

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 22 October 1996

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

DAWKINS, Hon. M.B., DEATH

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

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Maynard Boyd Dawkins, former member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

On behalf of all Liberal members in this Chamber—and I know that my views will be shared by all other members of the Chamber as well—I rise to speak to this condolence motion. Boyd Dawkins was born in 1917 and educated at the Gawler high and technical schools. He then went on to further study at Roseworthy Agriculture College, of which you, Mr President, would be well aware, and also the Elder Conservatorium at the University of Adelaide.

The Hon. Boyd Dawkins had a distinguished career in community and public service prior to his entering Parliament in the 1960s. He was a member of the District Council of Mudlawirra, a past President and Federal councillor of the Australian Society of Breeders of British Sheep and also a member of the Governing Council and Central Executive of the then National Farmers Union, South Australian Branch.

There would be only one or two, perhaps three, members in this Chamber today who served in the Legislative Council during the period that the Hon. Boyd Dawkins was a member of the Parliament. I know that my colleague the Attorney-General, who will be speaking later, is able to speak more intimately than I of the Hon. Boyd Dawkins' time in the Legislative Council, as he did share a reasonable period of time in the Legislative Council with him.

For the record, the Hon. Boyd Dawkins was elected to the old Midland District in March 1962 and served in the Legislative Council until his retirement in November 1982, at which election you, Mr President, I and a number of other colleagues, including the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, joined the Legislative Council. I obviously cannot speak from personal experience with respect to his term and time of some 20 years in the Legislative Council.

The record shows that the Hon. Mr Dawkins was a member of the parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee from 1975; he was the Government Whip and, prior to that, the Opposition Whip in the Legislative Council. Certainly, the numbers in the Council were different in the period that the honourable member was Opposition Whip and then Government Whip.

The Hon. Boyd Dawkins served on a number of other committees, including the parliamentary Land Settlement Committee. My only recollection of the Hon. Boyd Dawkins in the Parliament was prior to standing for preselection in 1982, when I came into the Legislative Council in that last 12 months or so prior to the preselection to look at the Legislative Council proceedings. It was around that time that the Hon. Boyd Dawkins was speaking on the issue of the Land Settlement Committee.

I cannot remember the exact detail—I have been racking my memory, I must admit—but it was either the actual time that the Land Settlement Committee was being abolished or he was talking about the time when it had been abolished. But certainly that was the subject of the speech that the Hon. Mr Dawkins was giving when I visited and observed proceedings in the Legislative Council.

As a number of longer serving members of the Liberal Party have indicated—and again I cannot speak with first-hand experience—the Hon. Boyd Dawkins had a very fine singing voice and certainly, when one looks at the newspaper clippings in the Parliamentary Library, that becomes apparent in terms of his interests not only prior to entering Parliament but also during his 20 years of service. I am told by some people that it continued after his retirement.

An *Advertiser* article in November 1980 contained a photograph of the Hon. Boyd Dawkins about to conduct Handel's Messiah as conductor of the Gawler Barossa Choir and of the Combined Events in the Biennial Festivals. Clearly, he continued to maintain his very strong personal interest in that particular area of enjoyment and recreation.

In terms of his political philosophy, the Hon. Boyd Dawkins—again from what I have gathered from other members—had very strong views in a number of areas. I noted, again from his press clipping file in the Parliamentary Library, that when first elected to the Legislative Council in 1962, representing the Midland District, he clearly nailed his political philosophy to the wall when he said:

If elected, I hope to be able to give full support to the positive developmental program of the Playford Government. I am a firm believer in the freedom of the individual and in private enterprise and initiative. Enterprise and initiative, two of the most important qualities, which progressive people can possess, can only be properly used and developed under a far-seeing LCL Government, such as that led by the Premier.

As I said, on behalf of the Liberal members of the Legislative Council, I express our thanks for the distinguished community, public and parliamentary service of the Hon. Boyd Dawkins and, in particular, his 20 years in the Legislative Council Chamber. Again, on behalf of Liberal members, we express our condolences to the family of the Hon. Maynard Boyd Dawkins.

The **Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition)**: I second the motion on behalf of the Opposition. The Hon. Boyd Dawkins had left this Parliament before I became a member in 1985, so he was not known to me personally as a member, but I saw him when he visited Parliament House following his retirement. As the Leader of the Government has indicated, he entered Parliament in 1962 and retired in 1982. So, he gave 20 years' service, which is indeed a very long period to be in Parliament. During that period, he was both the Government and Opposition Whip in the Legislative Council, a member of the Public Works Committee and the Lands Settlement Committee (which is no longer a committee of this Parliament).

Some of my colleagues have told me that he did have some kind of relationship with the Australian Labor Party in that he was a relation of John Dawkins, who was a former Minister in the Federal Parliament. I am not sure what that relationship was—an uncle or a second cousin—but I understand that he was related.

Clearly, as the Hon. Mr Lucas has indicated, he was also a very keen musician, although I was not able to hear him sing in the corridors of power because, as I said, he had left

Parliament. In the past, we have had many musical people including the Hon. Martin Cameron who used to play his bagpipes and the Hon. Don Hopgood who used to play the trumpet, so I am sure that, at some stage, those three would have made a very engaging trio.

The background of the Hon. Mr Dawkins indicated that he was educated, in part, for his tertiary education at the Elder Conservatorium and, obviously, this gave him a lifelong interest in music. He was, I understand, the President of the South Australian Country Choral Society for many years both during the period when he was a member and also following his retirement. He was also very interested in local government and I understand that he was a member of local government for 25 years. Again, it is made very clear that he has shown dedication to public office both in local government and in Parliament.

As I indicated, he was not known to me personally but, as the Leader of the Government has indicated, when he entered Parliament he certainly did nail his colours to the mast by saying:

If elected, I hope to be able to give full support to the positive developmental program of the Playford Government.

The Hon. Mr Dawkins indicated that he was a firm believer in the freedom of the individual and in private enterprise initiative. I am sure that during his 20 years in office he fulfilled those beliefs, and I put on record the condolences of the Opposition to his wife Constance and his two sons, Ross and John and their families.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I wish to be associated with the remarks of the Hon. Robert Lucas and the Hon. Carolyn Pickles and also reflect for a few moments upon the period of Boyd Dawkins's life that I knew when I became a member of the Legislative Council in March 1978. He had already been a member for about 16 years and was an old hand at parliamentary procedure. Whilst I did not share an office with him—his office was next door on the lower ground floor—Boyd Dawkins had a voice that did carry particularly well, not just to the rooms next door but along the corridor. He was certainly very supportive of me as I joined the Legislative Council. During my time as a Minister in the Government from 1979 to 1982 he was the Government Whip in the Legislative Council and always did control our side of the Council particularly effectively.

I suppose the things for which I remember Boyd Dawkins most are that he had a particularly kind disposition. Whilst his voice was gruff and sometimes loud, there was always an underlying kindness in the way in which he dealt with people. His word was his bond and I suppose one could really say that he was always as straight as a die because, when Boyd Dawkins said he would do something, he would do it and he would keep his word in every respect.

As has already been indicated, he was a very vigorous worker in his local community as well as in local government and played a very active role in the life of the Methodist Church and subsequently the Uniting Church. As has already been mentioned, he took a very active interest and participated extensively in musical and particularly choral work. I can remember on those occasions when, at the end of a session we might sit to the early hours of the morning and usually a few members would gather in the parliamentary dining room around the piano while others had to work, Boyd would be very much part of the choral renditions that emanated from

that group of members who were least occupied during the course of the late night sitting.

Boyd Dawkins was a loyal member of the Liberal Party, both its organisation as well as its parliamentary wing. He participated at both the local and State level as a member of the State Council of the Liberal Party and of course his family continues in that tradition of involvement in the work of the Liberal Party. It would be my guess, and I suppose very few would quarrel with this, that he joined the Liberal Party largely because it reflected what he believed should be appropriate values of independence of spirit, the fostering of initiative and provision of incentive. He supported particularly well the activities of the Liberal Party. Subsequent to his retirement in 1982 he regularly appeared in Parliament House, whether it was for meals or to participate in the past members' association, which of course is still fairly active for those who have recollections of their life in either this Council or the House of Assembly.

I do know that when the Hon. Don Laidlaw was a member of the Parliament for a period of, I think, six years he shared an office with Boyd Dawkins, and Don learnt a lot from Boyd, who was very much involved with the Public Works Standing Committee, about culverts, roads and other public works, and he appreciated the leadership and guidance that came from Boyd Dawkins.

I know that the family of Boyd Dawkins will be saddened by his passing, and I join with the Hon. Robert Lucas and the Hon. Carolyn Pickles in extending on behalf of all of us our condolences to his wife Con and his family.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I support the motion and wish to add a few words. I served in this House for seven years with Boyd and, while we were on opposite sides of the Chamber, Boyd was always very friendly with all members of the Chamber in his many years as the Liberal Whip. He was very cooperative with the Labor Whip and, indeed, with all of the Labor members.

Other members have mentioned his great interest in music and his singing abilities. I have heard him sing and even at the time when he was in Parliament he still had a very fine voice. After leaving Parliament he continued his interest in singing, particularly with the various choirs in the Barossa, and he always ensured that I received invitations to various concerts in the Barossa, and I think it was the Tanunda Choir that he was most associated with.

I was interested in his earliest remarks concerning emphasis on the rights of the individual and the benefits of enterprise. We certainly differed politically, greatly. Despite his belief in the rights of the individual, he strongly opposed the Homosexual Law Reform Bill, which was eventually passed by this Parliament. He also strongly opposed the Labor Government's legislation which prevented Alan Bond gaining control of the Moomba gas fields. In hindsight, even he might have agreed, following events which occurred in later years, that that was a wise move on behalf of the then Labor Government.

Others have mentioned his distinguished relative, John Dawkins, who moved to Western Australia and became a member of the Labor Party there and who subsequently served as a Federal Labor Minister in Canberra. Boyd would talk cheerfully about his relative, acknowledging their great political differences, but there was certainly no animosity or rancour on his part towards a relative whom he regarded as having strayed from the fold. I certainly have fond memories of the Hon. Boyd Dawkins as a member of this Chamber and

I join with others in expressing my sympathy to his widow and his family.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The late Boyd Dawkins entered the Legislative Council in 1962 at the age of 45 and served in the Legislative Council, as the Hon. Robert Lucas said, for 20 years. He was a member during the last three years of the Playford Government and in his time he saw six Premiers come and go: the Hon. Tom Playford, the Hon. Frank Walsh, the Hon. Don Dunstan, the Hon. Steele Hall, the Hon. David Tonkin and the Hon. Des Corcoran. Boyd Dawkins witnessed enormous and dramatic social, economic and legislative change during that 20 years of service in the Legislative Council, change which affected the Legislative Council and which saw an evening up of the numbers in this Council, which has continued until the present time under our current electoral system.

I confirm that Boyd Dawkins was a very good singer. In fact, until the late 1970s he led the Legislative Council in the singing of *God Save the Queen* on the last night of session. He also gave distinguished service to the singing community of South Australia. He was a gentleman and a stickler for the standards of the Council, a person of honour, decorum and propriety, and I pay tribute to his service to the Parliament and the community. I join with my colleagues in expressing our condolences to his family.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I rise to speak briefly in support of the motion. I was not aware until this motion was moved today that the Hon. Boyd Dawkins had died. Nevertheless, I want to pass on the condolences of the Democrats. Boyd Dawkins served 20 years in this place. I note that you get less for murder, so he must have been very committed indeed! I had no personal experience of working with Boyd, but around the House from time to time over the years I would bump into him in the corridors, and he always took the time to stop and say hello and have a brief chat. I saw in that man a very friendly and pleasant fellow, and I am sorry that I did not know him better. On behalf of the Democrats, I pass on our condolences to his family.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to pass on my condolences to the Dawkins family. There are two things that I remember particularly about Boyd Dawkins: first, his vigorous defence of the retention of the Legislative Council; and, secondly, his contribution to people who lived in the country. I recall vividly one very cold winter's night when I was a fresh-faced youth. We had travelled about 100 kilometres to Elliston to address about six or seven people. In those days it was the Liberal and Country League. I think I had stood for the seat of Flinders beforehand and been defeated. I will never forget the trip home: sliding all over the road, and dodging kangaroos and wombats. In the midst of this, Boyd said, 'Keep your powder dry, son.' I do not know whether I kept my powder dry, but I am here. I would like to thank him for his advice, although perhaps at this stage it is a little late. I offer my condolences and those of my wife to Connie and her family, and I ask members to stand in this place to carry this motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.45 to 3 p.m.]

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that written answers to question on notice No. 130 from the last session and the following questions on notice for this session be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 6, 7, 12, 14 and 20.

HEALTHSCOPE

- 6. The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:**
1. What was the quantity and purchase price of shares in Healthscope which SGIC received for the sale of its private hospital to Healthscope in 1994?
 2. Were any of these shares in Healthscope sold prior to the sale of SGIC and, if so—
 - (a) When were they sold?
 - (b) Who were they sold to?
 - (c) What price was received for the shares?
 - (d) How many were sold?
 3. If Healthscope shares were not sold prior to the sale of SGIC—
 - (a) Were these shares part of the sale to the new owners of SGIC?
 - (b) If so, what was the price and total value of the shares at the time of sale?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. SGIC received 8 850 000 shares in Healthscope on 28 April 1994. The shares had a unit value of \$1.69491, giving a total value of \$15 000 000.
2. None of these shares were sold prior to the sale of SGIC. On 1 July 1995 the shares were allocated between SGIC and the Motor Accident Commission (MAC) in the following manner:

MAC	6 814 500
SGIC General Insurance	2 035 500
3. MAC still owns its 6 814 500 shares in Healthscope. SGIC's 2 035 500 shares in Healthscope were transferred to SGIO upon the sale of SGIC on 30 November 1995. The shares were transferred at market value which was \$0.77 per share as at 30 November 1995.

COUNTRY ARTS TRUST

- 7. The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:**
1. How many employees of the South Australian Country Arts Trust were located in the South-East as at 30 June 1996 and what were the classifications and specific locations of these employees?
 2. What were the comparable figures for—
 - (a) 30 June 1995?
 - (b) 30 June 1994?
 - (c) 30 June 1993?
 3. How many of the employees who have left the region have taken targeted separation packages or retired and how many have been transferred to other locations?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

1. As at 30 June 1996 the number of full-time employees (FTE) engaged by the South Australian Country Arts Trust in the South-East increased by 0.5 over the previous year.

30 June 1996	FTE				
	Staff	Mount Gambier	Keith	Nara-coorte	Beachport
ASO-1	1	0.5			
ASO-2	3	2.5			
ASO-3	4	2.0	0.5	0.5	0.5
ASO-4	1	1.0			
ASO-5	0				
ASO-6	1	1.0			
ASO-7	0				
	10	7.0	0.5	0.5	0.5
Total FTE at 30 June 1996 = 8.5					

2. Comparable figures for 30 June 1995, 30 June 1994 and 30 June 1993.

30 June 1995	FTE				
	Staff	Mount Gambier	Keith	Nara-coorte	Beachport
ASO-1	0				
ASO-2	3	2.5			
ASO-3	4	2.5	0.5	0.5	
ASO-4	1	1.0			
ASO-5	0				

ASO-6	1	1.0			
ASO-7	0				
	9	7.0	0.5	0.5	0
Total FTE at 30 June 1995 = 8.0					
30 June 1994					
	Staff	Mount Gambier	Keith	Naracoorte	Beachport
ASO-1	0				
ASO-2	3	2.0			
ASO-3	6	3.4	1.0	0.6	
ASO-4	1	1.0			
ASO-5	1	1.0			
ASO-6	0				
ASO-7	0				
	11	7.4	1.0	0.6	0
Total FTE at 30 June 1994 = 9.0					
30 June 1993					
	Staff	Mount Gambier	Keith	Naracoorte	Beachport
ASO-1	1	0.5			
ASO-2	2	1.5			
ASO-3	6	3.4	1.0	0.6	

ASO-4	1	1.0			
ASO-5	0				
ASO-6	0				
ASO-7	1	1.0			
	11	7.4	1.0	0.6	0
Total FTE at 30 June 1993 = 9.0					
3. Number of targeted separation packages					
Retirements					
Transfer to other locations					

SPEEDING FINES

12. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:** How many motorists were issued speeding fines in South Australia and how much revenue was raised from these offences for the following years—

1991-92	
1992-93	
1993-94	
1994-95	
1995-96?	

