

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 22 July 1998

The PRESIDENT (Hon. J.C. Irwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:
Irrigation (Dissolution of Trusts) Amendment,
Sea-Carriage Documents,
Technical and Further Education (Industrial Jurisdiction) Amendment.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that written answers to the following questions on notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 104, 130, 135, 139, 142, 149, 150, 154, 156, 167, 169, 172 to 174, 176 to 178, 182, 183, 185 and 200.

JET SKIS

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

1. Following another summer of complaints from constituents unhappy with the anti-social behaviour of some jet ski riders, will the Minister, after consultation with the Department of Transport and the Local Government Association, together with the Jet Boat Sporting Association—

- introduce uniform legislation for seaside councils on the use of jet skis;
- introduce uniform legislation on restricted areas of use;
- legislate to require jet ski owners to take out third party insurance; and
- introduce practical tests for jet ski drivers?

2. Will the Minister also ensure the Department of Transport's Marine Safety section intensifies its surveillance of irresponsible jet ski users to ensure they are complying with current restrictions and by-laws?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

1. (a) A Jet Ski Consultative Committee, comprising representatives of Transport SA, metropolitan seaside and River Murray Councils, the Boating Industry Association and the Local Government Association has been meeting on a regular basis to devise a consistent set of controls governing the use of jet skis on the State's waters. Personal water craft (jet ski) operators and other recreational power boat users are also represented on the committee. At this stage, efforts are being concentrated on introducing controls covering known problem areas, such as the metropolitan beaches and River Murray, in time for next summer.

(b) See 1.(a) above.

(c) No. There is no justification, given the extremely low numbers of boating injuries and fatalities recorded annually, for the introduction of third party insurance for jet skis.

(d) Practical testing of boat operators, including jet ski operators, is one of a number of initiatives under longer term consideration Australia-wide as a result of proposed national boat licensing principles.

2. Transport SA's Marine Safety Officers, and Fisheries Compliance Officers who are also authorised to police recreational boating activities, are well aware of concerns associated with the use of jet skis and will continue to pay close attention to the activities of these craft.

It should also be noted that most seaside councils employ inspectors authorised under the Harbours and Navigation Act to police issues relating to recreational boating activities.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

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

1. What was the South Australian youth unemployment rate compared to the national average for the years—

- 1994-95;
- 1995-96;
- 1996-97; and
- 1997-98?

2. What is the projected rate for youth unemployment in South Australia for 1998-99?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Minister for Employment has provided the following information:

1. Below is data from 1991-92 onwards in relation to question 1, in order to assist you to make comparisons and realise the longer term trends in youth unemployment. Data on youth unemployment to population ratios is also provided.

Table 1: Youth Full-Time Unemployment Rates,
South Australia and Australia, original data
Youth Full-Time Unemployment Rate (per cent)

Period	South Australia	Australia
1991-92	34.9	31.0
1992-93	38.8	32.1
1993-94	38.9	32.2
1994-95	33.1	27.6
1995-96	37.1	27.8
1996-97	36.0	28.2
1997-98 ¹	33.8	27.6

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics data on AUSSTATS

Notes: ¹ The latest available data relates to the month of May 1998. Consequently, the figures for 1997-98 are the average of 11 months to May 1998.

Table 2: Youth Full-Time Unemployment to Population
Ratios, South Australia and Australia, original data
Youth Full-Time Unemployment to
Population Ratio (per cent)

Period	South Australia	Australia
1991-92	10.3	9.1
1992-93	11.0	9.0
1993-94	10.8	8.6
1994-95	9.0	7.4
1995-96	9.4	7.3
1996-97	8.7	7.1
1997-98 ¹	8.1	6.7

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics data on AUSSTATS

Notes: ¹ The latest available data relates to the month of May 1998. Consequently, the figures for 1997-98 are the average of 11 months to May 1998.

2. No projections of the rate are made. Due to the relatively small size and the variability in the composition of the youth cohort, the South Australian youth full-time unemployment rate fluctuates significantly on a month-to-month basis. Over the past 12 months it has ranged between 28.7 per cent (August 1997) and 38.2 per cent (May 1998), with monthly fluctuations of up to 6.2 percentage points. Such variability makes any potential forecasting implicitly unreliable.

SPEED ZONES

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

1. Considering the results of the review by the South Australian Working Party on 70 km/h speed zones show no significant change in vehicle speeds or the number and severity of accidents, is the Government considering introducing higher speed zones for any more roads?

2. If so—

- Which roads will have their zoning speed increased; and
- When are these likely to occur?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

1. The results of this review are just one item of information that will be considered by Transport SA and local Councils when determining if it is appropriate to increase the speed zone on a particular road.

The NHMRC Road Accident Research Unit at the University of Adelaide has, with the support of the Federal Office of Road Safety, undertaken a study of the increased risk of involvement in a casualty accident where vehicles travel at more than the 60 km/h urban speed limit. The results of this study were recently released by the Federal Minister for Transport and Regional Development, Hon. Mark Vaile MP. While this report deals with the increased risks associated with speeding in the urban area, Transport SA is currently in the process of examining these results with respect to their relevance to any

future proposals to increase speed zones from 60 km/h to 70 km/h in the urban area.

Having regard to such research, Transport SA also constantly monitors the suitability of speed restrictions and, where appropriate, adjusts the speed limit in line with the conditions applicable to the area under review. As with all forms of traffic control, it is essential that speed zoning be applied in a consistent and uniform manner—and conform with the guidelines determined by Australian Standard 1742 Part 4—Speed Controls. Speed limits are set having regard to such factors as abutting roadside development, road type, vehicle volumes, sight distances, accident history and actual vehicle speeds following extensive on-road monitoring.

2. (a) In the context of part 1 of the question, it is presumed that the honourable member is referring to urban type roads which would ordinarily be expected to be speed zoned at 60 km/h.

In the case of roads maintained by Transport SA, I advise that there are currently no plans to increase the speed zone on any roads. I am however unable to answer for Local Government, as councils are the road authority responsible for the management of traffic on local roads.

(b) See 2.(a) above.

139. The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:

1. Who was responsible for installing the 30 km/h speed zone signs on Military Road outside the Caravan Park at West Beach?
2. Why were the 30 km/h speed zone signs erected?
3. Are the speed zone signs temporary or permanent?
4. Is the Minister aware of allegations that unauthorised persons were seen standing on the road directing traffic at this location on Sunday, 8 March 1998, between 8 a.m. and 2 p.m.?
5. Under South Australian law, are unauthorised persons allowed to direct road traffic?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

1. Transport SA approved the City of Charles Sturt's proposal to install the speed limit signs.
2. The signs were erected by the City of Charles Sturt to provide increased protection for children arriving at and departing from the West Beach Caravan Park during the annual Adelaide North West Presbytery, Children and Youth Ministry (KUCA) Camp Out.
3. The speed zone, and the signs designating the zone, were a temporary measure to control traffic during the Camp Out. Council was given approval for the temporary 30 km/h speed zone to operate from 7.30 a.m. on 7 March 1998 until 3 p.m. on 8 March 1998.
4. No.
5. No information has been provided on the identity of any 'unauthorised persons' or the circumstances in question.

I have been advised that the power under the Road Traffic Act to give directions to traffic is limited to police officers and inspectors.

While the Act does not specify that other persons may direct traffic, it similarly does not prohibit such actions. Situations where this may occur are not uncommon eg. a vehicle may be broken down in the right lane of traffic, and a pedestrian requests traffic in the left lane to halt momentarily while the disabled vehicle is removed from the road or a heavy vehicle may be reversing into private property. While such vehicles may be obstructing the road, to ignore any directions may result in a collision.

The major distinction between an authorised or an unauthorised person directing traffic is that an offence is committed where a driver disobeys a direction from an authorised person.

In the meantime, the fact that a person is authorised or not does not remove a driver's obligation under section 45 of the Road Traffic Act to drive with due care and consideration of other road users. This includes, where possible, avoiding collisions with vehicles or persons. Generally, an unauthorised person attempting to direct traffic will do so only when there is a danger on the road requiring a driver's attention. At any time a driver who disregards other road users may commit an offence under section 45.

ELECTORATE OFFICES

142. The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:

1. How many reported instances of physical attack or verbal abuse, or threat of physical attack or abuse have occurred against personal assistants working in State electorate offices for the years—
 - (a) 1994-95;
 - (b) 1995-96; and
 - (c) 1996-97?

2. Are all new personal assistants given training in personal security arrangements at electorate offices?

3. What training are trainees given on security arrangements?

4. Is the Minister fully satisfied with the current security arrangements and training for personal assistants and trainees at State electorate offices?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. Statistics for the years 1994-95 and 1995-96 are not readily available. However, I can advise that during 1996-97 only one instance of a member of the public threatening staff at an electorate office was reported to the electorate office coordinator. This resulted in the offending constituent being issued with a restraining order. This has been the only incident formally reported to the electorate office coordinator since 1996. Records from Police Security Services indicate that during 1996-97 two duress alarms were activated with a Police response.

2. All new personal assistants in electorate offices receive instruction from Police Security or an existing staff member in the operation of the office security system and the duress alarms.

3. Personal Assistants, as the workplace supervisors of trainees, are expected to instruct the trainees on the location and operation of duress alarms.

4. As there have been no reported instances of physical attack and the limited number of threatening situations have been diffused by Police attendance via duress alarms, the current security arrangements appear to be adequate.

SMALL BUSINESS

149. The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:

1. How much State Government funding per year is each of the five small business service centres receiving that are being set up to advise companies on how to win Government contracts and cut red tape?

2. Of those already established, how many businesses has each been able to assist?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism has provided the following response:

1. A total of \$77 200 is provided per small business service centre.
2. For the period January 1998 to May 1998, a total of 1 390 client contacts have been managed by the three operating small business service centres.

DRIVERS, ELDERLY

150. The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:

1. Has Transport SA any figures for the number of elderly South Australian drivers who may have dementia and continue to own a driver's licence?

2. If not, will the Government investigate the number of South Australian drivers who may have dementia and hold a licence?

3. Considering their higher accident rate, are there any proposals to ensure people with dementia are unable to obtain a driver's licence?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

1. Dementia is not recorded as a specific medical condition on the Register of drivers' licences held by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles but is grouped with other mental or nervous disorders. I am therefore unable to provide an accurate figure on the number of licence holders who may be suffering from dementia.

2&3. It is considered that the risk of a person with dementia holding a driver's licence is very low.

As the honourable member would be aware, dementia is a condition that predominantly affects the elderly. All licence holders, 70 years of age or more, are now required to provide an annual medical certificate in order to continue to be licensed. The Certificate of Fitness to Drive, provided to the licence holder, advises the medical practitioner to refer to the booklet titled 'National Guidelines for Medical Practitioners in Determining Fitness to Drive a Motor Vehicle'.

This booklet urges doctors to look for early symptoms of dementia. If dementia is detected, doctors are asked to advise the person that they should no longer drive and then notify the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, who will take action for the driver's licence to be surrendered.

The current guidelines to doctors have been revised and a draft publication, 'Assessing Fitness to Drive, Guidelines for Health Professionals and their Legal Obligations', is due to be released later

this year. In a chapter dedicated to older drivers, the revised guidelines recommend that, where early signs of dementia are apparent, doctors should consider factors such as attention, concentration, thought processing, problem solving skills and memory, in assessing driving competence.

If the medical practitioner is unable to reach a conclusion, the driver may be assessed by means of a practical driving assessment conducted by an experienced Driver Development Officer. The Driver Development Officer will determine the person's ability to safely operate a motor vehicle and forward a recommendation to the Registrar for appropriate action.

Aside from the annual requirement for elderly drivers, medical practitioners in South Australia are obliged, under the terms of the Motor Vehicles Act, to inform the Registrar, in writing, of any person who suffers from a physical or mental illness, disability or deficiency which may affect their driving ability. Where advice to this effect is received by the Registrar, appropriate action is taken to have the person voluntarily surrender their driver's licence. If voluntary surrender is not achieved within a reasonable time frame, the Registrar will take action to suspend the driver's licence until such time as satisfactory medical evidence is provided.

It is also a legislative requirement that all licence holders must notify the Registrar if they suffer from any illness or injury that may impair their driving ability.

RAILWAY STATIONS

154. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:** How many verbal or physical assaults and property thefts have been reported to Trans-Adelaide at each of Adelaide's 87 metropolitan railway stations for the years—

1. 1994-95;
2. 1995-96; and
3. 1996-97?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services has been advised by the Police that the following data has been obtained from the Transit Division Database, prepared in turn by SAPOL Statistical Services for the Attorney-General's Crime Prevention Program project 'Safety on Public Transport'. The data does not reflect incidents that may have been reported to other police divisions or assaults committed on Police.

Statistical figures from the Transit Division Database are only available from 1995.

