trust property for a purpose which goes beyond or outside the limits of the purpose for which the trust was constituted. Consideration has been given to an application to the Supreme Court for a *cy pres* scheme but, after all the information was gathered, it was decided that such an application was unlikely to succeed because the original trust had not failed. All legal options for varying the terms of the trust have been examined and it has now been determined that an Act of Parliament is now the most appropriate way to deal with the matter.

The legal advice is that, in view of the history of the land and the likelihood that some of the past actions in relation to the land were most likely breaches of trust, the opportunity should be taken to ratify certain past acts as well as to permit the proposed new uses of the land. Accordingly, this Bill has been prepared. The key matters dealt with by the Bill are as follows:

- The location of a TAFE facility on the site. This matter is dealt with by providing that the land may be used for the purposes of vocational agricultural education and training.
- The issue of gender is addressed because it is arguable that the original trust was for an agricultural high school for boys only.
- The releasing from the trust of the land dedicated under the Crown Lands Act as a reserve for council purposes (this land is currently under the care and control of the Mitcham council). This land will remain dedicated under the Crown Lands Act.
- The ratification of the exchange of the 20 acres on which Unley High School is now situated for the Dridan land, and the fixing of the Dridan land with the Waite Trust and the releasing of the Unley High School land from the terms of the trust.
- The releasing from the trust of the various portions used for road purposes.
- In view of past uses of the land for non-trust purposes, release from liability for breach of trust for past acts is provided.

A further proposal has been developed by Primary Industries SA for the location of the State Tree Centre on the Urrbrae site. The State Tree Centre (located at TAFE's current horticultural campus at Campbelltown) currently comprises staff from Primary Industries SA, Greening Australia, Trees for Life and the Australian Trust for Conservation Volunteers.

It is considered that the location of the State Tree Centre on the Urrbrae site will benefit agricultural education generally. The main focus of the constituent bodies of the State Tree Centre is on revegetation, which is an important feature of agricultural land management. The State Tree Centre undertakes a wide variety of educational activities ranging from curriculum writing to the delivery of pre-vocational courses in natural resource management.

It is considered that it would be appropriate to locate the State Tree Centre at Urrbrae, but the Bill makes provision in general terms for this type of activity. This is done by

allowing the use of the trust land for other purposes beneficial to agricultural education and training approved by the Governor on the recommendation of the Attorney-General. It is the duty of the Crown to protect property devoted to charitable purposes and that duty is executed by the Attorney-General. This is a duty to protect the beneficial interest or the object of the charity. The use of the general wording in this area would allow for consideration of the use of the land for other purposes, although there are no other such purposes presently in contemplation.

In order to alter the Waite trusts affecting the Urrbrae land, this Bill has been prepared. It is usual in matters of this nature for the Government to promote what is essentially a private Bill as a Government Bill. Such legislation is required, pursuant to Standing Orders, to be considered by a select committee. The select committee process ensures public notification of the proposals and the ability for interested persons to provide evidence. I commend this Bill to honourable members and seek leave to have the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Variation of Waite Trust

This clause varies the terms of the Trust (without negating the original trust requirement that the land be used for the purposes of an agricultural high school) to allow the land to also be used for vocational agricultural education and training and other purposes beneficial to agricultural education and training approved by the Governor on the recommendation of the Attorney-General. The clause also makes it clear that the land may be used for the benefit of persons of either gender.

Clause 3: Extension of Trust to Dridan land

This clause extends the Trust to the land transferred to the Crown by Susan Dridan (which is adjacent to the Waite land).

Clause 4: Land freed from Trust

To put the matter beyond doubt, this clause frees from the Trust certain portions of the Waite land which have subsequently been applied for other purposes (ie. the portion of the land that is occupied by Unley High School, the portion of the land under the care, control and management of the Mitcham Council and those portions that have been dedicated for road purposes).

Clause 5: Duty of Registrar—General

This clause requires that the Registrar-General give effect to the provisions of the measure by making appropriate notations etc. on the relevant certificates of title.

Clause 6: Immunity from liability for breach of trust

This clause provides immunity from liability for breach of trust for anything done under the measure or anything done before the commencement of the measure to provide for the establishment and operation of Unley High School, the reserve for Mitcham Council purposes or the land set aside for road purposes.

Schedule

Lands freed from Trust

The schedule defines the lands freed from the Trust under clause 4.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. K.T. Griffin:

That the report of the Auditor-General 1995-96 be noted.

(Continued from 2 October. Page 65.)

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I welcome this opportunity to make some comments on the Auditor-General's Report. I believe that the Auditor-General has again this year made a very important contribution to debate on the public finances

of this State. Back in 1995 the Auditor-General's Report raised some very important issues relating to public accountability. Indeed, in that report the Auditor-General said that the questions of public accountability that were raised in his report were, in his view, the most important issues facing the Parliament at the time.

As a consequence of some of those issues being raised, this Parliament has been dealing with means of improving the accountability of some of the outsourcing contracts that have been entered into by this Government. As a result of those discussions, we have now at least moved some way down the track, although it remains to be seen yet whether or not the new processes provide adequate scrutiny. Basically, what has been agreed to is that summaries of the major outsourcing contracts that have been entered into by the Government will be provided and vetted by the Auditor-General. The reference to this matter is contained on page 120 of the Auditor-General's Report. He concludes:

Under the agreement, parliamentary select or standing committees will have access to an authentic summary of the relevant contract. The summary, which will exclude matters that are commercially sensitive, will be certified by the Auditor-General. This new agreement is expected to be implemented by the time Parliament resumes at the end of September.

Unfortunately, that has not taken place yet, but I hope that it will soon. He continues:

While the proposed parliamentary compact (protocol) will assist accountability regarding contracting out arrangements, it will be important to establish with the relevant parliamentary committees the criteria to be adopted by audit in discharging this responsibility.

I think that indicates that the means under which this new system will work is yet to be fully tried. I hope that it does. That has all come about because of some important recommendations made last year by the Auditor-General.

This year again in his report the Auditor-General has, I believe, made a great contribution to the debate on the public finances of this State. It is rather interesting that in his overview the Auditor last year provided 157 pages, and this year there are 203 pages. I think that is a reasonable measure of the growing number of issues which are of concern as a result, largely I think, of the policies of this Government in terms of its outsourcing.

I believe that this Parliament should thoroughly repudiate the criticisms of the Auditor-General made by the Premier in the press shortly after the report was released. It is well known now that the Premier of this State likes to blame everybody but himself—even the Premier of Victoria, Jeff Kennett, has noticed and commented on that. It is bad enough that we should have a news print media in this State that goes to extraordinary lengths to protect the Premier and the Government. That means that it is all the more important to have a statutory and independent officer, such as the Auditor-General, who can make his observations of the Government without being subjected to the sorts of criticisms made by the Premier. I am at least comforted by the fact that most of the commentators in this State have paid absolutely no heed to the Premier's comments and, indeed, they have sided, as they rightly should do, with the Auditor-General on those matters.

A number of issues are raised by the Auditor-General in his report this year which I believe give a suitable reference point on which we can judge the Brown Government's performance over its three years in office. I raise a number of issues, not in any particular order of importance, that reflect on this Government's performance over the past three years.

The first issue relates to the huge salary increases that have taken place under this Government. I well recall during the period of the previous Government when the present Government, the then Opposition, was extremely critical of some of the salaries that were paid by the previous Government to public servants and people in the public sector, but in the past two years there have been absolutely massive salary increases. What is more, these huge salary increases to the upper echelon of the Public Service have come at a time of massive job cuts—something like 13 000 jobs have gone in that time in the public sector—and also at a time when this Government has been opposing wage rises to such groups in our community as the police and teachers. The Auditor-General has done us a great service in revealing some of those massive salary increases for employees in the upper echelon that have taken place under this Government.

Another feature of the Auditor-General's Report is that there appears to be a growing symptom of arrogance and lack of accountability under this Government. At page 132 of his Overview, the Auditor-General makes the following comment:

An experience where inaccurate information was communicated has arisen in the course of the 1995-96 financial year. Although corrective arrangements have now been undertaken this occurred only following further audit inquiries.

That is of great concern. If the Auditor-General of this State is being provided with inaccurate information and he can discover that fact only as a result of further inquiries and, given that the Auditor-General has great demands on his time (and that is a matter to which I will refer in a moment), it is something about which we should be seriously concerned.

In relation to the Auditor-General's resources, I refer to page 133 of his report where he refers to the 'presently high and increasing demand for assistance'. The Auditor-General further states:

This need is, in part, driven by the changes that are being undertaken within Government and the fact that many of these changes are 'breaking new ground'. It is, in my opinion, also explained by the fact that with the reduction in the public sector work force there has been a 'run down' in certain competencies and a loss of institutional memory within some agencies.

I believe that is also a matter for concern. If, as a result of the shrinkage of the Public Service, we are losing people whose knowledge is such that they can prevent some of the errors of the past, that is something about which we need to worry. I guess we will be increasingly reliant on the private sector for many of the key functions, including those of accountability, that were previously in the public sector. If we are losing competency and loss of institutional memory, as the Auditor-General suggests, I believe we have much about which to be concerned.

The next issue relates to asset sales. I did speak to this matter at some length in my Address in Reply contribution yesterday, so I will not repeat it all today. However, although asset sales may be desirable in many cases, they will not necessarily reduce the State's interest repayments, and that is a point that the Auditor-General has made very effectively in his report. He warned about such matters last year, and I believe he has done a very good job for the people of South Australia in bringing that to light this year. At page 130, the Auditor-General refers to some of the high costs that are involved with asset sales. As an example, in referring to the settlement of the State Bank sale, about \$11 million was needed to meet expenses arising from the sale of the bank.

The Auditor-General is reminding us just how expensive some of the asset sales processes can be, as indeed can outsourcing in terms of legal and other costs involved with a sale. If, as a result of the sale of Government assets, the interest we save through reducing debt is actually less than we would have received in dividends if the operations had remained in public hands, we have a duty to query the benefits of such a policy. In relation to this matter, at page 35 of his report the Auditor-General states:

I have reported this year and last year that one of the issues in relation to private sector provision of infrastructure was the proper financial reporting of the arrangements entered into. I observed that some of these arrangements may be in the nature of off balance sheet arrangements whereby no liability or asset would be recognised in the balance sheet of a Government agency. In relation to Services South Australia, this was not the case and the department determined the arrangement to be on balance sheet. Nevertheless, there has been a difference of opinion on the extent of asset and liability value disclosure of the arrangement. In terms of whether an arrangement is on or off balance sheet, the trend in accounting and reporting developments is towards ensuring that all financing arrangements are recognised in financial statements.

I believe that is very important. The Auditor-General is referring to the sorts of schemes that were entered into first by the entrepreneurs in the private sector during the 1980s, when they were off balance sheet (and I do not exclude the people running the State Bank and Beneficial Finance). Whereas that was a habit of the private sector in the 1980s, sadly that habit is now spreading to the public sector in South Australia in 1996. To address that, as the Auditor-General said (and I repeat this comment):

... the trend in accounting and reporting developments is towards ensuring that all financing arrangements are recognised in financial statements.

The Auditor-General further states:

In my opinion the Department of Treasury and Finance should move from an advisory role to a mandatory role of assessing private sector participation arrangements. It is essential that the Government have an independent assessment of arrangements before any commitment is finalised.

In relation to asset sales and the private provision of infrastructure, the Auditor-General is giving us the very sound advice that we need independent assessment and to enter into such matters on the basis of that assessment. We should not be driven by some ideological fixation.

I refer particularly to the case of Services South Australia to which that quote referred. Basically, as a result of the sale of the vehicle fleet of this State, the way in which the Brown Government has accounted for that in its books has the effect of reducing both the assets and the liabilities of this State. This Government does not seem to care much if its assets are reduced—no-one worries about that—but it wants to go to the next election saying, 'Look, we have reduced our debt by so much.'

If the Government can get the debt down by a further \$67 million, as in this case, it believes that will make it look much better as a manager than it otherwise would. That is the obvious motivation behind that. However, the Auditor has pointed out that, in his view, it is not the correct accounting treatment. The sale of the vehicle fleet in this State is simply to mislead the public of South Australia as to the true state of debt. The Government is pocketing money from the sale of the fleet, which it will no doubt spend on making itself look good. It will reduce the debt of the State on the books, but the problem the State faces is that we still have an ongoing commitment into the future to supply cars through the private sector provider. This is an example of little more than asset

stripping and book fudging, rather in the same way that Alan Bond, Christopher Skase and a whole lot of other entrepreneurs did it in the 1980s, and for similar reasons.

The entrepreneurs of the 1980s tried to make their books look good for the shareholders. While they were ripping millions out of these companies and stashing it away in Swiss bank accounts or private companies, it was important for the shareholders—the poor suckers who were being taken for a ride—that their books looked in good shape. They provided many tricks for that—

The Hon. R.D. Lawson: You should know, your Government was the biggest entrepreneur of them all with the State Bank.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Perhaps the Hon. Robert Lawson was not here earlier, but I am quite happy to mention the State Bank and Beneficial Finance as doing that. As I have said over and over again, I do not want to see that behaviour happen again. What I find most regrettable is that it is happening in South Australia now, under this Government, because this sort of asset stripping is exactly what the entrepreneurs of the 1980s did.

The next matter that I would like to turn to is the provision of infrastructure by the private sector, that is, the provision of infrastructure that would normally be regarded as Government infrastructure. The two best examples of that are the Mount Gambier Hospital and the Port Augusta Hospital. Those hospitals are now provided by private financiers, although they will be leased back and operated by the Government. Again, the clear motivation for doing this is to make debt look smaller on the books. Instead of the Government borrowing money and providing for these hospitals under its capital works program, which would go onto public debt, these hospitals are being funded by private entrepreneurs, but we will still have to pay for them. You do not get anything for free in this society, so we will have to pay for those hospitals over the next 20 years or however long the contract is, and we will have to pay more.

We will pay more because the interest rate will be higher and, when they are privately funded, the private financier has to make a profit on his deal, otherwise he would not be interested. The Auditor has looked at these two deals and, on page 33 of his report he comes to the following conclusion:

In relation to two of the projects, Mount Gambier Health Service and Port Augusta Hospital, the South Australian Health Commission and the Department of Treasury and Finance have evaluated that the private sector funding of the projects results in net additional cost to the Government of approximately \$4 million and \$2.5 million respectively.

That will be the net effect of these deals. How does the public benefit from that? As I suggest, the only benefit is for the Government to say that it has reduced debt, because the cheaper capital cost of providing it through Government borrowings would appear as an increase in public debt, whereas it does not through a private financier. In terms of the public having to pay for the hospitals, it will cost us more in the way it is being done now.

I should like to raise another issue in relation to the funding of those two hospitals. The Mount Gambier Hospital project went before the Public Works Committee in 1994 and, from my inquiries, I understand that is the only report that has been undertaken by the Public Works Committee on that project. The report, which is dated October 1994, came to the following conclusion, and I read from page 4 of the report:

Options for both public and private hospital operations were examined at length. As the public hospital option would result in

operational savings of \$2.2 million per annum, which could be used to service a loan for part of the construction cost of the new hospital, this option was preferred over operational savings to the State Government of \$2.1 million per annum from the private option.

The Public Works Committee recommended that a hospital be built at Mount Gambier and that that hospital be publicly funded. Yet, after this report came down, for some reason the funding of that hospital was changed. To my knowledge, there has been no review by the Public Works Committee of the changed financing arrangements of that hospital, even though I note that the preamble to the report states:

The Health Commission is requested to notify the committee in writing should there be substantial changes to the nature of the project at any stage in the process.

What is going on with the private funding of projects? The Auditor-General has confirmed what the Public Works Committee found in October 1994, but for some reason the Government has deviated from the recommendations of that committee. It is interesting that, in the press at the moment, there are some rumblings about the Public Works Committee. I suspect that, if this sort of thing is happening, there should well be some rumblings.

As I said, the Auditor-General's Report goes into great detail about outsourcing, and I mentioned many of the findings in his report in my Address in Reply yesterday, and I will not go through them all again. However, in relation to the Government's information technology contract, I would like to make a couple of comments as they relate to pages 94 and 95 of his report. The Auditor states:

Unresolved issues continue to persist with respect to service level agreements for 'wave one' agencies, and inquiries made by audit to the Crown Solicitor's Office indicated that the agreed time of finalisation of the service level agreements had been extended to October 1996.

The Auditor-General concludes:

Audit considers it unsatisfactory that problems continue to be experienced with finalisation of 'wave one' agency service level agreements. . . a number of agencies had not completed documentation of the required security specifications relating to controls at the date of transfer to EDS operations.

On page 100 he states:

. . . it is of importance that unresolved matters relating to agency service level agreements, security specification documentation and the transfer to EDS of one major agency are satisfactorily resolved at the earliest opportunity. In respect of project development that may be progressed under the electronic service business and spatial information industry initiatives, it is important that the introduction of any new development is subject to the preparation of a business case.

In his conclusions on page 108, the Auditor states:

. . . audit found that critical documentation providing an overview of system function and operation and a description of management and audit controls and system reconciliation procedures were not available.

He refers there to the overall operation of the system. Given that this contract took two years to negotiate—and it was signed earlier this year—I believe it is of concern that there should be so many details that are still outstanding in relation to this contract. What the Auditor-General told us in his report last year was that world's best practice in relation to outsourcing of contracts is that before a contract is signed there should be benchmarking of the assets to be transferred, and all other like details should be resolved. I believe it is of great concern that at such a late stage in this contract, when it was signed some months ago, that the Auditor is still telling us that there are matters which are unresolved. That is clearly

not in conformity with the best practice which the Auditor-General made reference to last year.

In the time available to me today I have only briefly covered some of the issues that the Auditor brought up. There are many more detailed issues in his report in relation to specific departments which are of interest. But I believe that those issues in the Auditor's overview are some of the most important matters before this Parliament at the moment. I believe the Auditor's report clearly shows that some of the issues of public accountability are not being properly addressed by this Government. His report keeps growing every year as he alerts us to some of the problems particularly in relation to the outsourcing contracts of this Government. I believe all we can do is to take the Auditor's advice because it is quite clear that this Government is really not up to scratch in terms of its public accountability. I support the motion to note the Auditor's report.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES secured the adjournment of the debate.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (APPLICATION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

Clause 1—'Short title.'

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: At this juncture, I will place some comments on record so that honourable members can consider them before we proceed to further clauses of the Bill; therefore I intend to speak only on clause 1 and then report progress. I would like to thank the Hon. Sandra Kanck and the Attorney-General for their support in respect of the principle upon which the Bill is based. I am particularly heartened by the Attorney's comment that the Government agrees that sexual harassment is unacceptable and that sexual harassment by members of Parliament, members of local councils and members of the judiciary should be unlawful.

The Attorney raised a number of suggestions in respect of the proposals I have put forward in this Bill. The Attorney appears to agree with the principle underlying the Bill and he concedes that Mr Martin QC, in his review of the equal opportunity legislation, recommended that acts of sexual harassment against staff by members of Parliament, members of the judiciary and members of local councils should be prohibited. But the Attorney has echoed Chief Justice Doyle in warning that there could be difficulties in implementing the Equal Opportunity Act provisions and processes to cover the judiciary. I, therefore, have amendments on file to address those concerns.