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The statistics requested are depicted in the following table:

Table 1 SPEEDING OFFENCES ISSUED AND EXPIATED DURING 1/7/91 TO 2/10/96
(TOTAL SPEED CAMERA AND TRAFFIC INFRINGEMENT OFFENCES)

Year	ISSUED		EXPIATED	
	Number	AMT \$	Number	AMT \$
91-92	245 788	26 879 224	186 339	20 200 270
92-93	235 216	25 724 612	191 373	20 592 018
93-94	204 108	22 903 510	168 301	18 553 839
94-95	198 148	22 972 131	151 202	17 291 446
95-96	193 302	27 217 258	139 256	18 996 577
1/7/96 to 2/10/96	79 062	11 098 209	61 736	8 493 059

Notes: When a notice is Issued/Expiated with more than one offence, the amount Issued/Expiated for the speeding offence(s) is calculated based on July 96 offence penalty.

COMMERCIAL ROAD, PORT NOARLUNGA

14. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:** In the light of new information that motorists continue to speed on Commercial Road, Port Noarlunga, and that the accident rate continues to climb at the intersection of Commercial Road, Weatherald Terrace and Saltfleet Street, when will the Minister order the upgrade to begin that has been promised for more than three years?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Unlike the previous Labor Government, this Government has taken action to upgrade Commercial Road between the Onkaparinga River and Maslin Beach Road, in conjunction with planning for the Gray Street realignment between Murray Road and the Onkaparinga River at Port Noarlunga.

The planning phase has commenced. Community consultation will be a key feature of the consultancy, which is expected to be completed by March 1997.

It is anticipated that the upgrading of Commercial Road will commence in 1997-98, subject to the completion of preconstruction activities.

AQUATIC FACILITIES, COUNTRY

20. **The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:**

1. Is the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing aware that a recent public meeting in Naracoorte gave strong endorsement to Corporation plans to upgrade the town's swimming lake to meet new health and safety requirements so that the lake can re-open to the public following its closure last summer?

2. Can the Minister confirm that the costs of the upgrade will be \$210 000 for chlorination, filtration and associated equipment; \$18 000 to fence the entire perimeter of the lake; \$4 000 for security lighting; and another \$4 000 for signage?

3. Is the Minister also aware that the closure of the swimming lakes at Naracoorte and Millicent had an adverse effect upon tourism and forced the closure of learn to swim classes?

4. Given the importance of the swimming lakes to the economy and lifestyle of residents of Naracoorte and Millicent, and, given that the closure of the swimming lakes was a direct consequence of State

Government policy, will the Government provide any assistance to these two major country centres to enable them to re-open and maintain their swimming lakes or to provide other aquatic facilities?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:

1. I am aware of the need for public aquatic facilities in a number of country areas including Naracoorte and Millicent.

2. At this stage I have not received any details of the cost of upgrading the swimming lake.

3. I am aware that the closure of the swimming lakes at Naracoorte and Millicent has resulted in the closure of learn to swim classes. It is difficult to assess the effect of these closures on tourism without longitudinal evidence.

4. Arising from stage 1 of the 'Provision of Public Aquatic Facilities Report' was the need for Local and State Government to develop a strategy for the future provision of aquatic facilities in South Australia. This has become stage 2 of the report and it is nearing completion. Stage 2 aims to:

- Identify existing provision of indoor and outdoor facilities at local, regional and state levels;
- Develop criteria for site selection;
- Identify rationalisation, upgrade and new development opportunities;
- Identify specific management funding options;
- Explore the impact of potential Council amalgamations.

This report will set the direction for a state strategy regarding the future provision of aquatic facilities.

The report will provide strategic direction for me to consider in relation to the development of public aquatic facilities for South Australia.

EDS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD

130. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:**

1. How much does the Minister intend to save through changes to motor vehicle registration and driver licensing functions and how exactly will this be achieved?

2. What information technology functions of the Department of Transport has EDS taken over?

3. (a) Is there a service agreement between the department and EDS?
- (b) If so, will the Minister make a copy available to the Shadow Minister?
4. (a) What equipment has been transferred to EDS ownership?
- (b) What equipment did the department retain?
5. (a) How much did EDS pay for the equipment?
- (b) How was it valued?
6. (a) How much is the department paying EDS for providing this service?
- (b) How is this calculated?
- (c) How often are the payments made?
7. How many departmental staff positions have been cut as a result of the EDS contract?
8. How many EDS staff work within the department?
9. What annual savings are being made by the department as a result of these new arrangements?
10. How will technology upgrades be managed and financed?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

1. In relation to savings associated with the EDS contract, two distinct pricing models have been used by EDS for the management of infrastructure services:

- Monthly cost based on the Assumed Costs (of the service Settlement). The charges to Registration and Licensing continue to be at the level previously determined under the Service Level Agreement with Justice Information Services.
 - Unit pricing will commence once all Government agencies have been transferred and the price of charging has been calculated. Unit pricing is based on actual resource usage levels and as such will depend, as it always has, on the total level of resources consumed.
2. EDS has taken over:
- Computer Room operations
 - Data Network Management and operational support
 - Mid-range System Management Services
 - 'In-scope' equipment purchasing, installation and maintenance Functions remaining with the department are:
 - PC and Printer purchasing, installation and maintenance
 - Office equipment purchasing, installation and maintenance
 - Voice communications management and support
 - IT application development
 - Information planning and strategy

3. (a) There is a service level agreement for the Department of Transport that forms part of the whole of Government contract with EDS.
- (b) Matters relating to the EDS contract must be referred to the Department of Information Industries. Contractual details are available to a relevant Parliamentary Committee in accordance with the agreement relating to contract disclosure between the Government and the Opposition publicly detailed by the Attorney-General on 18 August 1996.
4. (a) All departmental computer processing and network devices including:
 - Mid-range computers and peripheral devices
 - Local Area Network servers and peripheral devices
 - Network management equipment and software
 - Wide Area Network equipment and software
 - Operating system and network software
 (b) Desktop equipment, that is Intel based PC's, Macintoshes and printers.
5. (a) The department did not receive any revenue from the sale of the equipment. The payment from EDS was made to the Department of Treasury and Finance.
- (b) Valuation of the equipment was negotiated with EDS by the Department of Information Industries on behalf of the Department of Transport.
6. (a) Matters relating to the EDS contract must be referred to the Department of Information Industries and are subject to disclosure on the basis set out in 3.(b) above.
- (b) The formula to calculate this is dictated by the whole of Government contract with EDS and so this matter must be referred to the Department of Information Industries.
- (c) Monthly.
7. The department began 'contracting-out' IT operational activities in December 1993 and has continued to do so in line with its Strategic Review which was announced in February 1995. Since December 1993, 11 staff members whose functions were considered to be 'in-scope' have either taken separation packages or accepted

positions elsewhere in the public service. As a consequence, no departmental employees remained to transfer to EDS.

8. Two EDS employees work at the department on a part-time basis—the Account Manager and Service Delivery Manager—and a further nine DIGITAL Corporation staff sub-contracted to EDS.

9. The contract with EDS is a whole of Government agreement. The projected savings have been calculated on a whole of Government basis, and are estimated to be \$100 million over nine years, compared to the Government's IT spending in 1993-94.

10. The EDS contract is a service contract. Therefore, the terms of the contract negotiated by the Department of Information Industries places responsibility on the contractor to determine the most appropriate technologies to utilise; and to refresh the technology.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Reports, 1995-96—

Department of Manufacturing Industry, Small Business and Regional Development
MFP Development Corporation
Office for the Commissioner for Public Employment
Office for the Commissioner for Public Employment—
South Australian Public Sector Workforce Information, June 1996

Response by the Minister for Infrastructure to the 20th Report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee regarding Vegetation Clearance Regulations

Regulations under the following Acts—
MFP Development Act 1992—Core Site
Public Corporations Act 1993—ETSA Generation Corporation Dissolution

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

Reports, 1995-96—

Director of Public Prosecutions
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing
Regulation under the following Act—
Magistrates Court Act 1991—Fees

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

Regulations under the following Acts—
Consumer Credit (South Australia) Act 1995—Savings and Transitional
Consumer Transactions Act 1972—Extended Definition of Service
Secondhand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995—Fees

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

Reports, 1995-96—

Environment Protection Authority
HomeStart Finance
Native Vegetation Council
South Australian Community Housing Authority
Crown Development Report by Minister Ashenden on the Proposal by SA Water Corporation to develop a Raw Water Pumping Inlet Structure (Jetty) in the River Murray

Regulations under the following Acts—
Controlled Substances Act 1984—Declared Prohibited Substance
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Farmers' Tractors
District Council By-laws—
Barmera—No. 38—Lake Bonney
Lease of Properties—Department of Transport.

OVERHEAD CABLING

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I seek leave to table the ministerial statement made in another place by the Minister for Industry, Manufacturing, Small Business and Regional Development. Leave granted.

QUESTION TIME

EDUCATION WASTEWATCH SCHEME

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 the education wastewatch scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: The 1993 Liberal education policy provided for the establishment of an education wastewatch scheme on the apparent presumption that money was being wasted by schools and the Education Department. The policy stated that the scheme would provide financial rewards to schools which identified examples of waste and would also provide ongoing savings to the department. It also stated that the financial rewards would take the nature of a one-off payment to schools and be related to the amount of savings achieved. Has this scheme been implemented? How many rewards have been made? How much has been saved by this scheme? Where have those savings been made?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The scheme has not been implemented. It is one of those issues about which, in government, we have made no decisions as to whether or not we will proceed. The Government, as would have been evident from, in particular, the first two budgets, has already embarked upon a program of reducing the level of over-expenditure and wastage within the Department for Education and Children's Services. We will consider the prospects of such a scheme as announced in our policy statement prior to 1993 for the possibility of a second Government program but, at this stage, there has been no decision to implement that program in government.

MIMILI SCHOOL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Members will recall that last week I asked a couple of questions with respect to the Mimili school. It is with some disappointment that I note that I have not received an answer to the first set of questions. Also, I am somewhat at a loss to understand the apparent lack of interest by the media with respect to this matter. One must say, 'I wonder what would have happened had these asbestos buildings been placed in one of the schools in the leafy suburbs of Burnside or Kensington Gardens.' However, I did ask a question of the Minister for Education and Children's Services, and I am quite appalled at his lack of enthusiasm in this matter. Apparently he thinks there is some comedy involved in this. In answer to a question I asked last Thursday—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: —the Minister advised the Council that Mr Geoff Iverson, Manager of Anangu education—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: —was travelling to Mimili (I am sure if it had been Burnside you would have recognised it), and would arrive at the school at approximately 3 pm to

assess the situation that was taking place at that site. That would have been two hours after the Principal had been ordered to return the staff and the children to the school—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Who ordered him?

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: You did—given the fact that the school council (that is, the relatives of the children) and the elected governors at Mimili had ordered the closure of the school on health grounds. I note that, in his explanation on Thursday, the Minister pointed out that it was not the role of the council to administer the school and its operations. I accept that, Mr President. The question with which I was concerned on Thursday was, given the health concerns of the council, why those children had been returned. I tried to pursue that question, but members were interjecting and, on that occasion, to my sadness, Mr President, you ordered me to desist and suggested that it would be wise to sit back and listen for a moment.

I took your advice on that occasion, Mr President, but now I have a series of questions that I would ask the Minister to address with the same enthusiasm on behalf of the people at Mimili as he would those in metropolitan Adelaide. My questions are:

1. What are the health qualifications of the Manager, Mr Iverson?
2. Is he qualified to reject or accept the safety of the asbestos situation at Mimili?
3. What did Mr Iverson find and what did he report to the Minister?
4. Was the asbestos cleaned up and removed by a licensed asbestos removalist?
5. Has the building been removed or will it be replaced?
6. Why were the children returned to the school before Mr Iverson had made his apparently unqualified assessment of the health aspects of the situation that exist at Mimili, and who will be held liable for any health damage if any is experienced by the children or staff at the Mimili school?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank the honourable member for his question because it gives me an opportunity in effect to correct some of the false statements that the honourable member has been making in this Chamber and publicly over the last few days. It involves some long-term embarrassment to himself and his own credibility, I suspect, but for the honourable member, that is perhaps not as much of a problem as it is for other members.

My office received a letter dated 18 October from Mr Alec Menajuka, the Director of PYEC (Pitjantjatjara Yankunjatjara Education Committee), the governing body for education in the Pitjantjatjara Lands. I want to share that information with members, because the views of the person who is feeding information to the Hon. Mr Roberts are not necessarily being shared by the official spokespersons for the Anangu people in relation to this issue. This letter, dated 18 October, reads:

Some information for you. Anangu want the building to stay. PYEC [the Education Council for the Pitjantjatjara Lands] has been receiving requests for a new building since 1992.

I might just interpose here. Since 1992, under the previous Labor Government, they have been pursuing a new building. The letter continues with dot points:

Finally have one. The Community Development Officer for Mimili—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Roberts does not want to listen to this.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Roberts does not want to listen to this.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: You're misleading—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He does not want to listen to this, obviously.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: You, with your cavalier attitude—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not think this conversation between the Minister and the honourable member is getting anywhere. I ask the Minister to get on with the response.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Community Development Officer for Mimili wrote a letter and got two Anangu people to sign it, but apparently he did not explain what the letter was about. They did not know what they signed. The letter continues:

The Chairperson of AP (Anangu Pitjantjatjara) wants the building to stay and be fixed on site. There is a Demac building already in the Indulkana community which was safely modified in 1995. Currently in Mimili, one class of children has to be taught in a caravan because there is no other building. The new building was to alleviate this pressure. Contact for Donald Fraser, Chairperson for AP—

A couple of telephone numbers are then given. That gives the lie to the information that the Hon. Ron Roberts has been sharing in this Chamber and publicly for the last week—from the official spokespersons for the Anangu people in the Pitjantjatjara Lands, not from some anonymous unidentified source.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: Signed letters.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We have just heard about the letters. According to the Director of the PYEC, the Community Development Officer wrote the letter and got two people to sign it but did not explain what the letter was about and they did not know what they signed. That is not my saying that: that is the Director of the PYEC indicating why those particular people signed that letter.

The Deputy Leader also indicated last week, and again today, that I had ordered the Principal of the school up there to send the children back into an unsafe situation. That was the allegation made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Deputy Leader knows that is not true. He was told last week that that was not true, and he came into the Chamber this afternoon and again stated that I had ordered the Principal to return the students to an unsafe position within the school. He knows that was not true. That decision was taken by Mr Mark Connolly—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, he is a lot of things, including that.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order on my right!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Coordinating Principal, Mr Mark Connolly, took the decision on that particular day in the interests of the students. The Coordinating Principal spoke to me yesterday morning and indicated to me that in his judgment the best place for the students was within the school buildings. The new building, which was not being utilised by students, was in effect isolated. The children were kept away from the facility that was brought to the school, and the students were told to remain within their classrooms and for the school to continue, as the Principal's judgment was—and

on the surface of it, it makes a lot of sense—that the safest place for the students was within—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, what would the Hon. Deputy Leader suggest? The Coordinating Principal made the judgment. He is on site: he is up there. Are you qualified?