Year	Assaults/Larcenies Occurring at Railway Stations		
	Common Assault	Serious Assault	Larcenies
1995	82	8	16
1996	48	8	15
1997	65	7	20

EXPIATION NOTICES

156. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:** How many speed camera expiation notices were discarded by the police for whatever reason during 1996-97?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Police, Correctional Services & Emergency Services has been advised by the Police that during the period of 1996-97 there were 28 012 expiation notices discarded under the following circumstances—

Reason for Withdrawal	Number
*Subject to Investigation	12 089
Withdrawn at Prosecution Services	52
Statutory Declaration received	15 871
Total	28 012

*Includes—

- notices re-issued after updating of information, e.g. addresses, hire cars
- prosecution for more serious traffic offences such as speed dangerous
- duplicate notices
- multi vehicle frames
- unable to locate owner/driver
- unassigned plates
- stolen vehicles
- obscured number plates
- incorrect codes/camera setup

ROAD SAFETY

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

1. How much has been spent by the State Government on all road safety education programs for the years—

- (a) 1995-96;
- (b) 1996-97; and
- (c) 1997-98?

2. What were the individual road safety education programs undertaken by the State Government for the years—

- (a) 1995-96;
- (b) 1996-97; and
- (c) 1997-98?

3. How much was spent by the State Government on each of these programs for the years—

- (a) 1995-96;
- (b) 1996-97; and
- (c) 1997-98?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:

1.	(a)	1995-96	\$1 119 981
	(b)	1996-97	\$2 111 582
	(c)	1997-98	\$1 950 177

2&3.

Year	Program	Expenditure
1995-96	Safe Routes to School	\$12 454
	Bike Ed	\$128 274
	Drink Drive (metropolitan)	\$589 949
	Drink Drive (rural)	\$82 896
	Pedestrians (school crossings)	\$66 366
	Small Wheel Vehicles	\$31 804
1996-97	Speed	\$208 238
	Safe Routes to School	\$157 914
	Walk with Care	\$4 641
	Bike Ed	\$160 100
	Share the Road Campaign	\$8 152
	Drink Drive (metropolitan)	\$1 025 338
1997-98	Drink Drive (rural)	\$111 473
	Pedestrians (school crossings)	\$148 225
	School zones	\$53 870
	Speed	\$441 869
	Safe Routes to School	\$304 165
	Walk with Care	\$18 619
	Bike Ed	\$198 321
	Share the Road Campaign	\$195 935
	Drink Drive (metropolitan)	\$474 535
	Drink Drive (rural)	\$134 329
	Speed (metropolitan)	\$506 188
	Speed (rural)	\$77 366
1997-98	Driver Fatigue	\$22 058
	Explorer Highway Road Safety	
	Booklets (Adelaide-Darwin)	\$10 000
	Pedestrians	\$8 661

LOTTERIES COMMISSION

169. **The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:**

1. Will the Minister for Government Enterprises provide details of how much was spent by the Lotteries Commission of South Australia on advertising and promotions for 'Instant Scratchies':

- (a) in total;
- (b) on radio;
- (c) on television;
- (d) in the printed press;
- (e) on direct mail (letterbox);
- (f) on billboards;
- (g) on point of sale promotion; and
- (h) other;

during the periods—

- 1 July 1993—30 June 1994;
- 1 July 1994—30 June 1995;
- 1 July 1995—30 June 1996;
- 1 July 1996—30 June 1997; and
- 1 July 1997—31 March 1998?

2. What were the gross profits (total sales less prizes paid) from 'Instant Scratchies' during these periods?

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

1. Instant Scratchies

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998
	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)
(a) Total	1 056	759	494	382	687
(b) Radio	28	73	-	24	-
(c) Television	809	494	383	184	442
(d) Press	110	34	-	14	-
(e) Direct Mail	-	-	-	-	-
(f) Billboards	-	-	-	-	-
(g) P.O.S.	96	152	50	104	187
(h) Other	13	6	61	56	58

2. Instant Scratchies.

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998
	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)
Gross Profit	13 211	10 308	8 195	6 694	5 790

172. **The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:**

1. Will the Minister for Government Enterprises provide details of how much was spent by the Lotteries Commission of South Australia on advertising and promotions for 'Saturday Lotto':

- in total;
- on radio;
- on television;
- in the printed press;
- on direct mail (letterbox);
- on billboards;
- on point of sale promotion; and
- other;

during the periods—

- 1 July 1993—30 June 1994;
- 1 July 1994—30 June 1995;
- 1 July 1995—30 June 1996;
- 1 July 1996—30 June 1997; and
- 1 July 1997—31 March 1998?

2. What were the gross profits (total sales less prizes paid) from 'Saturday Lotto' during these periods?

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

1. Saturday Lotto

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998
	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)
(a) Total	1 059	1 196	1 707	1 324	784
(b) Radio	99	115	164	130	145
(c) Television	446	476	933	771	373
(d) Press	187	283	340	154	114
(e) Direct Mail	-	-	-	-	-
(f) Billboards	-	-	-	-	-
(g) P.O.S.	83	288	250	211	127
(h) Other	244	34	20	58	25

2. Saturday Lotto

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998
	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)
Gross Profit	40 386	40 071	43 324	40 222	31 382

173. **The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:**

1. Will the Minister for Government Enterprises provide details of how much was spent by the Lotteries Commission of South Australia on advertising and promotions for 'Super 66':

- in total;
- on radio;
- on television;
- in the printed press;
- on direct mail (letterbox);
- on billboards;
- on point of sale promotion; and
- other;

during the periods—

- 1 July 1993—30 June 1994;
- 1 July 1994—30 June 1995;
- 1 July 1995—30 June 1996;
- 1 July 1996—30 June 1997; and
- 1 July 1997—31 March 1998?

2. What were the gross profits (total sales less prizes paid) from 'Super 66' during these periods?

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

1. Super 66

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998
	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)
(a) Total	15	16	-	15	4
(b) Radio	-	-	-	-	-
(c) Television	15	15	-	-	-
(d) Press	-	-	-	1	-
(e) Direct Mail	-	-	-	-	-
(f) Billboards	-	-	-	-	-
(g) P.O.S.	-	1	-	14	4
(h) Other	-	-	-	-	-

2. Super 66.

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998
	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)
Gross Profit	1 801	1 609	1 372	1 035	785

174. **The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:**

1. Will the Minister for Government Enterprises provide details of how much was spent by the Lotteries Commission of South Australia on advertising and promotions for 'Monday Lotto':

- in total;
- on radio;
- on television;
- in the printed press;
- on direct mail (letterbox);
- on billboards;
- on point of sale promotion; and
- other;

during the periods—

- 1 July 1993—30 June 1994;
- 1 July 1994—30 June 1995;
- 1 July 1995—30 June 1996;
- 1 July 1996—30 June 1997; and
- 1 July 1997—31 March 1998?

2. What were the gross profits (total sales less prizes paid) from 'Monday Lotto' during these periods?

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

1. Monday Lotto

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998
	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)
(a) Total	85	49	93	56	58
(b) Radio	5	-	-	10	11
(c) Television	38	34	33	35	28
(d) Press	40	15	20	4	8
(e) Direct Mail	-	-	-	-	-
(f) Billboards	-	-	-	-	-
(g) P.O.S.	2	-	40	7	11
(h) Other	-	-	-	-	-

2. Monday Lotto

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998
	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)
Gross Profit	6 422	5 579	5 612	6 105	4 764

176. **The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:**

1. Will the Minister for Government Enterprises provide details of how much was spent by the Lotteries Commission of South

Australia on advertising and promotions for 'Thursday Lotto':

- (a) in total;
- (b) on radio;
- (c) on television;
- (d) in the printed press;
- (e) on direct mail (letterbox);
- (f) on billboards;
- (g) on point of sale promotion; and
- (h) other;

during the periods—

- 1 July 1993—30 June 1994;
- 1 July 1994—30 June 1995;
- 1 July 1995—30 June 1996;
- 1 July 1996—30 June 1997; and
- 1 July 1997—31 March 1998?

2. What were the gross profits (total sales less prizes paid) from 'Thursday Lotto' during these periods?

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

1. Thursday Lotto

	1993-94 (\$'000)	1994-95 (\$'000)	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998 (\$'000)
(a) Total	325	152	447
(b) Radio	29	-	1
(c) Television	174	52	164
(d) Press	115	78	233
(e) Direct Mail	-	-	-
(f) Billboards	-	-	-
(g) P.O.S.	7	22	49
(h) Other	-	-	-

*Thursday Lotto ceased 25 May 1996

2. Thursday Lotto

	1993-94 (\$'000)	1994-95 (\$'000)	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998 (\$'000)
Gross Profit	12 207	9 046	7 541

177. **The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:**

1. Will the Minister for Government Enterprises provide details of how much was spent by the Lotteries Commission of South Australia on advertising and promotions for 'Powerball':

- (a) in total;
- (b) on radio;
- (c) on television;
- (d) in the printed press;
- (e) on direct mail (letterbox);
- (f) on billboards;
- (g) on point of sale promotion; and
- (h) other;

during the periods—

- 1 July 1993—30 June 1994;
- 1 July 1994—30 June 1995;
- 1 July 1995—30 June 1996;
- 1 July 1996—30 June 1997; and
- 1 July 1997—31 March 1998?

2. What were the gross profits (total sales less prizes paid) from 'Powerball' during these periods?

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

1. Powerball

	1995-96 (\$'000)	1996-97 (\$'000)	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998 (\$'000)
(a) Total	644	1 082	529
(b) Radio	18	7	63
(c) Television	551	749	207
(d) Press	52	151	127
(e) Direct Mail	-	-	-
(f) Billboards	-	-	98
(g) P.O.S.	23	67	26
(h) Other	-	108	8

*Powerball commenced 25 May 1996

2. Powerball

	1995-96 (\$'000)	1996-97 (\$'000)	1 July 1997- 31 March 1998 (\$'000)
Gross Profit	1 073	9 398	7 923

LOTTERIES AGENCIES

178. **The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:**

1. How many agencies does the Lotteries Commission of South Australia have located in:

- (a) South Australia; and
- (b) each postcode area of South Australia?

2. How many on-line agencies does the Lotteries Commission of South Australia have located in:

- (a) South Australia; and
- (b) each postcode area of South Australia?

3. How many on-line machines does the Lotteries Commission of South Australia have located in each postcode area of South Australia?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Government Enterprises has provided the following response—

1. (a) 580 (2 June 1998)

1 (b)

Postcode	On-Line Agencies	Postcode	On-Line Agencies
5000	19	5167	4
5006	2	5168	4
5007	3	5169	2
5008	3	5171	1
5009	3	5172	1
5010	1	5173	2
5011	4	5174	1
5012	5	5211	5
5013	6	5214	2
5014	7	5222	1
5015	4	5223	2
5016	4	5234	1
5017	4	5238	2
5018	1	5241	1
5019	4	5242	1
5020	1	5244	2
5021	6	5245	2
5022	5	5251	4
5023	8	5252	1
5024	5	5253	5
5025	1	5255	1
5031	5	5260	1
5032	1	5264	1
5033	7	5267	2
5034	1	5268	2
5035	1	5271	5
5037	2	5275	1
5038	5	5276	2
5039	4	5277	1
5040	1	5280	3
5041	2	5290	12
5042	4	5302	1
5043	4	5304	1
5044	1	5320	2
5045	13	5330	3
5046	8	5333	3
5047	2	5340	2
5048	4	5341	4
5049	2	5342	1
5051	6	5343	5
5052	1	5345	2
5061	4	5346	1
5062	3	5351	1
5063	5	5352	2
5064	2	5353	1
5065	3	5354	1
5066	1	5355	2
5067	5	5357	1
5068	5	5373	1
5069	2	5374	1
5070	6	5412	1
5072	2	5417	1
5074	5	5422	3
5075	2	5431	1
5076	1	5433	1
5081	4	5434	1
5082	5	5451	1
5083	3	5453	2
5084	6	5461	1