The Attorney also has concerns about the erosion on parliamentary privilege—or, at least, the implications of the Equal Opportunity Act processes applying without qualification to members of Parliament. I understand what the Attorney says in relation to this but, along with the public, I find it completely unacceptable that a select group of a few parliamentarians, typically of a certain age and gender, should be the enforcement officers for breaches of the sexual harassment provisions.

I make it clear that I do not mean to reflect on the current members or any particular members of the Joint Parliamentary Services Committee. The point is that parliamentarians should not be the ones judging their own behaviour in respect of sexual harassment. To borrow a phrase from the lawyers, no-one should be the judge in his or her own case. It is

therefore vital that the Equal Opportunity Commissioner and tribunal have jurisdiction to cover offences by the classes of people to be covered by this amending legislation, just the same as applies to any other citizen. If the Attorney has particular concerns, then with the benefit of advice from the Crown Solicitor's Office I am confident that the Attorney will be willing to move appropriate amendments for us to consider so that parliamentary privilege is maintained to the extent necessary. I acknowledge that parliamentary privilege is there for a reason, but I am also concerned that the privilege could be abused without effective sanctions.

Beyond legislative amendments that the Attorney may wish to move to address the issues of parliamentary privilege, the point is also then made that there should perhaps be a protocol and processes developed to resolve complaints against judicial officers and members of Parliament. That may well be appropriate, and I will be quite happy to work with the Attorney to ensure that proper processes are put in place. That should be a natural consequence of the Bill's being passed; it should not be a stumbling block for the Bill. I am sure that fair, practical processes can be worked out in due course.

The Attorney has also indicated that a preferable approach would be for the recommendations made by Mr Martin QC being dealt with as a package, comprehensively dealing with the equal opportunity legislation. I think the Attorney will forgive me for pointing out again that we have been waiting for about two years for a comprehensive reform package to appear, and it has not yet materialised, although I am glad to hear that the Attorney has indicated that he has instructed Parliamentary Counsel in this regard, perhaps recently. The preference for a comprehensive approach is commendable, but it should not stop this Bill's being put through. It may be that the Government would wish to incorporate the provisions of this Bill into a comprehensive Bill to be introduced imminently.

In summary, various objections have been made, but I think that we can work around them. I would also ask all Parties to join with me in supporting the Bill, including the amendments I have placed on file and any amendments that any other Parties may wish to place on file to improve the processes that follow from the extended coverage of the sexual harassment provisions.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

RETAIL SHOP LEASES (SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Retail Shop Leases Act 1995. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The issue of retail shop leases is one that has occupied a great deal of my attention over the last 3½ or four years. Not long after the last State election, I decided that I would follow up on what had been a large number of individual complaints that I had received about retail shop leases, and I put out a questionnaire to a number of shopping centres. I was stunned by the response that I received, in terms of the number of people who responded. Whilst I had anticipated that there would be a number of very small retailers running individual shops who may have been having difficulty, I was very surprised to find that even significant national chains were

having real problems. That came as an absolute surprise to me and indicated the very real power that landlords wield, more in shopping centres than in strip shopping, although not solely in shopping centres.

As a consequence of that, I had a private member's Bill drafted but, while I was going through that process, the Government itself introduced a Bill. The Bill that the Government introduced emerged following discussions that the Attorney-General had carried out, which involved BOMA (the Building Owners and Managers Association), which has more recently been renamed the Property Council, Westfield Shopping Town, the Retail Traders Association, the Newsagents Association, the Australian Small Business Association and the Small Retailers Association. Those groups met and prepared and signed off a document that led to the Government's Bill. What needs to be noted, of course, is that the Bill was based on what all those groups agreed on. Clearly, and not surprisingly, there were areas of dispute. Eight such areas were identified at the time.

It would be reasonable to say that the Bill that the Hon. Mr Griffin introduced on 30 November for the most part caused little concern to owners of properties, but there were still very substantial reasons for concern for those who were lessees. During the debate on that legislation—and I will not go through all the points again—I raised those concerns and sought to achieve amendments to the Act. The most important single issue was and remains to this stage the question of lease renewal and what happens at that point, because the simple fact is that the landlord, by the very threat of refusing to renew your lease, devalues your business overnight and, no matter how much time and effort you have put into it, you effectively have lost everything. It means that you are capable of being essentially blackmailed in terms of the level of rent that is charged.

You certainly would not seek to uphold other rights that legislation theoretically gives you because, if you seek to uphold your other rights, the threat of non-renewal of lease and therefore loss of business makes it totally impractical. I will return to that question of lease renewal later, but that clearly was the most important single issue. I repeat now what I said on many occasions during the debate: I am not seeking and was not seeking a right of automatic renewal. I was certainly seeking to come up with a form of words in legislation that would redress the imbalance of power that existed during those negotiations and the consequences that flowed from them.

A host of other issues were raised, but they were secondary in importance to that one issue. As things eventuated, a number of issues were of importance to retailers. They are the views of both the Retail Traders Association and the Small Retailers Association. Whether they represented large shops and national chains or small one-person businesses, they had a commonality of concern, surprisingly so. Both the RTA and the SRA were extremely disappointed with the legislation that emerged and felt that those key issues still needed to be addressed.

The Government at a later point sought to change trading conditions in the city of Adelaide and as a consequence of some protracted debate and discussion small retailers, at least, formed the view that, while they considered that Sunday trading was not in their interests (a view they continue to hold until this day), a number of other issues were of even greater concern to them. Paramount were issues around retail tenancy. The view was formed that loopholes were available to the Government whereby, through the back door, it could

have introduced Sunday trading anyway. We found a number of ways by which the Government could have done so and it was only a matter of time before the Government found those same loopholes.

In those circumstances it was felt that we should try, if Sunday trading in the city was inevitable, to put together a package that meant that the small retailers were not worse off. An important part of that package was the Government's agreeing to set up a select committee to look at retail tenancies. That was a great risk in one regard but on the other hand it was always my view that, if six fair-minded people sat down and took the time to receive the evidence, they would be persuaded that there were real and substantial problems in the area of retail tenancy.

As it eventuated, the select committee was established—a joint committee of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, with three representatives from each House. From the House of Assembly there were two members of the Government and one member of the Labor Party and from the Legislative Council there was one member of each of the three Parties in the Chamber.

I suspect—and other members may correct me—that when the committee first commenced taking evidence the majority of members of that committee would have had a view that there was not a substantial problem, but it was quite clear as more evidence came in that members were persuaded that there were real and substantial problems that needed to be addressed. At the end of the day the select committee produced a report that was tabled, as I recall, on 1 August—a report that we have not had an opportunity to debate in this place. That report contained 16 recommendations. It is worth noting that, of those 16 recommendations, on my recollection 12 were agreed to unanimously and the other four were agreed to with only one or two members dissenting.

For those people who take a look at the report, I note that the Hon. Trevor Griffin dissented on recommendation 2, the tenants' first right of refusal of a new lease. He dissented on recommendation 3, written reasons for a lessor's decision not to grant a renewal. There were two dissenters on review of rent, the Hon. Trevor Griffin and Mr Robert Brokenshire. I dissented on recommendations 7 and 8, not in terms of what was there but suggested that there could have been more. I did not reject what the committee had done but made recommendations for some addition to each of them.

The Bill now before us is based on the report and recommendations of that select committee. Only one clause does not relate to the recommendations, namely, clause 15, to which I will return later. It is a matter of clarification of the Act and I do not believe that there will be any dissent from anybody in this place and I felt comfortable in inserting it. I have been approached by a number of retailers and representatives of retailers raising a number of concerns outside of those considered by the select committee. My response was that with this Bill I am trying to put on the table all those matters on which we substantially agreed or had only one person dissenting. By so doing there would be a reasonable prospect of the legislation's passing through expeditiously and I did not want to complicate matters by putting in a whole lot of other issues that would put the Bill at some sort of risk. It would be sensible that this Bill seek to achieve what is possible at this point. Perhaps during the debate in Committee I will raise a number of other issues that will require further consideration.

I do not see this Bill as being the end of anything other than perhaps an end to the select committee process and

acting directly upon the recommendations of the committee. Only clause 15 does not flow from the recommendations and within the amending Bill I have also picked up the additional recommendations that I had put in relation to recommendations 7 and 8 regarding tenancy mix and refits.

It is not my intention at this stage to do a clause by clause analysis. Members have had a copy of this report since 1 August. It is a comprehensive report and explains why each recommendation has been made and gives a justification for it. The Bill simply follows those recommendations and I have outlined those few instances where it does not. Clearly we will have the more comprehensive debate as we go through the Bill clause by clause. It is likely that I will move further amendments because at this stage the Bill reflects my request of Parliamentary Counsel that a Bill be prepared that represents the views of the select committee.

We had some discussion about my understanding of the recommendations. Quite often one finds that, when Parliamentary Counsel carries out drafting, there are a number of ways of achieving the recommendation. One makes a particular request and they can achieve that end in a number of different ways. If I seek to move further amendments it will not be to move against the committee's recommendations, but it will involve, after further discussion with interested parties, my forming a view that the clauses as currently phrased are perhaps not the best way of implementing the committee's recommendations. So, it is possible that over the coming weeks—and I expect this Bill to sit here for some time—there will be further amendment not only from other members of this place but from me.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: There will be a Government Bill.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Will it follow the committee's recommendations?

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: A number of them.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Of the majority of the committee on all 16 recommendations?

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: We will wait and see. You will get it soon.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Okay. I do not think I need to go into detail. As I said, the select committee sat on 22 occasions, took evidence from a large number of witnesses and has produced a comprehensive report which is before us. The more detailed debate will occur during the Committee stages. I urge all members to support the Bill.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I move:

That the report of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee 1995-96 be noted.

The Statutory Authorities Review Committee, which was established by an amendment to the Parliamentary Committees Act in May 1994, has unanimously resolved from here on to present an annual report to the Parliament. We do so because we believe that, in the interests of accountability and because it provides a forum for us to summarise our activities, this is a positive step.

When the Liberal Government was elected in December 1993, it came to office with a strong commitment to accountability in Government. In fact, one policy plank was that it would establish a Statutory Authorities Review Committee

and that it would also reconstitute the Public Works Committee.

From May 1994 until 30 June 1996 the Statutory Authorities Review Committee met on about 80 occasions. It has been a very active committee, and its first task was to review the Electricity Trust of South Australia. That turned out to be a comprehensive and daunting task, because national electricity reform was very much on the agenda, and it was rather like reviewing shifting sands. Nevertheless, it has been an instructive, challenging and useful task.

In the period from the committee's inception until the present we have provided six reports on the Electricity Trust, with just one report to come shortly which will wrap up the committee's inquiry into what is South Australia's largest public sector commercial operation in revenue terms.

When the committee was established by the amendment to the Parliamentary Committees Act in May 1994 the Attorney-General at the time noted that the purpose of the committee would be to 'make the operations of statutory authorities more open to detailed scrutiny; to determine the desirability of their continuation and the propriety of their activities and actions'.

The Attorney also noted that when parliamentary committees function effectively they are one of the most important means by which a Government is held accountable to Parliament.

In addition to the exhaustive inquiry into the Electricity Trust, early in its life the committee resolved that it should better understand the subject which it was charged to overview. The committee resolved to conduct a survey into the statutory authorities as they existed in South Australia. We wrote to all Ministers of Government in November 1994 with an extensive questionnaire in an effort to better understand the statutory authorities which existed in South Australia, their role, their functions, their funding sources, the nature of their board and the remuneration of the board.

As a result of that survey work, the committee published quite recently its results of this inquiry into 292 statutory authorities and has recommended strongly that the Government should establish a central register of statutory authorities. The committee has recommended that its terms of reference as defined in the Parliamentary Committees Act should be broadened not only to allow for the review of statutory authorities in the strict definition of the Act but also to encompass statutory bodies, given that there is a definitional difficulty which exists between statutory authorities and statutory bodies.

In addition to the ETSA review and the survey of South Australian authorities, in the first two years of operation the committee also undertook an inquiry into the Rundle Mall committee. Initially, that was a preliminary inquiry. We came back to it later, took evidence from a number of witnesses and recently tabled the results of that Rundle Mall inquiry with some recommendations which were also *ad idem* with the recommendations of the highly regarded Adelaide 21 partnership project team calling for significant review in the structuring and marketing of Rundle Mall.

The report before members also includes the ministerial responses to the reports which the committee has, to date, tabled in the Parliament. It is important to note that the Parliamentary Committees Act requires Ministers to respond within four months to reports which fall within their jurisdiction. This annual report has provided a summary of the ministerial responses. The committee was pleased with the positive and prompt responses that it received, particularly

with regard to its inquiry into ETSA. The Minister responsible for ETSA (Hon. John Olsen) has for the most part agreed with the committee's recommendations, and in fact many of the committee's suggestions have been implemented or accepted.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: What about the wet Ministers?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I am not sure; we are moving into summer. The honourable member is generally behind the seasons and also behind the politics. Finally, the committee has committed itself to an annual report of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee. We see this as a positive measure. It would be presumptuous of me to suggest that this process should be adopted by all parliamentary committees, but in our case we have found it particularly useful.

In moving this motion, I pay a tribute to the diligent efforts of the staff of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee. In fact, we have had four members of staff in the period covered under the terms of the report: Ms Vicki Evans, who was the first Secretary, and Mr Mark McKay, the first research officer; and the current staff, Ms Anna McNicol and Mr Andrew Collins.

[Sitting suspended from 5.55 to 7.45 p.m.]

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I rise to make very few comments on the annual report of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, as the Presiding Member has already spoken of the work which the committee has done. Whilst it is not a requirement for the committee to submit an annual report to the Parliament, we felt it was highly desirable that we do so, particularly as we were investigating the production and/or non-production of annual reports from a whole lot of statutory authorities.

This report is evidence of the hard work which the committee has done in the 15 months since its establishment. I was astounded to read that we had met 35 times, which—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Another member comments that it felt like 335 times: I do not wish to name that member or share his feelings, but I appreciate what he means—the five of us seem to have been meeting around a table with ever increasing frequency. The result of the committee's work has been very productive. The ETSA reports, whilst very detailed and lengthy, add considerably to the understanding of the operations of ETSA, particularly at this time when we are about to move into the national electricity market, which will mean a whole new ball game not only for ETSA but also for its interstate counterparts.

The committee has produced the report on the Rundle Mall committee, which was tabled not long ago in this Parliament, and also the survey of South Australian statutory authorities. Two more reports are in the pipeline on which a great deal of work has been done, both by our most efficient staff and also by the members, and we hope that these will reach the Parliament before Christmas. There is no doubt that the committee has worked very hard and, I think, has produced reports of value. I realise that these reports are not light bedtime reading for most people in the community, and it is probable that not a very large number of people have read the reports from front to back.

However, the provision of requesting ministerial reaction to the reports is, I think, useful. It does mean that the reports are read in the Public Service, and that there is a response to them from the Minister and, in some cases, I think that this will result in improvement of Government procedures, which

will be to the benefit of both the statutory authority and the smooth functioning of government in this country. It may well be that not many members of Parliament, other than the five of us, have actually read our reports, certainly from front to back—

The Hon. J.F. Stefani interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Page by page but, nevertheless, they are there, and I am sure will be referred to in the future, if not in their entirety at least to various sections of them as members of Parliament have an interest in a particular matter. Probably the main benefit to result from the work of the committee is that it makes statutory authorities more aware of our existence, and of the fact that they are being examined and investigated, not necessarily in an antagonistic way, but the very fact that they are open to scrutiny in this way will, I think, improve their performance as they—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: It is also possible that we might learn more about the complexity of the operations, too.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It can be a two-way street: that the members learn more about the operations of statutory authorities and appreciate some of the complexity of their operations; and the reverse side of the coin is that the statutory authorities know that a parliamentary committee is able to scrutinise them, and this will ensure that they be kept on their toes and this, I think, will be of benefit to all concerned. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE: STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I move:

That the report of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee on a survey of South Australian statutory authorities be noted.

As I have previously indicated in speaking to Order of the Day: Private Business No. 5, the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, shortly after its establishment in May 1994, resolved that it would be appropriate to conduct the first ever survey of South Australian statutory authorities. The committee prepared a questionnaire, which was distributed to all Ministers of Government in November 1994, with a request that it be returned on behalf of all statutory authorities that were within their portfolio jurisdictions. We set a rather ambitious date of reply before Christmas 1994 and, with the benefit of hindsight, we recognise that.

But what we did encounter was an extraordinary variety of responses, an extraordinary variation in the quality of responses, and an extraordinary delay in many of the responses. In fact, after four months, one-third of the statutory authorities had yet to report on this survey. Quite clearly some of the statutory authorities were well organised—the Minister taking an overview and ensuring that there was some uniformity of approach in responding to this survey questionnaire; others came in like Brown's cows. The committee still does not know how many statutory authorities there are in South Australia. Indeed, it is not certain how many statutory bodies there are. The committee, which consists of five members of the Legislative Council, three Liberal and two Labor members—

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I am sorry. All right, three Government and two Opposition members—I stand corrected—brought down unanimous recommendations. We recognised that this had been a long-standing problem. I can remember that one of my very first speeches in the Legisla-

tive Council in 1979 made specific reference to quangos, as they were called (statutory authorities), detailing the growth in statutory authorities and the lack of accountability in statutory authorities. Over many years I highlighted this fact in the Parliament, pointing out that, in many cases, annual reports had not been presented within the required time as set down in legislation.

Indeed, some annual reports had never been presented. Some were being presented one or two years after the due date which, of course, meant that they were no longer relevant. Also, if that statutory authority had reported late or had particularly financial or administrative difficulties they would not come to public light for a long period of time. I, along with others, had suggested that there should be a register of statutory authorities as far back as 1986. To the Labor Government's credit, in its dying days, Christopher Sumner, who then was the Hon. Christopher Sumner, the Minister for public sector reform, tabled the first attempt at a register of statutory authorities, a list of statutory authorities, in South Australia, and indicated that the Labor Government was committed to developing a register of statutory authorities.

The committee grappled with the difficulty of what is a statutory authority, given that there is a definitional difficulty, particularly as set out in the Parliamentary Committees Act where, in section three, a statutory authority is defined as a body corporate with a separate legal existence; it includes members appointed by the Government, subject to the control or direction of a Minister and is financed out of public funds, which may well be Commonwealth funds, State funds, a combination of both, or may include private sector support. Advice from Crown Law confirmed that the only way to really define with precision what is a statutory authority is to actually look at each piece of legislation and perhaps also the constitutions of those respective bodies.

In conclusion, we resolved that there were probably 100 statutory authorities or so, as defined under our Act, and at least another 200 or so statutory bodies. The difficulty that we continue to have is that, presently, there is no register of statutory authorities and there is uncertainty in many departments as to what are statutory authorities and statutory bodies. We do not know whether all the statutory bodies in existence in South Australia were covered by our survey.

One of the recommendations that the committee has made is that the terms of reference of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee should be broadened to include statutory bodies. This broader role envisaged by the Statutory Authorities Review Committee would enable it to overcome the difficulty with definition that now exists. The report comments on bodies that are technically statutory bodies rather than statutory authorities. I instance the many health authorities, including large hospitals and health centres, in South Australia which, by the strict definition, are not statutory authorities.