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: No.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Exactly. Let the record state that the Deputy Leader said that he is not qualified. The Deputy Leader is not qualified: we all knew that and it is now on the record.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would have thought that the Hon. Ron Roberts would like to listen to this answer because I certainly would like to do so, as I am sure would other members in the Chamber. The more we listen, the quicker will be the response I hope, Minister.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The decision was not a decision that I ordered the principal to make. The Principal is on site: neither I nor the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are on site. We rely on the good sense and good judgment of our senior officers to make judgments in the best interests of students. Is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition making an accusation that that particular hardworking Principal is unqualified and took a decision that was not in the best interests of those students? Is that what he is saying on behalf of the Labor Party? As Minister, I reject that accusation on behalf of the Labor Party that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is making in this cowards' castle when he knows nothing of the local circumstances up there. For him to stand up in this Chamber and accuse one of our senior education officers of not acting in the best interests of the students up there and placing his students at risk is an absolute outrage. He ought to have the courage to stand up in this Chamber and apologise to that education officer. It is an absolute outrage that he should make that accusation.

Mr Geoff Iverson, who is the district superintendent, was there on that particular afternoon. The advice that I received—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There is nobody in the Education Department in the Lands who is an asbestos management expert.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Again, the Deputy Leader unfairly accuses the Principal and the staff of taking actions which place students at risk. I reject on behalf of those officers those unfair, baseless allegations. As quickly as it could, the department sent a senior officer and a building company representative to the area within 24 hours—I will check the exact timing of that. I think the company was Chapman Building Services, and a representative was sent to assess the situation and to make repairs, if needed, to the damage that had been caused at the site.

Discussions are continuing. The answer to the question about whether the building will be removed is 'No,' because the senior spokespersons of the Anangu people do not agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. They do not agree with his particular representative. They have put a point of view to us, which we are presently considering with Services SA, about replacement of the panels. We will look at that situation, consider the costs and try to take a decision as quickly as we can in relation to these issues. In conclusion, the Principal and the staff are looking after the best interests

of the students up there and the students are being kept away from this building.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: Why?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Because of the scare campaign that you and others are endeavouring to arouse in the community. The students are being maintained in the original buildings at the Mimili site and education options are being offered to the students at that location.

AIR QUALITY

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 air quality.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: In the *Guardian* of 18 September 1996 there is an article, 'EPA and MP clash over pollution'. The article goes on to state:

The State's environmental watchdog and a Liberal MP are at loggerheads over industrial pollution in Edwardstown. The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) has refused to run night patrols in the suburb, saying it has received few complaints about pollution. But Elder MP, David Wade [champion for his constituents] maintains that factories are still polluting the air and waterways with noxious fumes and chemicals. He says more residents are complaining to him than ever before.

EPA spokesman Max Harvey said any complaints were followed up with inspections, and some companies had been ordered to improve operations. Mr Harvey said the EPA helped design better work practices and waste removal systems for the companies and he did not believe there were any serious problems. 'There are not any night-time patrols in the area but we make inspections that are prearranged,' Mr Harvey said. 'Night-time patrols would be extremely hard to justify almost anywhere.'

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: That is what the article said. I and others who have had experience in the area of air quality (we may not be experts in the field) believe that in most cases the problems are cleaned up for pre-arranged visits and are not what they would be if spot patrols were carried out. The article continues:

Mr Harvey said the EPA would not pay Marion council to monitor the night-time pollution, which the council had offered to do. He also said this year's EPA-run Pollution Prevention Project workshops to improve recycling and cut wastes at 50 factories had been a success. But Mr Wade said night-time patrols were the only way the EPA could really understand the extent of illegal pollution by the handful of unscrupulous operators.

It is also well-known in the case of many companies which have boilers that if they intend to pollute then they will not pollute during the day when the monitoring can be done by residents. Instructions are generally given to burn waste in the evening when the smokestacks cannot be seen. But, unfortunately, for the people in the Edwardstown area and in the southern regions the inversion layers cause the pollution created in the evenings to stay sometimes up to four or five days, and I have been receiving as many letters as David Wade. My questions are:

1. Will the Government provide the funding required to the EPA to do spot checks or monitor air quality at night in the southern metropolitan area, including the Edwardstown area?

2. Has the EPA refused to conduct tests at night, even though Marion council has offered to cooperate in providing monitors?

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

WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Infrastructure, a question about water efficiency.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: At the beginning of National Water Week (almost two years ago to the day), the Government introduced a water labelling scheme which was part of an education program for South Australians to achieve greater water efficiencies. The scheme, which is similar to the compulsory energy efficient labels on electrical appliances, involves each appliance being tested for its water efficiency and given a rating: A for an acceptable level of water efficiency, AA for a high rating and AAA for excellent efficiency.

At the time he launched the water labelling scheme the Minister for Infrastructure said that households will benefit by being able to save a great deal of money through greater water efficiency. He also said that taxpayers would gain because, if water supplies were to go further, costly new infrastructure investment could be delayed. My questions to the Minister are:

1. With the demise of the water advisory service of SA Water, will the Minister advise which Government agency will promote water efficiency and demand management in South Australia and what funding has been allocated to this program?

2. Will the Minister advise why the South Australian Water Corporation does not have a target reduction in water consumption similar to that in the legislative performance agreement of Sydney Water?

3. Will the Minister advise what the effect of more efficient use of reticulated supplies would be on the revenue to SA Water?

4. Will the Minister advise whether a lesser volume of sewage being treated in metropolitan sewage treatment plants and a lesser volume of reticulated water to be pumped and treated would result in commensurate savings in the costs to the South Australian Water Corporation from its operating contractors?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I represent the Minister for Infrastructure, so I will be pleased to refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and bring back a reply.

VEHICLES, HEAVY

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport questions about alternative routes for interstate heavy vehicles.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Brown Liberal Government is currently looking at a plan to divert heavy interstate semitrailers which now come into Adelaide from Victoria along the South-Eastern Freeway. These semitrailers currently travel via Portrush Road and Hampstead Road in the eastern suburbs. The Liberal Party wants to divert these semitrailers along Greenhill Road and then South Road. The Liberal plan would mean most interstate semitrailers being diverted through Croydon, Ridleyton, Renown Park and Croydon Park. The Brown Government recently organised a workshop to discuss diverting the semitrailers. Three eastern suburbs Liberal MPs were invited and the letter said:

The study will not assume that the current national highway urban link along Portrush and Grand Junction Roads is the necessary route.

No western suburbs MPs of either political persuasion were invited and letters sent to them informing them of the workshop omitted that crucial paragraph. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Why did the Department of Transport's letter sent to the members for Spence and Peake about the value management workshop omit the words 'The study will not assume that the current national highway urban link along Portrush Road, Hampstead Road and Grand Junction Road is the necessary route'?

2. Why was Mr Joe Scalzi invited to the workshop when Mr Heini Becker and Mr Michael Atkinson were not, considering the proposed route does not even run through Mr Scalzi's electorate?

3. Will the Minister order a full investigation to discover what environmental effects and impact the preferred transport route will have on those people who live near these roads and, if not, why not?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The honourable member has leapt to many conclusions in suggesting that the Liberal Party wants to do anything at all in this matter. We are responding to community concerns along Portrush Road and Hampstead Road, an area involving many electorates. I understand a number of groups have been established and, in response to those concerns and council concerns, a value management study has been undertaken. The honourable member may not recall but it was the former Minister for Transport (Hon. Barbara Wiese) and a Labor colleague of his who nominated Portrush Road as the heavy vehicle link, the national highway link, linking the South-East Freeway (Mount Barker Road) with roads to the north such as Highway 1 and the like. This occurred under the former Federal Government plan whereby the linkage of principal linking roads between national highways would be transferred from State to Federal Government responsibility for funding purposes. The Hon. Barbara Wiese nominated that road when she was Minister for Transport. When Senator Collins was Federal Minister for Transport he accepted that nomination and trucks have been using that road because of those authorities issued by former State and Federal transport Ministers—both Labor, incidentally.

I have indicated that, because of the concerns being raised by the residents of Portrush Road and Hampstead Road, which, as I say, involve a whole variety of seats held by Liberal and Labor, not just Liberal, we will involve the community as well as seek to accommodate what is best in the interests of the heavy vehicle industry, in the knowledge that the heavy vehicle industry ensures that products from their many factories and warehouses in this State get to markets elsewhere. It is a critical industry, so we have to accommodate their interests and get their products to market as well as look at the interests of residents. That accommodation and involvement of all parties was not something that the Hon. Barbara Wiese entered into when she was Minister for Transport and it was not good enough; therefore, we are initiating this value management study. All options will be looked at. There is no basis at all for the honourable member's suggesting that the Liberal Party—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the Minister answer the question.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:—has any preferred course in mind. We want to work with the community, the heavy transport industry and local councils to find the best course of action.

I have no idea about the letters which went to various members. I do know that Mr Joe Scalzi together with Mr John Cummins and the Hon. Graham Ingerson from time to time have all written to me about this issue and I suspect it was on that basis that they were invited. If other members wish to be invited to such sessions in the future, the department would be completely relaxed about doing so.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to ask a supplementary question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: In what direction are all the heavy vehicles coming off the freeway into Adelaide, by whatever route, headed?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: To their destination I suspect.

MULTICULTURALISM AND ABORIGINAL RECONCILIATION

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Premier and Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs, a question about racism.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: Some in the South Australian community have stated that the comments of a Federal member of Parliament have caused untold harm both intrastate, interstate and overseas. They have struck at the areas of both social and economic well-being, undermining multiculturalism which, to date, has worked to produce a cohesive, understanding and harmonious Australian community. Such destruction has resulted in a letter to me personally which was in direct response to a letter to the editor of the *Advertiser* signed by a group of Asian leaders and myself. The letter states:

After I had read all the names of various wogs who had signed their names and occupation in the *Advertiser* letter (Thursday 17 October) I wondered who do you think you are. You are lucky that you are allowed to emigrate to this white country. White Australia was a white country as we wanted it to be. Along came the Asians etc. to mess it up. We do not want any more Asians here. Stop where you are and look after your own. Pauline Hanson is not a racist; she only speaks the truth on behalf of we white Australians. The Abos are getting their fair share of the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been paid out of taxpayers' taxes to help them. But what happens? The Abo community leaders are keeping their money for their own use, as you may have read in the news lately, spending it on cars, houses, etc. for themselves.

In any case, Abos smash up the new houses they have had built for them, again out of taxpayer taxes. Why should white Australians be asked to reconcile with the Abos? The Abos have never done anything good for Australia, except moan and moan. What did they ever build, except humpies to live in? The Abos here in South Australia have \$3 billion in the SA Bank. Why is it there and not helping the Abos? Since this country allowed Asians in, all we have had is drugs, money laundering, Tongs, Nip crooks, Italian mafia. I suggest all you people on that list go back where you came from and help your people there!

From a white Australian.

P.S. You would not be allowed to voice your opinion in your own country for fear of imprisonment. Shut up while you are here.

In all my 30 years here—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: Is it signed?

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: No.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: Then why did you read it?

The Hon. BERNICE PFITZNER: I read this letter to show the fall-out that Ms Hanson has engendered. In my 30 years in my adopted country—our Australia—I have never had such sentiment directed at me. Imagine these sentiments multiplied in the rest of the Australia-Asian community, who are all Australian and proud of it. The Premier has moved a most constructive motion which, briefly, affirms its support for policies relating to multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation, recognises that South Australia is a multicultural society, reaffirms its support for the ongoing process of reconciliation and calls for the conduct of public debate to be undertaken according to these principles, and I note that the motion was passed unanimously by both Houses. Therefore, I ask: what further strategies will the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs and the commission put in place to progress this motion?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I share the honourable member's concern at the correspondence she has received. It is an indication of some of the feelings that are being fanned in this debate at the moment. I would correct the honourable member by indicating that we have not yet supported the motion unanimously in this Chamber, but I hope that will be the case in the not too distant future, so that we will be able to say that both Houses of Parliament have unanimously affirmed their support for multiculturalism and Aboriginal recognition. Certainly, I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and ask for a response to be brought back.

TAB FORM GUIDE

In reply to **Hon. G. WEATHERILL** (1 October).

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has provided the following response—

1. TAB's regular/enthusiastic punter is well catered for with TABForm. The information provided in TABForm is regarded as a very good standard of service to a restricted yet committed market, however the average/non regular punter in the market place was not being catered for via TABForm.

By providing information in both TABForm and in the *Advertiser*, TAB is able to provide a service to the light users via the *Advertiser* as well as detailed information to the committed punters via TABForm.

Provision of information within the *Advertiser* has the additional benefit of the papers high circulation rate throughout the State. The new contract negotiated with the *Advertiser* not only provides for the provision of racing information, but also provides for general advertising and promotion of the racing industry in general. It is considered that this has provided a positive impact for the industry.

Because the contractual arrangements have been negotiated in confidence the contract fee cannot be disclosed; however, the fee is substantially less than \$2 million. A cost benefit analysis was undertaken to evaluate the breakeven point required for incremental turnover to cover the new fee. Since the introduction of TABGuide in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 7 September 1996, TAB turnover has increased by 7.4 per cent. This increase is well in excess of the breakeven point.

2. It is not possible to answer this question at this time. All relevant circumstances relating to both the TABForm and the *Advertiser* arrangements will need to be fully considered at that time.

OUTSOURCING

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (3 October).

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for State Government Services has provided the following response:

1. The Government has been examining the possible contracting out of building maintenance and minor works now carried out by Services SA on behalf of public sector agencies other than the SA Housing Trust and health units. The Government has not yet decided to proceed with the contracting out, but has decided to

publicly seek expressions of interest from the private sector for provision of these works.

2. The current value of the works is approximately \$50 million per annum, including approximately \$12 million in regional areas of the State. The total value of the works, if they are contracted out, will depend on the length of any contracts and the savings which the private sector will be able to achieve.

3. The final form and scope of any contracts, and whether they will proceed, will depend on the responses to expressions of interest to be called, and on subsequent negotiations with interested firms. Experience in other jurisdictions suggests that savings in the order of 10-15 per cent are achievable.

4. There are no plans to sign contracts in March or any other time. A decision on whether and when to conclude contracts will be made once the expressions of interest are assessed in early 1997.

5. Services SA staff and relevant unions have been kept informed of steps taken to date. Written briefings were provided to affected Services SA staff by the Chief Executive, Services SA in July and September this year. No negotiations or discussions are in train with private sector companies at this stage.

6. Public expressions of interest from private sector firms to provide the service will be called before the end of the year.

7. No. The decision to seek registrations of interest was made by Cabinet on 16.9.96. Services SA staff were briefed on 19.9.96, before the honourable member asked his question.

WEST BEACH TRUST

In reply to **Hon. R.R. ROBERTS** (2 October).

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

1. The intention of the letter MLG 391/96 was to indicate to the Local Government Boundary Reform Board that it needed to consider the geographical area of the West Beach Trust when considering structural reform proposals from councils.

2. Two letters that make reference to the area of the Trust have been received by the board. These letters merely register an interest in the area managed by the West Beach Trust and were a reaction to comments attributed to a metropolitan council in the local press. The board's correspondence to the Minister on 26 June 1996 was seeking advice in relation to these letters.

3. The board is not preparing a report on the future of the West Beach Trust.

4. The board's functions primarily address that of Boundary Reform within Local Government.

5. This is a matter for the board to determine should boundary reform proposals that could potentially impact upon the trust be received.

6. No proposals that involve the West Beach Trust area have been presented by councils to the board, and therefore there is nothing to inform the trust about.

7. The issue of trust assets is not a Council Boundary issue and therefore would not involve the board. A change to the trust would naturally be discussed with the trust and the unions.

WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

In reply to **Hon. T.G. ROBERTS** (1 October).

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

1. The Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources, Hon. David Wotton MP, is aware that both the Upper and Lower South-East Water Resources Committees, as his advisers on water resources management issues in the South-East, have considered numerous strategies for the ongoing management of groundwater resources in the areas of the South-East, not currently covered by proclamation. The Committees and Minister Wotton consider it imperative that groundwater resources be managed in a pro-active and sustainable manner to avoid over exploitation of those resources.

The preferred management options will be presented to Minister Wotton in the near future. If, after considering the information presented, Minister Wotton determines that proclamation of the groundwater resources is warranted, he will refer the matter to Cabinet for consideration. Proclamation will only be recommended after all options for effective management of the available groundwater resources have been considered.