Postcode	On-Line Agencies	Postcode	On-Line Agencies	Postcode	On-Line Agencies	Postcode	On-Line Agencies		
5085	3	5473	1	5046	8	5320	1		
5086	6	5485	1	5047	2	5330	3		
5087	4	5491	1	5048	4	5333	3		
5088	1	5501	1	5049	2	5340	2		
5089	1	5520	2	5051	5	5341	4		
5090	3	5522	1	5052	1	5342	1		
5091	1	5523	1	5061	4	5343	5		
5092	9	5540	9	5062	3	5345	2		
5093	2	5550	1	5063	5	5346	1		
5094	1	5554	2	5064	2	5351	1		
5095	4	5556	1	5065	3	5352	2		
5096	4	5558	2	5066	1	5353	1		
5097	3	5571	2	5067	5	5354	1		
5098	3	5573	1	5068	5	5355	2		
5106	2	5575	1	5069	2	5357	1		
5107	1	5576	1	5070	6	5373	1		
5108	15	5577	1	5072	2	5374	1		
5109	5	5581	1	5073	2	5412	1		
5110	1	5583	1	5074	5	5417	1		
5112	9	5600	6	5075	2	5422	3		
5113	8	5602	1	5076	1	5431	1		
5114	5	5605	1	5081	4	5433	1		
5117	1	5606	4	5082	5	5453	2		
5118	7	5608	6	5083	3	5461	1		
5120	2	5631	1	5084	6	5473	1		
5125	3	5640	1	5085	3	5485	1		
5126	4	5641	1	5086	6	5491	1		
5127	1	5652	1	5087	4	5501	1		
5152	1	5680	1	5088	1	5520	2		
5155	1	5690	2	5089	1	5522	1		
5158	6	5700	9	5090	1	5523	1		
5159	5	5720	2	5092	9	5540	7		
5160	1	5722	1	5093	2	5550	1		
5161	3	5723	2	5094	1	5554	2		
5162	10	5724	2	5095	4	5556	1		
5163	3	5725	3	5096	4	5558	2		
5164	1	5731	1	5097	3	5571	2		
5165	2	5950	1	5098	3	5573	1		
5166	1	Grand	580	5106	2	5575	1		
2. (a) 558 (2 June 1998)				5107	1	5576	1		
2 (b)				5108	15	5577	1		
Postcode	On-Line Agencies	Postcode	On-Line Agencies	5109	5	5583	1		
5000	16	5164	1	5110	1	5600	1		
5006	1	5165	2	5112	9	5605	1		
5007	3	5166	1	5113	8	5606	4		
5008	3	5167	4	5114	5	5608	5		
5009	3	5168	4	5117	1	5631	1		
5010	1	5169	2	5118	7	5640	1		
5011	4	5171	1	5120	2	5641	1		
5012	5	5172	1	5125	3	5652	1		
5013	6	5173	2	5126	4	5680	1		
5014	7	5204	1	5127	1	5690	2		
5015	4	5211	5	5152	1	5700	9		
5016	3	5214	2	5155	1	5720	2		
5018	1	5223	2	5158	6	5722	1		
5019	4	5234	1	5159	5	5723	2		
5020	1	5238	2	5160	1	5724	1		
5021	6	5241	1	5161	3	5725	3		
5022	5	5242	1	5162	10	5731	1		
5023	8	5244	2	5163	3	5950	1		
5024	5	5245	2	3.				Grand	558
5025	1	5251	3	Postcode	On-Line Machines	Postcode	On-Line Machines		
5031	5	5252	1	5000	25	5164	1		
5032	1	5253	5	5006	1	5165	4		
5033	6	5255	1	5007	4	5166	1		
5034	1	5260	1	5008	4	5167	6		
5035	1	5267	2	5009	7	5168	6		
5037	2	5268	2	5010	1	5169	2		
5038	4	5271	5	5011	5	5171	1		
5039	4	5275	1	5012	6	5172	1		
5040	1	5276	2	5013	8	5173	2		
5041	2	5277	1	5014	8	5204	1		
5042	4	5280	3	5015	6	5211	7		
5043	4	5290	12	5016	5	5214	2		
5044	1	5302	1	5017	4	5223	3		
5045	11	5304	1						

Postcode	On-Line Machines	Postcode	On-Line Machines
5018	1	5234	1
5019	6	5238	3
5020	1	5241	1
5021	9	5242	1
5022	7	5244	2
5023	12	5245	3
5024	6	5251	4
5025	1	5252	1
5031	7	5253	8
5032	1	5255	1
5033	7	5260	1
5034	0	5264	1
5035	0	5267	3
5037	0	5268	3
5038	0	5271	8
5039	0	5275	1
5040	0	5276	2
5041	0	5277	1
5042	0	5280	3
5044	0	5290	19
5045	0	5302	1
5046	0	5304	1
5047	2	5320	1
5048	6	5330	6
5049	2	5333	6
5051	6	5340	2
5052	1	5341	7
5061	5	5342	1
5062	5	5343	8
5063	6	5345	3
5064	2	5346	1
5065	3	5352	3
5066	1	5353	1
5067	9	5354	1
5068	7	5355	3
5069	2	5357	1
5070	9	5373	1
5072	3	5374	1
5073	2	5412	1
5074	8	5417	1
5075	3	5422	4
5076	1	5431	1
5081	5	5433	1
5082	7	5453	2
5083	6	5461	1
5084	9	5473	1
5085	4	5485	1
5086	8	5491	1
5087	5	5501	1
5088	1	5520	2
5089	2	5522	1
5090	4	5523	1
5091	2	5540	10
5092	15	5550	1
5093	2	5554	3
5094	2	5556	1
5095	5	5558	2
5096	5	5571	2
5097	4	5573	1
5098	4	5575	1
5106	3	5576	1
5107	1	5577	1
5108	22	5583	1
5109	7	5600	8
5110	2	5602	1
5112	12	5605	1
5113	10	5606	7
5114	8	5608	8
5117	1	5631	1
5118	8	5640	1
5120	2	5641	1
5125	6	5652	1
5127	1	5680	1
5152	1	5690	3
5155	1	5700	12
5158	7	5720	3
5159	6	5722	1
5160	2	5723	2

Postcode	On-Line Machines	Postcode	On-Line Machines
5161	4	5724	1
5162	14	5725	3
5163	4	5731	1
South Australia			760

LOTTERIES BILLBOARDS

182. **The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:**

1. Will the Minister for Government Enterprises provide full details of all of the locations of advertising billboards used by the Lotteries Commission of South Australia during the periods—

- (a) 1 July 1996-30 June 1997; and
- (b) 1 July 1997-31 March 1998?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Government Enterprises has provided the following response—

1. (a) There was no billboard advertising for the period 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997.
- (b) For the period 1 July 1997 to 31 March 1998 advertising billboards were used at:
 - 39 Burbridge Road, Mile End (above the Koala Car Rentals Building)
 - 12 Burbridge Road, Mile End (opposite Bunnings)
 - 219 O'Connell Street, North Adelaide (above Caledonian Hotel)
2. The current locations of advertising billboards are at:
 - 12 Burbridge Road, Mile End (opposite Bunnings)
 - 219 O'Connell Street, North Adelaide (above Caledonian Hotel)

LOTTERIES COMMISSION, DIRECT MAIL

183. **The Hon. NICK XENOPHON:** Will the Minister for Government Enterprises provide details of which suburbs of Adelaide and which towns in South Australia received direct mail from the Lotteries Commission of South Australia during the periods—

- (a) 1 July 1996-30 June 1997; and
- (b) 1 July 1997-31 March 1998?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Minister for Government Enterprises has advised that the Lotteries Commission of South Australia did not undertake any direct mail during the periods 1 July 1996 to 30 June 1997; and 1 July 1997 to 31 March 1998.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:

1. How much in total did the recent advertising campaign to promote this year's Budget cost the State Government?
2. How much was spent individually on—
 - (a) leaflets;
 - (b) newspaper;
 - (c) radio;
 - (d) television; and
 - (e) any other?
3. (a) how many of the letterbox leaflets were produced;
- (b) Who delivered them; and
- (c) How much did it cost to deliver?

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

1. Total cost of Budget advertising was \$176 509.90, which equals 11.8 cents to communicate the Budget details to each South Australian.
2. (a) The total cost of leaflets, including production and distribution promoting the Government's Budget was \$93 755.00.
- (b) The total cost of newspaper advertising communicating the Government's Budget was \$26 878.90. Metropolitan newspapers totalled \$13 260.10 and Messenger Press totalled \$11 118.80. Production costs \$2 500.00.
- (c) There was no radio advertising.
- (d) The total cost of the television advertising communicating the Government's Budget was \$33 876.00. Metropolitan television totalled \$21 968.00 and Regional/Provincial television totalled \$3 922.00. Production costs \$7 986.00
- (e) Agency fees for account management, creative work, media planning and all production supervision for the Budget totalled \$22 000.00.

3. (a) "Consumer" Budget brochures 603 000
 "Rural" Budget brochures 170 000
 Total 773 000
 (b) Brochures were delivered by Progress Press and Australian Post.
 (c) Delivery cost was \$44 110.00.

YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO:

1. Will the South Australia Captive Insurance Corporation insure SA Government Agencies against potential risk due to year 2000 date problem (Y2K) failures?

2. What action is the Government taking to ensure that private sector businesses or corporations which tender for, or have, Government contracts are Y2K compliant, or have programs in place to ensure compliance by the Year 2000?

3. Has the Government refused, or will the Government refuse, to award any contracts or tenders to non-Year 2K compliant businesses?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:

1. When the South Australian Government Captive Insurance Corporation (SAICORP) renewed the Government's catastrophe reinsurance program in the world market in September last year, a Year 2000 policy exclusion was imposed on one of the components of the program by the reinsurers.

It is anticipated that similar exclusions may also be imposed on other components of the program at policy anniversaries in September this year and next year.

SAICORP will endeavour to convince reinsurers to lift the existing exclusion and to not impose further exclusions, but may not be successful.

The insurance provided by SAICORP to SA Government agencies has few exclusions, but like all other insurers more generally and reinsurers, SAICORP is currently considering whether or not to provide protection for the Year 2000 problem.

SAICORP's decision will be influenced by the actions of its reinsurers and by the attitude taken by Australian insurers more generally to the Year 2000 losses and claims.

However, SAICORP will almost certainly apply a Year 2000 exclusion to any SA Government agency that has not signed off on its Year 2000 reporting responsibilities by 30 June 1999.

2. I am advised by Supply SA that all existing Government Supplies Contractors were approached in 1997, alerted to Y2K plans and asked to advise Y2K compliance. All recent contracts let by Supply SA have a Y2K warranty clause included.

3. I am advised that Supply SA is not aware of any refusal to award any contract on the basis of non Y2K compliance.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R. I. Lucas)—

South Australian Athletics Stadium—Charter for the period 9 October 1997 to 30 June 1998.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: On behalf of the Hon. Angus Redford, I bring up the fourteenth report 1997-98 of the committee and move:

That the report be read.

Motion carried.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: On behalf of the Hon. Angus Redford, I bring up the fifteenth report 1997-98 of the committee.

QUESTION TIME

AUSTRALIAN DANCE THEATRE

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I would like to provide answers to a question asked by the Hon. Carolyn Pickles in this place yesterday regarding the Australian Dance Theatre.

Yesterday, the Hon. Ms Pickles quoted selectively from a letter dated 26 June 1998 sent by Thomson Playford, solicitors representing the interests of the Australian Dance Theatre Limited, to Mr Peter Hannon of Duncan & Hannon, solicitors for Ms Tankard. The Hon. Ms Pickles failed to refer, either deliberately or unwittingly, to two paragraphs of that letter which support the information I have previously provided to the Parliament, as follows:

As at the date hereof the contract between the parties has not been terminated. Your client is therefore required to carry out her duties in accordance with the terms thereof. . . We advise that the offer made on 15 April 1998 to reach a mutually agreed termination which would permit your client to pursue her demonstrated preference for overseas touring, but would include an ongoing relationship with the company, will remain open to 15 July 1998. The offer made to your client contemplated an agreement with her to complete a new work for the company in 1999 as well as undertaking other touring activities. Our client has never had a specific response to that proposal. We consider, however, that we may now endeavour to bring the matter to a conclusion. Accordingly, after 15 July 1998, the board has instructed me to give formal notice of their termination of the contract.

Honourable members will appreciate that that contract remains current. It is now the subject of an agreement between Ms Tankard and ADT which varies some but not all its terms and which clearly specifies a termination date in the future—not now. In the end, it is interesting to note that in the final agreement Ms Tankard did not pursue the opportunity for the commission of a new work from the company, nor, so far, for an option on a new work offered by Arts SA. Arts SA's offers remains on the table.

In respect of the second question, I was advised of the position at Meryl Tankard Australian Dance Theatre on 1 April 1998 when the Hon. Justice Margaret Nyland, as Chair of the Meryl Tankard Australian Dance Theatre, met with me at her request. I was advised that the situation at the company had become unworkable and, regardless of the board's respect for Ms Tankard's talent and success as a choreographer, Ms Tankard was not fulfilling the role of Artistic Director.

The board's position is summarised in the letter of 16 July 1998 from Justice Nyland which I incorporated in my ministerial statement in this place yesterday. I highlight the following:

The board therefore decided that the current situation with the Artistic Director has become unworkable. We were confronted with two options:

- To permit the Artistic Director to do as she wished without direction from the board or management. This would have required the board to disregard its obligations as directors of the company, would have left the company without any management structure and would, in my view, [that is, Justice Nyland's view] have rapidly bankrupted the company.
- Enter into a new arrangement which would permit the Artistic Director the freedom to pursue her international career but which would enable the company to fulfil its obligations locally.

I was further advised on 1 April 1998 that the board believed a new arrangement could be agreed amicably. I encourage such a resolution while, of course, regretting the events that had taken place. It would have been improper for me to take any other action, and I did not do so.

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (7 July).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I said in answer to the original question on confidentiality that Ms Tankard's representatives have requested that contractual matters under discussion be kept confidential. The representative for Australian Dance Theatre has confirmed that he received a verbal request from Ms Tankard's representative to that effect.

Separately, the honourable member is correct when she states that the contract arrangement between Ms Tankard and ADT contains a confidentiality clause which prevents either party from publicly discussing the terms of the contract and actions arising from it.

The clause was included in the original contract signed by the parties in 1993 and was included in the contract signed last year as well. In both cases, the contracts were drafted by Ms Tankard's representatives. The contract signed on 16 July to vary the existing contract also includes a confidentiality provision. The rationale for the use of confidentiality clauses in such contracts is based upon the desire to keep confidential the terms of employment of a senior person as would be the case in the private sector.