The committee found that there was a lack of basic information and a lack of appropriate systems to monitor and record information with respect to statutory authorities. We asked and received cooperation from Premier and Cabinet. We had access to the Cabinet Handbook, which listed bodies which were not statutory authorities, even though they were under the heading 'Statutory authorities'. We discovered that Artlab was listed as a statutory authority, when in fact it is not a statutory authority but a division of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Was it listed by the Arts Department as a statutory authority? I wouldn't have thought so.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: No, it was not, but it was listed in the Cabinet Handbook as a statutory authority. The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board was listed in the Cabinet Handbook, along with SAMCOR, as a statutory authority. The only trouble with that is that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board was replaced by SAMCOR in 1972, 24 years ago, yet it remained in the Cabinet Handbook as a statutory authority in South Australia. That is a distinct worry. It shows that successive Governments—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: What worries you about it?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Successive Governments have yet to realise that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board has been renamed SAMCOR, but the two—

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: That's right. There was also a confusion in definition. For instance, the State Theatre Company saw itself as a business undertaking, the State Opera as an executive body, and the Art Gallery board was listed under 'Other'. I am not blaming the statutory authorities which happen to come under the umbrella of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development, but there has been not any coherent approach to categorising statutory authorities in South Australia, which makes statistical and other references a nightmare.

In examining the boards, the committee found that the average number on boards was about 6.8, although obviously that number varied enormously. What disturbed the committee, particularly, was that some of the boards had had vacancies for as long as 18 months. On some of the survey forms, there was a plaintive little note saying, 'We have been trying to get the Minister to fill the vacancies that exist on our board for a long time. Please help.' The Central Board of Health, for example, had vacancies on its board for 18 months prior to being abolished in May 1995. The Radiation Protection Committee had all positions vacant for five months.

Certainly, some of these committees may well have been wound up or been bundled into another committee, but there is a statutory obligation to have those board memberships full at all times. In many instances, there was quite clearly sloppiness. It was noteworthy that, although the Government has publicly committed itself in a very worthy fashion to having at least 50 per cent female representation on boards and committees by the year 2000, at the moment that figure is only 29 per cent.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: No, 30.3 per cent now.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: That shows that there is a long way to go before the 50 per cent target is reached.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: There has been a small increase.

The Hon. Anne Levy: We only did a one-off survey.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Yes. There was some suggestion of a fraction of an increase, but it did not come from our survey. I have seen other information which suggests that the figure has increased from 28 per cent to 29 per cent but, as the Hon. Anne Levy says, that was not part of our survey.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: As I said in Parliament last week, it is now 30.3 and we are the first State Government in Australia to reach that target.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Perhaps the point that should be made is that this survey relates to the 1993-94 year. It also draws on later data, but the survey itself was based on the

1993-94 financial year. It is important to recognise that annual reports provide the opportunity for parliamentary and public scrutiny of statutory bodies. They provide information on the activities of statutory authorities, detail the issues which have arisen during the year and the financial position. Parliament and parliamentary committees have the responsibility of monitoring the performance of Executive Government. They have a watchdog role and, in particular, this is the one of the prime roles of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee.

The committee was disturbed to note that, over many years, there has been a continuing problem of late reporting by statutory bodies. As required under the Public Sector Management Act, statutory authorities are obliged to provide the Minister, in most cases, with a copy of their annual report by 30 September for the year to 30 June, given that almost all statutory authorities report on a 30 June basis. The Minister is required to table that report within 12 sitting days of Parliament. It was obvious that in both 1993-94 and 1994-95, late reporting was the order of the day, that the cut-off date under the requirements of the Public Sector Management Act in 1995 was 16 November, but no fewer than 52 statutory bodies reported late, after 16 November 1995. Indeed, the Aboriginal Lands Trust has yet to report for the 1994-95 year. That was over 13 months late and clearly quite unacceptable.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Don't worry, Modbury Hospital has only just done so.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I will take up that interjection. Another select committee of the Legislative Council reported quite recently that Modbury Hospital, whose operations have been privatised, had still not reported for the 1994-95 year, 12 months after 30 June 1995.

The Hon. Anne Levy: It did a fortnight ago.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Right. Well, it has finally reported in September. That is 14½ months late for a hospital which has an expenditure of tens of millions of dollars and which in the public sector arena has an obligation to report.

It is instructive to know what the requirements are for a company like BHP. It is instructive to know—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Mr President, please protect me from these fierce interjections.

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: If the Hon. Ron Roberts wants to make a contribution in a minute he can do so, but I ask him to desist for the moment.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I would prefer it if he did not. To put Modbury Hospital and the Aboriginal Lands Trust against BHP and see what their requirements are under the Stock Exchange rules is a very good example of the problem that we are talking about. BHP has 49 000 employees in 80 countries of the world. The Australian Stock Exchange requires BHP, SANTOS and all other companies listed on the exchange to provide a preliminary final report of the year's results 75 days after the end of the year. So if they balance on 30 June they are required to provide a report by 15 September, or thereabouts. They are required to provide a full report 90 days after the end of the financial year. The annual report is required to be posted to shareholders within 19 weeks, and the annual general meeting is required to be held within five months. BHP, with its 49 000 people in 80 countries, managed to put out a comprehensive report and held its annual general meeting within four months of the end of its financial year, which so happens to be 31 May. That is

the sort of accountability that the private sector has to comply with. And yet over a period of decades in South Australia there has been continual sloppiness and arrogance in terms of the presentation of annual reports to Parliament.

The recommendation of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee—and it is a unanimous recommendation—is that a register of statutory authorities should be established by the end of the first quarter of 1997. That register should contain the names of all members of the board or committee, their term of appointment, and their remuneration, and that register should be made publicly available so that both the Parliament and the community can have access to it.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Stop trying to distract me. That is what the committee is recommending, and the Economic and Finance—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member knows that it is not correct to refer to people in the gallery, and I ask him to stop that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: He is short sighted in most things, Mr President. Indeed, the Economic and Finance Committee has made a similar recommendation, and we hope that that recommendation is taken up by Government. We have argued that this register of statutory bodies is vital to their effective monitoring, and the lack of progress in establishing a central register has been most disappointing. The committee in its comprehensive report, which I am sure the Hon. Mr Cameron will read after being so stimulated by my speech, shows that South Australia trails—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: It is a stimulating speech. We actually agree with you for once.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: You normally do: I am a very reasonable politician. South Australia trails best practice in other States. The Commonwealth, the Australian Capital Territory, Queensland and some other States have a register of statutory bodies. In fact, in Queensland it is available for purchase. We had a remarkable statement, however, from the then Director of the Deregulation Office, one Mr Weston, who gave evidence to the committee. He offered his views on the merits of the register, and I quote from our report on page 89:

As I understand it, there is no entity with formal responsibility for maintaining an index or for settling on a definition of what constitutes a 'statutory authority'. I am not aware that the absence of such a list is of any practical consequence.

That rather surprised the committee, and in its report it noted:

The committee does not share Mr Weston's view that the lack of a list is of no 'practical consequence' and is surprised there was not a more sophisticated appreciation and professional approach exhibited by the Deregulation Office. There are obvious implications for Government accountability and responsibility arising from the lack of a statutory authorities register.

Clearly, there needs to be a whole of government approach to this important issue. The survey of statutory authorities, which analysed responses from 292 statutory bodies, details of their structure, board membership and reporting requirements, will demand an answer from Government under the terms of the Parliamentary Committees Act within four months of that report's being made public. That means that the Statutory Authorities Review Committee and, in fact, the Parliament will be entitled to receive a response, which may well be a whole of government response or a response from

individual Ministers, to the very detailed and comprehensive and, I would suggest, cogently argued 137 page report.

This is a watershed document. Quite clearly, it is the very first detailed analysis of statutory authorities in South Australia. The fact that there has been no consistent mechanism within successive Governments to monitor these bodies has been, I think, to the disadvantage of the Parliament and of the public. Although there have been sporadic efforts over a period of years, as we say in our report:

This present unsatisfactory situation has occurred because of long-term neglect and has been aggravated by the apparent inability of successive administrations to fully address this issue.

In conclusion, I again quote from the committee report, when we say:

The committee cannot overemphasise the urgency of developing and implementing systems for centrally monitoring statutory authorities and, more specifically, for improving their accountability to Parliament.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In supporting the motion my remarks will be brief, as the major aspects of this report have been adequately covered by the Presiding Member of the committee. This report is certainly—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Is it a watershed?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: No, it is not a watershed. It is ground-breaking; it is certainly a first and, I think, a very important report in a first attempt to tackle the question of categorising, counting and obtaining facts and figures about statutory authorities in this State. I agree with the comments of the Hon. Legh Davis when he says that this is part of accountability and that statutory authorities and Government need to be accountable to the Parliament. Many of the results in the report are based on a survey that was carried out by the research officers of the committee. We need to recognise that there were limitations on this survey, as a result of which I would not like to vouch for the complete accuracy of the data that has been presented. I am sure that it is within the ball park and that it gives a true indication of the situation regarding statutory authorities, but I would not like to be held to any of the detailed figures.

The survey was limited in its reliability because of the way it was done. Questionnaires were sent to Ministers, and it was up to the Ministers' officers to distribute them to statutory authorities. It is obvious that the Ministers' officers differed in their efficiency in getting the questionnaires out to statutory authorities. Secondly, the statutory authorities themselves differed considerably in the thoroughness with which they responded to the survey. Some gave very careful, detailed and, no doubt, accurate responses, where others seemed very slipshod; only half the questionnaire was filled in and there was a general air of unreliability in the responses. This may, of course, reflect the level of the individual within the statutory authority who was given the task of completing the questionnaire. Certainly, some seemed very sloppy and gave considerable cause for concern. If the questionnaire was answered so sloppily, what confidence could one have in the efficiency of that statutory authority?

One of the major problems with the survey was that the different authorities were asked to categorise themselves into one of five categories. The five categories were clearly set out: they were the same five as were used in a major study of statutory authorities at the Commonwealth level quite a number of years ago. I suppose that these five categories were chosen for our survey so that comparisons could be made with the earlier Commonwealth data. However, this meant

that the individual organisations had themselves to decide into which category they fell. I am sure that there was variation in the way they approached this task.

As the Hon. Legh Davis has said, State Theatre classified itself as a business enterprise, whereas State Opera classified itself as 'other'. I would have thought that their functions were highly analogous, but it may well be that some statutory authorities did not fit very comfortably into any of the five categories and had difficulty in deciding which was the most appropriate category for them. Different executive officers obviously made different decisions.

So, any conclusions that are based on saying that such and such can be said about category 1 organisations, whereas category 2 is different, rely on the organisations classifying themselves correctly into category 1 or 2. Because of various limitations, the fact that some responses were never received and that for some categories of organisations the response rate was much poorer than for other organisations means that the data cannot be relied on as being strictly accurate but only to give a general picture of the situation regarding statutory authorities.

The Hon. Legh Davis has spoken about the response delays which occurred and which were extremely frustrating, but I am inclined to think that they are probably not unusual when surveys are done and that, as such, the slow or low response rate was probably no different from that encountered by many researchers in the social sciences who send out questionnaires.

The delays in the production of annual reports to which the Presiding Member has referred are a different matter. This I would regard as a serious dereliction of duty on the part of some of those statutory authorities. True, some are not required to produce an annual report, and one can hardly castigate people for not doing what they have never been asked to do—that would be grossly unfair. Certainly, many statutory authorities are required to produce annual reports and often are required to produce them within three calendar months of the end of the financial year, yet the vast majority, it seems, do not fulfil that obligation.

The Hon. Legh Davis referred to the case of Modbury Hospital—one that comes readily to mind because it relates not only to the report of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee but also to a select committee set up by this Parliament. However, Modbury Hospital has only just produced its 1994-95 annual report—16 months after the end of the financial year to which it refers—whereas it should now be producing the following annual report for the 1995-96 year. I have no idea when that will be produced.

I do not particularly wish to single out Modbury Hospital in this regard, although I point out that it is under private management, and lack of production of a report cannot be regarded as a public servant responsibility. It is now the responsibility of a private organisation, so let us not have stories about the public sector being less efficient than the private sector. Many statutory authorities are equally late or dilatory with their annual reports.

While I am sure that many organisations like to produce pretty annual reports with pictures and happy graphs, the formal requirements for an annual report do not extend to such cosmetic features, and a bare bones report which provides the basic information is all that needs to be produced because it is through this basic information that accountability is achieved—accountability to the Minister, to the Parliament and to the public of South Australia. It is through these dreary facts and figures that judgments can be made about the

performance of the statutory authority. That can be done without pretty pictures. It is quite unnecessary to delay annual reports so that they can be produced on glossy paper with pretty pictures. I stress the necessity for annual reports to be produced on time and made available to those who can then use them for investigating the efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation producing that report.

The other matter I will briefly mention is the question of the register of statutory authorities to which the Hon. Legh Davis has already referred. The members of the committee were absolutely unanimous in their recommendation that there should be a register of statutory authorities. It may take considerable time to build up such a register that can be completely relied on, and it is essential that it not contain any bodies which should not be there (such as Artlab) but that it include all the bodies which should be there. It may mean that there will have to be several attempts before a complete list can be accurately obtained and relied upon. However, we believe it is important that this should be done and that the register should contain details such as when each authority was set up, under what legislation, who are the members of the board, when they were first appointed, when their term ends, what remuneration if any they receive and other such information about the authority.

Furthermore, this information should be public information, as it is in other States. In most States of Australia there are registers of public bodies or statutory authorities, and these registers contain the type of information that we are requesting here and are publicly available. In Queensland one can even purchase a copy of the list to make whatever use of it one wishes. Certainly it is publicly available in other States. We are lagging behind badly in this State and such a register should be established and publicly available.

A similar recommendation has been made by the Economic and Finance Committee, which has looked at some of these matters, although from a different perspective. It also concluded that there should be a register and that it should be publicly available. We understand that the Premier does not support the recommendation from the Economic and Finance Committee, but he has not yet responded to the report of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee where I think the arguments in favour of maintaining such a public register are clearly set out and elaborated. I trust that our cogent arguments will convince the Premier and, indeed, the Hon. John Olsen (who is no longer in the gallery, so I gather that I am allowed to refer to him) that such a public register should be established with the information indicated.

Certainly, a great deal of that information is public information, anyway, but it would be very hard to collate given that it is dispersed through myriad annual reports published in some editions of the *Gazette* and in various parliamentary papers. In other words, although publicly available it is not brought together and collated in a suitable form as we suggest. This would be extremely useful not only to our committee but also to a vast number of other people, and it would add to the general accountability of Government. I certainly hope that such a register will be established.

If the Government does not move on this recommendation, it can be assured that it will hear a lot more about this from the entire membership of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, which is united in this matter. There are no Party-political divisions occurring on this. All members are unanimous. We can assure the Government that we believe very firmly in our recommendation and that we will

pursue it through every possible avenue until such a register is established and is publicly available. I support the motion.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I refer to the contributions of the Hon. Legh Davis and the Hon. Anne Levy. First, I congratulate the Hon. Legh Davis not only on an extremely erudite contribution but also on the courageous stand he took on this issue. He was brutally honest with members of the Council, and that is only to be appreciated.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I am somewhat disappointed that members of the Government are interjecting. It was extremely disappointing to hear the Minister for Transport constantly interjecting against the Hon. Legh Davis's contribution. I hope there is no disagreement in the Government ranks about whether or not they will support the Statutory Authorities Review Committee's recommendations.

The Hon. Anne Levy: She didn't interject on me.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: No, that is true. The Hon. Anne Levy just pointed out that the Minister did not interject against any of the comments she made, yet the Minister chose constantly to interject against what sounded like a great deal of commonsense being put forward by the Hon. Legh Davis. A register is much needed. For the life of me I cannot see why the recommendations being put forward by the committee will not have the unanimous support of everyone in both Houses.

I have been advised by one of my colleagues that it appears that the Premier is not too keen on some of the recommendations being made by the Statutory Authorities Review Committee. For the life of me, I am somewhat puzzled why the Premier would not support the recommendations. We have to only go back a little while to find the Premier's stating that South Australians believe that the Government has become remote from the people, out of touch with their needs and aspirations and unwilling to account for Government actions which have let us all down.

On the one hand we have a Premier talking about Government accountability and openness. We also find the Premier stating that a Liberal Government will revitalise the institution of Parliament by ensuring Parliament is strengthened in holding executive Government to account. We know the truth of that statement.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Actually, it is not all that long ago. It was entitled: 'Open Government Accountable to the Parliament'. It was a document released by Dean Brown just prior to the last election. Some of these quotes are a little laughable if the Premier intends to oppose the committee's recommendations. I can see that the Minister for Transport finds this extremely humorous. She must know more about the Premier's views on this than we do. But listen to this quote where, under the heading 'Accessible Government', the Premier said:

A Liberal Government will insist the public is at all times fully informed about Government decisions and activities.

How does that statement sit with the Premier's opposing the recommendations being put forward by the Statutory Authorities Review Committee?

The Hon. Anne Levy: No, he's not opposing ours: he opposed the Economic and Finance Committee's recommendations.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Oh! I thank the honourable member. He also went on to say that a Liberal Government

would ensure that freedom of information legislation was fully effective in providing access to Government information. We know what happened to that promise: it is similar to most of the other promises that have been made.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I note that the Hon. Robert Lawson is interjecting, so I will give him a few more quotes to digest. In the Liberal Party's 1993 policy speech one finds that the Premier said that Parliament must be and must be seen to be a forum for careful scrutiny of legislation and debate of important public issues and the body to which the Government is ultimately accountable. We will be very interested to see what the Premier's thoughts on this matter are. The Hon. Legh Davis—and I commend him on it and hope that he does not get into too much trouble with his colleagues for being honest with us—referred to the Modbury Hospital. I was absolutely shocked to hear that Modbury Hospital is about 12 months behind with its accounting. How would a company listed on the Stock Exchange get away with being over 12 months behind with reporting its financial results? I can tell members what would have happened: it would have been delisted.

I do not know whether or not the promised savings in relation to the Modbury Hospital have something to do with why it is so far behind with disclosing the true picture of its economic situation. We did see a financial document released yesterday that contained a highly dubious and qualified set of cost comparisons which, quite frankly, used assumptions that are impossible to test. However, we look forward to seeing the Modbury Hospital's financial statements. It is interesting to note that, since it was privatised, six to 12 month waiting lists have increased by 55 per cent and that the Health Commission's waiting list figures for January to October 1995 show that the number of patients waiting for surgery at Modbury has increased from 114 to 218.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Did you read the statements to the Parliament yesterday?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I just referred to those statements. Obviously the Minister was too busy having a go at the Hon. Legh Davis for having the temerity to put forward the Statutory Authorities Review Committee's recommendations. In conclusion, because I would not like to take up too much of members' time tonight as I hope to deliver an Address in Reply speech, I once again congratulate the Hon. Legh Davis. I note that he has not only an economics degree but also a law degree. His skills in this area are well known to members of the Council who have any understanding of economic and accounting matters. I congratulate both the Hon. Legh Davis and the Hon. Anne Levy on the recommendations that they put forward. I look forward to every member opposite supporting the recommendations.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I note that the Hon. Angus Redford has been interjecting. I understand that he is a lawyer of some reputation in Adelaide. One would have thought that a person with the Hon. Angus Redford's legal background and skills would have been the first on his feet to congratulate the Statutory Authorities Review Committee. The Hon. Angus Redford has often talked about accountability of Government and the accurate reporting of information. I look forward to the Hon. Angus Redford living up to the many contributions on proper accountability that he has made in this Council and to him being the first on his feet in the Liberal Party Caucus backing up the Hon. Legh Davis when he gets embroiled in another blue with the Premier, who

seems to want to continue to operate one of the most secretive Governments in this country.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MULTICULTURALISM AND ABORIGINAL RECONCILIATION

The House of Assembly transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

That this House—

(a) affirms its support for policies relating to multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation being based upon the principles of non-discrimination, racial harmony, tolerance and the Australian concept of a 'fair go' for all;

(b) recognises that South Australia is a multicultural society which places value on the significant contribution which continues to be made to the development of the State by all South Australians, irrespective of ethnic or racial background;

(c) reaffirms its support for the ongoing process of reconciliation and achieving a greater understanding between Australians of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal background and recognises the special needs of Aboriginal communities, especially in health and education; and

(d) calls for the conduct of public debate concerning multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation to be undertaken according to these principles.