2. Minister Wotton proposes to introduce a Water Resources Bill to Parliament during the current session.

3. The Government will not withdraw the current draft Water Resources Bill and put together another draft for public consultation. Minister Wotton is satisfied that, where possible, the Water Resources Bill to be presented to Parliament adequately addresses the concerns raised during the extensive public consultation on the draft Bill which was released for public comment in late May 1996.

ABC FUNDING

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question about the ABC.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I wish to quote from the document 'Better Broadcasting', the Coalition's national and community broadcasting policy, issued on 18 January this year. Amongst many other things, it states:

The ABC's domestic services include ABC television, six radio networks and the State symphony orchestras. Furthermore, the ABC has an international arm which comprises Australia Television (ATV) and Radio Australia. This vast network provides a diverse range of programs and performances of cultural value and intellectual integrity. The ABC has a proud record of offering high quality and diverse programming across a broad spectrum of human interests, including news, current affairs, drama, sport and the arts. The ABC must be an independent, truly national, publicly funded broadcaster devoted to excellence and objectivity. The ABC should reflect the broad spectrum of interests, values and views in the Australian community.

The Friends of the ABC indicate that since the Federal Government announced the savage cuts which it proposes making to the ABC its membership has been increasing at a rate of between 70 to 100 individuals a week. Previously, it was a fairly small organisation but now it is a very large one, and many of its new members indicate that they were Liberal voters who trusted the promises of the Coalition before the Federal election but now have many doubts about the broken promises which are being peddled by the Coalition Government. Some of the promises include the Coalition's promises to:

- maintain existing levels of Commonwealth funding to the ABC and retain triennial funding—

I might say that there was no comment about maintaining existing funding for the then current financial year—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is far too much background noise and private chattering going on.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The promises continue:

- maintain the current prohibition on advertising and sponsorship on ABC television and radio;
- support the ongoing extension of Triple J into regional Australia;
- ensure Australia Television (ATV) has a long term future in the Asia-Pacific region.

There are other promises also. We all know that these promises have been broken and that savage cuts to the ABC will severely hamper it in its attempts to provide what the Coalition document stated must be its function. It will no longer be able to reflect the broad spectrum of interests, values and views in the Australian community and will provide a very reduced and inferior service—if not closing some of the six networks and the television channel it currently runs. Is the Minister aware of the incredible damage that cuts to the ABC will inflict on the cultural life of South Australia? Does she agree with the statements in the document 'Better Broadcasting' put out in January this year? If she does, has she taken up the matter with the current Federal Government to persuade it not to damage the ABC and

Australia's cultural life in the way it has proposed and, if not, why not?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: What I know in terms of this matter is that I do not envy the Coalition Government in the tasks that it has to undertake to restore health and wealth to the Australian economy, and that has meant that decisions which I suspect were hard to take and which may not be palatable have had to be taken. I note from the electors of Lindsay—when it was last put to the vote, when voters had an opportunity to comment on the Government and the way it is addressing the ABC and a whole range of issues—that at the weekend Jackie Kelly recorded a 6.8 per cent increase in her—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: A 6.7 per cent increase, and that was on top of an 11 per cent increase in March. So, while we sometimes do get excited about various decisions that have to be made, I think when it has been put to the vote there is a general understanding in the community that the Coalition does not have an easy task in restoring health and wealth to the economy and generally there is backing for the Coalition in undertaking this onerous task.

The Hon. Anne Levy: So you support the cuts?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I did not say that.

The Hon. Anne Levy: You didn't say you didn't.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! If honourable members wish to continue their conversation, there are very good lobbies at the back of this Chamber.

GERMS, DISEASE RESISTANT

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a precised statement prior to directing some questions to the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister for Health, on the subject of the mutation of disease resistant germs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I have exempted the Government backbenchers from that! Members in this Chamber would be aware that over the past couple of years I have directed two or three questions to the Minister for Health on the subject of virus mutation. I have no complaint about these matters, as they were answered promptly by the Minister. However, my attention has recently been drawn to the alleged behaviour of the livestock antibiotic Avoparcin. This drug was banned last year in Germany, Finland and Denmark. The top Australian medical watchdog is currently investigating whether or not to ban the drug from use in Australia. That top body is, of course, the National Health and Medical Research Council.

This body fears that Avoparcin may be linked to an antibiotic resistant bacteria, Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci—or VRE for short. This condition is usually found in cattle, pigs and poultry which are fed Avoparcin. The chairman of an NHMRC working party, Professor John Turnidge, of the Adelaide Women's and Children's Hospital, has said that there was 'a very strong association' between the use of the drug and the emergence of the bacteria in humans. In addition to this statement, the Professor of Microbiology at Flinders Medical Centre, Professor Peter McDonald, said that the greatest fear was that VRE's resistance gene—his words, 'resistance gene'—could be passed on to other antibiotic-resistant infections which were troublesome in all Australian hospitals. Yet again, the Chairman of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, Dr Richard West, said that

the emergence of a Vancomycin-resistant germ in Australia would have a devastating effect on surgical patients.

The first case of VRE in Australia was detected in Victoria in 1994. Further infections have been detected—four in New South Wales and one in Queensland this year—thus giving rise to the fear that the infection is already spreading. In light of the foregoing, I direct the following questions to the Minister:

1. In the light of the ability that we now have in respect of genetic manipulation, has a monitoring body been set up in the South Australian Health Department to investigate the side effects of resistant genes to antibiotics or, indeed, any other potential dangers brought about by genetic mutation or change, and are these brought about in turn either by man-made or naturally occurring mutations?

2. If there is not, and South Australia is dependent on national bodies for such information, then what is the lead time on average between the time of discovery of such information and it being passed on to South Australian health authorities?

3. What mechanisms, if any, exist in order that such information may be promptly passed on to individual medical practitioners, hospitals or indeed any other individual or body to whom such information might be essential?

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

MINERAL EXPLORATION

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services, representing the Minister for Mines and Energy, a question about mineral exploration.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: It was recently reported that Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that in Australia for the year 1995-96 mineral and petroleum exploration was up 7.5 per cent, and \$960 million of that was spent on mineral exploration. It has been reported that the largest increases were in Western Australia, where exploration spending was up to \$520 million, the Northern Territory up \$18 million to \$94 million and Victoria up 25 per cent to \$43 million. It was also reported in relation to petroleum exploration that \$725 million was spent by Australian companies in the year 1995-96. The main increases in that field, which was up overall 6 per cent, was Queensland up 29 per cent to \$107 million, the Northern Territory up \$40 million to \$96 million, and in Western Australia petroleum exploration spending fell by \$27 million, but still was at the level of \$319 million.

In the 1995-96 annual report of Mines and Energy South Australia which was tabled in this place on 1 October it was recorded that mineral exploration by companies in South Australia for the calendar year 1995 was \$20.8 million, the highest level since 1986, and a 3 per cent increase on the level in 1994. It was also reported that petroleum exploration for the 1995 year was \$59.4 million, which compared favourably to \$47 million spent in 1994. My questions are:

1. Will the Minister provide the Council with the South Australian figures on exploration for 1996? The figures to which I referred the Council were for 1995.

2. What are the prospects for South Australian mineral and petroleum exploration for the years 1996, 1997 and beyond?

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

TEACHER NUMBERS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services a question about teacher numbers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I think it was last week when I asked the Minister a question about teacher numbers in South Australian schools over the next couple of years. Since asking that question, I have had an opportunity to meet with Professor Kym Adey, the President of the Australian Council of Deans of Education. I have also had an opportunity to look at the draft report, which will not be released because there have been some changes that have caused the numbers to be reconsidered. However, I might add that, as I understand it, that reconsideration will make the situation worse, because the changes are being caused by the Federal budget and the impact that that is already starting to have.

I reported in this place last week that, unlike the situation in the late 1960s and the 1970s when we had a shortage and we were able to go interstate and even overseas to recruit teachers—in fact, in the mid 1970s I taught with a number of teachers who had been recruited overseas—we now have the reverse situation where other States are facing shortages. In fact, I understand that Victoria will have a shortage of as many as perhaps 1 000 teachers next year, that the UK and New Zealand are actively recruiting in Australia, and that the US will face a shortfall of 250 000 teachers by the year 2002. So, we will not be in a position to recruit interstate if we find ourselves short.

My understanding is that, in response to the last Federal budget, a number of universities in Australia are cutting back on some teacher education programs. The University of Adelaide has had a cutback of 100 staff positions, and there has been a significant impact on teacher education. I believe the intake—

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Ms Vanstone has been at work. I understand that the impact will be close to a halving of the number of secondary graduates that will come out of that university in the future. I understand that the St George Campus of, I think, the University of New South Wales, which has a significant teacher education component, is about to be shut down *in toto*. So, there seem to be cutbacks happening nationally which will make the situation worse than that anticipated by the Council of Deans.

It has also been suggested to me that the increase in HECS fees for maths and science graduates will mean that teaching will be an even less attractive proposition, because they will be offered the same salary—and in South Australia it will be much lower than in other States—but will pay a much higher HECS fee than that which will be paid by other teachers. So, they will have a lower take home pay, and there will be no incentive for people to go into maths and science and then go on to teaching. I also understand that there will be a significant impact on the updating of courses offered by universities in terms of post-graduate training—the sorts of courses that we are trying to encourage teachers to do.

In the light of this further information—I am not at all certain whether the Minister has spoken with Professor Adey—I ask the Minister whether he still stands by his position that we may not be facing difficulties, not next year

but the year after. My understanding is that it has been suggested that the best we can hope for is a 48 per cent shortfall in the number of secondary graduates who will go into teaching in the year 1998. Does the Minister still insist that there is no difficulty, and will he acknowledge that he may have to take on board teachers whom he otherwise would not have? This is something about which the Minister has complained for the past decade—teachers that he wanted to get rid of, as he saw it. What will the Minister do to address the impending teacher shortage, and what is he doing, in particular, regarding schools in regional South Australia which obviously will cop the brunt of this in the first instance?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Let me say at the outset that I am delighted that the honourable member takes the view that I will be the Minister and part of the Liberal Government in 1998 after the next election. I thank him for that and for having that placed on the public record.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, I don't think you will have much to say about it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The honourable member probably now realises what he said. The Government's view regarding the specific issue which has been raised by Professor Adey, that of massive shortages in 1996 and 1997, remains exactly the same. What we are seeing, however, is a slight change of position by Professor Adey and the Deans of Education in response to the position that the Government has put down. As I indicated last week to the honourable member, these concerns were first raised in, I think, 1994 by Professor Adey and others when they said that we would have significant shortages in 1996. We are now in 1996.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes. At that time, we said that there would not be those shortages in that time frame. We believed that planning needed to be achieved towards the end of the decade and the start of the next century. The honourable member now indicates that Professor Adey says that there will be massive shortages next year. Again, as I indicated last week—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We talk all the time. I haven't spoken to him recently.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I know what he is saying, but I have not spoken to him recently. We happen to disagree on the issue of the timing of the shortage. As I said last week, we believe there will be a need for large numbers of teacher graduates to come out of the system at the end of this decade and the start of the next century. That is the view not of me personally but of professional public servants in the Department for Education and Children's Services. That is where we have had the difference of opinion. We do not say that there will not be a need to match supply and demand at some time, but we disagree with Professor Adey's view, which he has wanted to put publicly, that in South Australia the shortage will be in the short term in 1996 and 1997. We have disagreed with that assessment.

I shared the information last week that my professional officers within the department are saying that next year we will need to hire only approximately 220 to 230 teachers overall—not just secondary teachers, but new teachers. They are the predictions. The predictions are that we will not have any concern in the broad. I indicated last week, and I say

again this week, that we have some problems relating to specialist areas. In particular, languages other than English is a difficult area for us, and—and this is a related issue, but it can also be treated separately—we have some problems in getting certain teachers with certain skills to go to country areas. It is not that they do not exist: they exist in the city, but they are not prepared to go to the country. So, that is related, but it is also—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: That's always been true.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is more so recently since we got rid of compulsory country service. It is not correct, as the honourable member says, that it has always been true, because the honourable member should recall—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:—that there was something known as compulsory country service. It is not true, as the honourable member interjects, that that has always been the case, because under the old arrangements with the equitable service scheme there was a requirement that teachers had to go to the country. So, I remind the honourable member that that interjection is not correct or accurate.

Other issues in relation to the possible effect of Federal Government budget changes are important, and I think there might be some common ground between the Deans of Education, the Governments of Australia—in particular, the employing teacher Governments: the State and Territory Governments—and the Hon. Mr Elliott. Some of these issues are being discussed at the moment and we need, as future employers of teachers, to look at the effects that the Commonwealth's budget changes might have on teacher education.

As I said last week and have said publicly over the past week as well, we need to ensure that the young people leaving our schools at present are attracted into teacher courses because it will be these young people who will leave the universities at the end of this decade and the start of next century, which will be the critical time frame. I share some of the concerns that a number of people are currently contemplating in relation to the effects on teacher education. If the effect of the current changes is a significant reduction in the number of young people going into teacher education courses, then I believe that would be a concern to most, if not all, Ministers for Education throughout Australia.

As I indicated last week, the South Australian Government is looking, hopefully with some support from other educational groups, to try to see what we can do to encourage more young people to look at their future career prospects in terms of teaching at the end of the decade and the start of the next century.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: Why don't you try valuing the teachers? Value the teachers first.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We do value the teachers, and that is why we have desperately been trying to pay them a significant pay increase; that is why we give them smaller class sizes than any other State in Australia; that is why we give our teachers more school support officers than any other State on the national average; that is why we spend more money on education than any other State in Australia—because we do value our teachers and staff and believe that it is an important—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: That's not what they say.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, that's the Teachers' Union. We believe it is an important occupation and we want to encourage young people who are leaving school to contemplate teaching as a career. This is particularly the case if we

look at some of the other high status occupations of medicine and law in recent years. At the moment we are seeing as many law graduates being trained as there are lawyers in practice, so we are told; and we are seeing for the first time medical graduates not perhaps being guaranteed future employment. So, a career where there might be, at the end of this decade, significant numbers of people being employed within our teaching system should be an attractive proposition for young people leaving the school system. We will be looking, together with other education interest groups, at a range of initiatives to see what we might be able to do, albeit in a small way, in this area.

WAITE TRUST (MISCELLANEOUS VARIATIONS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 16 October. Page 145.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the second reading. This Bill deals with a number of issues arising out of the use of the land entrusted to the Crown by Mr Peter Waite on trust for the establishment of an agricultural high school. Urrbrae High School was established on the site and additional land originally owned by Susan Dridan was incorporated into the Urrbrae site. It appears that various developments have taken place over the years without strict regard to Waite's trust—use of some of the land for roads, a public recreational reserve being created, and some land being given over for the use of Unley High School in exchange for the Dridan land.

These various developments were not harmful to the purposes of the original trust, and the Opposition considers that there is justification for excusing any past breaches of the original trust. It seems sensible, on the information provided to this Parliament last week by the Attorney-General, to ratify these various uses, even if there has been some departure from the literal formulation of Mr Waite's trust.

The Opposition also is sympathetic to the Government's intention to use some of the Waite land for TAFE purposes provided that the courses offered are purely directed at agricultural vocational training. The Opposition approves a variation of the terms of the trust to encompass students of both genders. The Opposition also approves of the relocation of the State Tree Centre to the Urrbrae site and considers that the revegetation focus of that organisation will fit into the scheme of an agricultural education which will continue to be carried on at the site.

In conclusion, we are of the view that Mr Waite would probably approve of the changes proposed by the Attorney, but the final word on the merits of this Bill can only be given after it has been considered by a select committee, as is required by Standing Orders. The reason for the select committee process is to allow for public consultation and submissions. Public consultation and submissions are always important but are especially so when pre-existing private rights are being specifically varied or abrogated by an Act of Parliament. We will support the second reading of this Bill, and if some objections are raised within the select committee the Opposition will reconsider the matter at that stage.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 17 October. Page 189.)