I accept that there are other considerations where public funds are involved and have asked for this aspect to be considered in the Review of Australian Dance Theatre which I announced on 21 July.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: My questions are directed to the Minister for the Arts:

1. Is the Minister able to confirm the resignation of one of her arts ambassadors, Peter Goldsworthy, who we understand has resigned over the shameful loss of Ms Tankard to South Australia?

2. Given the Minister's alleged hands-off approach to the ADT board, has the Minister at any time during her term met with the present Chairperson or the former Chairperson or any other board members to discuss company matters, including the Artistic Director? Clearly, in her answer to a previous question of mine the Minister detailed that she had. So, what were the nature of those discussions in the past?

3. Did the Minister at any time suggest to the board a recommendation for resolution of the difficulties between the board and the Artistic Director? In her previous response, the Minister stated that she gave encouragement. What was the nature of that encouragement that she gave to the board?

4. According to the Minister's own statements about ultimately being responsible for taxpayers' money, why did she fail to act to resolve the situation by appointing an independent mediator as suggested by me and the Arts Industry Council, a fact which she conveniently omitted from her cowardly speech yesterday?

5. Will the Minister appoint an independent person to chair the review into the ADT which she also announced yesterday, and does the Minister agree with the following statement made by Mr Leo Schofield in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 18 July 1998:

What the hell is the board of the ADT in Adelaide up to, ousting Meryl Tankard as Artistic Director of the company? This is another example of our accursed tall poppy syndrome and represents a triumph of parochialism—

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I rise on a point of order, Mr President. First, the practice is for the Leader to seek leave if she wishes to make an explanation. She is now branching into an explanation. Secondly, I have made a note of eight questions. How many questions is the Leader entitled to ask?

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is correct that the Leader of the Opposition did not seek leave to make an explanation and immediately began to ask questions. Under those circumstances, no member should debate or refer to anything other than questions.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: She didn't—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member raised a point of order. Secondly, the practice followed at one time or another by most members has been to ask multiple questions. Previous Chairs and I have indicated that members ought only to ask one question not with multiple parts, but the practice of the Council has been to allow multiple questions. So, there is no point of order. However, I ask the Leader of

the Opposition, if she intends to ask a question with multiple parts, to do so and not to add any further comment.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Mr President, I thank you for your direction. I will take another tack. Does the Minister agree with the statement made by Mr Leo Schofield as reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 18 July 1998, which I now seek leave to table?

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am not sure whether there were five or eight questions, because I was busy trying to scribble the questions and the comments to enable me to respond. Clearly, I will have to come back with some of the information, as I have done so promptly today in reply to questions asked yesterday by the honourable member. However, regarding the review of the legal structure of ADT, which has been commissioned by Arts SA and which has been undertaken with the full support of the Australian Dance Theatre Board, an independent person with expertise in the arts and an individual who is respected Australia-wide has been approached and is actively considering the position. I hope that within the next 24 hours I will be able to advise the Council of the decision.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Well, he is respected, but he has not been approached to undertake this task. He has mentioned—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: You want him to do it? He has mentioned to me that he is a very close friend of Ms Tankard and that he has some personal views on this matter.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister, if she is so inept at answering my questions, bring back a reply tomorrow to the other questions that I asked?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I have—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have not called the Minister for Transport. The Leader of the Opposition should not reflect on another member in the way that she has.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I think it was also a bit churlish for the Leader of the Opposition to phrase the question in that way because I had already indicated, as I did yesterday, in answer to the honourable member's question—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I promptly brought back a reply today to the questions asked by the honourable member yesterday. I indicated in my answer to the honourable member's questions today that, because of the speed, the comment and the number of questions that she asked me, I will bring back the replies tomorrow.

RAIL REFORM TRANSITION PROGRAM

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning a question about the rail reform program.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Yesterday the Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism, Mr Ingerson, told the House of Assembly that he took over the chairmanship of the committee that oversees the distribution of funds under the Commonwealth's rail reform program (which was established following the sale of Australian National) when the Minister

for Transport stood down from that position. My questions to the Minister are: when did the Minister stand down from that position, and why did she do so?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Last year the Parliamentary Secretary for Transport and Regional Development invited me to chair this committee. At that time the honourable member would recall that we were in the midst of a sale program for Australian National and, as I had chaired the task force for Port Augusta that dealt with coping with the adjustments, particularly to the work force, I was very keen to accept that invitation to chair the rail reform group. That group was responsible for distributing Federal Government funds that had been provided to help communities cope with the adjustments required, particularly for the work force, arising from the sale of AN. I saw that as a continuation of my role as chair of the task force and that it was a transport task at that time. However, as the committee progressed its considerations of applications from around the State, it became apparent that these matters were no longer transport issues: they were State development and industry issues and that it was more appropriate for another Minister to chair the committee in that environment.

Also, I should highlight that while I chaired the committee the officers serving that committee were always seconded from the Department of Industry and Trade, as it was called this year; earlier it was called the Department of Economic Development. So, they were not officers from the Department of Transport. For those various reasons it was seen that, as the applications were industry, economic and State development related, it was more appropriate for the Minister directly responsible for those matters in the State Government to chair the committee. I therefore suggested to the Premier that it would be appropriate that Minister Ingerson chair this task and Minister Ingerson readily agreed.

RAW LOG EXPORT

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about raw log export.

Leave granted.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The reconfiguration of the departments has a lot to do with the problems that the Government experiences in being able to provide answers to questions, as indicated in the Minister's previous reply. My questions relate to a matter that the Hon. Legh Davis and certainly the Treasurer would know a lot about, because they sat on a committee with me some time ago looking into the problems of the timber industry and the scimber collapse or loss at the time. One of the matters that came out of the report for the education of all members on it was that it was difficult for a single monopoly to manage plantations from milling through to retail and wholesale sales.

In the main, the report was not critical of the integrated operations that the Woods and Forests Department at that time were running. We are at the stage now where the raw log available to the milling operations of public and private sector operators in the South-East is under threat. The continuity of supply to those mills has broken down and at least one mill is in danger of closing (and there was a statement by Carter Holt Harvey in relation to the Nangwarry mill) with a loss of 70 jobs and a multiplying factor, as the Hon. Mr Davis would know, of about three-to-one outside the gate. That is a lot of jobs to lose in a regional economy.

There are also doubts about the future of the Mount Burr mill, although the company spokespeople have said that there is at least another two years for that mill to operate based on raw log supply. There have been a number of reports in the local paper, the *Border Watch*, and the local member in the Lower House has asked questions in relation to the supply of log to the millers. I have asked a question in this Chamber about the Government's intentions to privatise the forests and the reply that I have received is that there is no intention at this stage to sell the forests, which should sound a good note for the people who are using the logs in that area, but unfortunately—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: It is the opinion of those people in the industry. Unfortunately, the problem has now emerged that there may be some breaches in the understandings that the State Government has in relation to how the private sector is using its raw log. The matters taken up by the union and the local member relate to the export of raw log through the port of Portland.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Which company is doing that?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: It has been indicated to me that CSR might be doing it. Other companies are denying that they are doing it, but a number of double-B log trucks have been seen going across the border and heading for Portland.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Joy-riding.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: That's right. The logs certainly aren't being dumped at the border and carted back; they seem to be continuing on the way down to Portland. The argument in the industry is whether they are saw logs or breaker logs. Breaker log can be exported under the rules and generally is used for chips or low grade uses, as opposed to saw log being exported raw, which is what happened in New Zealand. It built a port specifically for the export of raw log. Hundreds of jobs were lost in that area and a lot of log went out of the country overnight. A lot of people in the industry believe that this may be happening in the South-East, which has caused the shortage of log for Nangwarry. My questions are:

1. Is the Treasurer aware of the raw log export across the Portland wharf?
2. Is he aware that raw log is being exported in quantities that could keep the Nangwarry mill operational, thereby saving all those jobs?
3. What is the relative revenue loss to the State and the nation if this policy of exporting raw log without value adding is adopted?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank the honourable member for his question. One of my fondest memories of my period in the Parliament was serving on the select committee with the Hon. Mr Roberts and other members, learning all about—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Trevor Crothers puts his hand up; there was also the Hon. Legh Davis and the Hon. Michael Elliott. There were many long hours. It was a wonderful trip for three days or 2½ days to Greymouth in New Zealand or something, which was—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: You're kidding?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, the select committee went overseas for three days or so.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That's right, it was immediately after a flood. As we entered the hotel the carpets were hanging outside because it had just been flooded.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As I said, one of my fondest memories was serving on that select committee with the Hon. Terry Roberts. In terms of the dilemmas for the timber industry in the South-East, I refer the honourable member—I am not sure how his memory is serving him these days—back to the evidence—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: It was never good.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It was never good and is steadily getting worse, I suspect. I refer him to the evidence that Mr Eric Roughana (as I would refer to him, but the Hon. Mr Roberts used to call him Roughy Roughana) gave to the select committee. If the honourable member can find copies of the transcripts of the evidence, Mr Roughana put a very strong view—and this was some 10 or 12 years ago—about the economies of scale in the timber industry. I know there are a few people who raised their eyebrows at the time he gave his evidence, which was reported publicly at the time. He certainly put a very strong view that the economies of scale operating in the timber industry internationally were such that he could see in the not too distant future significant shaking out. I forget the capacities he quoted—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Your memory is not going too well, either.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That is true, but I did remember Mr Roughana's evidence. Certainly, the capacities he talked about were significantly greater than the capacities of the existing mills in the South-East. As I said, that was 10 to 12 years ago when we took the evidence from Mr Roughana. He remains somewhat of an expert in the industry and I am sure his views would not have changed as a result of the passage of time.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am sure he probably did not. We spent a lot of time in New Zealand trying to follow the path down the various rivers and wherever else the logs were going to be floated from wherever John Bannon had decided they were going to be grown in some part of New Zealand and floated down myriad rivers and creeks to the poor mill in Greymouth.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is the Treasurer getting close to an answer of the question?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President, I should not be further diverted by my memories of the select committee. The answer to the three questions is: 'No, no and I do not know.' I will take advice on the 'I do not know' and see whether there is anything useful I can offer to the honourable member.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: Can the Minister for the Arts comment on the recent Telstra Adelaide Festival press release stating that the Festival is back in the black and the previous commitment by the Festival to cover its losses from the 1996 Festival over the period of the next two Festivals?

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: A question has been asked of me—that is why. The Hon. Carolyn Pickles was able also to attend a major announcement yesterday by the Chairman of the Telstra Adelaide Festival and supported by the Artistic Director, Robyn Archer, in relation to the 1998 festival. It is with great pleasure that I repeat for the benefit of this place that the box office for the 1998 Telstra Adelaide

Festival surpassed the \$2 million mark and that attendance exceeded 600 000 people. There were more than 70 performing arts events including 21 which were exclusive to Adelaide. That is important because, in terms of the direction of the Festival now and in the future, to distinguish it from festivals in all other States we must maintain a high level of exclusivity for the Adelaide Festival. That was achieved in 1998 in part because of increased Government funding.

A further \$500 000 of Government funds was provided for the Festival this year, exclusively for the showcasing of South Australian new work. It was a major coup for South Australian performers as well as for the State as a whole. It was an artistic success and now that the board has confirmed it is a financial success, it is particularly good news for the Festival and brings credit to the arts overall in terms of management of the arts—the artistic and financial side of the arts—in this State. The honourable member asked about that positive result in the context of the deficits from the 1996 Festival. Certainly, the positive result from the Festival this year has enabled the Festival to pay back \$300 000 of the 1996 deficit. There was some discussion about whether the Festival, having made \$600 000 profit, would pay back the whole sum to the Government, to Arts SA, in terms of the \$600 000 from the 1996 Festival.

It was agreed that \$300 000 of the \$600 000 profit should remain as reserves with the Adelaide Festival at this time so that the Festival can gain the interest from those funds. That was agreed as a sign of goodwill and respect for the management of the 1998 Festival. I highlight that the Government still requires the Festival to repay the further \$300 000 owing from the 1996 Adelaide Festival but the board believes it can accommodate that. It is a good example for other companies that such a leading organisation like the Adelaide Festival is operating on the basis of artistic excellence and financial prudence. I wish that all arts companies could do so.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, representing the Minister for Human Services, a question about mental health services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: My office has been informed that the southern region of Adelaide is grossly under resourced regarding the provision of mental health services. It is generally acknowledged that 20 per cent of the population suffer from a mental illness at any given time and, of this number, 1 per cent are acute enough to warrant admission to hospital and/or professional care. On the basis of these statistics there would be 600 people living in the southern health region who are currently suffering from acute mental illness. In the past a person suffering from such illness could admit themselves to hospital. This is no longer possible and it is even becoming difficult for doctors to get patients admitted. One of the remaining points of entry is through the emergency crisis team known as the Assessment and Crisis Intervention Services or ACIS. There is only one ACIS team providing mental health services in the southern region.