MOTOR VEHICLES (DEMERIT POINTS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Read a first time.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to clarify the intentions of the existing provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 in relation to the disqualification of drivers who accumulate 12 or more demerit points within a three year period. The Points Demerit Scheme was established to contribute to road safety by applying a sanction against drivers who repeatedly offend. The scheme provides that a driver is liable to disqualification from holding or obtaining a licence for three months if an aggregate of 12 or more demerit points is accumulated within a period of three years.

During 1992 the demerit point provisions in the Motor Vehicles Act were amended to ensure that demerit points accrued as a result of offences committed interstate were also included in the aggregate. Recent advice from the Crown Solicitor suggests that an unintended consequence of that amendment may allow the most recent offence not to be included in the aggregate.

The proposed amendment clarifies the intent of the Points Demerit Scheme (introduced in 1992) to ensure that all of the points accumulated by a driver in the preceding three years are included in the aggregate, and will ensure that the scheme continues to operate as an effective deterrent against repeat offenders.

The provisions in relation to this interpretation are retrospective because they clarify the original intent of the Parliament. Failure to provide retrospectivity could result in a large number of damages claims against the Government by drivers who assert that the previous interpretations of the Act, and hence their disqualifications, were made in error. Such retrospectivity will not apply in respect of criminal

proceedings, in cases such as driving while disqualified, where these proceedings apply to an offence which occurred before this amendment and were commenced or completed after the commencement of the amendment. Such cases will be determined by the court.

The proposed amendment also clarifies the Third Schedule of the Act to ensure that drivers who are convicted of exceeding the speed limit by exactly 15, 30 or 45 km/h will accrue demerit points as intended by the National Points Demerit Scheme. In the case of exceeding the speed limit by exactly 15 or 30 km/h the offences will attract 3 points instead of 1 and 4 points instead of 3 respectively. The speeds at which the demerit points have been attributed were previously out of step (by 1 km/h) with the National Points Demerit Scheme.

The existing wording for exceeding the speed limit by 45 km/h was ambiguous and could be interpreted so that four points were accrued. The amendment will also ensure that in the case of exceeding the speed limit by 45 km/h or more the six points required by the National Points Demerit Scheme will be applied. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 98BC—Liability to disqualification

This clause amends section 98BC to clarify the intent of that section. The amendment makes it clear that a person is liable to be disqualified if he or she incurs 12 or more demerit points in a period of three years, up to and including the most recent date on which an offence was committed.

Clause 3: Amendment of Schedule 3

This clause amends schedule 3 of the principal Act to make it consistent with the Uniform National Points Demerit Scheme.

Clause 4: Effect of disqualification notices issued prior to commencement of Act

This clause makes the amendment to section 98BC operate retrospectively except for the purposes of criminal proceedings commenced or completed after the commencement of the amendment that relate to the driving of a vehicle before that commencement.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 15 October. Page 125.)

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In concluding my remarks in this Address in Reply debate, I wish to make a few comments regarding the arts situation in this State. It seems to me that, in recent times, the arts have been falling into the doldrums. People are leaving the State and people are leaving their public jobs in the arts. There has been a whole spate of resignations of top people since the Parliament last met in early August. I quote first the resignation of the CEO of the Department of the Arts, the Artistic Director of the Festival Centre Trust, the resignation of the Artistic Manager of the Adelaide Festival, and the resignation of the CEO of the Jam Factory. A great spate of resignations are occurring.

I make no criticism whatsoever of the individuals concerned, and I certainly wish them all well in their future careers, but when we get this constant loss of senior people in the arts one has to wonder why this is occurring. Are they so despondent and disappointed with the Government

approach to the arts that they just cannot stand their jobs any longer and are looking for alternatives where they will have more freedom and can better express themselves? One strongly suspects that there is a depression and a lack of morale throughout the arts, which results from the penny-pinching approach of the Government, to the lack of vision as to where the arts are going in this State, and that some of the best people can no longer put up with the negative approach and the constant cuts in funding and are leaving their public sector positions to obtain both better remuneration, and particularly more opportunities, for their artistic creativity to express itself in other fields. If this creative drain continues, the arts in this State will indeed be in a very serious situation.

It is not only top administrators who are leaving, I was told that, in the past 18 months, or so, 18 visual artists have left this State. They have obtained better positions elsewhere, mainly in Melbourne or Sydney. They feel stifled in this State, that there are no opportunities for them. Consequently, they have left and South Australia will be the poorer for not having them here contributing to our arts scene. These artists who have left include some of the best and most promising artists that this State has seen in a long time.

It is a tragedy which is occurring, and the lack of vision of this Government will result in South Australia's becoming a backwater in the arts instead of a leader, as it has been in the past under Labor Governments. There is also a question relating to the arts about which I wish to comment and which relates to the board fees that are paid to members of boards in the arts. My information is taken from the Auditor-General's Report, which was tabled recently in Parliament. It is interesting to look at a number of these boards. The directors of the State Theatre Company receive no remuneration at all. It may be that they are entitled to it but have decided not to accept it, and contribute their services voluntarily, and I commend them for this honourable approach.

One member of the board of the State Opera of South Australia receives \$5 000 for serving on that board, the other seven members, I think it is, receive absolutely nothing at all. I am not aware of who the individual is who receives \$5 000. I suspect it may be someone from the private sector who feels it appropriate to receive some remuneration for the time spent away from earning his living: in other words, it is an opportunity cost payment. Again, I commend the other members of the board who selflessly and for no remuneration contribute a great deal of hard work and effort to the success of State Opera in this State.

There are other boards where the remuneration of the board members is not even mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report. I am surprised at this, and I presume that he does not mention the remuneration because it was not given to him in the data provided by the organisations concerned. The Minister for the Arts might care to examine this and see why it is that for the Libraries Board fees for board members is not even mentioned as a topic and, likewise, for the Art Gallery of South Australia, fees for board members is not even mentioned. So whether these people are remunerated for their hard and valuable work, I do not know and nor, I presume, does anyone else.

The South Australian Museum is not even mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report. I cannot understand why the Auditor-General has not audited the books of the Museum. It is not just that any fees—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: There is a qualification in the front of the Auditor-General's Report about the South Australian Museum.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: But there is no mention at all of whether or not the board members of the Museum receive any remuneration. So, we are none the wiser as to whether they do and, if so, how much.

I now turn to other arts boards about which there is information on the board fees which are paid. For the Film Corporation, there are 14 board members, all of whom are paid in the band between \$0 and \$10 000, with a total of \$50 000 being expended. As an average sum, that would be quite a low figure. For the History Trust, again, any fees paid to board members are not mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report. I feel that this is a sad lack. I do not accuse History Trust board members of being overpaid, because it may be that they receive no remuneration. I am sure that, if they do, it is not an exorbitant sum, but I think that the Auditor-General's Report should contain the information as to whether the board members of the History Trust are remunerated.

I mention also Living Health which, while not an arts board, certainly has a very important arts function in this State. The seven board members for Living Health receive remuneration between \$1 000 and \$10 000. The fact that it says \$1 000 I presume means that no-one gets zero, in other words, no-one is working without remuneration, but again it is obviously not a large sum which each person receives. The total remuneration is not given, and I do not know why. The normal procedure is to give the bands within which remuneration of members falls and to give the total amount. That is the situation in the private sector and most annual reports of listed companies provide the information of the bands and the total remuneration of the directors. For some reason, Living Health does not give the total remuneration.

For the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, there are eight board members who receive between \$0 and \$10 000, but the total remuneration to board members is \$39 000. I presume that the chair receives greater remuneration than the ordinary members of the trust but, ignoring that, the remuneration received is obviously less than \$5 000 each on average. That is hardly a munificent sum for the extremely responsible and onerous task which members of the Festival Centre Trust undertake, managing an organisation with millions of dollars worth of assets and with millions of dollars turnover each year. I certainly commend their selflessness in the task that they undertake for obviously small remuneration.

However, I point out that there is one exception to the situation for all the other arts boards which I have quoted for which information is available, and that is the Festival board. There are eight members of the board of the Adelaide Festival who, according to the Auditor-General's Report, receive remuneration between \$0 and \$10 000; yet the total remuneration for the eight board members is \$126 000. Even if all eight received \$10 000, that could not be more than \$80 000, so there is obviously something wrong with the data in the Auditor-General's Report. Either the total is incorrect or the bands are incorrect or the number of directors receiving remuneration is incorrect. I presume that this results from what is commonly called a typo, that is, that some transcription mistake has been made at some stage and I hope that, some time, the Minister for the Arts can inform us what is the true position regarding the Festival board.

If it is true that the total remuneration for Festival board members is \$126 000 a year, that seems totally out of kilter

with the remuneration that is given to board members of other arts organisations. In fact, one might well compare the Festival board with the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. Both boards have extremely responsible positions and the quality of the board can well have a very important effect on the arts life of this State. However, the Festival occurs only once every two years. If the figure of \$126 000 is accurate, the eight members on the Festival board receive an average of \$15 750, whereas the board members of the Festival Centre Trust receive an average of less than \$5 000 each. That seems to me to be disproportionate, when one considers the relative responsibilities of the two organisations.

I do not think it could be said that one of them has three times the importance and three times the responsibility of the other; yet the average remuneration of Festival board members is certainly three times that of the board members of the Festival Centre Trust. Given that the Festival is starting with a debt of \$600 000 around its neck because of the loss of the last Festival, one could suggest that, over two years, the remuneration to the members of that board would make up about 35 per cent of the loss which the Festival incurred.

There is obviously something wrong with the figures in the Auditor-General's Report but, if that figure of total remuneration of \$126 000 is correct, there should be a reconsideration of that remuneration, which is so disproportionate compared with all the other board remunerations relating to arts bodies. The money saved in this way could well be put to reducing the debt hanging around the neck of the next Festival as a result of the losses on the last Festival. That could make a considerable difference to the finances of the 1998 Festival.

When in Edinburgh recently, I discovered that members of the Edinburgh Festival board, who have the responsibility of producing a Festival comparable with the Adelaide Festival, not every two years but every year, receive no remuneration at all. They undertake their duties on a completely voluntary basis, and I can assure the Council that the list of board members of the Edinburgh Festival contains many luminaries from the British arts scene, as well as highly influential and important industrialists, and top figures from throughout the British Isles.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Do you think we should be doing that here?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I see no reason, if the Edinburgh Festival can run so successfully with no remuneration for its board members, why the same could not be expected in Adelaide for the Adelaide Festival and that the quarter of a million dollars that this would save could be put to very good use by the festival in producing a top-class event.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Where do you get a quarter of a million dollars from?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: \$126 000 per year for two years is quarter of a million.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: But you question whether the \$126 000 is right or wrong.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Well, there is something wrong because eight times between nought and \$10 000 cannot equal \$126 000.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: I assure you it is not right.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I would be very interested to have a correction either from the Minister for the Arts or from the Auditor-General. But there is obviously something wrong about the data as presented.

There are other interesting matters which arise looking at the Auditor-General's Report relating to the Adelaide Festival

Board. If we compare its income and expenditure for the 1996 and the 1994 Festivals, we can see that in both years grants received from the South Australian Government and other grants—which would include the Australia Council and other Government organisations—account for about a third of the total income. Likewise, the Edinburgh Festival receives about a third of its income in grants. There is a difference, of course. The Edinburgh Festival receives half its total grants from the Edinburgh City Council, which provides £1 million per year, which is equivalent to \$2 million per year, to the Edinburgh Festival. There is no doubt that the Edinburgh City Council is fully conscious of the enormous benefits which the annual Edinburgh Festival brings to that city.

One cannot but compare the generosity of the Edinburgh City Council to its Festival to the approach of the Adelaide City Council to its Festival. I appreciate that the Adelaide City Council has increased its grant to the Adelaide Festival in recent years and it is certainly taking the Festival more seriously than it did until quite recently. So there has been an improvement. However, it is still derisory compared to the effort made by the Edinburgh City Council.

If we look at the income and expenditure of the Adelaide Festival Board as set out in the Auditor-General's Report, we notice that sponsorship rose from 11 per cent of total income in 1994 to 21 per cent of income in 1996, a commendable increase in sponsorship. However, it is still a lot lower in proportion than provided by sponsorship to the Edinburgh Festival, where about 30 per cent of the income comes from sponsorship. That is 50 per cent greater than the Adelaide Festival enjoys. One can only extrapolate that the Edinburgh Festival is more appreciated by the business and commercial community of the United Kingdom—and of Scotland in particular—than the Adelaide Festival is here.

Box office accounted for about 25 per cent of the income of the Adelaide Festival, both for 1994 and for 1996. Again, the Edinburgh Festival receives nearly one-third of its income from box office, but it is interesting to note that its ticket prices are comparable to those of the Adelaide Festival. It does not want its ticket prices to climb to those which are demanded at some of the more elite festivals in Britain, such as the Glyndebourne opera festival, the Wrexford opera festival or even the Chichester theatre festival, where tickets of the order of £100 are not unusual; that is, \$200 for a seat. The Edinburgh Festival does not charge those prices. As I say, its prices are very comparable to those charged by the Adelaide Festival.

In fact, in order to keep the festival accessible to people on low incomes, a small number of seats are reserved for sale for every performance on the day of the performance itself at ticket prices of £5, which is equivalent to \$10. For every performance on the day itself a limited number of seats are available at these low prices. This is done deliberately so that students and people on low incomes, provided that they are prepared to queue from fairly early in the morning to obtain these tickets when the box office opens, can be sure of seeing some of the top quality shows of the world that are presented at the Edinburgh Festival.

Turning again to the Auditor-General's Report relating to the Adelaide Festival board and looking at the expenditure side, one realises that there are very important comparisons to be made between the 1994 and 1996 festivals. Whilst the amount spent on administration was strictly comparable for the festivals, the marketing budget is really extraordinary. In 1994, \$890 000 was spent on marketing, and this was 10 per cent of the total expenditure of the festival. In 1996,

\$3 420 000 was spent on marketing, and that was nearly 30 per cent of the total expenditure of the festival: a rise from 10 per cent of total expenditure to 30 per cent of total expenditure on marketing. I suggest that the board needs to look at this very carefully.

It seems to me that the marketing strategy must have had faults with it, where there has been about a 400 per cent increase in marketing costs, yet the result is an enormous deficit of \$600 000. It may be that, if less had been spent on marketing, the deficit could have been reduced. But that is an extraordinary difference between the 1994 and the 1996 festivals, about which I hope the Minister is asking questions of the festival board.

Making further comparisons, the Writers' Week and Artists' Week components were very similar between the two festival years. They constitute only about 8 per cent of the total expenditure of the festival. If I may make comparisons with Edinburgh again, the Edinburgh Festival board is responsible only for the performing arts section of its festival. The Writers' Week equivalent is run by a completely separate board, as is the film festival, which occurs at the same time, as is the jazz festival, which occurs at the same time and as is the Edinburgh Tattoo. These are quite separate events that are not under the control of the festival board.

So, in some respects the festival board in Edinburgh has less responsibility than that of the Adelaide Festival board. Even the arts exhibitions are not in any way the responsibility of the festival board in Edinburgh, being organised as they are by the individual venues. I understand that these various organising bodies do get together to make sure that their efforts are coordinated, but this is done in a voluntary capacity with no overarching responsibility being taken by the festival board.

The outdoor program is interesting. Consisting of largely free events, it virtually doubled in expenditure between 1994 and 1996 but remains a fairly small proportion of the total festival budget.

Again making comparisons with the Edinburgh Festival, the outdoor program there is not organised by the festival board at all; it is completely paid for and organised by individual sponsors. The wonderful outdoor concert and magnificent fireworks display are completely organised and paid for by the Bank of Scotland. It must cost them a huge amount, given the quality of the organisation and the quality of the fireworks display, which is a lengthy display lasting nearly an hour.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: And stunning.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Absolutely stunning, but it is completely paid for and organised by a sponsor, the Bank of Scotland, which should be congratulated for its efforts. It contributes a significant highlight of what is called the Edinburgh Festival yet officially it does not come under the organisation of the festival board at all, although doubtless there is coordination and discussions in its organisation.

I have touched on certain items in the Auditor-General's Report relating to arts organisations. Obviously a great deal more can be said of the Auditor-General's Report, but there is a separate motion on the notice paper relating to the Auditor-General's Report when more detailed comments can be made.

I reiterate my earlier comment that I am fearful for the future of the arts in this State with a brain drain, low morale and constant cuts in resources. It is not surprising that morale is dropping, that people are leaving, that there is consternation, a feeling that the arts are drifting, that there is no vision

and that the future is unfocused and grim. It will certainly be a sad day if Jeff Kennett achieves his aim of making Victoria the premier arts State of this country. There is no doubt that the Adelaide Festival has a very high international reputation. Most people associated in any way with the Edinburgh Festival are fully cognisant of the existence of the Adelaide Festival and, as yet, it has a very high reputation. It is recognised as having a standard comparable to Edinburgh, and there is not the same recognition or appreciation of the Melbourne Festival.

I hope that that situation does not change—that the Melbourne Festival does not outshine the Adelaide Festival. I would have thought that the Adelaide Festival was one of the few things that South Australia had going for it at the moment and that we should be making the most that we can out of it. I would certainly hope that we do not sink further and lose our reputation both within Australia and internationally as having had—as it is no longer the case—the best arts in the country. I support the motion.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I join other members in congratulating our new Governor Sir Eric Neal on his speech in opening this session of Parliament, and I welcome he and Lady Neal back to South Australia. I also add my good wishes to the many already expressed to Dame Roma Mitchell in her retirement. I am sure that history will continue to judge Dame Roma as one of the truly great South Australians of this century. She is an outstanding example to us all, particularly to women in public life. Her energy, exuberance and limitless ability for sheer hard work will be remembered by all of us. In speaking tonight I wish to congratulate the Government on getting the State's finances back on track. The pain endured whenever we are asked to practise fiscal responsibility, whether on a personal basis or as a State, is never easy, but the people of South Australia have responded to this need and will soon begin to reap the rewards.