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: My very first speech to this Parliament was on the subject of population. Since that time little more has been said on the subject by members of this Parliament except for the occasional lament from a Liberal MP that South Australia was not getting its share of the newly-arrived immigrant population to Australia. Such cries from the heart are based on a particular economic and consumerist view which says that every last little immigrant is another consumer, and we should welcome every new consumer we can get because they create demands for goods, and that is good for the economy. Indeed, I saw just that point of view in today's *Advertiser* from Rex Jory.

It is a very faulty view because it requires a never-ending growth of population in order to create further demand for more products. It is also an ecologically barren view because it assumes that the consumption of resources is a positive and it bears no recognition to the fact that we cannot continue to live this way and that not all resources are infinite: indeed, I doubt that any resource is infinite.

Neither the Australian Government nor any State Government has developed a population policy, despite the fact that this is so crucial. It is because the Brown Government accepts the old view for the need for an increase in population that I am again putting the counter view. Having a population policy is not a question of race; it is a matter of determining what is the sustainable level of population for a country, or, if the Federal Government is afraid to address this issue, at least for South Australia.

Five or six years ago, as a representative of the Conservation Council of South Australia, I was involved in the consultations which the then Immigration Minister, Mr Gerry Hand, undertook in each State to assist in determining what the next year's immigration level should be. I asked him, given that the Federal Government had failed to develop a population policy, why he simply did not open the floodgates and let in whoever wanted to come. His reply was that it was important to set levels so that Governments could make orderly decisions about the needs for facilities, such as schools, housing and hospitals, and if too many people arrived at once the country would be unable to cope. So, in a vague sort of fashion, there was the beginning of a population policy. But it was not in reference to anything other than what the country could cope with in the following year in regard to the provision of infrastructure.

In 1993, the House of Representatives Standing Committee for Long-term Strategies took on a reference investigating Australia's population carrying capacity. I was one of 271 people who made submissions to that inquiry and, had the committee visited Adelaide, I would have appeared in person. In its report entitled 'One Nation: Two Ecologies', the committee noted that more than 90 per cent of the submissions argued for population stability or decrease. The committee, which was not exactly a radical one, having a make-up of one National, seven ALP and four Liberal Party MPs, recommended:

The Australian Government should adopt a population policy which explicitly sets out options for long-term population change in

preference to the existing situation where a *de facto* population policy emerges as a consequence of year by year decisions on immigration intake in an *ad hoc* fashion, such decisions being largely determined by the state of the economy in the particular year with little consideration of the long term effects—

which is exactly the situation that Gerry Hand was painting in his picture to me when I was involved in those consultations some years ago.

This committee was not the first to advocate the development of a population policy in Australia, but it is the most recent one. The National Population Council recommended in its report, 'Population Issues and Australia's Future', issued in December 1991, that the Australian Government should develop a population policy. Almost six years later it has not happened. 'One Nation: Two Ecologies' is critical of the Australian Government for not having developed a population policy, and I quote again:

In population matters, Australia cannot rely on luck and chance factors. It must know where it wants to go.

The explanation offered by the Government at the Cairo Conference on Population and Development in 1994 that 'Australia does not have an explicit or formal population policy in part because there would be a diversity of community views as to the character and objectives of such a policy' is at best an agnostic position: at worst, an abdication of responsibility simply because the subject is difficult.

Through 1992 and 1993, I was involved in a working group of the Conservation Council developing the Conservation Council's own written policy. That policy advocated the development of a population policy both by the Federal and State Governments. I will read some of that policy into the record:

National Population Policy.

1.1 The Conservation Council calls on the Australian Government to develop a national population policy for Australia which is based on principles of ecologically sustainable development.

1.2 The national population policy should be precautionary and aimed at stabilising Australia's population within 30 years.

1.3 The national population policy should address the social, economic and environmental impacts of all people in Australia, including residents, migrants, temporary visitors and tourists.

Not many people realise the environmental impact that tourists make, particularly with the numbers that are coming to Australia. If you think of the number of toilets they flush and the number of showers alone, they are making an enormous impact on our water supply. The policy continues:

1.4 The national population policy should address not only the numbers of people in Australia but also where these people live, work or visit, so as to minimise the impact of people on Australia's diverse and often delicate environments.

Immigration.

2.1 Australia's immigration, tourist and temporary visitor levels should be set so as to stabilise Australia's population at an ecologically sustainable level within the next 30 years.

2.2 Immigration policy should be weighted towards refugee, humanitarian and immediate family reunion intake, and should not be geared towards fuelling economic growth.

I now move to the section on State Responsibilities:

5.1 The Conservation Council calls on the South Australian Government to develop a population policy for South Australia which is consistent with the national population policy.

5.2 South Australia's limited water resources should be a key parameter in determinations under this policy.

Under the heading, 'Immigration to South Australia', it reads:

The South Australian Government should not actively recruit permanent nor temporary migrants from overseas, nor from elsewhere in Australia other than in accordance with national and South Australian population policy.

What is of significance for this Parliament is the call on the State Government to also develop a population policy which recognises our limited water resources and calls for a cautious approach to immigration. You would also note that immigration is treated as a separate issue. 'One Nation: Two Ecologies' noted that many people confuse immigration and population policies and some use the concepts interchangeably. I observe that, while they are very much inter-related, they are not one in the same.

The Democrats have separate immigration and population policies, of both of which I am very proud. The population policy recognises the limited capacity of our environment to sustain increasing numbers of people living the consumptive lifestyle which we are all encouraged to adopt in this country, as well as addressing issues such as contraception and where people should live. The issue of where people should live is an interesting one. I have here an article from the *Australian* of 24 February 1993 with the heading, 'Migration Fuelling Pollution'. This is referring to Queensland, and it is not about immigrants from overseas, but talks about people from other States moving into Queensland. It reads:

'South-East Queensland faces an environmental crisis unless new planning strategies are introduced to cope with population growth fuelled by interstate migration,' a planning advisory group has warned. The main concerns raised by the group, made up of scientists, planners, environmentalists and industry and Government representatives, centre on air pollution, water storage and loss of natural habitat. It warns that Brisbane has the potential to become one of the most polluted cities in Australia with several air quality criteria already at or exceeding critical levels.

Further on it states:

On present trends, the State Government has predicted that the population of South-East Queensland will increase by about 500 000 by the end of the decade.

That is a fairly hefty increase, by the way. In South Australia, we are looking at perhaps a 300 000 increase in the next 30 years in Adelaide: here we are talking about 500 000 in the south-east of Queensland alone by the year 2015. The article continues:

In a seven point resolution, the group warns that there is a direct relationship between population growth and declining environmental policy. It calls on the State Government's Regional Planning Advisory Group to give priority to the protection of environmental values rather than a growth management strategy in order to protect and enhance the region's environmental resources.

As I mentioned, the Democrats have quite separate population and immigration policies and the immigration policy recognises human factors and social justice. The Democrat policy is that immigration levels should not exceed emigration levels, that refugees are an integral part of the immigration intake and that the highest priority should be given to refugees, followed by family reunions, in deciding the composition of our immigrant intake.

What are Australia's responsibilities to the rest of the world? Can we address the demand of people wanting to come to our country? If we cannot—and I believe that we cannot—whom do we let in? I believe that the policy that the Democrats have in their immigration policy is the most humane: priority first of all to refugees, then family reunions and business migrants, might I say, come very low on the list. We cannot take on responsibility for the whole world. But in looking at population questions we must balance to some extent the social versus environmental demands.

During the recent break from parliamentary sittings, I attended a lecture by Rob Grey, Professor of Accounting at the University of Dundee, who made distinctions between

inter and intra generational equity, one being to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of resources to people in the current generation and the other to ensure that we look at an equitable distribution between people of this generation and subsequent generations. He extrapolated these to two terms that he called eco-efficiency and eco-justice which were two new concepts to me but which make a lot of sense.

This moves me on to the question of what is Australia's carrying capacity. Tim Flannery in his book *The People Eaters* suggests that it is somewhere between six and 12 million people and certainly if we use resources at the rate that we are using them then it would have to be around the six million mark. As a member of Australians for an Ecologically Sustainable Population, I attended this organisation's annual conference in July. While I was there I was given a book written by one of the members of AESP, Dr Peter Todd, a retired doctor, who feels so passionately about this issue of intergenerational equity that his book is entitled, quite emotively but accurately, *Stop Thieving from our Children*.

At that conference, one of the speakers, Professor Bob Douglas, who is Director of the National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health at the Australian National University, posed a question to us in relation to the growing population: can we all survive in the style to which we have become accustomed and not irreversibly damage the ecosystem and can we all live fulfilling lives? I think in that question the operative word is 'all'. I think, if you look at the population of the world and the way that we in the first world live, the answer to his question is, 'No, we cannot.' If we cannot, who will decide? Who will be God and decide which people can live our sort of lifestyles and which ones cannot?

One of the overhead transparencies that was put up amongst the presentations—and I do not know who was giving that presentation—had some projections of world resources, the finite resources that we use so profligately, showing how much of those resources we would have left if all the people in the third world were suddenly able to use resources in the same manner as we do. I was not quick enough to get them all down, but I recall one of the minerals that he mentioned was copper. If that was to be used by the people in the third world now at the same rate as we use it, there would be eight years of copper supplies left in the world.

Bob Douglas made the observation that many people desperately hope that there will always be a techno fix to solve the next problem which emerges and that such hopes or beliefs prevent action at both the political and social level. Professor Brian Roberts, Director of the Land Use Study Centre at the University of Southern Queensland, told us that throughout the world we are down to .1 hectares each of productive land. There is only 11 per cent of soil that has no limitations, that is, at least within some sort of foreseeable future will not lose its fertility. In Australia the figure is at 10 per cent.

He also put a rather unusual view about why the Roman Empire came to an end. He suggested that, because the Romans took their taxes in grain, the fall of the Roman Empire occurred because in the areas where that tax was being levied the soil productivity started to run out. He also pointed out to us that 24 per cent of the irrigated lands of the world have already been damaged by salinity.

Someone at the conference drew my attention to an article which was published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 18 February this year and which I have not yet had time to follow up. The article was headed 'Sydney found to be

consuming 35 times its share of resources' and referred to research done by a Griffith University team led by Ron Simpson. That article referred to the footprint that a city can have. In that particular example, you get to see that in the land that is available for the millions of people who live in Sydney they cannot sustain themselves on that land. They must have recourse to land 35 times the size of Sydney in order to sustain that population.

I was recently looking at a magazine called *Population News* which tells of an example of population pressures in Indonesia coming on water. Approximately 11 million Indonesians drink water from wells which have more than double the nitrate level recommended by the World Health Organisation. I note that those nitrate levels can cause iron deficiencies which, in turn, can lead to breathing difficulties. In Yogyakarta, the cause found by Professor James Fox, Dr Geoffrey Smith and Robert Wetselaar of ANU has been toilet pits. The process of boiling that water to clean it (it having been contaminated from the toilet pits) increases the level of nitrates. One health problem is substituted with another in this particular case. The observation of these three men is that the problem itself is that the population is too large to allow the soil and water to cope with the amount of nitrates that are leaching into the soil.

The Dalai Lama made what I think is a lovely quote about population.

Buddhists consider each human life is precious. However, the precious life too many now, so best thing is more monks and more nuns.

Over a number of years we have seen that the Federal Government has been unwilling to develop a population policy. If it is not willing, I believe that the State Government should. As I mentioned before, the State planning review had predicted in 1993 that over the next 30 years there would be an increase of 300 000 people living in Adelaide. The sorts of problems which are population related in this State range from urban growth and sprawl through to waste disposal, habitat loss, land degradation, salinity, and species extinction including, might I say, the odd problem such as not being able to predict how many teachers we will need from year to year.

The Conservation Council's policy on population recommended that the South Australian Government should develop a population policy with water resources as the key and that the South Australian Government should not actively recruit immigrants. I support the motion for this Address in Reply, but I look forward one day to hearing the Governor giving a speech at the opening of Parliament which says that the State Government will develop a population policy which will be done in conjunction with wide public consultation.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: In beginning my contribution to this Address in Reply, first, let me pay tribute to His Excellency the Governor on this the first occasion of his opening of State Parliament. I am sure that he will prove to be a worthy successor to our previous Governor Dame Roma Mitchell. I wish His Excellency Sir Eric Neal well in the discharge of his duties and functions. I, who was at one time a believer in having the monarchical system for our head of State, have in recent times been converted to the cause of republicanism, basically due to the exposure of our royal family triggered by the apparent uncaring, spendthrift attitude of the two princesses who married into the Royal House of Windsor. There are thousands of Australians like me. I have no doubt that as people of my generation die away Australia

will become a republic. It is, in my opinion, not a matter of if but a matter of when. This will mean some considerable change in the way in which Australia is perceived in the world and the manner in which Government is acted out in this future great nation.

Talking of change, those members of this place who have heard or read all my contributions over the past 10 years or so will recall that at most, if not at all, times I have spoken of the change which has been occurring and, in particular, the changes which have led us down the path towards economic globalisation. In order not to upset too many of my parliamentary colleagues, today's contribution will be more of the same. First, though, I would like to paint a backdrop against which these particular changes are taking place because, if these are not understood and indeed given account to, then the risks that this world runs in giving effect to the changes which are upon us will be enormous and, instead of them leading to a land flowing with milk and honey, a veritable peaceful form of Valhalla, these changes which are upon us could very well lead us back to the Stone Age.

Let me just list a few of those things which I perceive must be taken into account and I shall then proceed to expand further on each of them:

1. The pace of change itself.
2. The levels of unemployment which these changes have brought in their wake.
3. The impact on the structures of today's society and the effect which these changes are having on us.
4. The lagging behind of society in reacting to these changes by use of the various political systems in place throughout the world.
5. The continuing and ever quickening damage to our environment brought about by the pace of change.
6. The failure of world bodies such as the United Nations to fulfil the role which it was intended to when it was first set up.

These six points by no means cover the whole of the field nor are they intended to do so but, even if this world was only giving consideration to one, then that, in my opinion, would be 100 per cent improvement on what is currently happening.

I now turn to the first of the six points I have made, namely, the pace of change itself. There can be no doubt that the pace of change taking place is staggering by whatever standards one would want to apply. For instance, I understand that some 80 new types of drugs come onto the world market every four weeks. How any physician or practitioner of medicine can keep pace with the knowledge needed in their application defies description. The same thing again in the field of aeronautics. Indeed, does this Council need reminding that the Wright brothers first flew a heavier than air machine at Kittyhawk, South Carolina, in the early part of this century, yet some 65 or 66 years later humankind had succeeded in landing the first man on the moon?

The list is endless, but it is in the field of computers that the pace of change has been truly frenetic. The modern computer stemmed from a World War II piece of equipment located at Bletchley House in England. This machine was most secret and was used by the British to decipher the German Government's encrypting machine, known now to the world as the enigma machine. I understand that large valves were used in its manufacture and as such it filled the two or three very large rooms where it was located. Of course, in its present day, what with, first, the advent of the transistor and then the microchip, it would fit very comfort-

ably in one's lap—truly astounding when one looks at the change that that has entailed.

But it is the speed with which computerisation has taken over almost every aspect of our society with which I now wish to deal. First, I for one am not opposed to computers but rather I am opposed to the pace of their introduction and the damage which this speed has caused. I also add that most benefits which flow from the computer to the human race are, in my view, arrived at by accident rather than by design. The unemployment which they have wrought is incalculable. Likewise, the damage to our society's fabric which is busily fermenting away. These have not been taken into account by the forces which have been responsible for the pace of this change. Instead it would appear that the great god Mammon and associated greed for better and bigger profits are the main triggers.

The emergence of the computers has also aided and abetted the ever shrinking number of people who control the world's economic and investment decisions. The ability to electronically pass money from one nation to another has played a very large role in more and more Governments losing any control they ever had over their own economic destiny and, ultimately, the welfare of the people they were elected to serve. In respect of this matter, most politicians of all political Parties have been less than forthright with their electorates on just this one subject. But time as ever is the enemy and I must press on which leads me to the second of the six points which I made in my foregoing preamble, namely, the levels of unemployment which the changes have brought in their wake.