I have been told of a woman in that region who recently attempted suicide. The ACIS team was called. When the team arrived they merely took away her medication, which she had used for the attempt, and then told her to walk around the block. After that it was left to the woman's local support group to provide the necessary support. In following up the

matter with the Regional Director the support group was told that the woman was not admitted to hospital as she was suffering from a multiple personality disorder and hospitalisation would have been worse for her. Previously such patients received care through the Willows program at Glenside. However, this program was scrapped by the Labor Government as a cost-cutting measure.

So, on the face of it the official assistance offered to the woman was inadequate immediately after the initial emergency and non-existent by way of long-term treatment. It was left to an unfunded support group to provide this woman with ongoing assistance. Two months ago the Minister for Human Services made a major announcement in relation to mental health services, which will include both new funding arrangements as well as the sale of Glenside Hospital. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Can the Minister advise how many patients will have to be relocated with the closing down of Glenside Hospital?
2. Can the Minister provide specific details as to where the relocated patients will reside once Glenside Hospital is closed?
3. What support services will be provided for Glenside patients once they are residing in the community?
4. Can the Minister advise whether the Government has made any financial savings in the shift away from institution based care to community based care?
5. If so, what is the level of these savings and how have they been achieved?

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

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE OF TAFE

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, representing the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training, a question about the 1997 annual report for the Adelaide Institute of TAFE.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Last week, I received a copy of the latest annual report for the Adelaide Institute of TAFE. This would not be an unusual occurrence as many annual reports are received by members of Parliament, adding to the paper flow to their offices. However, what was unusual about this report is that it was produced on a CD ROM which takes up less storage space and, obviously, uses less paper. My questions to the Minister are:

1. What was the cost of producing the 1997 annual report in CD ROM format, including postage costs, and how many copies were produced?
2. What was the cost of producing the 1996 annual report as a printed document, including postage costs, and how many copies were printed?

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

YEAR 2000 COMPLIANCE

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a precised statement prior to directing some questions to the Treasurer and Leader of the Government in this House on the millennium bug.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Over the past two years or more, much has been written concerning the millennium bug. Included in some recently released facts on the bug is the fact that Australia's top 20 companies have thus far spent some \$1.2 billion in trying to come to grips with it. Secondly, if the problem is not totally resolved insurance companies believe litigation which could follow such failure will cost many billions of dollars. Thirdly, such is the concern on this issue that it is reported that President Clinton is seeking to bring in legislation to outlaw any insurance claims in respect of the millennium bug.

Matters of relevance to this State are that most of the State's revenue measures, wage and bill payments, are done by computer. As well as those matters, the Government has in recent times leased out most, if not all, its computer services and functions. Of course, what applies to this State applies equally to all other States and Territories of Australia. In addition to the foregoing, all banking and foreign exchange mechanisms are also computer based. It has been said that the millennium bug is not so much a Government or business problem but should be regarded as a total community problem. It is further asserted by computer gurus that, if even one business does not get things right, then that business, whether it be big or small, could throw a glitch into all computing systems to which it is tied. Given the foregoing, and given that there is less than 18 months to go before the year 2000 is upon us, I direct the following questions to the Minister:

1. Is this Government treating the problem as a community problem and, if not, why not?
2. What oversight has the Government set up to overview the progress of solutions which can be successfully applied to this State Government's computer system?
3. What assistance, if any, has the Government set up to assist small businesses that may not have the means to find solutions relative to the millennium bug in respect of their computer operations?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This is an important issue. Minister Wayne Matthew has carriage, generally, of the—

The Hon. P. Holloway: Why has he got it?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Because he knows a lot about this particular area and—

The Hon. P. Holloway: He thinks he does.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I can assure you that he knows more than the Hon. Mr Holloway. Having sat across the table from the Hon. Mr Holloway for the past four or five years, let me assure you that he knows more about this area than the Hon. Mr Holloway—and he also has ministerial responsibility which is another reason why he is looking after it.

I will take up the issue with the Minister. It is an important issue which is acknowledged as such by the Government. The Premier and the Cabinet, together with the Minister, are taking a great degree of interest, obviously, in the way that Government agencies, in particular, try to manage the millennium bug problem and the costs which are involved. I think that at budget time Minister Matthew indicated, to use his words, the ballpark costs were something of the order of \$70 million to \$80 million.

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, that is exactly right and, as each month goes on, new issues are found. Minister Brown, for example, has been highlighting some of the problems with equipment that is used in hospitals.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, I am sure they have been part of the process.

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am sure the raw log mills are probably struggling with it as well. I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Minister and, as soon as I can, I will bring back a reply.

MAPICS

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer as Leader of the Government a question relating to Ministerial and Parliamentary Information and Communication Services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: The Leader may need to seek other ministerial help in answering this question, and I am sure he will avail himself of it. I note with interest the Government's newsletter and timetable for implementing the Ministerial and Parliamentary Information and Communication Services project (MAPICS). I note that the aims of the project include, first, 'more effective communication' between members and their constituents and, secondly, easier access to parliamentary information such as *Hansard*

In the first edition of the MAPICS news, the Project Director, Colin Lumsden, points out that:

... most of the wealth of information generated inside Parliament is currently paper based, which is becoming an inefficient, dated and costly way to distribute it.

Very few members would disagree with Mr Lumsden on that, and the question I will ask concerns information relevant to members of Parliament which is accessible at the Parliament House Library but which is not actually generated inside Parliament. I refer to the Parliament House Library collection of newspapers and newspaper clippings. In common with many other members, I am sure, I have had need occasionally to research issues from the files of newspapers and newspaper clippings held at the Library. Sometimes it is necessary for me, or for whomever is available to help me, to spend hours sifting through pieces of paper held in envelopes. The parliamentary Library staff do a very efficient job in terms of clipping the newspapers and filing articles appropriately, but the question must be asked whether we are making the most efficient use of our time by searching in this rather ancient manner.

Both News Limited and Fairfax publishing houses maintain electronic databases of newspaper articles. Dozens of different newspapers can be searched on-line in only a fraction of the time it takes to do a manual paper based search of clippings in envelopes. The Fairfax archives are available through the Internet; the News Limited database is not—at least not yet. In both cases, one is charged for accessing documents either through a subscription fee or pay per view.

This resource is currently available, as I understand it, to the staff of the parliamentary Library. However, the situation at present in this Parliament is that in order to keep down costs and fit within its budget the Library has made a policy decision not to make this service available to members or their staff.

The Hon. Sandra Kanck: This is the IT State, isn't it?

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: The Library's position is that the cost of searching for specific items in newspapers should be borne by individual members, not by the Library. As a consequence, my occasional assistants have spent many hours searching manually through piles of newspaper

clippings for items which they presumably would have found within two or three minutes if they had access to an electronic database such as Presscom. From MAPICS information, we note that it will eventually bring e-mail and Internet access to members.

An honourable member: Eventually.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: Yes, eventually. I ask the Treasurer:

1. Will members' access to information through MAPICS be extended to include access to newspaper databases, whether or not on the Internet?

2. If the access is to be offered, on what basis will it be available?

3. Will each member require separate subscriptions to Presscom or the Fairfax archive, or will MAPICS subscribe for the benefit of all MPs?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I know that with technology things move on, but it would be very sad to leave the days of the Parliament with which most of us have been familiar where we enjoy the process of working our way through those wonderful press clippings in the Parliamentary Library. I have spent many years blissfully going through the Parliamentary Library press clippings with great joy and retrieving the past comments of the John Cornwalls and the Ian Gilfillans. It could well be one of those tragedies of progress that the joys of that experience might be lost to future members, but I suspect that is probably just a little way down the road yet.

I will have to take up that issue again with Minister Matthew, the Minister responsible for the MAPICS project, and get his advice. Certainly, from that newsletter and the various briefings, I am not aware that the particular project extends to each individual member in terms of having automatic access to Presscom. That might be possible—I do not know—but it has not been highlighted.

Of course, the main issue of access to Presscom is the cost. Having been in Opposition for many years and with much fewer facilities and much less service than this generous Government has provided to the Opposition Parties in recent years, I remember having to pay out of the electorate allowance significant Presscom bills on a monthly basis—

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: You had to buy your own fax.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, that and a whole range of things, but we will not go back to that. I know the parliamentary Party had to share the costs for its use of the Presscom searches as well. Yes, on a lot of occasions this information is available, but it is the cost of access to that information and a matter whether or not the \$20 000 electorate allowances with which members of the Legislative Council are provided to help them service and undertake their jobs might have to be used to help provide that service or, indeed, whether it might be picked up in some other way. I am not sure what would be the cost of access to the Presscom service now or whether it could be done individually or more cheaply through the Parliamentary Library. Inevitably—and, as I said, somewhat sadly—at some stage we will see the clipping service changed to some sort of electronic access service in the Parliamentary Library in the first instance.

I am sure the Hon. Mr Gilfillan would acknowledge that that is not a decision for the Executive arm of Government to take in terms of how the Parliamentary Library is run. It used to be a decision for the old Joint Library Committee. Again, sadly, the Joint Library Committee has gone and that decision now rests with you, Mr President. The Joint Parliamentary Service Committee of the Parliament has

usurped the role of the Library Committee on which many of us have fond memories of serving.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will not be diverted by the interjection about the Printing Committee. The issue of the services provided by the Parliamentary Library would be an issue that the honourable member should take up with the President or with other members of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee, which does have oversight of the services provided. If the honourable member has a problem with access being provided to a service to staff of the Library and not to members, that is properly an issue for the Parliament to resolve. As a member of the Executive arm of Government, I would not see it as my role to poke my nose in where it was not wanted in terms of the operations of the Parliament. On that part of the issue, I suggest that the honourable member take it up with the President or a member of the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee. In relation to the other aspects of the honourable member's questions which do relate to ministerial responsibility by Minister Matthew, I will happily take up the issues with the Minister and bring back a reply.

NURSING HOMES

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Disability Services and for the Ageing a question about nursing homes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Last week, the Federal Treasurer was reported as announcing that the Productivity Commission has been asked to undertake an inquiry into the cost of operating nursing homes in all parts of Australia. I am aware that nursing homes in this State receive less Commonwealth funding than those in other States. Does the Minister believe that this new reference to the Productivity Commission will benefit nursing homes in South Australia?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Members opposite will recall that in the 1996 Federal budget the Federal Government announced that the disparity which then existed between nursing home subsidies would be removed over a period of seven years, commencing 1 July 1998. The process was announced as a process of coalescence. At the moment, nursing homes in South Australia receive the second lowest subsidy of any subsidy paid by the Commonwealth to nursing homes amongst the various States.

By way of example, a South Australian nursing home in category 1 receives \$95.13 per day for an occupied space, compared with the next lowest State, Western Australia, which receives \$96.45. On the other hand, Victoria receives \$106. These daily fees and disparities do not sound very great in real terms. However, when they are aggregated over the course of a year one finds a very great disparity, for example, as between South Australia and Victoria. A 40 bed nursing home in Victoria receives about \$167 000 more per annum than does a South Australian nursing home. This applies both to the private for profit operators and also to the not for profit sector. The effective—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: In a couple of months you will be able to go to a Federal Labor Government.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: That is highly unlikely but, in any event, during the 13 years that the Federal Labor Government was in power it did absolutely nothing to remove the disparity. At least the Howard Liberal Government faced the issue and announced a program of coalescence.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister has the call.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The people who suffer in consequence of this disparity are, of course, the occupants of nursing homes. With that additional \$167 000 in South Australia, a 40 bed nursing home could and would employ—as they do in Victoria—an additional three level one nursing staff members. So, the staffing levels in South Australia are correspondingly lower, but of course the needs are precisely the same.

The industry, both for profit and not for profit, in this State made strong representations to the Federal Government earlier this year about the seven year period of coalescence. Whilst the industry accepted the need for coalescence, it believed that seven years was too long.

The announcement last week by the Treasurer and by the Federal Minister, Warwick Smith, that the Productivity Commission will undertake an examination of these costs was welcomed by me on this ground: I do believe that a consequence of that examination will be that the seven year coalescence period will be substantially telescoped and the deficit from which South Australian operators suffer will be more rapidly removed. However, it is unfortunate that the process which was due to begin on 1 July has been delayed.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: No. It has been announced that the Productivity Commission will report within six months. Whether or not a Federal election is called within that period only time will tell. This State Government does not welcome every report of the Productivity Commission. I see in today's press that the Australian Labor Party has announced a policy to abolish altogether the Productivity Commission. However, I have every confidence that this examination will show that, certainly in South Australia, our nursing home operators and residents of nursing homes and other aged accommodation will benefit.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: By way of an interjection, an honourable member asked what I have been doing about it. Over the months that I have held this portfolio, I have pressed the Federal Minister and the Federal Government to abandon the seven year coalescence program or to accelerate it. Success has been achieved in the announcement of this review, which I welcome.

AGED CARE

In reply to **Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO** (27 May).

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: In addition to the answer given on 27 May 1998, the following information is furnished:

The Department of Health and Family Services announced successful applicants for the CACPs in June and funding is available from 1 July 1998. Agreements with agencies are currently under way.