The Governor spoke of the \$11.1 million strategy for Eyre Peninsula. I chaired the task force for that strategy and I am very proud of its achievements. I spoke at length on the strategy in my last Address in Reply, so I do not propose to go over that again except to report that the strategy committee is up and running and is operating most efficiently under the chairmanship of Mr Geoff Pearson. Most Government appointments have been made, and today for the first time I was able to listen to the person who is overseeing the strategy for the desalination of the salted area in Lower Eyre Peninsula. When that strategy is up and running, with the cooperation of the farmers involved, it should add many millions of dollars worth of potential economic development to this State in the form of reclaiming once fertile grain growing land in that area.

I also draw the attention of the Council to the fact that once again only a few people will be responsible for the majority of the export income of this State—our primary producers. Of course, 'primary' means 'first', so they are the first generators of income in this State. Our farmers, fishers and miners are the creators of the true wealth of this State, and as a Government we must begin to pay due regard to the enormous input of these people who often live in isolated circumstances.

Of immense excitement to me—and I hope to all citizens of South Australia—is the proposed expansion of the Olympic Dam mine. This mine is the fifth largest copper mine in the world and has approximately 200 years of

reserves. I have been told on good authority that it has such a huge mineral deposit that it would still be the fifth largest copper mine in the world and extraordinarily profitable even if there were no uranium, no gold and no silver in the deposit. It would be a profitable uranium mine if there were no copper, no gold and no silver, and it would be a viable gold and silver mine without any copper or uranium. We need always to remember that Olympic Dam is, in fact, a copper mine and that the other minerals are by-products.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: Well, that is what I have been told by the principals of the Western Mining Company at current market prices. The expansion proposed by the Western Mining Company—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: According to the Labor Party, this was to be a mirage in the desert.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: As the Minister quite rightly interjects, it is meant to be a mirage in the desert. The expansion proposed by Western Mining Company will cost it \$1.2 billion. It will double production and double the royalties payable within our State; 1 300 construction jobs will be created at Roxby Downs; and, with an estimated flow-on of 6:1, this equates to over 6 000 jobs over the next four years in South Australia. This is surely the most exciting economic development to take place in South Australia for very many years.

Just as exciting are the aeromagnetic surveys which suggest further mineral deposits of similar magnitude in the north and west of this State. By the end of the year, we will have increased exploration expenditure over the past five years by 300 per cent to \$35 million, and I am confident that this will pay dividends in the near future.

One area which appears to have extraordinary prospects is the pipe formation which is to be found in the Yumbera National Park. I beg the Opposition to display the good sense to support further exploration in that area. Having recently visited the Ranger uranium mine on the edge of the Kakadu National Park, I am more than ever convinced that with good commonsense and goodwill mining and environmental issues can co-exist quite happily.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Were you there during the wet season?

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: No, I was there during the dry season, as the honourable member well knows. Any move to block further exploration in Yumbera would be seen by those who live nearby as a cynical exercise by those who do not live nearby but in fact live in urban areas. For industry, particularly primary industry, to thrive in South Australia, it is vital that we have efficient, cost-effective freight systems. I commend the Government on its commitment to the upgrading of the Adelaide Airport, and I look forward to further details on the development of a deep sea port system. These will make our State cost competitive on a world scale.

Perhaps the most vital link of all is the completion of the Alice Springs-Darwin rail link. This has long been a hobby-horse of mine, and I am pleased that our Government continues to pursue this project together with the Northern Territory Government. I believe that its completion would at last set us up as a central region for freight throughout Australia. As an aside, it interests me that the only real opposition to this project always seems to come from the populous and verbose Eastern States. Could it be that they do not like the idea of competition?

I have collected some interesting facts about the Alice Springs-Darwin rail link which I would like to share with members. It would be a standard gauge line 1 410 kilometres long, and its construction would employ 2 000 people over four years. A further 200 people would be required to operate it and maintain it. Its construction would require 1 700 cubic metres of earthworks, 120 new bridges and 1 220 culverts. It would also need buildings and workshops costing \$26 million. These would use approximately 3 500 tonnes of structural steel, 100 000 cubic metres of reinforced concrete, 155 000 tonnes of steel rails, 9.2 million spring steel fasteners, 2.3 million sleepers and 15 kilometres of concrete culvert pipe as well as 2 million cubic metres of ballast. The boost this would give to the economy, particularly in towns such as Port Augusta and Whyalla, is almost too great to imagine. Environmentally, the railway will reduce road traffic and, therefore, stop the emission of 100 000 tonnes of carbon dioxide *per annum*. Over a 50 year period, it would also save 2 million litres of fuel. Current analysis shows that the railway would carry 1.19 billion tonnes—a considerable upgrade on the previous estimates of 785 000 tonnes.

An integrated system of rail shipping out of Darwin—and, as many members would know, dredging for the deep sea port at Darwin is well advanced, at a cost of some \$80 million, and is 18 months ahead of schedule—would be highly competitive with air freight out of the Eastern States. For example, it would cut 12 days off sea freight from Melbourne to Nagoya and 15 days off the same trip from Adelaide. Expressions of interest have already been received to transport some 280 000 tonnes of freight between Japan and Australia, and other countries have shown similar interest. People have long said that Australia needs a big project—something on which to centre our minds and energies and something of major economic benefit. The Alice Springs to Darwin rail link is that project, and I urge all members of Parliament, of whatever political persuasion, to get behind it in whatever way they possibly can. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: In my contribution I intend to examine the results of the Brown Government's economic policies and the commitment by its Ministers to election promises made at the 1993 State election, as well as some promises made since then. The Brown Government has been in office for nearly three years. In that time, it has implemented a vast range of measures which it believed would reduce debt, boost business confidence and raise living standards. While some of the consequences of Government economic strategies may take years to be felt, there is a growing body of evidence that indicates that the Government's policies have failed to achieve their set goals. The Brown Government's economic policies are based largely on conservative economic ideology which accepts, first, that smaller Government is better and, secondly, that services are both cheaper and more efficient if carried out by the private sector—hence the move to privatisation or contracting out of many Government services, with which I will deal in more detail later.

Where previous South Australian Governments had actively used the public sector to promote growth over and above that which might have otherwise occurred, the Brown Government's economic policies have shifted the boundary between the public and private sectors in favour of the latter. While earlier Labor and Liberal South Australian State Governments have generally been pragmatic in their approach to the economy, to a large extent the Brown Government has

abandoned that pragmatism and is locked into following economic orthodoxy ever more rigidly.

Within days of its election, the Brown Government announced the appointment of a Commission of Audit to undertake a broad ranging review of South Australian public sector finances. Its recommendations for reducing the State's debt and size of Government were underpinned liberally by neoclassical economic arguments asserting the superior performance and efficiency of markets over Governments in allocating resources and providing goods and services. The new Government used the report to justify the economic direction taken by it. The truth of the matter is that the real agenda of the Brown Government is to transfer resources from the public to the private sector, which it unreservedly believes to be more efficient and, where possible, to ensure that the private sector is the driving force of the economy.

The Brown Government's advocacy of free market solutions, of smaller government, through the corporatisation, privatisation and contracting out of the public sector, owes more to ideological conservative orthodoxy than to any real analysis of South Australia's economic position.

With these points in mind I will begin by giving a quick overview of the current position of the South Australian economy before moving on to examine the results of the Government's economic policies from both an economic and a social perspective. I will then conclude with an assessment of the commitment by each of the Government's Ministers to the promises made by the Liberal Party at the last State election. I do not promise that that examination will be totally exhaustive, because I might well have overlooked a number of promises which were made and which have not been honoured.

In a general overview of the South Australian economy, at the moment the South Australian economy is riding on the back of the agricultural sector following an improvement in 1995 which boosted growth that year. But despite a massive jump in rural exports, the South Australian economy must still be described as being generally weak. Unemployment remains at a high level, and I will say more about that at a later date, in particular youth unemployment. Employment growth remains disappointingly slow. Activity remains at low levels in many key sectors such as retailing, motor vehicle sales and home building activities. Other signs of continuing fragility in the South Australian economy include falling private new capital expenditure. More than four years out from recession, South Australia has not been able to achieve a sustained lift in capital expenditure.

At the 1993 State election key Liberal economic promises and targets included the following: a 4 per cent annual growth in State product; the creation of 12 000 new jobs in the first year of office and the creation of 200 000 jobs over the 10 years to 2004; and export growth of 15 per cent per annum. What have been the results of three years of Liberal Government? I took those quotes directly from the *Advertiser* of 9 June, which set out a summary of some of the promises made by the Liberal Party prior to the election.

Gross State product is up 5.3 per cent in 1995-96, the result of a sharp rise in rural exports. This number overstates the general health of the economy. Activity in most sectors of the South Australian economy remains much weaker than this. Retail sales are up only 2.8 per cent. The majority of retailers continue to experience flat to weak sales. One has only to speak with small business people to ascertain firsthand the difficult economic conditions that small businesses are attempting to grapple with in South Australia.

There was a 7.9 per cent fall in new vehicle sales. New vehicle sales are an important indicator both of the State's economic health and of the future prospects of the State because of the industry's significant presence in South Australia. New motor vehicle sales continue to be very volatile. The underlying trend is one of essentially zero growth, a situation which has persisted for 18 months. New home approvals are up 3.9 per cent, but home building activity remains at a very weak level. I understand that it is predicted that about 6 000 homes will be built in South Australia, which does not compare very favourably with figures if we go back five and 10 years, when 10 000 to 13 000 homes were being built in South Australia.

The main reasons for the continued low level of building activity are the changing demographics of the State and the slowing down of the South Australian economy. House prices in most localities have declined in the past 12 months, and recent figures released today show at long last that there was a small increase in the demand for new homes. But there is a long way to go before the housing sector is anywhere near back to making a substantial contribution to economic growth and playing its vital role in providing urgently needed jobs for South Australians.

Capital spending in manufacturing is down 11.9 per cent. Across all industries, it is down 25.9 per cent. Investment by private business has turned down sharply in the past 12 months and is now almost back to the same poor level seen in the wake of the 1991-92 recession. Exports comprise 70.8 per cent rural product, 2.3 per cent manufacturing, and 17 per cent all goods. The sharp slow down in the growth of manufactured exports is a matter for some concern, since this is a key component in lifting South Australia's economic growth prospects.

Manufactured exports from South Australia rose only 2.3 per cent in 1995-96, less than the rate of inflation. While there were exports in rural products, depicting strong growth, the overall growth prospects for the State are dependent upon a lift in total exports, not just in one or two areas. I think the Hon. Carolyn Schaefer, who obviously has strong links with the rural and farming community, would know only too well how fickle rural production can be and how much farmers can be subject to the vagaries of climate and fluctuations in commodity prices. So, there is no point in relying on a rural product export boom here in South Australia. It could be here one year and gone the next. At a time when we find—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Well, we took a bit of a hit in Port Lincoln with the tuna fishing. That was an excellent example of some of the problems that farmers and people involved in the agricultural industry have. They can sow their crops when prices are high, as well might be the case this year. It would appear that we are headed for very substantial harvests this year, but whilst it is encouraging to note that farmers will be rewarded with a great harvest, it is disturbing to note the decline in commodity prices, particularly for wheat. The point I am trying to make, that the Hon. Angus Redford just mentioned—and I would have thought that he would agree with me—farming and engaging in primary production can be a risky business.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer: Absolutely!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Well, my father used to be a farmer—not a very big one, and apparently not a very successful one, because he left that to go to work with the Australian Workers Union, but at least he kept his links with farming. He used to impress upon me constantly the difficul-

ties that faced farmers, and I can recall as a young teenager my father disagreeing with what he often referred to as a bit of farmer bashing. I would find that he would constantly stick up for the farmers. I guess that was due to the fact that our ancestors, including my grandfather and my father, came from the land. I was brought up to have some sympathy for them.

Whilst I take the Hon. Angus Redford's point, I hope he is also accepting the point that I am making. To rely on a 70.8 per cent increase in our rural product, to point to the 5.3 per cent increase in our Gross State Product for the year is not necessarily relying on a terribly sound foundation. What is worrying is that there has been only a 2.3 per cent increase in our manufacturing exports, and that is the point I was trying to make.

Employment is up only .7 per cent. That is one of the areas that concerns both me and the Opposition greatly. Employment growth in South Australia remains weak with the total number of persons employed up only .7 per cent in the past 12 months. Unemployment in South Australia is currently 9.8 per cent and is likely to go higher. Male full-time employment in South Australia remains almost 10 per cent below its level in 1990-91. In almost five years there has been little recovery in this area. In this respect South Australia has performed far worse than any other State bar Tasmania.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Since 1991.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: That is correct.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Why is that?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I will come to that if you give me some time. To make matters worse, in the past four years an estimated 20 883 more people left the State than moved to it. I understand that this is the highest sustained interstate migration loss on record and without this net migration out of South Australia the State's population growth would have been more than doubled. The high level of outflow also disguises the depth of South Australia's poor economic performance. For example, if these people had remained in South Australia, the unemployment rate would in fact be in the range of 10.5 per cent to 11.2 per cent. Is that what Dean Brown means by, 'Going all the way'?

While the Brown Government claims its policies 'show a commitment to rebuilding the State's economy', it has increasingly added to the State's unemployment levels through its downsizing of the public sector. Between December 1993 and December 1995, the Government reduced the size of the public sector in South Australia by 10 521 positions. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a table for South Australian public sector job cuts 1993-94 and 1994-95.

Leave granted.

Table 1: South Australian Public Sector Job Cuts 1993-1995

Agency	1993-94	1994-95
Arts & Cultural Development	53	67
Attorney-Generals	47	35
Building Management	352	197
Courts Administration Authority	21	44
Correctional Services	58	144
Environment & Natural Resources	106	75
Education & Children's Services	841	1131
SA Water	327	396
Family & Community Services	91	75
Mines & Energy	41	20
Office of Information Technology	15	24
Police	23	33
Primary Industries	253	296
South Australian Health Commission	704	1277
South Australian Housing Trust	195	62

State Services	211	64
Transport	343	383
ETSA	741	212
Ports Corporation (Marine & Harbours)	69	27
TransAdelaide	315	219
Other	248	203
Total	5281	5243

Source: the *Advertiser*, 28 December 1995, p.3

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: These losses go right across the board in all Government departments but, quite clearly, the majority of the cuts fell in the education and health sectors. If one looks at table 1, one can see that in 1993-94 there was a loss of 841 positions in Education and Children's Services which jumped to 1 131 in 1994-95. So much for the Minister for Education's commitment towards improving education here in South Australia. If one looks at the Health Commission, one can see that in 1993-94, 704 jobs were lost and this quickly accelerated in 1994-95 to 1 277 jobs.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I will come to that. The Hon. Angus Redford is interjecting and would like to know what impact this might have had on either the quality or quantity of services. It is a very pertinent interjection and one which I anticipated so I am happy to assure him that I intend to adequately answer that interjection in about five minutes. The acceleration of retrenchments in key areas such as Education and Children's Services and in the South Australian Health Commission is of grave concern to the Opposition, as I am sure it must be to many South Australians.

These losses go right across the board of all Government departments. It is quite obvious when one looks at the table—and I can see the Minister for Transport studying it intensely at the moment—that if the trends as outlined continue to accelerate, then as far as education and health are concerned South Australia will be in grave trouble. We are not quite sure how many more Public Service jobs are planned to be eliminated by the Government come 1 July 1997, but on 28 December the *Advertiser* reported that the Government planned to eliminate a further 3 200 Public Service jobs by 1997. It would be a real worry if the Government were looking at cutting more jobs and more services in the critical areas of education and health.

I will deal with some of the impacts on our State education and health systems shortly. The undeniable fact remains that South Australia has the highest unemployment rate on mainland Australia, and this is at a time when the Government is hell-bent on eliminating jobs in the public sector. South Australia recorded an unemployment rate of 9.8 per cent in September, whilst the national rate stood at 8.7 per cent. I was hoping that the Hon. Legh Davis would be here to challenge these figures if they are incorrect, but I understand he is currently speaking with the Premier about his latest contribution on the recommendations of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee.

If the Hon. Angus Redford challenges the veracity of my figures, I am quite happy to provide him with the reference number if he would like to take the time to look at the statistics released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. If they are wrong, then I apologise for misleading the Council. They are not my figures but figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, catalogue 6202.0, if the honourable member wishes to look them up later on. The Government's own independent report prepared by the Centre for Economic Studies on the South Australian economy stated that employ-

ment growth would remain relatively low for the rest of the decade.

The report predicted that, with an average growth rate in employment of just 1.6 per cent, the State's unemployment rate could take up to 10 years to fall below 8 per cent. I obtained that information from the *Advertiser*, our esteemed daily publication about which the Hon. Mr Paul Holloway spoke so highly earlier in the day. I am sure that those figures are correct. The situation is much worse for youth unemployment, which has grown from 27.9 per cent in January 1995 to 38.9 per cent in September 1996—once again, the highest on mainland Australia and well above the national youth average of 30.2 per cent.

This is a disgraceful figure by anyone's standard, and one of which the Government should be totally ashamed, but it is obvious to see from the expressions on their faces that Government members are not ashamed of it at all. One of the effects of the high level of youth unemployment is that many of South Australia's best and finest are leaving to look for work interstate because they cannot find work here.

I was recently asked by my 17-year old son whether he could go to Queensland because he might be able to find a job up there. As he is under 18, I would not let him go. There is documented evidence of increased drug use and one only has to look at the Winefield Tiggeman report of 1993. There is documented evidence of high youth suicides and the enormous pressure placed on families with young unemployed people. There is disturbing new research by Mr Peter Turner, the Principal of Salisbury High School, which shows that after six months of unemployment year 12 students lose the benefits of their study from years 11 and 12 and that after 12 months of unemployment year 12 student skill levels have fallen to those of year 10 students. It is totally unacceptable that, with youth unemployment rates as high as they are, the Brown Government still has no youth employment policy.

It is time for a rethink by the Government, and perhaps the first step could be the establishment of a State employment authority as the key coordination and policy organisation for South Australia. Among other things, the authority would oversee the implementation and coordination of policy and program initiatives through all relevant State Government departments and report directly to the Premier and Cabinet. Perhaps the Government could consider setting up a central fund to provide resources to schools with low retention rates and to develop and extend viable programs for youths at risk. When we move around the community and talk to parents of teenagers, we find that not only are parents becoming increasingly concerned and alarmed about the likely job prospects for their teenage children at school, but they are also having to cope and deal with the fact that they have unemployed children at home.

Many families are in working class suburbs where youth unemployment rates are significantly higher than 38.9 per cent. I am a politician and I get well paid, but I am talking about families where they might have only one breadwinner who might be working at GMH or Mitsubishi and bringing in \$30 000 or \$35 000 a year—with overtime. Their base rate would be less than that, and these people are trying to cope not with one child who cannot get a job but in some cases with two or three unemployed children. We have hundreds and hundreds of situations in South Australia where parents are trying to cope. I can see that the Government is not interested in youth unemployment, and that is obvious by the lack of a coordinated approach to what is arguably the most

serious problem that we face in South Australia at the moment.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: They're waiting for the *Advertiser* to draw up a policy.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: That may well be true. It is particularly disappointing. Like other members of this Chamber and another place, I have teenage children who are unemployed and it is of grave concern to the Opposition that, after three years in office, the Government still has no coordinated youth policy. I am not sure whether the Minister for Transport is trying to send me a message by turning her back, but I am assuming that she is trying to get better light for reading and I will not take it as an insult.