The nations of the European economic community have for the past 10 years or more been having to live with a registered pool of unemployment of some 30 million people. For the past decade or more it would appear that their best efforts to address this problem have failed—likewise, in Australia and the United States, indeed in all the top seven of the so-called leading economic nations of this earth and, in a wider sense, all the 12 top members of the OECD nations. This position even now includes Japan.

The excuse proffered for this is that the cost of production in these nations is too high. This so-called fact has led to multinational companies, whose directors—unlike most politicians—are for the most part not answerable to anyone. Time and again those of us who have an interest in this matter have seen annual general meetings of shareholders in multinationals stacked so that the same body of people who control them are re-elected to their positions. I suppose it appears that, so long as enormous profits flow and keep flowing, they have nothing to worry about, regardless of the fact that the pursuit of profit is being done with little or no thought being given to the damage done to the social fabric of our society. The 'too much cost to produce' argument has led to many of these companies relocating their businesses in the low wage nations of this earth. The recent emergence of the so-called South-East Asian tigers in our region in no small measure owes their recent so-called prosperity to these decisions to relocate both industry and investment into that region.

Of course, as unemployment continues to grow in the once affluent West, so consumer spending power continues to shrink. I put it to the Council that the maximisation of profit motive, rather than cost competitiveness, has been the real driving force for the relocation of both industries and investment finance into these low wage and, therefore, low cost regions. As I have stated, as unemployment continues to

grow in the West and as purchasing power continues as a diminished force, then the captains of these multibillion-dollar corporations of state have to find other markets for their ever increasing volume of production. As anyone with half an eye to see will know, there has been a concerted effort by these multinationals to open up the Chinese market of some 1.2 billion people so that they can be future purchasers of industry output.

That they have succeeded—and as each day passes they are succeeding even more so—is self evident to even the most casual onlooker. I find it truly ironic that it was only some 24 years ago that the Whitlam Government became one of the first—if not the first—within the so-called western nations, to accord recognition to the Chinese through the opening up of the Australian Embassy there. Truly, a day is a long time in politics. All of this of course could not have been done without the advent of computerisation and the capacity that that gave us through quick electronic placement to relocate investment capital. Concerted attempts are also being made to open up India with its population of 1000 million people. However, to give that Government its due, within the past nine months or so it has publicly stated that overseas investment capital is not welcome there unless it fits in with the Indian Government's own plan of industrial development.

Of course, the blame for all of this does not lie solely with the captains of industry. Politicians from all walks of life must shoulder the burden by being less than forthright with their electorates and not informing them concerning the real causes of unemployment. Take our own country, for instance, at both the last State and Federal elections. The then Leader of the Liberal Opposition, Mr Dean Brown, and the then Federal Opposition Leader, Mr John Howard, both promised to address the problem of unemployment. What has happened in reality, now that both lead their respective Governments, is exactly the opposite. Unemployment has remained at about the same levels as before, irrespective of election to office. Why is that? The truth is that the global economic village in which we now live has ensured that all Governments have now little or no control over their own economic destinies unless they can find a new methodology to deal with the problems of unemployment.

On reflection, I believe that the Keating Labor Government understood the problems confronting us much better than does the present Howard led Liberal Government. The one way out of the present impasse is to ensure that our scientific people have access to the best education processes in the world to ensure that Australian-based industries have that scientific edge over our competitors in the global marketplace. I believe that Keating recognised this. Indeed, I think that either he or Hawke coined the phrase 'the clever country' and, even if they did not, they certainly used that phrase enough to show me that they understood it well.

On the other hand, John Howard does not and I believe that the first Howard budget is clear evidence of the lack of understanding by the present Liberal Prime Minister and his sometimes too vociferous Treasurer, Mr Peter Costello. Three points are important to make here. First, to try to bring our deficit back into balance, the Liberal Government used the old fashioned method of economic slash and burn, with hundreds of millions of dollars cut from all over the place. This is reflected in the cuts to CSIRO funding. Secondly, the cuts to research and development and, thirdly, the massive cuts to our education systems at both secondary and tertiary levels. All this is at a time when it is crying out, to anyone with vision, that the only way out of our present problem is

to have a much cleverer and better educated work force than anyone else.

Therefore, my advice to the present Liberal Prime Minister is this: in order for a nation to succeed these days, it is not the history of the past that we have to understand but what will be the history of the future. In short, I believe that the framework of the Howard-Costello first budget was based on the lessons of the past and not what will be the history of the future. It would have been a far better thing for us to have continued to run a deficit so as to ensure the better education of our children because this would have ensured a better and more stable economic future for them, their children and their children's children. If the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries were the centuries of the Industrial Revolution, then the twenty-first century and beyond will be the centuries of a scientific revolution. Mr Howard and Mr Costello clearly do not understand this, though to his credit I believe that our Premier does, though to date he has not delivered very much for South Australia.

As to the third point to which I have already referred, that is, the impact and structures on today's society and the effect that these changes are now having on us, I have no doubt that scant attention has been given to the impact that newly introduced technologies are having on the fabric of our society. Certainly, it is mind bending for our younger people to have to try for a job day after day with little or no chance at all of success. If even they occasionally do succeed, it is only to find that the only thing on offer is casual or part-time work. How soul destroying this is can only be truly understood by the people involved at the coalface of this modern house of horrors.

And, lest we forget, the young people of today will still be about when those of my generation have passed away. The absolute failure of Governments everywhere to address these problems has led to higher suicide rates. In Australia the suicide rate amongst our youth is twice as high as that for the same age group in Great Britain. There is a total lack of trust by young people in their political leaders and in most of the institutions around which the fabric of our societies is based.

In addition to the younger generation, also involved in this slag heap of unemployment are the more mature citizens. Irrespective of how long they have faithfully served an employer, once they have reached the ripe old age of 45 or so they are retrenched because some factory has either relocated offshore or rationalised its operations within Australia, or a mixture of both has occurred. Many of these people will never find another job. Much of the causative effect of this is brought about either by rationalisation of industry (*a la* Thatcher) or computerisation, and all done not for any benefit to the human race but in the pursuit of that great god Mammon and indeed of more and more profit than even that.

Let me illustrate what I mean. We have seen all our public transport services reduced to one person crews, brought about—you have guessed it—by computerisation. The minimum job loss to this State in respect to that matter was about 1 500 people. Smaller service stations in this State are closing down because they cannot afford to computerise their sites, and those larger petrol outlets which could afford computerisation are reducing their staff by upwards of 75 per cent or more. One such site of which I personally know shed 20 of 29 staff when they computerised their site.

Consider further the many rural bank office closures brought about by rationalisation and the many hundreds of

jobs shed within the total banking system, yet again as a result of massive computerisation.

I will mention a couple of observations of my own as examples: the processing of all cheques and financial transactions by computer; the introduction of word processors and outside automatic telling machines and, indeed, many other computer-led applications within our banking system. The computerisation of check-outs in supermarkets has led, and will further lead, to more jobs being lost in those outlets in South Australia.

Consider then the thousands of jobs that have been lost in this State alone. And consider that within the parameters of our small population—a population of 1.5 million people—this job loss has occurred. If that is to be multiplied 1 000 times or more, then truly the nature and extent of our employment problems begin to materialise in all their hideous monstrosity.

It is no small wonder to me that these days the world's societies live in what I would call the culture of complaint, as people in the main blindly head out looking for explanations for what is our present day society. I am reminded that it is not all that long ago that a former Liberal Prime Minister, Mr Malcolm Fraser, called the long-suffering unemployed 'dole bludgers'. The only phrase which I think fits this particular statement of his is 'Oh ye of little knowledge'. One may well ask what has changed when we see the present Liberal Prime Minister and his garrulous Treasurer using old and failed methods in endeavouring to rein in Australia's present deficit problems.

The fourth point that I wish to address is the lagging behind of society in reacting to these changes by use of the various political systems in place throughout the world. Earlier in my contribution I said that such was the rate of change in respect of new drugs that the medical people were having trouble keeping pace with the change.

Thus it is also with legislators. When we consider the damage done by computer hackers, for instance—people who gain access to the computerised banking system and then proceed to rip off many millions of dollars from the system—it is just staggering. The manner in which computerised systems assist criminals to wash and launder their ill-gotten wealth and the amounts involved are mind-boggling.

These occurrences of which I have just spoken are but two of the many evils which the pace of computer change has imposed on society. There is no doubt that if society is to survive necessary legislation on a massive scale will have to be introduced. Here the problems for legislators are compounded by the pace of change itself. In other words, legislation is enacted today with some changes but, because of the pace of the introduction of change itself, one legislates one day only to find that on the following day that legislation is out of date because of further introduced changes.

So that are the horns of the dilemma confronting politicians. Whilst I am on the subject, computerisation of the type that we are witnessing also puts at considerably higher risk than is already the case the absolute right of all of our citizens to privacy.

How does one deal with these technological explosions? Perhaps what needs to happen is for the people responsible to pause for a considerable while so that society in general, and politicians specifically, can take a long, deep breath and consider how best we can legislate so as to give our citizens their inalienable rights from the criminal elements of society, to keep their bank accounts from being plundered by outsiders, and to protect the individual's right to privacy.

I turn to my fifth point, namely, the continuing and ever quickening damage to our environment brought about by the pace of change. There can be no doubt that the control of the world's investment, research and development funding is becoming more and more the domain of fewer and fewer. This has led, and it will continue to lead, to enormous damage to this earth's environment. For instance, as poverty becomes more and more endemic in the Third World so does the hunger and the poverty of these peoples lead them ever faster to exploit their country's own resources, whether it be in the degradation of their soils by cash-cropping, the pollution of their lakes, rivers and streams, by the greedy exploitation of their mineral resources, by multinational mining companies, by the felling of their forests in their desperate pursuit of export income to keep the wolf of hunger and poverty away from their doors, by over-fishing off their lakes and off-shore waters for sustenance and export dollars and, in some instances, by the selling of fishing rights and licences to those wolves and predators of ocean fishing stocks on a global basis, namely, the Japanese.

One of the greatest, but as yet hidden, fallouts of farming rationalisation, and again done purely in the pursuit of ever more profitability, is the rationalisation of farms by making them bigger and bigger. This is the way in which the diversity of strains of particular crops is being lost due to fewer and fewer strains of crops being grown. For instance (and you, Mr President, would certainly understand this), I am told that 100 farms in the United States supply more than 90 per cent of the United State's vegetable needs. It is hard to imagine, in that nation of 260 million people or so, that 100 farms could do this?

The question that immediately springs to mind is just how vast are these farms and what immense quantities of fertiliser and pesticides are they using to ensure the productivity of their arable lands—in other words, to make sure that the huge monetary investment expended on growing areas of this size is not lost. Again, I ask the question: what damage is occurring to the groundwater in the vicinity of these farms by the quantities of pesticides and fertilisers that are used?

I am told that there are in our world 30 000 edible plants, of which 7 000 are either grown or collected for food. I am also told by the same authority, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation, that food crops made up of only a handful of genetically distinct varieties are mote vulnerable to disease, pests and severe weather. Crops which are at present particularly vulnerable are potato crops, genetically uniform crops of wheat, maize, sugar, bananas, and clover, all of which have been severely damaged in recent times. For instance, a new form of leaf blight wiped out 15 per cent of the United States maize crop, whilst in 1980 as much as one million tones of Cuba's sugar crop was destroyed by cane rust, and yet again in the 1980s the production of bananas in Central America was almost halved by a fungal disease called Black Sigatoka.

However, the daddy of all this is the ever more dangerous breeds of potato blight. This blight, called P. Infestans A2, first hit potato crops in the middle 1980s in nations as far apart as Europe, Asia and Latin America. Yet, in 1992 an even greater and even more virulent strain of the blight was discovered in Mexico. By 1994, this strain had spread to the United States, where it was named P. Infestans US-8. This blight then actually overpowered the United States' potato crops which had had genes bred into them to resist blight. At the moment, there is no known fungicide that can harm it, and it repeatedly mutates to combat new genes or fungicides. At

the moment, 30 crops supply 95 per cent of this earth's protein. Indeed, more than half of our energy needs come from only three crops: wheat, rice and maize.

To make the point regarding lack of genetic diversity, I point out that one single genetic strain of wheat, namely, Sonalike, is grown on 67 per cent of Bangladesh's wheat fields (1983) and 30 per cent of India's wheat fields (1984). Indeed, a report from the United States National Academy of Sciences in 1991 said that that country's main crops depended on fewer than nine varieties. Clearly, if we do not get our act together there is an enormous chance of very black and parlous times ahead. What surprises me is that we heard very little on this matter from some of the normally active environmental and wilderness groups in our community; likewise, in respect of the earth's rapidly increasing population. Perhaps it is felt that these issues would not be sufficiently emotive or appealing to run with. But if these issues are not addressed—and soon—by this generation while our children are alive we face very black times indeed.

I turn now to the appalling damage that is being done to our own ozone layer by the apparent insatiable greed for energy, still mainly generated by fossil fuels and, of course, the outpourings of various chemicals all over the face of our planet. I find it appalling that the agreed Montreal protocols in respect of ozone destruction have not yet been put in place. I include Labor Governments in that criticism as well as the Governments of other persuasions. I believe that the inability to implement those Montreal protocols has occurred in the name of the great god profit.

I could go on about the damage that is being done to our environment, but time prevents me from doing so. So, I will now turn my attention to my sixth point, to which I referred earlier in this contribution, that is, the failure of the United Nations to fulfil the role which it was intended to perform when first it was set up.

Let me say from the outset that the role of the United Nations is easy to pervert because it is so dependent, if it is to function at all, on the very large contributions made to it by the most wealthy of the world's nations. If that body does something of which they disapprove, they simply withhold their contributions until such time as the UN is dancing to the tune of its financial masters. For instance, at present the United States is doing precisely that. It owes moneys to the tune of many millions of dollars. It is said by those who know that one of the reasons for this is that the US is not happy with the present Secretary-General Boutros-Boutros Ghalli, who has indicated that he will run for another term of office. On the surface it appears that the US is showing its displeasure by withholding moneys from the UN in order *pour encourager les autres etats*; in other words, to encourage the other States in favour of a different candidate than Mr Ghalli.

I do not know what the dispute is about, nor do I really care, but the tragedy of this farce is that, when this earth urgently needs global government and planning in respect of the rapidity of change, the destruction of our arable lands, the pollution of our waters, the lack of genetic diversity which has crept into our farming practices, the destruction of our forests and the over use of the gifts which nature has bestowed on this planet—all these things brought about either by the introduction too quickly of technological change or the greed and avariciousness of our multi-corporate bodies—here we have a body such as the United Nations which can set the pace internationally, because that is the only way to prevent one nation being played off against another nation, and such action is being prevented by a petty squabble, that is to say,

petty by the standards of the daunting problems which confront us all and for which global solutions not only must be found, but more importantly once found must be given effect to.

The United Nations was set up for this very purpose. Global problems can be dealt with only by the imposition of global solutions. Yet, I find it ironic in the extreme that at a time when we truly are a global village the trend of the world's people seems to be in the opposite direction as we witness all sorts of ethnic interests emerging as separate interest groups.

I want to put something else on the record. Let me say this in winding up my contribution: at a time when the world's best interests are served by our all pulling together, we all seem to be pulling further and further apart. I would like to be more optimistic if I could, but as things currently stand I fear the worst.

After I had completed my notes on this speech, I was called down to the Parliamentary Library and was told that a book I had ordered was waiting for me. This book, *The Return of Scarcity* by H.C. Coombs, is a compilation of nine essays which he wrote over the years for various addresses that he had delivered.

H.C. Coombs (or Nugget Coombs, as everyone probably knows him) was the Governor of the Reserve Bank of this nation until 1968. I think he is now in his late 80s or early 90s, but his mind is still as alert as it ever was. In his time as a public servant he served Prime Ministers of both Labor Party and Liberal Party persuasion. He was regarded by those who worked with him as a man of very significant intellect, and that includes Prime Minister Menzies, Prime Minister Chifley and anyone whom, I understand, had the pleasure of working with him. He is regarded as the doyen of all Australian public servants.