The successful applicants were:

Agency	Local Government Areas/Target Groups	Places
Elderly Citizens Homes	Charles Sturt	49
Alwyndor Aged Care	Holdfast Bay	41
Resthaven Inc	Holdfast Bay	10
Elderly Citizens Homes	Walkerville & Prospect	24
St Louis Nursing Home	Unley	27
Home Care Services	Pt Elliot, Goolwa, Strathalbyn, Victor Harbor	22
Boandik Lodge Inc	Mt Gambier	20
St Anna's Residential Care Facility	Croatian, Ukrainian, Belarus	20
Italian Village	Italian	28
Set aside out of round	Aboriginal	10

TRANSPORT FARES

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Is the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning aware of the impact on patronage of the budgeted increase in public transport fares? If not, will she release the department's calculations on the impact of the fare increases on public patronage in South Australia?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Fares were increased from Sunday 5 July. Since that time, TransAdelaide, together with the Passenger Transport Board and others, has conducted a vigorous fare evasion—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Did you say, 'Since then'?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes, since then. On 12 July, TransAdelaide and the Passenger Transport Board started a comprehensive fare evasion exercise to ensure that people have a ticket, that they have the right ticket, and that if they have a concession ticket they also have on their person a concession card entitling them to that ticket. It is not possible to confirm at this stage the patronage for July, as I receive the figures for each month in the following month. As I have said, the increase applied from 5 July. It is now only 22 July. When I have those figures I will provide them to the honourable member.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I direct my questions to the Treasurer, as follows:

1. What is the precise source of the funds that the Government has used to promote the sale of ETSA, including the television and press advertising campaign launched in recent weeks?

2. What is the legislative provision or provisions under which the expenditure of those funds was authorised?

3. Who authorised this expenditure?

4. What are the precise details of the amounts spent on the campaign, including a breakdown of the expenditure to show when, where and on what those amounts were spent?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Starting with the last question first, the figure that I have used publicly is, I think, about \$300 000, but I am happy to provide that detail. I think the first advertisements appeared on the Channel 10 news on Sunday evening at about 5.20 p.m. I do not know whether the honourable member wants any more precise detail—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It was 14 minutes past five.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It might have been 14 minutes past five. I am happy to provide the detail of the period of time during which the television advertisements ran. From memory, I think it would have been for a period of about seven to 10 days. To my recollection, there were no radio advertisements. There were a number of press advertisements in a number of newspapers. I am happy to provide details for the honourable member regarding that aspect of his query.

The Government authorised the program. Again, I am happy to provide the detail of the process of approval for the honourable member. I will also inform the honourable member of which budget line was used to fund the process. If there are other aspects of the honourable member's four or five questions which I have not addressed, I will take them on notice and bring back a reply as soon as I can.

The only other point I make is that the Government has taken a strong view—as, indeed, have all Governments—that, with respect to an issue as critical as this is to the future of South Australia, it is important for the public to know the facts. This is particularly so because, on a daily basis, we

have constantly had to correct claims made by the Deputy Leader of the Australian Democrats, the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Treasurer which have no basis at all in fact. Yesterday's example was the most recent, but it is only one of a number of examples where we have had publicly to correct the record. The Deputy Leader of the Australian Democrats (Hon. Sandra Kanck) appeared on weekend television leading, I think, two news bulletins and on another news bulletin making a range of claims which had no basis in fact. I understand that the Electricity Supply Association of Australia was so offended that it provided us with a response yesterday and has now written to the Adelaide *Advertiser* indicating—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, I am not sure. I have not seen it in the newspaper yet. The association to which the Deputy Leader attributed her statements made on ABC radio on Monday morning is clearly dissociating itself from the interpretation placed upon the figures by her and, I think, has taken some offence. The detail of the association's response, if the *Advertiser* chooses to print it, will again make apparent the reasons why it is important that the facts are able to be put as part of this process.

When the honourable member introduces his Bill, we will have an opportunity to debate this issue. I will not debate it in this response but, as I have indicated through public comment, many members of Parliament, including the Australian Democrats and Labor members, use taxpayers' money to put out in the public arena their views on a whole range of issues, particularly on this issue of the sale of ETSA and Optima, prior to the Bill being discussed in the Parliament. As I have said, we will address those issues at the appropriate time, and that will be when the honourable member introduces his Bill.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I ask a supplementary question. Has the Government conducted a public opinion poll regarding the ETSA sale and, if so, what are the details of that poll?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Government has not funded any quantitative market research, contrary to the interjections and assertions by—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I do not know. Neither the Government nor I have funded any quantitative market research. Through our communications consultant the Government has funded some small group research. That is qualitative research, but it is not of a nature such as to be able to provide you with the same sort of information from the quantitative research that, for example, Morgan research or others do, which would indicate what the broad cross-section of the community think in percentage terms about the sale of ETSA and Optima. If members are interested in that, I would refer them to the *Advertiser* and a number of other public outlets which have done some quantitative market research indicating the general views of the public regarding the sale of ETSA and Optima.

MATTERS OF INTEREST

URANIUM, MINING

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Despite grave reservations from the environment movement about potential long-term environmental damage, the South Australian Government has approved trials of in-situ leaching (ISL) as a means of mining uranium at the Beverley and Honeymoon deposits. Last month the Conservation Council of South Australia and the Australian Conservation Foundation convened a public meeting to discuss the expansion of the nuclear industry in South Australia. Mr Gavin Mudd, a hydrogeologist from the Victorian University of Technology, who has undertaken extensive studies into the environmental performance of ISL mines in Europe, the former USSR and the USA, was amongst those who addressed the meeting. His findings have implications for the Beverley and Honeymoon proposals and, as a consequence, I am placing some of the this information on the public record in this Parliament.

ISL can be done by injecting either alkaline or acid solutions into the ore body to dissolve it. It is an attractive method for the mining industry, because there are minimal labour costs and on the surface (quite literally) it looks clean. The industry prefers acid over alkaline solutions, because they are able to leach out more of the uranium. But unfortunately the downside is that acid solutions, unlike the alkaline solutions, also release other toxic and heavy metals from the ore body.

The South Australian trials are using acid solutions and, given the cargo cult mentality of this Government, it is therefore highly likely that full scale uranium mining will go ahead using acidic solutions. Yet in the US there has never been a commercial ISL mine which uses acidic solutions, and for the past 15 years there has not been an acidic ISL trial, because the regulators are preventing the use of acid. Restoration of the ground water following ISL mining is mandatory in the US, yet this is not a requirement for Beverley or Honeymoon.

Why in the 'land of the free' are these restrictions in place? Why is it that in this wild frontier called South Australia we ignore the international experiences? Those experiences are less than positive, ranging from contamination of surface soils by spills and leaks of the sulphuric acid to contamination of ground water. That contamination includes an increase in the overall salinity of the ground water, the release of heavy metals such as arsenic, lead, cadmium and molybdenum from the surrounding rocks and a general increase in the level of radionuclides in the water. In Europe this contaminated ground water is now impinging on human settlements.

Heathgate Resources, which is operating the Beverley mine, has repeatedly claimed that the ISL process it is using is the same as in the US. This is so blatantly untrue that I would be inclined to call this a lie, except that I know it is unparliamentary language. A newspaper article in January stated that Southern Cross Resources, the owners of the Honeymoon mine, are intending a \$7 million expansion of plant to lift production from the current levels of 250 000 pounds of uranium per annum to one million pounds. This surely makes a mockery of the concept of a trial.

The overseas experience demonstrates that the toxic solutions resulting from ISL mining can travel significant

distances, and the original Honeymoon trial in the early 1980s showed that leaching solutions moved outside the mining zone. Yet it is an article of faith of those promoting these mines that there will be no such movements. They claim that the aquifer is contained and that there will be no leakage to ground water. Given the overseas experience, surely it should be up to the proponents to conclusively prove their conjecture that this contaminated ground water will not travel slowly towards Lake Frome and perhaps even contaminate the Great Artesian Basin. The proponents' claims that the ground water quality will return to normal is really no more than hypotheses.

The Democrats believe that at the end of the trial period the Government must undertake its own independent and extensive sampling at the site to ensure that the claims stand up to analysis. It is not acceptable to allow the mining companies to undertake such studies. The overseas experience has shown that ISL miners have a poor record of site restitution at the conclusion of mining. At the very least, this must be a condition of licence with provision of funds up front so the companies do not scarp at the end and leave it to the taxpayers of South Australia to foot the bill. Unfortunately, this is unlikely to happen because, as Gavin Mudd told last month's public meeting, for South Australians it is all a case of out of sight, out of mind.

SUTHERLAND, Ms K.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I rise with sadness today to pay tribute to one of the Labor Party's most respected ladies, Kaye Sutherland, the State Secretary of the Party in South Australia, who passed away on Sunday 12 July after a long struggle with ill health. Kaye Sutherland was a competent and hard working woman who devoted her working life to the Labor cause. More than anything else, she had people skills, a rare quality in so many people. Even though Kaye said it like it was, she was a conciliatory person and a great organiser, who was always able to see the overall picture. Kaye was the type of person who put her all into everything she did. She loved her position and what she had achieved and worked hard to make it a success. At her funeral one of her brothers commented that Kaye had commenced in this latest position in life with dedication and passion. Regrettably, her time was cut short.

I think it would be honest to say that in politics one has friends and acquaintances at many levels. Although I had known Kaye at the trade union and political level for many years, my friendship with Kaye came fairly late in life. We had the type of friendship where we could be honest with one another, to the point where we could share our (sometimes) insecurities. I think that good friends can do that and come away with an honest appraisal of what is important in life. When we visited her in hospital she talked about nothing but the Labor Party and getting back to her job. Our joke was that politics always threw up something interesting, and no doubt there would be several problems for her to solve simultaneously when she returned. She was even recruiting members in hospital. She was grateful to the medical staff who looked after her, but she missed her work and her work mates and was very keen to return as soon as possible. I know that people such as John Boag will miss her dreadfully. She has left a great sadness, and at this time it is very hard for us all to remember her positive outlook on life and great love of life.

At a personal level, Kaye Sutherland had great style. She loved clothes and wore them with class. I know that Kathy of La Prima Vera boutique has lost a good friend. A great deal of her spare time was spent raising money for the Australian Kidney Foundation. She was always grateful to have been given the opportunity 11 years ago of receiving a kidney and celebrated its birthday in style every year. I thanked Kaye Sutherland in my maiden speech for her support and mentioned that she had formally made history as the first female State Secretary of the ALP in South Australia. I am pleased that a person such as Kaye was the person in our Party to have made such history, especially at the time when the greatest number of women in the history of South Australia entered Parliament. I only wish that I did not have the need to mention it again in Parliament under such circumstances.

In the short that time Kaye Sutherland was the Secretary she proved her competence and skills, particularly with the magnificent State election campaign she directed. I am sure that, had her time not been cut short, she would have continued to build on her expertise and gained even greater respect. Following true Labor precedent from what has happened to previous State Secretaries, she no doubt would have joined either this Parliament or the Federal one and would have continued in her contribution to the Labor movement.

The respect in which Kaye Sutherland was held by so many people was evident by the very many hundreds of people who were present at her funeral. I was touched when a Labor supporter at the funeral left an ALP badge at her coffin as we were filing past. Along with her husband, family and friends the ALP was a big part of her life and increasingly had become a very important part to her. To her husband Carl and stepdaughters, to her mother and brothers and their families, I offer the condolences of myself and family, the Labor Party and in particular my parliamentary Labor colleagues, the SDA union, where she started her association with the Labor movement, and the rest of the Labor movement.

I know that the pain of the family that loved her will be the greatest and no words and replace Kaye Sutherland. I hope that in time they will be comforted to know that Kaye was so very well respected and loved and that she will also be missed by so many other people.

GAMBLING, US RESEARCH TRIP

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I rise to give honourable members a brief summary of the trip I made to the United States and the Netherlands last month and to acknowledge just some of the many people who gave me invaluable assistance on that trip and, time permitting, to place on the record my view of the importance of travel in broadening a member's outlook and improving a member's effectiveness in serving his or her constituents. Members may not be surprised to know that my time away was focused very much on gambling issues and policies.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer: Did you win?

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I will talk about the extent of my gambling in a minute. In the United States I had the privilege of spending a number of days with Tom Grey, the Executive Director of the National Coalition Against Gambling Expansion. He heads a remarkable organisation that runs on a shoestring but has managed to tie the gambling industry up in knots throughout the United States. It is an

organisation that has drawn support across the political spectrum and, interestingly, from both so-called moral conservatives and libertarians.

His organisation has been successful in 37 out of 41 local ballots in the United States to prevent the expansion of gambling and seems likely later this year to wind back the proliferation of gambling venues in a number of US States. What impressed me about Tom Grey and his eclectic support network was the way in which he managed to harness grassroots community support into a very effective political campaign. For instance, in one referendum the pro-gambling lobby spent over \$600 000 supporting a new casino development, but Tom Grey's forces spent in the order of \$3 000 opposing it and still won the ballot easily.

Tom Grey organised for me to meet with Ralph Nader in Washington DC and I see as significant the fact that the father of the consumer rights movement is increasingly vocal on gambling as a consumer protection issue. I changed my travel plans just before I left so as to go to South Carolina where there is currently a huge debate on that State's burgeoning video poker machines industry. The Governor, David Beasley, has taken a courageous stand against the industry and the impact it has had.