As a parent, I come into contact with a lot of young people who cannot get a job. It seems to be that, if you have a child who is unemployed, it is often the case that most of his mates and their girlfriends, etc., are experiencing difficulty, too. I do not know whether it is just the friends that my son keeps or whether this is some kind of an epidemic sweeping through the youth of South Australia, but I can assure members, and I would like to impress upon the Government and hopefully the Minister for Transport will take this message back to Cabinet, that youth unemployment is currently a tragedy here in South Australia.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Thank you for the interjection. It is a shocking tragedy for the youth of South Australia; yet we have a Government and a Premier that seem to care very little about it. One can only assume that, in his position, he has been able to find jobs for all his children and all his relatives, but I can assure you, Mr Acting President—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: He didn't get one for his mate.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: He has not been able to get one for everybody, as we know. Poor old Abdo missed out. The Hon. Angus Redford is currently in the chair, and you are a lawyer, Mr Acting President, and I have no doubt that over the past three years you have probably had occasion to represent a few clients who are young and unemployed. I am sure that you would agree with me that a top priority for this Government must be getting our young people back to work.

Let us consider some of the social implications of what happens to these young people when they are not working. They get involved in a no-work culture. They get that way that getting up in the morning is a bit of a problem because there is nothing to get up for. It just means that you have got to hang around for the rest of the day. Most of the young people to whom I have spoken genuinely want to work. If there were jobs out there, they would grab them.

My son had a job at one stage, and I asked him one night why he was so tired. It was 6.30 at night and he had gone to sleep watching TV. I woke him up and said, 'You had better go to bed, son, if you are tired. What is wrong? Have you been working hard today?' He then recounted the story to me. He had been employed by a builder, and at 16 years of age he was the labourer on the site, and he had been carrying bricks all day up and down scaffolds. For this he was receiving the princely sum of \$6 an hour cash. I can assure you, Mr Acting President, that I did not let him stay in that job very long.

The Brown Government's failed economic strategies are also having serious social consequences, and I should like to spend a short time to examine the four important areas of health, education, transport and housing. It is difficult to measure the impact of the Government's massive cuts to the health system as there is generally a long lead time before the

cuts to services are reflected in the quality of service provision. Nevertheless, available information shows that the Brown Government cuts are a disaster for both the level and quality of health services in this State. In 1995-96, \$1.476 billion was spent on health care in South Australia.

As part of its debt reduction strategy, in the first two years alone the Brown Government reduced spending on health by some \$80 million or the equivalent to closing two Modbury Hospitals. Significant cuts in job numbers have occurred in the health area under the Brown Government. Between 1993-94 and 1994-95, 1 983 jobs were cut from the health area or approximately 20 per cent of the total public sector cuts. The Government cuts to health have led to both debt problems and reduced services for many South Australian hospitals. Health budget cuts have left five of the largest metropolitan hospitals with a collective debt of \$44 million: the Royal Adelaide Hospital, \$12 million in debt; the Flinders Medical Centre, \$10 million; the Lyell McEwin Hospital, \$1 million; and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, \$13.9 million—and I apologise to the Council for providing out-of-date figures. These figures were as at November 1995, so one would assume that, with the way our hospitals are running into debt, that figure is now in excess of \$50 million.

In an attempt to tackle the problem of rising health care costs, the former Arnold Labor Government had examined the opportunities for reducing costs through casemix funding and contestability. Casemix works on the basis that the hospitals claim a set fee for each medical service. If the hospital is able to perform the surgery more cheaply than the fee, the hospital keeps the balance. The Brown Government was quick to adopt casemix and contestability as its own but, rather than use them to change the culture of health care delivery, the Government has used them as an instrument to implement cutbacks. The introduction of casemix funding has led to a number of problems for the health system. First, it was dumped onto hospitals at the same time as they suffered severe budget cuts, leaving hospitals to manage financial difficulties. Secondly, in the lead up to the 1993 State election, the Brown Government promised that savings returned through the introduction of casemix would create savings of between \$40 million and \$50 million, which would then be returned to the health system to improve patient services.

This does not accord with statements made later by the Minister for Health, Dr Michael Armitage, in Parliament on Wednesday 27 September 1995 when he announced that \$35 million of the health budget had been returned to Treasury. If anyone would like confirmation of that—I can see that the Minister for Transport does not believe me—I refer them to *Hansard* on 22 September 1995.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I am sorry, I did not pick up that interjection from the Hon. Ron Roberts. Did the honourable member tell me that the Minister for Transport was not listening so she could not be upset? The Brown Government's cuts have also led to reductions in both the quality and quantity of services at many of the State's public hospitals. It is interesting to note that the interjections from the other side of the Chamber have dropped off somewhat sharply since we changed our Acting President. However, I did promise the interjector at the time that I would go into some details in relation to the impact that the reduced services have had in South Australia and I will do that now in relation to health. It would appear that the Minister for Transport is not in good health at the moment, either. Perhaps the

honourable member had better go to one of these hospitals and have her hip seen to.

The Brown Government's cuts have also led to reductions in both the quality and quantity of services at many of the State's public hospitals. At the Queen Elizabeth Hospital 50 beds were closed, two wards were shut down, 90 nursing positions disappeared and an estimated 5 000 patients were turned away in a bid to meet budget cuts. At the Women's and Children's Hospital the average waiting time for patients to see a specialist doctor has grown to 12 months—a direct result of budget cuts. At the Flinders Medical Centre a cut of—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yes, anything is possible. At the Flinders Medical Centre a cut of 15 per cent in the 1994-95 budget resulted in the closure of 100 beds, an operating theatre and the shedding of 191 staff through targeted separation packages. The hospital's management has also frozen replacement of staff vacancies, asked staff to take leave without pay and reduced elective activity during selected periods.

The Brown Government is progressively introducing privatisation as a means of reducing costs in the health care system, the Modbury hospital being the most obvious example. Just to assure the Minister for Transport that I did read the ministerial statement today, I will refer to it in a minute or two. The private management of Modbury hospital, previously one of the most efficiently run hospitals in the State, began in February 1995. Healthscope, the firm that took control of the management of the hospital, promised \$6 million a year in savings to the Government. Evidence of this occurring is as yet nowhere to be seen.

A cost benefit analysis of services in the 1995-96 financial year was released by the South Australian Health Commission yesterday. It contains a dubious and highly qualified set of cost comparisons using assumptions that are impossible to test, particularly estimates of the cost overruns that might otherwise have been recorded. It is just a first step in the development of a political argument to review the Healthscope contract, a review which is designed to put money into Healthscope's bottom line and which will not improve the efficiency of Modbury Hospital or health outcomes for the people of Modbury one iota. Instead, Healthscope has reduced staff numbers, downsized services, and, incredibly, contracted out its anaesthetic and intensive care services back to the public health system through the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Further, since the management of the Modbury Hospital has been privatised, 6 to 12 month waiting lists have increased by 55 per cent. The Health Commission's figures on waiting lists for January to October 1995 show that the number of patients waiting for surgery at Modbury Hospital has increased from 140 to 218.

The highly respected academic from the Department of Labour Studies at the University of Adelaide, Dr Ray Broomhill, has consistently argued that there is no theoretical or empirical evidence to support the argument that outsourcing of hospital management saves money. Instead, he argues that reforms to the health service by the Brown Government are nothing more than a political stance. They have nothing to do with making the system more efficient but are based on 'a highly dubious accelerated debt reduction program.' I am quite happy to provide members of the Government with the reference if they would like it.

I hope that that satisfies the Hon. Angus Redford in relation to how some of these measures have impacted on the

quality and quantity of services. From the silence in the Chamber it would appear that I have more than adequately responded to the interjections of the Hon. Angus Redford. What was even more surprising was the startling and shocking revelation of the Hon. Legh Davis today that Healthscope has not provided the Government with its financial statement for over 12 months. As he correctly pointed out, if this was a publicly listed company it would have been delisted by now and would be under investigation by the ASC.

I turn now to how the Brown Government's cuts have impacted on education. I am somewhat disappointed that the Minister for Education and Children's Services has chosen not to stay here and listen to this, because I spent some time preparing—

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting President. It is not accepted practice to reflect on whether or not members are present in the Chamber. It is not possible to be present at all times. This is a longstanding practice, but it does not seem to be one that is respected by the honourable member.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. A.J. Redford): I do not accept the point of order, but I warn the honourable member that it is inappropriate to reflect on other members.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Mr Acting President, I cannot see how I was reflecting on the Minister for Education and Children's Services. I was merely expressing my disappointment that he was not present to hear what I had to say.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! I have made my ruling, so it is inappropriate for the honourable member to discuss it any further. It is inappropriate for the honourable member to reflect on another member, and it is also inappropriate to reflect on a ruling made by the Chair.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Mr Acting President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Education is a big ticket item for South Australian Governments.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting President. A quorum is not present.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: There is no point of order. A quorum is present.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Mr Acting President, thank you for your guidance in pointing out to me that I am not allowed to refer to the fact that no one is sitting in the Chamber. Education is a big ticket item for South Australian Governments. In 1996, \$1.860 billion was spent on education, or approximately 30 per cent of the State budget. At the 1993 State election, the Liberal Party promised to increase education funding by \$270 million over four years. That promise was made by the now Premier in 1993, just prior to the last State election.

Between July 1994 and March 1996 the Brown Government cut the public education budget by more than \$69 million, closed 23 schools, scrapped 1 000 teacher jobs, slashed 287 SSO school assistant jobs, increased class sizes, cut School Card and cut school maintenance and works funds by \$11 million. At the same time Government funding to non-Government schools increased from \$53.2 million to \$57 million. The cuts by the Brown Government have impacted on the State's public education system in a number of ways, including a fall in Year 12 retention rates, larger class sizes, increased levels of fees and levies paid by parents and the escalation of responsibility for schools by local

communities. South Australian Year 12 retention rates have been in rapid decline since the election of the Brown Government. From a high point of 87.6 per cent in 1992—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I thank the honourable member for his interjection. It is somewhat disconcerting when the level of background noise in the Council becomes so loud that you cannot hear yourself think. When it happens from this side of the Chamber, we get pulled up for it. I will have to repeat what I said, because I am not sure that members opposite heard me. So, I will go back to the beginning. Education is the big ticket item for South Australian Governments. In 1996, \$1.86 billion, or approximately 30 per cent of the State budget, was spent on education. The Brown Government promised at the 1993 State election to increase education funding by \$270 million over four years.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I am surprised that the Hon. Mr Lawson knows that it is repetition; he was engaged in a conversation when I said it about a minute ago. It must have been a good guess on his part. The Brown Government promised at the 1993 State election to increase education funding by \$270 million over four years.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson: And we will.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Hon. Robert Lawson interjects 'We will'. God only knows how many taxes the Government has to put up between now and the next election to meet that promise. I would be interested in the Hon. Robert Lawson's comments on some of the other statistics: that between July 1994 and March 1996 the Brown Government cut the public education budget by more than \$69 million; closed 23 schools—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Rubbish!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has yelled out 'Rubbish'. I stand corrected: it is 26 schools that the Government has closed. He has another 123 to go, and I might be able to appeal against that judgment I got against me. The Government scrapped 1 000 teacher jobs; slashed 287 SSO school assistants' jobs—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It is good to see that the Minister for Education and Children's Services is back in the Chamber and in fine fettle. The Government increased class sizes; cut schoolcard; cut school maintenance and works funds by \$11 million; and, at the same time, Government funding to non-government schools increased from \$53.2 million to \$57 million. So, in response to the Hon. Robert Lawson's interjection, I guess we have some way to go if we are going to increase education funding by \$270 million over four years. The cuts by the Brown Government—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: What, that the promise was nonsense? Does the honourable Minister mean that the Brown Government never promised prior to the 1993 State election to increase education funding by \$270 million over four years?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is right. You find the promise.

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

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Exactly: you can't. It is another one of those things you made up prior to the election.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: No, not at all.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Actually, I have the Minister saying it. It is in the Dean Brown policy speech of 28 November 1993.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: There is no such statement.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: No such statement? Okay. I guess it is like the Minister's ministerial code of conduct: it does not exist, there is no such statement. But I will come to the ministerial code of conduct a little bit later, because you are one Minister in particular who ought to pay special attention to it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I will not be distracted by the interjections from the Minister for Education and Children's Services, but I am so pleased that he came back into the Chamber to hear what I have to say about his

portfolio. The cuts by the Brown Government have impacted on the State's public education system in a number of ways, including falling year 12 retention rates; larger class sizes; increased levels of fees and levies paid by parents; and the escalating of responsibility by local communities for their schools.

South Australian year 12 retention rates have been in rapid decline since the election of the Brown Government. From a high point of 87.6 per cent in 1992 retention rates fell to 62.9 per cent by 1995—the lowest on mainland Australia. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a table showing the retention rates of year 12 students for the period 1990 to 1995 across Australia.

The PRESIDENT: Is it purely statistical?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yes.

Leave granted.

Table 2: Retention Rates of Year 12 Students 1990-95

State	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
NSW	51.4	56.3	64.4	66.5	66.2	64.5
VIC	58.0	71.1	77.9	75.6	73.2	69.9
QLD	66.8	75.4	82.1	79.2	73.7	69.7
SA	64.4	76.8	87.6	80.5	75.5	62.9
WA	58.1	67.1	69.0	72.9	70.5	67.5
TAS	43.2	52.1	59.5	58.9	56.2	57.7
AUS Avg	58.3	66.9	73.8	73.1	70.6	67.2

Source: Schools Australia ABS Cat No. 4221.0

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Mr President, can I give this table to the Minister for Education and Children's Services?

The PRESIDENT: No, the honourable member should stay right where he is.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: But I want him to have a look at it, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It will be collected by an attendant in a moment. I ask the honourable member to leave it on his desk.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I am disappointed that the Minister for Education and Children's Services is not interested in the table, so I will read out some of the statistics for him. If the Minister looks closely at the table, he will see that back in 1992 South Australia had the highest retention rates in the country at 87.6 per cent—a figure that the Government was proud of. The teaching profession, the Institute of Teachers and everybody concerned with education in this State was enormously proud of the fact that in 1992 South Australia had an 87.67 per cent retention rate for year 12 students. Not only did we have the highest rate in the country but also our figure was 13 per cent higher than the average for the rest of Australia.

It saddens me as a parent with two kids at high school—although it obviously does not sadden the Minister for Education and Children's Services, judging by the smile on his face—that we have fallen from 87.6 per cent down to 62.9 per cent. In the space of just three years we have gone from having the highest retention rates in the country to having the lowest retention rates of any State on mainland Australia—the lowest figure on the mainland. We have gone from having the highest figure—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: You have them in front of you. You said that you did not want to read it—now you want me to read out the figures to you. Will you please make up your mind?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: What would you like to know?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It was 75.5 per cent. And it has dropped to 62.9 per cent.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Perhaps I can give you the source. The Minister seems to be doubting the veracity of the figures. I will send to the Minister's office, when I have completed my speech, not only a copy of the table so that he can study it carefully but also the source so that he can check its veracity. I will read out the figures. In 1990 it was 64.4 per cent and in 1991 it was 76.8 per cent, rising to a high in 1992 of 87.6 per cent. That was the end of that. In 1993 it fell to 80.5 per cent and in 1994 it fell to 75.5 per cent. It is now down to 62.9 per cent. Heaven knows—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It is interesting to note that the Minister for Education has just said that a fall from 87.6 per cent in 1992 to 80.5 per cent in 1993 was the Labor Government's fault. Is it then his Government's fault that the figures are now down to 62.9 per cent?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Well it must be. How can you blame the Labor Government for the decline from 87.6 per cent to 80.5 per cent and accept no responsibility whatsoever for the decline to 75.5 per cent in 1994 and then to 62.9 per cent?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That's yours: that's your budget.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I will provide you with the source. It has fallen to 62.9 per cent in 1995. Heaven knows what it will be in 1996, and heaven knows what it will be the year after that. This fall has been most noticeable in the northern, southern and western suburbs and the Upper Spencer Gulf region.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister for Education. The Hon. Paul Holloway.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Mr President, I will say that again, because the Minister for Education was too busy arguing with the Hon. Paul Holloway. I would have thought that the Minister for Education would have a deep interest in these figures.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member would be wise to ignore the interjections and the outside comments and get on with his speech.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I was distracted, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is becoming very repetitive. I suggest that he get on with it. The Hon. Terry Cameron.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: This fall has been most noticeable in the northern, southern and western suburbs and in the Upper Spencer Gulf region. Cuts to the number of teachers has led to an increase in both class sizes and discipline problems in primary and secondary schools. Surveys of increasing class sizes undertaken by the South Australian Institute of Teachers in June 1996 found that—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It is all right for the Minister for Education to chuckle and laugh, but this is a serious matter, and I would have thought that he would treat it as such. He may well disagree with the South Australian Institute of Teachers but, as the Institute is responsible for looking after its members, it has conducted surveys, and I would have thought that, if the Minister has not heard the results of this survey, he would sit and listen in silence. This survey found that more than half the classes surveyed had student numbers above the average, with some primary classes having up to five students more than the average. It also showed that 20 per cent of teachers reported that increased class sizes were leading to less individual attention for students, concerns about safety, and serious or very serious discipline problems in their schools. More than half the teachers surveyed believed they would be better able to manage difficult pupil behaviour if they had fewer pupils in their class. I know that the Minister for Education is not interested at all in what teachers think. He has demonstrated that by the contemptuous way that he has laughed in the Council today at the results of this survey.

I now turn to the Brown Government's funding cuts and its active encouragement for schools to be more reliant on raising their funds through such means as fees, levies, fundraising and sponsorships. This has raised concerns about equity. In the past, parents might have made small voluntary payments to help supplement school funds and provide extras. Recently, however, parent contributions have become a major component of the operating budgets of schools, not including capital and staff costs. Schools are increasingly dependent on fundraising to pay basic operating costs and to purchase essential resources and equipment.

Under the Brown Government, South Australia's 123 000 primary school students pay fees totalling

\$18.5 million, and the State's 56 000 secondary students contribute fees totalling \$11.2 million. In total, the Government is supplementing its education budget with nearly \$30 million from parents. The Minister for Education will not contradict those figures, because they were printed in the *Advertiser* of 8 August 1996. Recent reports in the *Advertiser* show that schools are considering new get tough tactics including the wider use of debt collectors, as fee debts in some schools run as high as \$30 000.

Recent research by the Australian Council of State School Organisations indicates that the increasing reliance by public schools on funds raised at the school level has dramatically exacerbated inequalities between schools and students. The research found that parents in wealthier suburbs find it much easier to afford set levies and to raise significant amounts of money through fund raising for their children's schools than those parents who lived in poor areas. That is from a report written by Martino, from the Australian Council of State School Organisations. I would like to refer the Minister for Education to that report. If he has not read it, he would find it useful bedtime reading.

As schools become increasingly reliant on money raised at the school level, with parents required to directly supplement Government funding through fees and fund raising, the likelihood of inequity is inevitable. It is a major concern for many South Australians that there are students who are being turned into second class students by the Brown Liberal Government because of their family's socioeconomic status. There has also been a move by the Department of Education—

The Hon. R.D. Lawson: Piffle!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Hon. Robert Lawson interjects and says 'Piffle!' What would he know about problems faced by families of lower socioeconomic status? I would like to address the question of outsourcing. There has also been a move by the Department of Education and Children's Services to outsource and commercialise education services so as to capitalise on its entrepreneurial potential. The outsourcing of school fees and fund raising are all part of a move by the Brown Government to gradually move the sense of responsibility for the functioning of Government schools away from the State to the local community level.