He wrote an essay (I do not know when it was written) entitled 'Towards a Sustainable Society', and so important did he regard this that he put it in as the first of the nine essays. These words are worth placing on the record because for years I have been telling the Parliament what has been wrong, although some people have said, 'Poor little Trev. Don't listen to him, he's a scatterbrain,' and so on. The words of H.C. (Nugget) Coombs himself are something I want to put on the record so that perhaps those scatterbrains to whom I have been talking will give some importance to what I have been saying—not for my sake but for the sake of their children and grandchildren and for the sake of the human race on this planet. He talks about fewer multinationals coming together and states:

The trend which the classical economists feared appears to be evident within industries like agriculture where individual working proprietors face declining rewards, or are being 'proletarianised' into contract farming or other components of agro-business, whose ownership and/or control is predominantly external to the productive enterprise itself. This separation of ownership and control from the process of production means also a personal divorce of decision-makers from the land itself. Increasingly, this has been reflected in a deterioration of husbandry, a lack of concern for the future of the land and finally its degradation and destruction. Similar trends are evident in forestry and fishing, and indeed all the industries which have grown out of the natural productivity of the earth.

The trend to 'proletarianisation' is also evident in the professions and occupations which previously have been the preserve of the self-employed or members of specialised institutions with long-established traditions of independence. Legal and medical practitioners previously practising as individuals, but with the status and protection provided by membership of traditional professional bodies, are increasingly becoming salaried employees. Universities and other centres of learning and research are no longer seen as

communities of independent scholars but as employed or supported agencies of the state or large corporations, for the training of the skilled employees those organisations will need and for the conduct of their research and development functions. The role of these institutions as the source of independent analysis of all aspects of human life and of intellectual and moral innovation is subordinated by government policy to the short-term needs of corporate profit.

That is a very profound statement. It shows the keenness of Nugget Coombs's mind, his perspicacity and his capacity to project his mind beyond the parameters of what society would regard as classical thinking. I commend the Address in Reply to the Council.

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

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 October. Page 89.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the second reading of this Bill. All Parties would agree that when criminals are convicted they should not profit from their crime. In the case of some crimes, generally drug offences and various forms of corporate dishonesty, huge sums of money are involved. The former Labor Government was part of a national and international trend, when it introduced legislation in 1986, to confiscate the proceeds of crime in certain circumstances.

In this area of the law it is essential to keep in mind the balance between the power of the State to fight crime and the right of individuals to enjoy their property. There are some aspects of this Bill which give rise to cautious concern. The difficulty in allowing comprehensive restraining orders over a person's property prior to conviction should be recognised as a severe measure which the courts presumably would only permit where there is a real risk of the subject property ultimately being liable to forfeiture on the basis that potentially it is tainted property and there are prospects of the Crown obtaining a conviction.

The proceeds from criminal activity often translate into lavish lifestyles. Often in the case of marijuana offences huge areas of land are involved. It is exceedingly difficult in the case of drug offences particularly to trace the profits of crime back to the offending transactions, and thus there is a case for requiring convicted people to prove that certain property was legitimately obtained if a serious drug offence is involved. It appears that throughout Australian jurisdictions this burden of proof about whether property was acquired legitimately is only placed on the criminal in the case of serious drug offences and I wonder whether the Attorney has considered broadening the types of offences involved to include other offences such as serious fraud and embezzlement where they are defined by category of offence or monetary value involved.

Perhaps in the case of these white collar crimes there is no need to impose such a presumption because of the availability, in most cases, of a trail of documentary evidence. Perhaps the Attorney might like to comment on that when he responds. The Opposition is glad to see the provision for payment of legal expenses even where restraining orders are made against an accused awaiting trial. This type of legislation is going too far if it prevents accused people from being able to engage decent legal representation.

It is to be hoped that the passage of this legislation will lead to increased funding for criminal injuries compensation pursuant to clause 19 of the Bill. The Attorney can then entertain fair and reasonable reforms to improve the criminal injuries compensation scheme, as the Opposition tried to do only a few months ago. We will need to consider the amendments to be moved by the Attorney, but we are pleased to support the second reading.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from this page.)

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I support the motion and endorse the comments of all my parliamentary colleagues in welcoming His Excellency and Lady Neal to the Vice Regal position in South Australia. Last week I had the opportunity of being present when Sir Eric received an honorary doctorate from his *alma mater*, the University of South Australia. During that presentation, the Vice Chancellor (Professor Robinson), outlined his qualifications for that award, and they were most impressive.

Professor Robinson's departure will be a sad loss to South Australia when he takes up his position at Monash University. I wish him well. On every occasion I met Professor Robinson, I was impressed, and I believe that his departure to Monash University, whilst it is that institution's gain, is a great loss to South Australia. In some regards, it is disappointing that greater efforts were not made to retain his valuable services to South Australia.

While I am on the topic, it is important that I go on record in congratulating Professor Robinson for the enormous task he undertook in amalgamating the institutions that now comprise the University of South Australia. On every occasion I come into contact with the University of South Australia, I am impressed by the work it is doing and the areas in which it is becoming involved. I have no hesitation in saying that the University of South Australia is now as important an institution in South Australia as the Adelaide University, which was the university I attended, and the Flinders University.

I also would be remiss in not paying a tribute to the former Governor, Dame Roma Mitchell. Much has been said about her contribution to this State, and I endorse everything that has been said about her. Her contribution and her dignity in performing her duties in the office of Governor set a very high standard, and one which I am sure was endorsed by all members in this place. In fact, it really capped off a most magnificent career in the law, and her record in the area of human rights is unchallenged and one which we all admire. I take the opportunity to wish Dame Roma Mitchell all the best for her future.

I note that she has recently been appointed as an adviser to the Minister for Ageing on the topic of ageing. I must say I listened to her being interviewed on radio recently with some degree of amusement, I think 10 minutes after her appointment to that position, when the interviewer asked her what she intended to do in her new position. She rebuked the interviewer, albeit in a humorous fashion, and said she had only been in the job five minutes and perhaps her only

qualification was that she was nearing old age, and then proceeded to say she would be available for a media interview after she looked into this issue of old age.

I want to deal briefly with two issues in this address. The first is what I perceive and what people continuously perceive to be a lack of confidence in South Australia, generally speaking, and to make some comments on that topic. Secondly, I want to speak, albeit briefly, on the topic of legal aid. Over the last few months as I have travelled around the State, I have perceived from people talking to me that there is a lack of confidence in this State. I hear constantly people saying, albeit anecdotally, that people are leaving this State, and that we have a low population growth. There is a feeling that, in the scheme of things, South Australia is becoming less relevant and more unimportant, and there are also a number of confusing economic indicators, on the one hand indicating economic growth and on the other hand indicating doom and gloom. The Government, in partnership with the rest of the community and not by itself, needs to address this lack of confidence in ourselves and our future.

The Brown Government inherited what anyone would describe as a financial disaster. No-one opposite would disagree that the State Bank cast a pall over this State. It influenced everything. The new Government, upon being elected, faced in my view two very significant challenges. The first was to fix up the disastrous financial position the State had gotten itself into, *a la* the State Bank, *a la* SGIC and various other financial disasters. Secondly, the Government had a responsibility to improve the morale and confidence of the people in South Australia. In that regard, the Government has done an excellent job in relation to dealing with the budgetary and financial position of the State in the brief three years that it has been in office. The budget is on track and, despite the fact there has been some criticism of asset sales, it is my view we are in a much stronger position than we were under the previous Government.

I might say, in dealing with some of the comments the Auditor-General made, that it is disappointing that some of his comments were taken out of context. I am sure that the Auditor-General would agree that we are in a much safer and less risk prone position than we were when we owned the State Bank. However, my concern is that the Government has real problems in improving the morale and confidence of South Australians. Despite all the good that the Government has done, there are still significant morale and confidence problems.

To a large extent, the shadow of the State Bank has seeped into all our psyches, so much so that the job of changing the perception of ourselves has proved far more difficult than we ever could have imagined. I still hear comments that this is only a small State, that Adelaide is only a country town, and it will never get anywhere in the scheme of things. Campaigns such as 'Going all the Way', 'SA Great' etc. have not had the desired effect of improving the morale of this State. I think the time has come for all of us—Labor, Liberal, Democrat, Callithumpian or whatever—to look at precisely how our morale and attitude towards our State and our capital city can be improved and changed.

Indeed, it is pleasing to see (and I spoke on this last week) that the Government is taking initiatives in relation to the governance of the City of Adelaide, and I support that move. One cannot help thinking that the morale and confidence of this State could be better improved if some of our civic leaders perhaps looked at things more positively from the point of view of the overall benefit of all South Australians.

In that regard, I draw the attention of members to an article that appeared in today's Messenger newspaper where the Lord Mayor called the Government and all the members of the Government racist. I have heard from a number of sources that the mayor has attended functions, one of which involved a number of people from overseas, where he said that retailing in South Australia was finished. He said that retailing has had it, and there is no money in retail businesses in South Australia.

It is that sort of attitude that has to be overcome by this Government in partnership with the rest of the community. Indeed, it is disappointing that comments made in the Adelaide 21 report and comments made by the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, of which I am a member, in relation to the Rundle Mall Committee have been ignored for the sake of short-term, personal, political gain. Is it any wonder, with the sort of comments made by the Lord Mayor, Henry Ninio, that morale in this State is low?

I think that the Government, in conjunction with the Opposition, ought to call a conference of members of Parliament from both sides of Parliament, business leaders and community leaders to develop a strategy so that we can all feel good about South Australia and positive about the future of Adelaide and South Australia. Too often I hear people say, 'If only we had a Jeff Kennett running this State.' I must say that I suspect that some of the sentiments that drive comments of that nature might be the 'grass is always greener over the border' syndrome. If one looks at any of the economic indicators, particularly those from the right, the performance of this Government outstrips that of the Kennett Government. The fact is that we have not sold that as well as Mr Kennett, and the Jeffrey Kennett style of Government would not be acceptable to the people of South Australia.

In any event, I think that we can take a lesson from the Victorian Government. On those rare occasions that my parliamentary travel allows me to go to Victoria, I have noted a more positive attitude. I do not believe that its economy is in any better state. In fact, all the leading indicators would suggest that it is not. The fact is that we do not feel any better off and we do not feel that much more advanced because of all the important and good initiatives made by this Government.

I would hope that, if we did have a conference or a summit along the lines I have suggested, all of us, particularly the politicians, Labor and Liberal, could put aside our partisan differences and the obvious temptation to deliver a cheap political shot to deal with the issue of re-establishing the confidence of all of us in this State. I believe that we must tell South Australians that we do live in a great State, that we do have a great city, that there are unlimited opportunities in South Australia and Adelaide and not somewhere else, that we can achieve what we want here and that we can bring up our children confident in the fact that they have a good future and can achieve all their aspirations by staying in South Australia.

In calling for such a conference, I would throw out a challenge to people like the former Premier, Don Dunstan, who spent and gave so much of himself to the service of South Australia. Whilst I do not agree with his politics, I do think that in his position and in his capacity he can assist the Government and all of us to improve the morale of South Australians. I believe that if people such as him throw their considerable intellect and influence into lifting that morale then we all will benefit.

As I said, I think we should put aside our political differences to improve that morale. The single biggest failure of the Opposition has been the failure to come to grips with that aspect and that issue. Too often political opportunism has been given precedence and too often there has been a failure by the Opposition to acknowledge the strengths and opportunities of this State and this city. Too often the Opposition is negative, too often it talks down South Australia and, too often, there is an opportunistic approach to many issues.

Indeed, it is exceedingly disappointing that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Rann, takes every opportunity to talk down South Australia. I would hope, if he does take the opportunity to read this contribution, that he can look at some positives, at least in morale terms, of lifting this State. I am not suggesting that he should not play the part of an Opposition leader to test and probe, but I would hope that he might consider the suggestion that I have made.

In looking at some of the positives—and I will not go through them all because I am preaching to the converted in this place—I noted an interesting article in the *Financial Review* on 26 September last which was written by Peter Roberts and which was entitled, 'Populate or Accumulate'. In that article he pointed out that the population in this State has been growing at a rate of .4 per cent a year compared with 1.4 per cent for Australia as a whole. When those figures have been put out, it has been suggested that this means that South Australia is, 'An economic also-ran compared with the fast growing Queensland and Western Australia.'

However, Mr Roberts suggests that by having that low population growth perhaps we are on the right track. I am not suggesting that he is right, but I am suggesting that he is putting a positive slant on South Australia's position in regard to population growth. He reasons it in this way. First, he says:

... the Gross State Product has been rising at rates similar to the rest of Australia.

In fact, he says:

... the Gross State Product per capita led the nation in the year to June 30, rising a massive 4.4 per cent.

Further, he says that the effect of that is to boost the individual product or Gross State Product per capita to average Australian levels. He goes on:

... with South Australians destined to be the richest in the country early next century if the trends persist.

I have not seen a more positive slant put on our population growth in comparison with other States than in this article. Nor have I seen in the Australian *Financial Review* those who would think that we need that great population growth. Nor have I seen them say what is wrong with the reasoning adopted by Mr Peter Roberts in this article. I think that we ought to be selling some of the positives of this State, what we perceive those positives to be, not what others might perceive them to be.

The Hon. Sandra Kanck: Quality of life.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The honourable member interjects and I think part of her contribution earlier today followed a similar line of reasoning. I think that there is a lot of room for agreement between the three political Parties about how to make South Australians feel better about being South Australian so that when we go interstate and overseas we can feel proud of saying, 'I come from Adelaide', not because there was a circus called the Grand Prix here but because of the quality of life, the quality of the people and because of the way in which we live our lives. The article goes on:

South Australia's export sector has been expanding rapidly, contributing 3 per cent to growth in the latest year. Manufactured exports are up 17 per cent a year, with elaborately transformed manufactures growing their share of total State exports from 15 per cent in 1988-89 to more than 26 per cent today.

That is a very positive figure and one of which we can all be proud as South Australians. He continues:

Australia suffers from similar perceptions to South Australia of laggardly economic performance, largely because of our slide down international tables comparing growth in gross domestic product.

He goes on and says that, if we continuously focus on just that figure without looking at the comparative advantages of a lower population and the fact that that means that our wealth per head relative to the rest of the world is growing at a rapid rate, if we do not look at it from that perspective and reason it through and debate whether or not that is important, then we may well miss an opportunity to create a unique society in this world. I know, whilst there have been many negatives said—and I will make a contribution on this tomorrow—about the immigration debate, that this is a very important debate and one which should not be dismissed or hidden under the shadow of racist comments from certain quarters in our society. At the end of the day, in relation to lower rates of immigration he says:

In fact, there are good economic reasons for this move.

I do not necessarily endorse that point of view but it provides a positive look at how South Australia is performing economically and, if that is a valid economic and political argument, it gives us a springboard from which to sell to South Australians the fact that we do not have to be ashamed of being South Australian, we are doing very well in comparison with Victoria and New South Wales and, indeed, doing exceedingly well when we look at ourselves in the context of overseas countries.

I turn now to the issue of legal aid. Every member in this Chamber would share the concerns expressed by the Attorney-General (Hon. Trevor Griffin) about the recently announced cuts to legal aid by the Federal Government. I certainly will have much to say about that issue in a broader context on another occasion. However, I do wish to share with members some comments made by Chris Butler of the South Australian Council of Community Legal Services at a recent colloquium on legal aid. She made a number of comments which bring home the human effect consequent upon the proposed cuts and, by no means, did she claim that what she said at that colloquium was exhaustive.

The first point she made was that community legal centres will be required to take more cases because the Legal Services Commission will fund fewer cases thereby putting increasing pressure on their resources. Secondly, she said that people will not be funded or assisted in their dealings with Federal Government agencies, including the unemployed youth, people with low literacy skills and so on. She pointed out that the Welfare Rights Centre, an organisation which specifically deals with people who are having difficulty in dealing with Federal Government departments, has a near 100 per cent success rate in dealing with the Federal bureaucracy. With the removal of funding one wonders what will happen to those people who, from any angle, are entitled to the benefits which successive Federal Governments allow to those disadvantaged groups.