I was fortunate enough to meet with the Governor and I thank his Director of Family Policy, Larry Huff, for organising that. I also wish to particularly thank Mr Tom Landess, a former literature professor who is now Director of Public Affairs for South Carolina's Attorney-General, for his invaluable assistance and hospitality in South Carolina.

In Maryland I met with the Governor, Parris Glendening, who is facing re-election this year and for whom gambling has emerged as a major issue with Governor Glendening taking a strong position against the further expansion of gambling in Maryland. In Las Vegas, of all places, I attended the National Council on Problem Gambling Conference and I met with a number of experts in the field of problem gambling and gambling addiction. I am sure that my ongoing contact with them will be most useful, particularly Dr Durand Jacobs, who is an expert on the impact of gambling on children.

I can safely confirm to all members, including the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, that contrary to mischievous speculation I did not place any bet on any form of gambling whilst in Las Vegas. Indeed, the only gamble I took on the entire trip was when I was a passenger on a flight that had to make an emergency landing because of a rudder malfunction.

In Las Vegas I also met with Professor William Thompson from the University of Nevada, who has written about the conduct of G-TECH Corporation, a matter that I have also raised in this Chamber. A number of experts have also raised with me their concern about the potential influence of the gambling industry on the research that they do. This to me has shades of the now discredited industry funded Tobacco Research Institute.

In California I met with community groups which have taken on the gambling industry in opposing the expansion of gambling in their local communities. I also met with a member of President Clinton's National Commission into Gambling, Mr Leo McCarthy, a former Lieutenant Governor of California, and his information on the progress of the US Commission was most useful. I also received an informative briefing from the legal counsel to the Governor of California, Daniel Kolkey, on gambling issues and also on the manner in which citizen initiated referenda were run in California.

Across the Atlantic in the Netherlands I met with Pieter Remmers of the Jellinek Consultancy, which has advised the Dutch Parliament on issues involving problem gambling. There is currently a Bill before the Dutch Parliament to modify gaming machines.

This is by no means a comprehensive survey of the people that I met in the United States and in the Netherlands. I do wish to complete this speech by indicating the importance as I see it of travel through the legitimate use of the members' travel allowances in bringing back new and fresh ideas that can be applied to this State. I will, of course, be filing a comprehensive report in accordance with the rules. I believe that the controversy we have seen in recent times over members arguing over their travel entitlements has been an unfortunate development and counterproductive. I believe that there is an obligation on all members who use their travel allowance to let the public know of the benefits that can flow to this State rather than allowing the issue of travel to be turned into a political football.

BALTIC STATES

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: In June this year I was privileged to be invited to attend the 46th Commemoration Service and Concert organised by the Baltic Council of South Australia. The commemoration service was held at St Peter's Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church and was attended by members of the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian community, as well as other people.

As members would be aware, Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians have lived on the shores of the Baltic Sea for over 5000 years. All three countries share a similar history. The defeat of the German and Russian empires in 1918 provided an opportunity for the Baltic people to take up arms and fight for their freedom, resulting in the declarations of independence. During their brief period of independence the Baltic countries made considerable progress in all aspects of their economic, social and cultural life.

As a result of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in 1939 the Red Army invaded the three Baltic States in 1940. The Second World War was a time of genocide, terror and torture, during which many Baltic people perished in the Siberian labour camps. Others escaped to seek refuge in the west. From the beginning of the occupation on 17 June 1940 until the end of the Stalin era in 1954 these three States with a population of 6 million lost almost 605 000 people, or about 10 per cent of the total population. The arrests, executions and deportations behind the Iron Curtain were never made public.

Since that period of extensive repression, the Baltic States combined in a joint effort of great uprising against the communist regime demanding the independence and freedom of their countries. They kept alive the memories of the 14 June 1941, the night of the first mass arrests, by regularly placing flowers on the national monuments in Tallinn, Riga and Vilnius. The people of the Baltic countries also held protest rallies as an expression of their anger. The yearnings for freedom by the younger generations were the beginnings of the aspirations for the independence of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Indeed, they were the seeds of hope for freedom for the many other ethnic republics of the Soviet Union.

But Moscow attempted to quell the uprisings and used army tanks to crush demonstrators in Vilnius. They also shot reporters witnessing demonstrations in Riga. Barricades were erected around the seats of Parliament and television and

broadcasting stations were declared out of bounds. Nevertheless, the demonstrations continued and the efforts of the captive nations were supported by many members of the Baltic communities, both here in South Australia and elsewhere around the world. They called in one voice and in one spirit of solidarity for the democratic freedom and independence of their beloved homelands and their fellow compatriots.

As a close friend of the Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian communities, I am proud to have joined them in their efforts to have achieved the freedom and independence of their homelands. It was a triumphant occasion when, in 1991, after more than 50 years of Soviet oppression and occupation, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia became independent nations once more.

Finally, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the contributions made by the Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian communities in many fields of endeavour to enrich and develop our State. I congratulate all members of the Baltic nations for the achievements they have accomplished and wish them continued success for the future.

GREYHOUND RACING

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I wish to continue the sorry saga concerning the greyhound racing industry. Last week an *Advertiser* report headed 'Mutiny as axe falls on dog races' caught my attention and reminded me to review my involvement in this matter involving the greyhound racing industry. I was particularly interested to note a report about Mr Graham Inns who, as members will remember, after his report into the greyhound industry was appointed Chairman and incurred the wrath of country greyhound clubs to the point where a motion of no confidence was moved against him. Mr Inns said that he had negotiated with the clubs 'till my gums bled'. I was reminded to look at some of the correspondence I had seen when, after continual requests for negotiations and discussions by the country clubs and by the Secretary of the Port Pirie club in particular, a meeting was arranged in Port Augusta on the night of the Sapling Stakes. That meeting was on a Chairman to Chairman basis. The clubs then asked for a record of the meeting and agenda and they were told there was no agenda.

On 29 June 1998 a fax was sent requesting the official minutes of the meeting and a fax was received from the Acting Chief Executive Officer saying no official minutes were taken. In other correspondence of 25 June 1998 it was said that a meeting was held at Port Augusta on Wednesday 24 June 1998, where it was the unanimous opinion that the northern triangle clubs could not sustain more than one meeting a week in that area. Members can understand the frustration of people trying to undertake businesses in country areas when they are given this sort of runaround. The *Advertiser* report said:

'You cannot artificially prop these things up,' Mr Inns said, acknowledging that some country clubs would have to close.

He clearly applies another standard because, in the Inns report, he suggested that the Gawler club, which was on the brink of bankruptcy, ought to be closed down or made just a Friday afternoon club. Since the ructions within the industry, Gawler has been allocated 26 meetings and Port Pirie and Strathalbyn country clubs have been cut by 13 meetings. People are absolutely furious out there and it has been put to me that Mr Inns's gums are not bleeding from negotiation but from putting his foot in his mouth every time he opens it.

There is continual concern within the greyhound racing clubs and I am pleased to note that in the past couple of days I have been advised that, owing to the intervention of a number of people, including the Mayor of Port Pirie, and further representations to the Hon. Rob Kerin, a meeting will be held with Mr Barrett from RIDA. Unfortunately, that meeting is not scheduled until 29 July and that may well be after dates are allocated for greyhound racing for the coming season and it will then be a *fait accompli*. I hope I am incorrect in that assumption and I call on the new Minister for Racing to start off with a clean slate and exercise ministerial responsibility to assist in the promotion and conduct of greyhound racing throughout South Australia.

I hope that with his new intervention and some cooperation and consultation the industry can get about its business and promote greyhound racing throughout South Australia, not just in metropolitan and near metropolitan areas, and give country clubs and all those volunteers who are working out there some assistance to get on with the job.

STATE DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: South Australia is a State of 1.5 million people in a nation of about 18.5 million. Recent demographic trends reveal that the strongest population growth continues to be in Western Australia and Queensland. South Australia and Tasmania have the lowest population growth. In fact, Tasmania became the first State or Territory in the nation to record a negative population growth this century when its population declined marginally in calendar 1997. Recent publicity has been given to Australian Bureau of Statistics population projections through to the year 2051 and suggests that the population of Hobart and Tasmania could shrink dramatically over the next 50 years or so. It also projects that Queensland could become the second most populous State after New South Wales by the year 2050, surpassing Victoria. That forecast also projects the possibility that the population in Adelaide and South Australia could decline over the next five decades. What does this forecast mean for South Australia? Is it important?

South Australia already has the highest percentage of any State or Territory of people aged 65 years or over. Clearly, if this State's population continues to age—and that is the undoubted projection—and if the population continues to shrink over the next five decades, it will have adverse consequences on the prosperity of the South Australian economy. It will restrict employment opportunities, impact on property values and new investment in South Australia and, importantly, impact on general perceptions about the State. How does a State reinvigorate itself after the devastating loss we suffered from the \$4 billion loss from the State Bank, SGIC and Scrimber? For a start, I suggest we have to start believing in ourselves and start thinking positively instead of reacting negatively.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: You will have a moment of truth shortly and we will be able to see the colour of your attitude, Mr Holloway. Let me give some examples to reflect on the attitude which bedevils this State. In 1983 the infrastructure at Mount Lofty Summit was comprehensively destroyed by the tragic bushfires of Ash Wednesday. For 13 years that site remained undeveloped. It was a site which previously had been visited by visitors to South Australia, lovers and others. It was tragic that it took 13 years to restore the site. It was not

until November 1996 that the site was finally reopened with a new restaurant and attractive tourist visitor facilities.

There was then the matter of some trees in the road. The Hon. Mike Elliott, the Australian Democrat Leader at the time, when asked whether these trees should be knocked down, said, 'These trees should be left to grow because eventually their canopies will be high enough not to obscure the views.' Most of these 42 trees were simply regrowth from the 1983 bushfires and the others were 14 stringy barks, no more than 40 years old, and when they were knocked down so that people could have a view of Adelaide the Hon. Mike Elliott described that act as gross vandalism. That was an extraordinarily small minded attitude.

That attitude has also been reflected by the Democrats' view on Roxby Downs. They continue to deny the reality of Roxby Downs. In statements in this House by the Hon. Sandra Kanck as little as a few months ago, they have continued to berate the fact that Roxby Downs with its population of 4 000 people, contributing \$350 million in exports in this State, actually exists. The Hon. Mike Elliott laughs at that.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Well, it is entertaining but it is also factual. That is the tragedy: I have to get up here to remind you of it. You still do not accept it. Of course, a more recent example has been Marree man.

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

MOTOR VEHICLE COSTS

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Through its May State budget, the Government is treating the thousands of South Australians who own a car as nothing more than cash cows to be milked for all they are worth. By increasing fees for compulsory third party insurance, a driver's licence, and registration and administration and traffic fines, the Government will raise millions of dollars in the coming year. As usual, low income families living in our southern, northern and western suburbs who rely on their cars will be hardest hit.

Let us look at some of the measures introduced in the recent budget. To place a car on the road, four charges and fees have to be paid, including registration, compulsory third party insurance, stamp duty and an administration fee. Following the budget, it will now cost \$68 to register a four cylinder car for 12 months, up from of \$65. There are similar increases for six and eight cylinder cars.

Compulsory third party insurance premiums have risen from \$58 to \$63 for three months and from \$115 to \$125 for six months. Administration fees have risen from \$5 to \$6 each time a car is registered. However, the most savage increase is the 300 per cent hike in the cost of compulsory third party insurance stamp duty from 1 September. In total, the cost to place a four cylinder car on the road will rise from \$86 to \$102 for three months and from \$311 to \$377 for 12 months. For a six cylinder car, costs will rise from \$103 to \$121 for three months and from \$377 to \$446 for 12 months.

There have been other increases as well. Drivers' licences have risen from \$20 to \$21 and now attract a very unfair administration fee of \$10 each time the licence is renewed. If a driver takes a 10 year licence, he is then up for \$90 extra over a 10 year period. But most unfair of all under the current system, low income earners end up paying more for their car registrations. This is because they cannot afford yearly registrations and most low income earners are now paying

quarterly. I understand that the figure is now over 30 per cent. If you can only afford to pay your registration quarterly you will be \$31 worse off on a four cylinder car, \$38 on a six cylinder car and \$39 for an eight cylinder car than if you had paid your registration for a 12 month period.

South Australia is a highly motorised State. After the United States, more people own and use cars in Adelaide than any other country in the world. As of 30 June 1997, there were nearly 1 million people with drivers' licences and 800 000 motor vehicles in South Australia. The State Government is raking in as much as \$15 million extra from increases to car registrations and \$3.8 million from drivers' licences from those sections of the community who can least afford it.

These new fees and charges used to slug motorists do not even take into account the increase in speed camera and laser gun fines which have risen by between \$5 and \$8 respectively, or the recently announced funding arrangements for emergency services which will apply from July next year. It is not as if the Government spends the money on our roads. South Australia still has the lowest level of road funding of any State or Territory in the nation, spending just 5.8 per cent on roads compared with an average of 8.8 per cent. One has only to travel out into the country and talk to local government, community leaders and people interested in transport to hear what they are saying about the state of the country roads. No wonder One Nation is making inroads into the Conservative vote when the Government continues to neglect its traditional supporters.