There are both political and educational dangers in privatising public education services. In a recent American study, entitled 'Baltimore's risky enterprise' by the distinguished academic Norman J. Walsh into the city of Baltimore's move to privatise nine public schools, claims by private companies that they could run schools more efficiently and effectively than the State were shown to be totally erroneous. An audit of the privatised schools found that, in order to make profits, the private companies cut staff numbers, increased class sizes and reduced services to students. I am quite happy to provide that reference to the Minister because, before we start embarking upon that path in South Australia, I would like him to read that paper.

Despite the Baltimore experience and other documented experiences, until recently the Brown Government was still considering similar overtures to outsource education services from the British company Serco. It could be concluded from the actions of the Government that education should be driven by the market so that good education is available for those who can afford it, and a lesser education for those who cannot.

The Brown Government has made major changes to the public transport system. That has resulted in further social inequality, as people who use public transport the most are those who are likely to be the least well off. Through the introduction of outsourcing, the Government has moved to reduce transport employment levels from 2 600 to 1 300 by December 1996 and secure financial savings to the Government of \$141 million over a 10 year period. I understand that the Auditor-General has been having a bit to say about the accuracy of the so-called savings. The Government argued that benefits to the public would include improved services, lower user costs and charges, and an improvement in the Government's budgetary position. On 1 July 1994, the Passenger Transport Board was established by the Brown Government to oversee the change from public monopoly to private enterprise. Under the Passenger Transport Board's charter, the metropolitan area was subdivided into 10 areas, and competitive tenders were called to run the services. The Brown Government believed the major threat to the public transport system was the falling number of patrons, and it introduced competitive tendering to reverse the trend.

By July 1996 the Government had outsourced the inner north, the outer northern, the outer north-east, including the O-Bahn services, routes TL3, TL10 and 560, the outer southern and the hills area of the transport system. Nevertheless, the 1996 parliamentary Program Estimates indicate that the annual public transport patronage in Adelaide has continued to fall—from 49.1 million in 1992-93 to 44 million in 1995-96, or a reduction of 10.4 per cent over three years.

It is quite clear that the so-called claims of substantial savings to be achieved by this outsourcing have proven to be false. The Auditor-General has already challenged the veracity of the amounts that the Government is claiming to have saved. I submit to the Council that the savings—if there are any at all—have been achieved by the Government in a most draconian and savage way by forcing bus drivers employed by TransAdelaide to renegotiate their rates of pay and conditions. This has seen drivers' weekly wages, if you compare like with like, cut by \$50 or \$60 per week.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: And they have lost 5 million passengers.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: And still lost well in excess of 5 million passengers. I now turn to the matter of railways. This area has been a misery for the Brown Government. I refer to the recent recommendations contained in the Brew report, which the Minister for Transport has now admitted she has read, of which she has a copy but which she and the Federal Minister for Transport are refusing to release. One can only speculate as to what are the real reasons for the failure of both the State and Federal Governments to release the report.

A recent study prepared for the City of Port Augusta by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies painted a bleak picture for the city if the Brew report is implemented. The study into the potential impact of the Brew report on the economy of the Port Augusta region looked not only at AN operations but at the possible flow-on effects for associated suppliers. It estimated that the closure of Port Augusta's national operations could cost 872 jobs long term and more than \$63 million in lost income. The report says that 14 per cent of the total jobs in the city could be at risk. This follows on from a significant decline in local job opportunities over the past few years which has already had serious implications for the city's economy. One can only hope that, when Premier Brown calls the next election, the people of

Port Augusta will pause to think very carefully about the commitment that both the State and Federal Liberal Governments have made towards AN and that, when we finally hear what the real news will be after they get their act together, the people of Port Augusta will remember and cast their vote accordingly.

I refer to housing. One of the main strategies adopted by the Brown Government has been to reduce the size of the housing trust rental stock. The Government has sought to redefine public housing in South Australia away from the general provision of low cost, good quality housing for a broad range of less wealthy citizens and a growing population to one exclusively geared to welfare recipients. The approach is summarised in the Audit Commission's recommendation 16.1 which states:

The South Australian Housing Trust should reassess its strategic planning and acquisition priorities as embodied within its business plan to recognise the changed requirements associated with its increased welfare housing role. However, its approach is undermining its capacity to fulfil that welfare housing role.

According to the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies:

Housing construction is at its lowest level in 30 years: in the financial year to 30 June 1996, only 6 200 buildings being approved compared to 10 942 buildings in 1965, when reliable records began. The fall in housing construction is a result of a lack of demand, due to a combination of low population growth, uncertainty over interest rates, and changes within the public housing market, with far fewer houses being constructed by the South Australian Housing Trust.

As I mentioned earlier, interstate migration away from South Australia is exacerbating this problem. Under the Brown Government, the Housing Trust has gone through its biggest change since public housing started in South Australia. First, the Brown Government has reduced the number of new Housing Trust homes being built. Mr President, I seek leave to incorporate into the *Hansard* a table showing the number of Housing Trust homes built in South Australia for the period 1985 to 1996. I can assure you that it only contains statistical information.

Leave granted.

Year	Number	Year	Number
1985-86	2 355	1991-92	1 038
1986-87	1 812	1992-93	889
1987-88	1 503	1993-94	734
1988-89	1 509	1994-95	637
1989-90	1 425	1995-96	280
1990-91	954	1996-97	230

Source: the *Advertiser*, 2 September 1996: 4.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: We can see from the table that back in 1985-86, there were 2 355 Housing Trust homes built in South Australia. We can see that it was 734 in 1993-94. However, in 1994-95, it fell to 637, and in 1995-96, it fell to 280, and the projected forecast for 1996-97 is 230. One can only guess how much further that figure is likely to fall. According to the *Advertiser* of 2 September, 1996:

The number of new Housing Trust homes built each year has plummeted 87 per cent, from 1 812 in 1986-87 to only 230 in 1996-97.

As reported in the *Advertiser* of 23 June:

As part of a plan to tackle the Housing Trust's \$1.3 billion debt, the Brown Government is cutting the number of Housing Trust houses. In its 1996 budget, the Government announced that the Housing Trust would slash its property holdings from 60 000 to 55 000 over the next five years.

This has caused significant concern, as a large number of the properties to be sold will not be bought by Housing Trust

tenants or those on the waiting list but by investors and developers who could jack up rents or evict tenants. In the 1995 financial year, about 90 per cent of vacant homes were bought by tenants. This fell to only 50 per cent in 1996, which is an extremely disturbing trend. If people would doubt the accuracy of those figures, they should look at page 9 of the *Advertiser* of 22 June 1996.

The move has been severely criticised by community housing groups, as it would effectively strip the community of assets built up over more than 50 years. As Mr Phil Harrison, the Community Liaison Officer for Shelter SA has argued, South Australia is in the unique position of having 10 per cent of its housing stock owned by the Housing Trust. This acts as a regulator on the entire market, keeping house prices and rentals in the private sector at a reasonable level. As Housing Trust stock dwindles, so will its effect on these prices and rentals.

The Government has also sought a more commercial approach for the Housing Trust by splitting it into two operating units, a commercial property manager and a housing services manager/landlord. Staff numbers have been reduced, in the case of property managers, from 280 to 110 people.

Housing Trust clients are now subject to a draconian credit policy which consolidates all debts to the Housing Trust, including private rental assistance, excess water rates and rent arrears. Any person who fails to repay such a debt from one service is ineligible for other services. What a disgraceful position in which to put Housing Trust clients. South Australia is gradually losing its uniquely large and socially equitable public housing system. Over time, the downsizing of the public housing stock combined with a waiting list attrition will increasingly reduce trust tenants' options. The long-term costs for South Australia are likely to be very high.

Mr President, you were not here when I started my contribution, but I stated that I hoped to give an assessment of the economic performance of the Brown Government with an analysis of some of the strategies that it has employed. I also stated at the beginning of my Address in Reply speech that I did want to conduct an examination, albeit relatively small, of some of the promises that—

The Hon. R.D. Lawson interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Hon. Robert Lawson has interjected without hearing what I have to say. He has already labelled it a superficial contribution.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson: Your speech has been.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I guess he is in the wonderful position of being able to do that because, after all, he is a QC and much more intelligent than the rest of us mere mortals. So, I guess he must be correct that it is a superficial report.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I am getting to some of the interesting bits now, Minister.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: After two hours?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I think I will have another two hours to go if you keep interjecting.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: That is all right; I do not mind staying here until 1 or 2 o'clock. It is fine by me, as long as you will sit here and listen to me.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: That will depend on what time I get up in the morning.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: When you make appointments without consulting me, you must deal with the result.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I am sorry, Mr President, but I am being distracted again by the interjections from the Minister for Transport.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the honourable member of Standing Order 186. If he continues on this track, he ought to brief himself on it. I do not want to be here until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning but I remind him of Standing Order 186 which might be of use to him. He might also look at Standing Order 170.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Mr President, for drawing my attention to Standing Order 186. I would have thought that my comments were extremely relevant but I am being distracted by interjections. I should take more notice of the advice you gave me earlier which is to ignore them. Provided I am able to exercise that discipline, I shall follow your advice and ignore their interjections.

I want to run through some of the promises made by some of the Ministers. First, I would like to deal with the Premier, the Hon. Dean Brown, who is the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs and the Minister for Information Technology. In his policy speech on 28 November 1993 he said:

We will not betray your trust.

Dean Brown has since broken nearly every major election promise that he made. Let us look at some of these election promises that he made.

State charges would increase at a rate no greater than inflation.

I know that I am not a QC, and I know that I am not blessed with the Hon. Robert Lawson's intelligence, but even I can understand that statement. But in 1994 at least 500 charges increased by more than inflation, and in 1995 another 340 increases exceeded inflation. What did Dean Brown say about public sector jobs? In the *Advertiser* of 1 December 1993, Dean Brown said:

The public sector will not be reduced by more than 3 900 jobs.

On 2 August 1994 Dean Brown told Parliament that 11 500 jobs would go. I do not have the source of the quote with me, but we now understand that another 3 200 jobs are to go before the end of 1997. I turn to the area of information technology, and this is a ripper. I will include the source of my quotes because I do not think the Minister for Education and Children's Services believes me. I think he thinks I am making them up. So for the Minister's benefit I will include the source of the quotes so that he can check them out in more detail. The Liberal Party—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It will be interesting to see whether any members opposite believe Dean Brown after we look at some of the promises he has made. In a media release on 9 December 1993, Dean Brown said:

The Liberal Party has reached an in-principle agreement with IBM Australia for a wide ranging partnership project involving planned investment of \$150 million in South Australia over the next seven years.

What happened? In the Parliament on 21 April 1994, Dean Brown said:

Let me make it quite clear, there was simply an exchange of letters between the Liberal Party and IBM prior to the last election.

In his policy speech, Dean Brown said:

Already private industry has agreed to invest \$150 million in a computer technology centre to create more than 2 000 direct and indirect jobs.

What happened? The Government decided not to proceed with IBM for outsourcing information technology. Instead, negotiations were commenced with EDS, and one has to look only at what is happening in the select committee inquiry to see how that is unravelling. What about accountability to Parliament? In his policy speech, Dean Brown said:

A Liberal Government will ensure that Parliament is strengthened in holding Executive Government to account.

I could give dozens of examples but time does not permit me to do so. The Brown Government has refused to give Parliament details of the \$1.5 billion water contract, or the \$565 million EDS deal. In relation to open and honest government, in his policy speech Dean Brown said:

A Liberal Government will be committed to open and honest government, fully answerable to Parliament and the people.

What have we got? Outsourcing contracts have been kept secret. The Brown Government has continually refused to release public information, even though the Ombudsman, under FOI in the case of the HUS documents and the marine park report, directed that the documents be released. The Liberal Party policy of 1993 states:

A Liberal Government will ensure that full information about the business of Parliament is given at least on a weekly basis through a public notice in the *Advertiser*.

That is like the ball-bearing bird—it has never been seen. With respect to constitutional education, a Liberal Government policy document released in November 1993 states:

A Liberal Government will ensure the availability of education services and information in various forms about the Parliament and our constitutional structure.

The old Constitutional Museum was closed in 1995.

As to parliamentary standards, the Premier is reported as follows:

The Premier, Mr Brown, said he believed the standard of debate in Parliament had improved significantly since last year's election. He said he did not indulge in name calling.

Let us look at some of the quotes. On 4 August 1994, the Premier stated:

What a hypocrite the Leader of the Opposition is.

On 4 August 1994, he said:

I have just had a message from WorkCover that it is grateful that it does not cover the policy for this sick Opposition.

On 23 February 1994, he stated:

The Leader of the Opposition seems to be somewhat thick in the head.

On 24 February 1994, he said:

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I do not know whether he is deaf and dumb or both.

On 8 February 1995, he said:

[The Leader of the Opposition] is squealing like a little rat.

He has also said on different occasions:

The member for Spence is a bit thick between the ears. The member for Hart has apparently one big brick between his ears. The member for Hart is acting as no more than a one-eyed lap dog.

I am sure the South Australian public will be interested to hear that the Premier said he believed the standard of debate in Parliament had improved significantly since last year's election and that he did not indulge in name calling. If it is all right for the Premier to refer to the Leader of the Opposition as a hypocrite, it is all right for me to refer to the Premier as a hypocrite.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: No.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I have to accept the President's advice and ignore these incessant interjections. We talk about irrelevancies: I have not heard a relevant interjection from the Minister for Transport all evening. I would now like to raise a serious issue relating to the code of conduct 'Government to serve the people', a document released in November 1993 and I will quote a couple of passages. The document starts with a preamble:

A Minister of the Crown is a position of trust bestowed by the people of South Australia. A Minister has a great deal of discretionary power, being responsible for decisions which can markedly affect an individual, groups of individuals, organisations, companies, local communities or all South Australians. For these reasons—

I am quoting from the Liberal Party's 'code of conduct'—

Ministers must accept standards of conduct which are higher than those applying to others having office in the Parliament or the wider community. Ministers must act honestly and diligently and with propriety in the performance of their public functions and duties and ensure that their conduct does not bring discredit upon the Government or the State.

I will not read the entire document into the record but I hope that members of the Government, particularly the Ministers, are well aware of what is contained in that code of conduct. But I raise this issue which is receiving attention in the Commonwealth Parliament at the moment, that is, the treatment of the conflicts of interest by that Liberal Government. The question must be asked: how are these issues dealt with by our own State Government? Before the last election the then Opposition Leader received a document 'Code of conduct, Government to serve the people' and under the heading 'Advice to the Premier' it states:

Ministers will inform the Premier should they find themselves in any situation of actual or potential conflict of interest. This information will be tendered at Cabinet immediately a Minister becomes aware of an actual or potential conflict of interest and a record will be made that the Minister tendered that information. The record will be available for scrutiny by the Auditor-General—

The Hon. T. Crothers: Do you think that would apply to parliamentary secretaries as well?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It ought to. The Hon. Trevor Crothers has raised an interesting point. He has raised a question of whether or not the code of conduct—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I see that the Hon. Robert Lawson has his head out of his book for a change.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: We will have to seek an opinion.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yes, we will. I have no doubt that the Hon. Trevor Crothers will pursue this at some length in his usual diligent way, but it does raise the question of whether parliamentary secretaries are bound by the ministerial code of conduct. We have one here in the Chamber. Perhaps he can enlighten us. Are you bound by the ministerial code of conduct? I do not know the answer to the question. Are parliamentary secretaries bound by the ministerial code of conduct?

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: They are not Ministers, so how can they be?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The silence is deafening. Either he does not know or he does not want to answer.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Similar requirements—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I will not be distracted. I will take the President's advice and I will ignore the Hon. Di

Laidlaw's incessant stream of interjections. Dean Brown said—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Dean Brown said it. It is in the code of conduct document. Perhaps the Minister does not remember when Mr Brown waved it around and said that this is what his Ministers would be bound by. However, we do not know whether it applies to parliamentary secretaries. Judging from the confused look on the Hon. Robert Lawson's face, he would like to know, too. I have a spare copy here, so I will make it available to the honourable member later.

Similar requirements were to relate to a Minister's spouse and children. Under the heading 'Directorships', the code also said:

No Minister shall be a member of a board of a publicly listed company. On assuming office, a Minister shall resign any directorship of any private companies whose interests are such as to be likely to give rise to a conflict of interest with the portfolio responsibilities of the Minister, unless in the case of a family company the Premier approves the retention upon conditions which can avoid the Minister exercising official functions in respect of the situation of conflict.

That is all a direct quote from the Premier's code of conduct.

In view of the failure of the Prime Minister to adequately enforce his code of conduct in relation to Commonwealth Ministers, it is our responsibility to ask the question: are the arrangements in place in South Australia working properly? A prudent Premier would quickly examine the way in which his own code is operating and make public specific information on its operation. That means reporting both on any instances of identified conflict or potential conflict and any instances where the Premier has used his discretion to allow a Minister to retain an interest.

There is an inherent inadequacy in the Premier's code of conduct. It restricts access to information on specific conflicts of interest and how they are dealt with to just two people: the Premier and, if he has reason to seek it, the Auditor-General. Public accountability and transparency require that information must be publicly available.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Minister for Transport interjects yet again, and I would have thought that she would be very interested—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Mr President, I cannot hear myself think.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The banshees are screaming from the other side of the Chamber again. I would have thought that members of the Government would take this matter seriously, not laughing and chuckling about it on the other side of the Chamber. When one looks at the trouble that the Federal Government has got into, one finds that two have already gone, John Moore is hanging by his teeth and there are two more in the sights.

I would have thought that the Premier had a very close look at his ministerial code of conduct and that he would have already advised the media and the public that there has been no conflict of interest. If one had a more detailed look at the code of conduct, it would be very interesting to look at the other lists which have been compiled in relation to gifts to Ministers.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Be my guest.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: When members opposite shut up and we can all hear ourselves think, I will go on with my speech. It is obvious that the Minister for Transport wants to stay here until 2 or 3 o'clock tomorrow morning. The Hon. Stephen Baker, our erstwhile Treasurer who, according to the Auditor-General, has managed to blow \$700 million in two years, had this to say about superannuation on 19 April 1994:

There are no plans to change the current arrangements. What happened? The Treasurer (Hon. Stephen Baker) said on 9 August 1994:

The main State and police superannuation schemes will be closed permanently.

It took the Treasurer only four months to break that promise. Again in relation to police, a community safety policy statement released on 28 November 1993 stated:

A Liberal Government will increase the number of operational police by 200 during its first term in office.

However, in the *Advertiser* of 23 August 1995 the Treasurer said:

At least 310 jobs will be slashed from the State's Police Force in a State cost cutting drive.

The community safety policy also stated:

Ensure that the Police Force is maintained at adequate operational levels.

However, it was not maintained. Another promise states:

A Liberal Government will expand neighbourhood policing and establish neighbourhood police stations.

Very little has been done at all. A further promise states:

Encourage the establishment of youth crime prevention panels in schools.

We are still waiting for that one. The policy statement continues:

Emphasise that speed and red light cameras are designed to reduce accidents, not raise revenue.