The third impact she pointed out was that people with intellectual disabilities will be very much disadvantaged. She argued that courts, prosecutors, police officers and the like are in a very poor position to determine whether or not people

suffer from an intellectual disability. It is only those people representing them—and I am talking about legal aid lawyers—who identify those intellectual disabilities. The people with intellectual disabilities are over represented, whether they be offenders or victims in our justice system. She pointed out that these people would be very much neglected if these cuts were allowed to remain.

She also pointed out—and this is a matter which is close to my heart—that the protection of women from violence will be less likely to occur. One does not need to be a Rhodes scholar to imagine a woman who is subjected to domestic violence going along to the Legal Services Commission and being told, ‘Look, do not go for a restraining order in the Magistrates Court’—and I might say that does not cost very much money at all; it is a simple, easy straightforward process—‘because the State is not funding that part of your claim but, if you go to the Family Court the Federal Government will fund it.’ So, the already clogged Family Court, which has also been the subject of cuts, will have increasing pressure placed upon it because of a decision made by the Commonwealth Government to fund only Commonwealth matters. Indeed, how will we look a victim of violence in the eye and say, ‘For that aspect of your matter, that is, to deal with the State courts and the State police, you are on your own and you do not get any help, but for the other aspect of the matter, that is, when you are dealing with the Family Court and a violent partner, you do get legal aid.’

People will look at us with some degree of disbelief and, ultimately, it will bring the legal system and the law into disrepute. When that happens we are starting to tear at the very fabric of our society. I do not know whether this is true, but to me it is cause for great concern, but in her speech she said:

The really great news for the Attorney-General’s Department was that they received a 16 per cent increase confirming an earlier pre budget memo from the department to staff assuring them that any cuts to the portfolio budget would be to programs rather than to administration. I am not sure how the mathematics work in this equation: less services with more bureaucrats to administer them, but then maths was never my forte.

If that is accurate—and she is saying that there has been an increase in bureaucracy but a cut in programs—then as a Liberal I would have to say that that runs counter to everything that Liberals have espoused in the past 15 years; that is, to increase the size of the bureaucracy and to cut the size of programs. I can rattle off the Ministers in this State Government who have gone to extraordinary lengths to enhance programs and services—and transport is one, I am looking at the Hon. Diana Laidlaw—and at the same time minimise the bureaucracy so that the taxpayer receives the best value for money. That has been a difficult task but, to a substantial extent, one which has been achieved. But to see the Federal Government make a decision to increase the bureaucracy and reduce the programs astounds me and at every opportunity I will speak against the decision made by the Federal Government in terms of legal aid funding.

In closing, I again reiterate that I would like to see some mechanism, some program or some conference where in a tripartite way we can come up with strategies to improve the self-esteem of South Australians and South Australia because, if we do not do that, all the good things that we do and all the positive things that Governments achieve will come to naught. I commend the motion.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport): Recognising the time, I will be brief in my remarks. First, for the record I welcome the new Governor of South Australia Sir Eric Neal and Lady Neal to Adelaide. It has been an interesting challenge for them to come to South Australia after having lived in Sydney for many years. I recognise that they return to this State, having lived and worked here when they were much younger. I have seen Sir Eric and Lady Neal at many functions—principally associated with the arts—and in my view they have been absolutely stunning in their attendance at so many functions. They have warmly received all who have performed at such functions and been generous in their hospitality to many people in the arts.

It was not necessarily an easy act to follow Dame Roma Mitchell, who was such a strong supporter of the arts, but I believe that people in the arts themselves would acknowledge that they would be well served with the knowledge and enthusiasm of Sir Eric and Lady Neal.

His Excellency and Lady Neal entertained the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra on its return from its first international tour last month to Singapore, Korea, China—including Beijing, Jinan and Shanghai—and also Hong Kong. In every respect it was a triumph. I congratulate the management and all the players and acknowledge the very generous support from Clipsal and Gold Peak, whose sponsorship ensured that this tour could be undertaken. The relationship established between Clipsal, Gold Peak and the ASO is positive, and I hope that it will be of great benefit to both parties, not only arising from the tour but also in the longer term. I have received by e-mail a message from Mr Barry Plews, who was engaged to manage the tour. Dated 9 October, it states:

I have been alerted to many articles in the press in Beijing, Shandong Province and Shanghai following ASO’s visits. Copies are being mailed to me.

He mentions a fellow named ‘Qiao’ and states:

Qiao saw the televised Beijing concert when he was in Tianjin last week visiting his family. Tianjin is about 100 kilometres to the east of Beijing and falls within the CCTV footprint. Qiao said the CCTV had broadcast the ASO concert three times on its music channel. He said the recording was very good, if a little dark, because of the low level of lighting in the hall. He said it was very watchable and the sound quality was very good.

It is extraordinary that in Beijing the ASO should have its performance broadcast three times on Beijing television. I understand that the audience for CCTV is 300 million people. Potentially, the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra was received and enjoyed by 900 million people in those three broadcasts. I know that in addition to the live broadcast from Beijing there was also a delayed television broadcast of the Shanghai performance. So, the Chinese served the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra in a most handsome fashion, not only through the television broadcasts and newspaper articles but also through hospitality and friendliness in general.

I know that Clipsal was pleased with its association with the ASO. This tour and Clipsal’s involvement certainly prove that in the longer term there is much more that we can do in this State to reap benefit for South Australian companies, trade, exports and the arts by bringing about a much closer association between the businesses of arts and commerce.

A number of matters relating to the arts were raised by the Hon. Anne Levy on 16 October in her contribution to the Address in Reply debate. The first relates to the exodus of senior arts bureaucrats, and I would respond as follows. Although there have been some staffing changes in the arts

in recent times, this is not indicative of a 'drain' in personnel from South Australia. Changes in personnel are normal in any industry, and I highlight that none of the individuals mentioned by the Hon. Anne Levy is leaving South Australia. Most are staying in the arts, and it is a compliment to arts training in South Australia and arts business practice that they see that they are now sufficiently skilled and have built up sufficient contacts in the arts world to be confident that they can establish themselves in the private sector focusing on arts opportunities.

Also, there will be many benefits to South Australian audiences through the initiatives of Rob Brookman, Ian Scobie and their company, and Colin Koch and Steve Brown. Those individuals have not been lost to South Australia or to the arts. They have retired from their respective positions, where they served the Adelaide Festival and the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust for many years, and this provides many opportunities for new, fresh and energetic young people to take their place.

I highlight that Mr Tim O'Loughlin has recently been appointed as CEO of the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development, and this is also an indication of the Government's desire to inject new ideas and energy into the arts industry in this State. I noted today that in terms of the State Theatre Company Rosalba Clemente will be coming from Sydney to work as Assistant Executive Producer. I place on record my delight in her decision to do so.

The Hon. Anne Levy also referred to the exodus of visual artists, but I note that there is always an element of immigration and emigration within the visual arts population. A number of artists have left South Australia over the past 18 months and all are continuing to maintain close links with Adelaide. They visit and continue to exhibit here on a regular basis. They also promote themselves interstate as South Australian artists, thereby acting as ambassadors for South Australia's visual arts industry.

Some of the artists have left Adelaide on a temporary basis only. Having established a strong reputation in Adelaide, they have gone interstate to facilitate development of a national reputation but hope to return in the mid to long term to Adelaide, where they have access to relatively cheap working and living accommodation close to the city. This is of real interest to artists generally, who certainly one would not count as being amongst the most well paid in our community.

The fact that some of Adelaide's talented visual arts practitioners and administrators are winning jobs interstate—amid fierce competition from practitioners and administrators from all over Australia—reflects the high calibre and healthy state of the visual arts industry in South Australia. A number of talented artists/administrators have moved to South Australia over the past 18 months, for example, community artist/landscape designer Kate Cullity, whom I recently appointed to the Art for Public Places Committee, has moved to Adelaide, as has Bala Star, Director of the Contemporary Art Centre. In recent years a number of very talented graduates from the Jam Factory's training program who were recruited from interstate have opted to remain in South Australia. Greg Healey is one.

In terms of remuneration of boards which have not been mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report, I make the following comments. The Auditor-General reports separately on the funds controlled by the State Library and the Art Gallery board for the year 1995-96. However, for the same year the Auditor-General exercised his discretion and did not report on the Museum board. Board fees for these three

organisations are paid from operating expenditure provided by the department and not board controlled funds; therefore, they are not mentioned in the notes to the board's accounts. This expenditure is included, but not separately identified, in the payments made through the Department for the Arts and Cultural Development. For the honourable member's information, the total amount of board fees paid in 1995-96 for the State Library was \$9 673, for the Art Gallery \$4 764 and for the Museum \$2 745.

In respect of disclosure requirements and board fees, I advise as follows. Under accounting policy statement No. 13, agencies are required to disclose in their financial statements information about employees who receive \$100 000 or more. The policy statement is silent on board fees. Accordingly, there are some variations in the disclosures made by authorities in the Auditor-General's Report. The History Trust accounts do not disclose the fees paid. In 1995-96 the trust paid \$6 391 in board fees.

In respect of board fees for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and the Adelaide Festival, I can advise that in 1995-96 there were eight members of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust board and 12 members of the board of the Adelaide Festival. Members of both boards were entitled to receive \$7 451 per annum in 1995-96 and the Chairs of both companies \$9 969 per annum. In relation to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, one member waived their fee and there was a period of vacancies which resulted in the low annual cost in 1995-96. In the case of the Festival board, it is important to note that of the 12 board members 10 are paid and two are not, and the Auditor-General's Report covers a two year period for the Festival.

The amount of \$126 000 included in the Auditor-General's Report covers a 21 month period, as the new board was appointed in September 1994. I highlight that matter because the honourable member was most concerned at what appeared from the Auditor-General's Report to be an excessive amount in board fees for a 12 month period: in fact, it did cover a 21 month period.

I indicate also that whether a member is working in the area of the State Library, the Art Gallery, the Museum, the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, the Adelaide Festival, the History Trust, Meryl Tankard's Australian Dance Theatre or the Jam Factory, I know of no member or Chairperson who does not work excessive hours over those which I had envisaged when inviting them to participate in those respective capacities. Their devotion to the task and to arts in South Australia should be applauded by us all. The remuneration they earn is nothing compared to the hours and the expertise that they put in to serving on these boards in the State's interests.

I wish to make some comments about the contribution from the Hon. Ron Roberts. He mentioned that the *Island Seaway* 'has been dragged off to the economic knacker and sold'. The honourable member may not wish to recall, but it is a fact, that Asset Management conducted a very well-researched inquiry for expressions of interest. The vessel was sold and no longer are the taxpayers and the State, through the Department of Transport, losing about \$5.4 million a year. We made some money on the sales and we are not losing on the subsidy payments. Now the money is being reinvested in an asset in the transport portfolio in terms of the sealing of roads on Kangaroo Island.

The South Coast road is being sealed at the present time, and that should be completed by the end of 1998. Other roads on the island are also being sealed with funds saved because

the State no longer has to fund the operating losses on the *Island Seaway*.

The honourable member also mentioned that the Marino asphalt department had been dragged away and slaughtered. This is a pretty emotive and ill-informed statement and, as my colleague the Hon. Caroline Schaefer indicated, perhaps I should expect no less, in terms of research, from the honourable member. However, I would like to put on the record that in June 1994 the Department of Transport decided that it was no longer in the business of manufacturing and laying asphalt and therefore the Marino Asphalt Plant was to be sold and the asphalt gangs were to be closed down. It was a decision by the department, endorsed, but not directed, by me.

All affected employees were given the option of either redeployment within the department or taking a TBSP. Of the 60 employees involved, 45 accepted TBSPs and 15 remained with the department. Both options were fully explained to all affected employees by the relevant director and personnel from the human resources section. All employees were treated with compassion and in a sensitive manner and were offered appropriate counselling services. I recall also that I wrote to all asphalt gang employees personally explaining the reasons for the decision. The sale, conducted by Asset Management, has seen Emoleum purchase the business, and roadworks in the southern area of the metropolitan area are now being provided at 20 per cent cost of past practice.

The Hon. Ron Roberts talks about the privatisation of the STA. Again, he is right off beam. He knows, but I do not think wants to acknowledge, that the Government has not privatised this organisation, as Governments in Victoria and Western Australia have done. We provided TransAdelaide—the former STA—with the opportunity to compete for work, and it is a compliment to the extraordinary commitment of the bus operators, in particular, that they have got behind this initiative. They have appointed best practice committees and worked out the terms that they would like to see TransAdelaide submit as part of competitive tenders for various parcels of work, and in the outer south and the inner north and various transit link routes TransAdelaide has come up trumps in winning contracts against fierce competition. They have not won them all, and this has been a frustration to TransAdelaide—not only as bus operators but throughout the organisation.

In the meantime, every contracted area has had fantastic increases in patronage since that contract was undertaken. Taxpayers have also saved money in operating costs overall, some of which have been reinvested in new services. So, from every perspective the competitive tendering policy aimed at new services and reduced cost to the taxpayer and greater power to influence decision-making at depot level has been a success, and I think it is regrettable to create a situation which is based more on rhetoric than reality that the Hon. Rob Roberts has sought to find out the true situation. And, if he had found out, one would have wished that he had reported it correctly. However, he has not chosen either course.

In terms of the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, I indicate that the women's statement to which she referred will be tabled in this place during the first week of sitting next month.

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

MFP DEVELOPMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill proposes amendments to the *MFP Development Act 1992* as a result of the decision by the Commonwealth Government in June not to continue funding for the MFP project.

This decision followed the release of the Bureau of Industry Economics (BIE) evaluation of Commonwealth support for the MFP. The report acknowledged that the MFP has made significant progress and has met the achievement targets agreed by the State and Commonwealth Governments over the past two years.

The BIE report indicated that the benefits are more likely to accrue to South Australia than to the nation as a whole. The Commonwealth Government decided that in view of this it would continue to support the MFP as a State-based project but it would not provide further direct funding.

As announced on 6 June, the State Government intends to refocus the MFP effort to ensure that the organisation is best placed to deliver major benefits for the State.

To facilitate this, the organisation needs to be able to operate in an efficient and business like manner, consistent with the normal and appropriate levels of accountability of a Government statutory body.

The Bill therefore provides for a smaller Corporation which can focus on the key issues. The need to consult with the Commonwealth Government is no longer relevant. It is also intended that appropriate people with relevant expertise will be appointed and it is not necessary to include the specific requirements in the Act. The provision for deputies will also be removed. These changes will result in considerable cost savings and better decision-making.

The Community Advisory Committee has provided input to the Stage 1 economic development project. A reduction in Committee membership will reduce costs and improve efficiency.

The opportunity has also been taken to address some house-keeping matters relating to the core site. Regulations have been gazetted which vest land in core Area C (Pelican Point) in other appropriate agencies as this land can be put to better use by them in the short term and would not be required by the MFP for many years into the future.

I commend the Bill.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 15—Composition of Corporation

This clause—

- reduces the membership of the Corporation to a maximum of 7 members
- removes provision for the appointment of deputies
- removes the requirement that the State Minister consult with the Commonwealth Minister before nominating persons for appointment as members
- removes Commonwealth Government representation in the membership of the Corporation
- removes the requirement for members to have expertise in specified areas and replaces it with a more general requirement that members have expertise in areas relevant to the operations of the Corporation.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 26—Composition of Advisory Committee

This clause reduces the membership of the MFP Community Advisory Committee to 8 members. At present the Act requires a not less than 9 and not more than 12 members.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 27—Procedures of Advisory Committee

This clause makes a consequential amendment. The provision fixing a quorum for an odd-numbered membership of the Advisory Committee is unnecessary.

Clause 6: Transitional provision

This clause has the effect of vacating the offices of all members of the Corporation and the Advisory Committee.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.17 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 23 October at 2.15 p.m.