The Treasurer had something to say about that yesterday. It is a major revenue source for the Government. Total revenue from traffic fines for the year to 30 June 1996 was \$30 million or more than \$300 000 higher than in 1994-95.

I turn now to some of the promises made by the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon Robert Lucas). The Minister might recall making some of these promises, but in his defence—and I will always defend the honourable member if he is unfairly attacked, and I would be the last one to attribute quotes to the Minister if he did not say them—I do not attribute these comments to him. They were all contained in Dean Brown's policy speech released on 28 November 1993. I am not sure whether the Premier consulted the Hon. Mr Lucas about these promises—one would hope that he did—but let us look at some of them.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Which faction is the Hon. Mr Lucas in?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: He is in the wet faction. It is just a pity the honourable member does not have a vote to support the Premier—he is only two in front at the moment. One of the statements made by Dean Brown in his policy speech of 28 November is as follows:

There will be no cut to this year's budget, and education spending will increase in 1994-95.

However, in a media release of 25 August 1994, the Hon. Mr Lucas said:

The education budget will be cut by \$40 million over three years.

In relation to class sizes, the Dean Brown policy speech states:

This will ensure current class sizes are maintained.

However, the Minister announced increased class sizes on 25 August 1994. In respect of school maintenance, Dean Brown said:

A \$20 million plan to rebuild our schools will reduce the serious backlog in school maintenance.

In 1994, the school maintenance program was underspent by \$9 million. In 1995, the maintenance budget was cut from \$41 million to \$30 million, a reduction of \$11 million. This was \$3.5 million less than Labor's last budget. The policy speech also indicates that, in respect of education capital works, \$240 million would be spent over three years on new schools and redevelopments. Labor's last capital budget for major education projects was \$43 million in 1993-94. The Liberal Brown Government in 1994-95 cut this to \$40 million; the actual expenditure was only \$28 million; and eight major projects worth \$27 million were scaled down. Also in the policy speech (and this is a ripper), it is stated that the Government's initiatives would see education standards lift through improved school maintenance and resources. What is the record?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Hear, hear!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: 'Hear, hear!' says the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Let us see whether he says 'Hear, hear!' to these: 422 teachers cut in 1994, 250 support staff cut in 1995, 100 specialist teachers cut in 1995, school card cut, pre-school staff cut, building maintenance cut, and capital works programs reduced. The Liberal education policy in November 1993 was:

Choice, excellence and equity in our schools.

While the Brown Government slashed the public education budget by more than \$69 million between July 1994 and March 1996, at the same time it increased funding to non-government schools from \$53.2 million to \$57 million. Further, parent contributions, which had once been small, voluntary payments to help supplement school funds to provide extras, are now compulsory and are supplementing the education budget by nearly \$30 million. Research shows that this dramatically exacerbates inequalities between schools in wealthier suburbs and those in poorer areas. The liberal education policy of November 1993 stated:

The individual needs of all students are recognised and every student is provided with the opportunity to achieve their full potential.

What has happened? Retention rates for Year 12 students have declined rapidly since the election of the Brown Government. From a high point of 87.6 per cent in 1992—the highest in the nation—it has now fallen to the lowest in mainland Australia at just 62.9 per cent.

The Hon. Trevor Griffin, Attorney-General, promised in the Liberal Party domestic violence policy of 1993 to establish a domestic violence crime prevention program in the Attorney-General's office. It has not been done as yet, as far as we can determine. The Hon. Mr Lawson went a bit quiet then. The Hon. Trevor Griffin also promised, in conjunction with the Victims of Crimes Service, to provide support to victims through the justice system. Nothing has been done. Perhaps if we have a new Attorney-General some of these things will be attended to. The Liberal Party's domestic violence policy states:

Provide courses in and outside correctional institutions to address the causes of domestic violence.

Once again, nothing has been done. The policy speech also promises to ensure the availability of adequately resourced shelters and long-term counselling support. However, funding has been cut. The Liberal Party domestic violence policy also states:

Fund 008 toll-free telephone information services for victims and counselling services for men likely to commit violent acts.

Funding has been reduced to victims and counselling services. Graham Ingerson, the Minister for Tourism, Industrial Affairs and Recreation, Sport and Racing stated on 8 December 1993:

Sunday trading will not be permitted while I am Minister.

Graham Ingerson stated to Parliament on 9 August 1994:

Sunday trading will be permitted in the central shopping district only from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m.

I think he is still Minister. The Liberal Party industrial relations policy is to ensure that equitable compensation benefits and rehabilitation services are available to all people who are genuinely injured at work. I wonder what John Lesles would have to say about that promise, because the 1994 Liberal legislation proved otherwise. The tourism policy states:

Aim to increase South Australia's share of international visitors to Australia by 50 per cent by the year 2000.

Judging from the increases so far, we have a long way to go. The Hon. John Olsen MP—

The Hon. T. Crothers: Now you are talking about a great man.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yes, we are talking about a good man. What were some of the promises that Dean Brown made in his policy speech? He stated that a Liberal Government's aims for South Australia are at least 4 per cent annual economic growth; 15 per cent annual real growth in our export earnings; and the creation of 200 000 jobs over the next 10 years. I could go on and on—but I would be here until 5 o'clock if I did. Since the election South Australia's economic growth has lagged behind that of the rest of the country and has at no time come anywhere near 4 per cent. During 1994-95 our exports fell by 1.3 per cent compared with the years 1985-86 to 1993-94, when our exports grew by an average of 9 per cent.

I turn now to health and Aboriginal affairs. Dean Brown's policy speech states that public hospitals will receive an extra \$6 million a year. The health budget was cut by \$79 million in real terms over 1994 and 1995. So, I guess there is some truth in the statement made in the *City Messenger*. The statement that was made was, 'However, Dean, as we have already mentioned, does fudge the truth.' Well—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the honourable member should give—

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I am quoting. That is a direct quote from the *City Messenger*. I have got it here for you. I threw it in the bin, but I will drag it out for you. In an article on page 4 of the *City Messenger* of 9 October 1996, Alex Kennedy stated, 'However, Dean, as we have already mentioned, does fudge the truth. It is quite likely he fudged it with Nassar to get him out of the office.'

The Hon. T. Crothers: What date was that in the *Messenger*?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: That was in an article written by Alex Kennedy in the *City Messenger* of 9 October 1996. Liberal health policy of December 1993 was to halve public hospital waiting lists in its first term of Government. The waiting list has been reduced from 9 195 in December

1993 to 8 198 in April 1996, or by just 10 per cent—nowhere near the 50 per cent the Government promised. But I do not want to be too hard on the Minister for Health. We have another year to go if we do not have an early election. So, if I can give him some advice, he had better get cracking if he is to get that figure anywhere near the promise made in the Government's health policy to halve public hospital waiting lists in its first term.

In his policy speech Dean Brown stated that by the end of his first term \$40 million a year would be redirected to help cut hospital waiting lists. What has happened? City and country hospitals are facing severe budget shortfalls and community and women's health services are reduced. And more nurses. The Liberal health policy speech stated that a Liberal Government's new approach to health administration in South Australia will increase funding for direct patient care and give public hospital managers the incentive to manage more efficiently, which will produce an increased need for qualified nurses. The fact is that hundreds of nursing jobs have been cut from our public hospitals in the first two years of the Brown Government.

Dean Brown's policy speech provides that a building program would renew essential facilities at our major hospitals, including the Queen Elizabeth. The future of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital remains under a cloud pending moves to privatise services and management.

With regard to women's health, the policy speech provided that a Liberal Government would address the particular health needs and problems of women as matters of prime importance. The first Brown Government budget severely cut funds to women's health centres.

Mental health was another Liberal health policy. We had better send a copy to Dr Michael Armitage; I think he must have lost it. The Liberal health policy of December 1993 stated that a Liberal Government would maintain institutional support for those middle aged and elderly patients who have lived in institutions for many years and for whom a move into the community would create confusion and anxiety. 1996 saw widespread community anger over the lack of resources for mental health and the realignment program. It was subsequently revealed that mental health patients were being booked into a Hindley Street hotel.

According to Dean Brown's 'Pamphlet to the people', 29 November 1993, there will be a hospital bed when you need one. What are some of the facts? Let us look at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Fifty beds closed; 200 staff cuts; and the number of patients treated is cut by up to 5 000 in 1995.

The Liberal health policy of December was to dismantle the Health Commission and devolve significant administration responsibility to regional and local levels. We are still waiting for that one. Liberal health policy of December 1993 was to undertake an immediate and complete assessment of community infrastructure available to support the deinstitutionalisation of patients with mental illnesses. This has been an absolute disaster for the Government and for mental health patients, and I referred to some of the problems earlier. These statements are all from the liberal policy health documents.

The next is to dedicate within the office of Ombudsman staff and resources to examine and act upon inquiries related to publicly funded health services. What has happened? The Government attempted to frustrate FOI applications, for example, the one on Garibaldi.

The following are all quotes from the Liberal Aboriginal Affairs policy of 1993. It would ensure conservation and preservation of Aboriginal heritage, including sacred sites,

artefacts, traditions and arts. Nothing has been done. It would encourage employment schemes that provide appropriate business management expertise where finance in the form of business loans is not required. We are still waiting. It was to support programs to improve school attendance by Aborigines and expand opportunities for Aboriginal tertiary education. We still have a year to go: I suppose we can look forward to that one occurring, as well. Let us look at transport and the arts.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Not the arts!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: There are about five pages on these. On transport, Dean Brown said on 28 November that a Liberal Government would adopt new approaches to improve transport services for metropolitan and country residents. I think this was code, because what he actually meant was that bus services would be privatised, but we did not quite interpret it that way at the time. On 2 December 1994, fare increases were announced. Multitrip concession fares went from \$3.60 to \$4.80, an increase of 33 per cent.

In Opposition, the Minister promised to extend the Glenelg-city tram line from Victoria Square to North Terrace. On 13 February I asked the Minister whether she supported the extension of the tram line to North Adelaide. Her answer was not one of her usual 10 minute diatribes but a very simple answer: 'No.'

In the *Advertiser* of 13 August 1992 we read that in Opposition the Minister promised to extend the unemployed travel concession schemes to country areas served by licensed bus operators. What has happened? In Opposition the Minister for Transport, according to the *Advertiser* of August 1993, promised that a Liberal Government would build a rail overpass across the Morphett Road-Diagonal Road intersection to ease traffic congestion. Where is it? Will it be built? If not, why not, or are they still drawing up the plans?

Bike policy is interesting. As part of the Liberals' bike policy the Minister promised to make South Australia a cyclists' paradise. The Government pledged to: establish secure bicycle parking stations; allow STA train commuters to take bicycles onto STA trains without charge; lobby the Federal Government to lift the bicycle ban on the freeway between Crafers and Stirling; establish bike routes through the State's wine-growing regions; establish lighting along bike paths and to install sensors that activate traffic lights; provide right of way for cyclists on roads; provide coloured bicycle lanes to enhance visibility; establish Glenelg as the seaside hub of cycling, including the provision of a bike rail on the old Glenelg tram line, extending east and west to establish a foreshore bikeway; and triple to \$750 000 a year the funding to a reformed State Bicycle Committee.

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It could be. They are direct quotes from the Liberal Party bike policy of 1993. Of these many promises, which have the Minister implemented and what is the status of the rest? I now refer to the 1993 Liberal transport policy. It is all very well to stand up and get a rush of blood to the head and make a promise or two in front of a reporter, but the Liberals are in government now and everyone is looking at all the promises made. Members will be pleased to know that I am coming to a conclusion. The 1993 Liberal transport policy stated, at page 2:

The Liberal Government, in association with the RAA, conservation groups and employer associations would initiate a car pooling scheme which targets the workplace.

The scheme was supposed to promote the benefits of sharing a ride for employees travelling regularly to work in the same

direction. What has happened to the scheme? Has it been initiated; have we done any research or undertaken consultations or was this another promise that, once in government, has been stuck in the bottom drawer and left there?

The 1993 Liberal transport policy promised to investigate, in association with the Environmental Protection Authority and the motor vehicle industry, recycling options for used tyres, retreading and processed tyre products plus whole tyre products such as artificial reefs, crash barriers, soil erosion controls and playground equipment. What research has been undertaken by the Government as promised in these areas and what have been the results?

The Liberal Party before the last State election promised to increase by \$10 million, indexed each year, the amount from State fuel tax for road construction purposes. This has not occurred. South Australians are now paying more petrol tax than are drivers in any other State. At present only 15.9 per cent of petrol tax grabbed by the State Government goes towards road construction.

The Liberals promised to develop a 10 and 20 year strategic plan for transport, which was to focus on integrating road and public transport networks to cater for Adelaide's long-term passenger and freight needs. They promised to introduce legislation to enable ignition locking devices to be installed in vehicles driven by drink-driving offenders with blood levels over .1 per cent. It is all there in the Liberal transport policy. As yet, there has been no strategic plan. Why not? One wonders when we can expect to see a draft copy, how much it will cost and what community and local government groups are to be consulted. In relation to ignition locking, nothing has been done at all.

In the *Advertiser* of 22 December 1993 it was stated that major changes to public transport released in a report by the Minister promised strategic planning for wider application of 70 km/h and 80 km/h rather than 60 km/h speed limits on some suburban roads and 40 km/h on some back streets. What progress has the Government made on those promises? It was to relocate speed cameras to known black spots and to use them for road safety and not for revenue raising. We now know that the Treasurer wants to hide them anywhere he can. The Minister stated that most of the parking signs would be replaced with colour coded markings on kerbs (*Advertiser*, 20 October 1994). Has this occurred as yet? I have not seen too many of them.

The Minister promised that a 25-year age limit would be imposed on all buses operating in South Australia, including school and country buses (6 November 1994). The Hon. Caroline Schaefer would be very interested in the next one. Are any buses currently operating that are more than 25 years old and what are the current figures on the age of buses?

The Minister confirmed that the Government was looking at sharing the \$2 million-plus cost of a high-tech simulator to help learner drivers. What has happened? The Government commenced a six-week trial by a private security firm to patrol the Salisbury, Modbury and Paradise interchanges to combat crime. TransAdelaide was also investigating the use of camera surveillance in its car parks (*Advertiser*, 25 November 1994). What were the results and how much has been spent?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I missed an interjection from the Minister for Education as he wandered back into the Chamber. Would you care to repeat it?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I went home and had eight hours sleep. I thought you might have finished.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I doubt whether you have ever had eight hours sleep. Rewards of up to \$1 000 were to be offered to TransAdelaide passengers who supplied information about assaults, property damage or other serious offences on public transport. How many payments have been made since 1995? New pedestrian light crossings containing pressure pads were promised. How many have been installed? The Minister stated that bus contracts would include special financial incentives to private operators to boost passenger numbers. How much in incentives has been paid?

The Government promised to rebuild South Australia's pre-eminence in arts and maintain current levels of funding for arts and cultural activities, to adopt a festivals policy which coordinates both Government funding and Government marking of arts and cultural festivals—a liberal arts and cultural development policy. Apparently, nothing has been done. The next promise was to provide an environment in which the arts would thrive and in which the community would participate. That has not occurred.

Let us look at some of the other promises, such as to fund a secretariat to advise and assist youth groups working for the environment—I cannot find it; to support the establishment of more private sanctuaries dedicated to preserving endangered species—nothing done as yet; to assess the options available through desalination of sea water and the development of sustainable underground water in the State's north—have they done anything on that one yet, Terry?

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: No.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I didn't think so. The Government was to establish a South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Commission—a liberal environment and natural resources policy. Are we still waiting for that one? I think they now want to mine in a national park, do they not?

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It is a pristine wilderness, and they want to mine it. It was to ensure that within 10 years 20 per cent of the State's energy will be delivered from renewable energy resources. We are still waiting for a policy announcement on that one. The Government was to implement a comprehensive and coordinated waste recycling program at a cost of \$7 million. Have they done that one yet? I cannot find any evidence of it.

In correctional services, a Liberal Government was to expand education and skills training for prisoners as part of their rehabilitation programs; allow the police to make submissions to the Parole Board on parole applications; segregate hard core criminals from other offenders; provide adult literacy programs for prisoners below a prescribed literacy level; and segregate those prisoners found to be carrying either of these diseases and provide ongoing medical treatment. I cannot find that any of those has been implemented—not one of them.

According to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Youth Affairs—Liberal Party youth higher education schools and development policy—the Government would provide new education and training opportunities for young South Australians, including 2 000 new traineeships over the next three years—the TAFE budget has been slashed.

There were the objectives of creating 12 000 new jobs within 12 months and 200 000 new jobs in South Australia during the next 10 years with a particular focus on jobs for young people. The number of full-time jobs has fallen in South Australia since the last election. The total number of jobs created over the past 2¾ years has been less than 20 000.

Youth unemployment has grown from 27.9 per cent in January 1995 to 38.9 per cent in September 1996. Our current youth unemployment—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: It is all right for the Minister for Education to laugh. Obviously, he is not a parent of unemployed children. It is interesting to see that, once the Minister can get rid of them out of the school system—and he is doing an excellent job of that, as he has cut the retention rate—he obviously does not care whether they get a job. I commend the Hon. Bob Such. I believe that he is one of the few Ministers in the Government who has a bit of compassion for unemployed youth. My observation of him is that he has a genuine interest in and a genuine desire to do something about youth unemployment. I call on all members of his Cabinet to get behind him and support some of the initiatives that he is placing before Cabinet.

I would like to commend the Hon. Bob Such for some of his initiatives to reduce unemployment. But it is obvious from the statistics, Minister, that despite a lot of the good work you have done, there is still more to be done, and I as one member of the Opposition would like to encourage you to do more for youth unemployment, as I believe it is one of the most serious problems facing our State.

However, some of the initiatives that have been introduced by Bob Such are as follows: \$500 000 allocation in the 1996 budget for programs such as Kickstart for Youth and Focus on the Future; the Employment Brokers Scheme, which turns part-time work into full-time work using private labour companies; self-starter schemes to assist young people to start their own businesses; the traineeship scheme which was a very welcome initiative and which has targeted 1 500 young people to enter the Public Service. I would like to place on record my appreciation to the Minister and his office for the regular flow of information that comes out of his office, and in particular to the information that he has provided me on a number of occasions.

The Minister may well want to examine some of the excellent suggestions made by the Youth Affairs Council in its joint response to the South Australian Youth Employment Task Force Report. I would hope that he would take the time and trouble to have a look at this. I am sure he will, because he has a genuine interest in this area. Some of these include: the establishment of a State employment authority as the key coordination and policy organisation for South Australia; to accept responsibility for strong leadership in both job creation and growth; to acknowledge and respond to the regional pattern of youth unemployment in a clear policy response; ensure the provision of a high quality education for all young South Australians which actively supports successful transition to work; recognise its own substantial role within the stages of an employer and contractor of services; and be willing to engage in negotiations with the Commonwealth on addressing negative impacts of Commonwealth employment education and training policy on young South Australians on the State based infrastructure which serves them.

It is not that I am handing out bouquets, but I believe that the Hon. Dr Bob Such needs a bouquet for the compassionate way he has addressed this youth unemployment problem. But, Minister, you can see from the most recent statistics that there is a lot more work to be done, and I would just like to encourage you in going down that path. I realise that it is getting very late in the day, so I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

RACIAL VILIFICATION BILL

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.56 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 17 October at 2.15 p.m.