If motorists think they can get out of the clutches of the Government's grab for cash by using public transport, they should think again. Ticket prices have gone up by about 7 per cent. The RAA, which represents hundreds of thousands of motorists here in South Australia, in the July edition of *SA Motor* described the Government's budget increases in this way (and I cannot sum up the situation any better):

The State Government has clearly targeted South Australia's 'wallets on wheels' in a massive tax grab. The car owning family is \$100 a year worse off, with low and middle income families being hardest hit.

That is only for a one car family. Something like in excess of 50 per cent of women work today, so many families will be \$200 a year worse off. Under this Government, owning a car is becoming an expensive luxury.

CONSTITUTION (PROMOTION OF GOVERNMENT BILLS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act 1934. Read a first time.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill to amend the Constitution Act with respect to the promotion of Government Bills, whilst narrow in its scope, takes into account fundamental principles of good governance. The catalyst for this Bill has been the Government's extensive advertising campaign costing, I understand, in the vicinity of \$300 000 and using public moneys to promote its Bill for the sale of ETSA. I should note at the outset that a number of telephone calls I have had from constituents, both

for and against the sale of ETSA, in recent weeks have expressed concern that public money has been used to promote the ETSA sale Bill.

Here we have a situation where the Government of the day, before the last election, specifically said on a number of occasions that ETSA would not be sold. So, the Government went to the people last October with a specific promise that the sale of ETSA was not on its agenda. I can understand how exigencies force Governments to take a U-turn in policy from time to time, although in this case the Government has done a double back flip somersault that would make Nadia Comaneci jealous.

However sceptical I am of the Government's change of mind on ETSA, I accept its right to introduce the Bill and for the Bill to be debated on its merits, but I cannot accept that the Executive branch of Government should use public moneys in an attempt to influence public opinion and, in turn, influence the Legislature in its deliberations on the Bill. That to me is an irregular and improper course to take given the fundamental principles inherent in the separation of powers doctrine. Maybe the Government has had a memory lapse on the meaning of the separation of powers doctrine; maybe like the former Premier of Queensland, Johannes Bjelke Petersen, the Government by its conduct is showing an ignorance of the doctrine.

I think it is important that Government Ministers and, indeed, Government members be reminded about what the separation of powers doctrine is all about. The eminent constitutional law experts, Professors Wade and Phillips, in their text *Constitution and Administrative Law* have set out that the doctrine may mean, in considering the interrelationship between the Executive Legislature and judiciary, that:

One organ of Government should not control or interfere with the functioning of another organ.

This Bill seeks to prevent the Executive arm of Government attempting to interfere with the functioning of the Legislature by preventing public moneys being spent on an advertising campaign on a Government Bill or its underlying policy unless the nature and extent of the advertising campaign has been approved by resolution of both Houses of Parliament or the Bill has been passed by both Houses.

The first exemption allows for public moneys being expended where the extent of the advertising campaign has been approved by both Houses. Presumably, this will mean that a condition of any such campaign, particularly for a controversial piece of proposed legislation, will allow for an alternative view to be articulated in any advertising campaign, surely a desirable development that would help facilitate a fulsome and fair public discussion on the merits of the Bill.

The Bill does not prevent a member's electoral allowance being used to publicise the merits of a Bill or to promote to public discussion. But there is a clear difference in the scope and magnitude and effect of using such an allowance and having a massive advertising campaign that the Government has undertaken, for instance, in relation to the ETSA sale.

Also, this Bill does not seek to prevent a Government publicising a Bill that has been passed. I understand and accept the need for the public to be informed through a mass media advertising campaign from time to time about legislative changes, although that in itself raises broader issues of the cost involved and the scrutiny of such expenditure. I acknowledge the leading role and principled position that my colleague the Hon. Mike Elliott has taken over a number of

years in raising these issues of concern with both this Government and previous Governments.

The scope of the Bill is sufficiently narrow to quash any concern that this Bill, if enacted, would hamper a Government's getting its message across over laws that have been passed by this Parliament. Clearly, it does not affect that and does not prevent a Government from spending moneys to promote a policy that does not require parliamentary approval. For instance, the Bill would not have affected the advertising campaign that publicised the water outsourcing arrangements, because that did not require parliamentary approval, although there may be many in the community who wish that it did.

At this stage, I acknowledge the support of the Hon. Mr Elliott in seconding this Bill. I note that the Hon. Mr Elliott has foreshadowed changes to the Parliamentary Committees Act which would have a similar effect, but I understand that his proposal had different mechanisms in place via the committee system to ensure public accountability. I look forward to the Hon. Mr Elliott's contribution on this issue and to any amendments he proposes in due course.

I urge the Government, and the Opposition in particular, to consider this Bill seriously, because quite rightly the Opposition has raised concerns about the publicly financed ETSA sale campaign. I cannot overstate the important principles at stake with this Bill. If I can quote from the seminal constitutional text *An Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution*, by A.V. Dicey, written over 100 years ago, where in the section dealing with the rule of law and the revenue, Dicey in discussing the authority for the expenditure of public moneys states in blunt and explicit terms:

Not a penny of revenue can be legally expended except under the authority of some Act of Parliament.

Implicit in that reference is the principle that an appropriation for specific expenditure ought to be clearly made and it not be part of some amorphous fund where moneys are expended at will by the Executive arm of Government not only with little or no accountability but, further, in an attempt to influence the Legislature in its deliberations. It is this latter aspect that concerns me the most, as it seems to be a clear and dangerous breach of the separation of powers doctrine. I commend the Bill to members.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I rise to support the Bill. It is an issue that has been exercising the Democrats' mind for some time now; in fact, I gave notice on 2 July of my intention to introduce a private member's Bill to address the same issue. I was unhappy with the first draft that I had and, as a consequence of both illness and some other pressing legislation, did not have my Bill ready. However, this Bill is elegant and does the job extremely well. I intended to cover some wider ground, but my intention at this stage is to look at how I might amend this Bill to do so.

This Bill does focus on one particular area, namely, the question of Government advertising in relation to matters which will be subject to legislation. Whilst there might be some arguments about shades of grey and whether or not Government advertising is Party political, when a Government is using the public purse to promote a view about legislation which is yet to be debated, and when it is using that money to promote only one side of the debate, there is no question that that advertising is clearly Party political.

The Government has already conceded that it is spending some \$300 000 on this campaign in relation to ETSA, but I

suspect that is not all the money that is being spent. I believe that is the direct advertising money in terms of the cost of advertisements and the design of advertisements but that it still does not take into account the fact that the Government has also taken onto its payroll by way of contract Alex Kennedy and Geoff Anderson, neither of whom would have come cheaply. We do not know whom else, but all those people have been taken on for one reason and one reason only, namely, to sell one side of a story. As I said, this is an issue which is to be debated by this Parliament and which should be debated by this Parliament exhaustively—as indeed should all issues.

The views that have been expressed by the Hon. Nick Xenophon and held by the Democrats are not held by us alone. I remind members that during Question Time on 18 February I asked some questions in relation to consultants and drew the Treasurer's attention to page 46 of the Auditor-General's Report in terms of this issue. I quote from the Auditor-General's Report, as follows:

Where communications or issues management consultants are engaged to advise on, and provide services in relation to, legitimate promotional and campaign activities by public authorities, particular care should be taken to ensure that that advice and those services are not used for purposes that can be characterised as being, or substantially being, Party political in nature.

On page 47 of the report the Auditor-General also said:

Departments of State, statutory authorities, and other public agencies, in meeting their responsibility to keep the public informed about the activities of Government, regularly need to notify the public about a range of matters. These matters include information regarding existing rights or responsibilities under various Government programs or policies, changes to existing Government programs, and the launching of public awareness campaigns aimed at modifying public behaviour for the public good.

These promotional and campaign activities are an integral part of representative democracy and accountable government. They increase the public's knowledge about the activities of Government. Promotional campaigns about Government services also serve to educate members of the public in their capacity as consumers. However, when public funds are used to finance promotion and campaign activities relating to measures which implement Party political platforms, where the benefit of those activities accrue principally or substantially to a political Party, questions of propriety may be appropriately raised.

The Auditor-General made reference to the fact that in other jurisdictions there are proposals in place under which one measures advertising campaigns, promotional campaigns, etc., to determine whether or not they are Party political in nature. We note that that is being done in other jurisdictions, and it was an issue that I did pursue with the Treasurer. Indeed, I asked him whether or not the Government would look at a code of conduct. The Treasurer's response on 18 February was:

I am not sure what a measurable code could be. I will take advice as to whether any work has been done on it, but the honourable member may be able to suggest what a measurable code might look like. As I think about it, I must admit that it is an extraordinarily subjective area.

I suppose some parts of it may be subjective and there may be shades of grey, but I do not think there are any shades of grey in terms of what is proposed under this legislation, which looks particularly at matters which are to be the subject of legislation—legislation which is to be debated and has not already been carried by the Parliament. Quite clearly, putting a single Party view in those circumstances is very black and white. There is no question whether or not that is of a political nature.

I know that in his past responses the Treasurer has asked, 'What about the fact that members have allowances?' True, all members have allowances, and those allowances are of a fixed sized; it is not a bottomless pit. To that extent, if there is a code of practice, it is that each member of Parliament has a fixed size allowance and we cannot spend beyond that amount because there is no extra money. If there is a control, it is a control in terms of the absolute figure. As I have said, it is certainly not a bottomless pit. That is available to every member of Parliament, including Government members. Ostensibly, a Government should have a majority, something approaching a majority, or at least enjoy majority support on the floor. To that extent, by using their allowance Government members are capable of putting a view in the same way as every other member. But for the Government to use public money—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: No. When I first asked the question in this place it was about objective codes and having in place some sort of a code of practice. I argue that regarding legislation that is yet to be debated quite clearly a code of practice should be that Government money not be spent to promote one side of an issue. That is precisely what the Government is doing at the moment. That would not prevent any Government or Opposition member using their allotted allowance for that purpose, although I must say that so many issues are involved that you would not spend much on one issue because you would not get very far. The question whether or not to raise members' allowances is a legitimate one, but the point I make is that at the end of the day there is a limit, namely, the size of the allowance that is available.

However, regarding what the Government is doing in terms of advertising on the ETSA issue, for example, there is absolutely no limit and no code of behaviour whatsoever. The Government can spend as much as it likes to put before the public one side of an argument. If it wants to involve itself in a public education program, it should be of the same sort that we have in respect of referendums where, if there are two sides to the story (a pro case and a con case), both those cases should be put.

Members of the public are not stupid. Even though only one side of the argument has been put by the Government, the overwhelming majority of the public see through that and no doubt will continue to do so. I think the public would accept a campaign to put all information before them and not just that information which represents one side of the case. This is being done contrary to promises that were made nine months ago before the last State election.

The Bill is a clear-cut piece of legislation. I do not think it contains any shades of grey. The Bill I drafted would have gone far wider into areas of shades of grey and would have involved some more difficult questions. I do not think there are any difficult questions in relation to this Bill, which the Democrats strongly support.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I wish to make a brief contribution in respect of this Bill which has been introduced by the Hon. Nick Xenophon to amend the Constitution Act. I take this opportunity to congratulate him for putting such a contentious piece of legislation on the table in the Legislative Council for consideration by the major Parties. I say 'for consideration by the major Parties' because I refer to the Liberal Party and the Labor Party, one of which is usually in government. I will be interested to hear the Liberal Party's attitude to this Bill. I will be even more interested to hear the

Labor Party's attitude to it as we count down the days to when we will assume office in the State of South Australia. It is no longer a matter of 'if'; rather, it is a matter of 'when'—no doubt fuelled on by the blood-letting that continues to go on unabated in the Liberal Party. I sincerely congratulate the Hon. Nick Xenophon for putting this Bill on the table. It serves to remind us that there is a role for Independent members to play in what is essentially a two Party system in this country.

Clause 10B—and the Hon. Mr Xenophon might like to clarify this later—provides a definition of 'advertising campaign' which means 'an advertisement or series of advertisements published, or to be published, in printed form or by radio or television'. My interpretation of that definition is that it does not include public meetings or the caravan tour that the Treasurer is carting around the country at great expense with flights being chartered, etc. I do not think that definition includes the 101 expenses that the Government must be incurring as it wages its public relations campaign on the ETSA Bill.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You didn't bother to come to one of our meetings.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: As much as I would have loved to attend one of your public meetings, I think it has been decided that others will go in my place. I am a little surprised that I am not going to speak on behalf of the Liberal Party, because I have learnt quite a bit about this subject over the past week or two. I think it would be better if I made my contribution on the Bill when it comes before the Council.

The Hon. Nick Xenophon has raised an interesting topic for the consideration of members. I have no intention of canvassing the ground which the Hon. Mike Elliott covered, but today I have received replies to questions that I put on notice in relation to Government expenditure on promoting its budget. It runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars. That should not surprise anyone, because one should have thought that it would cost millions to get any kind of acceptance by the South Australian public for the budget that was just introduced. I will have a little more to say about that tomorrow.

As I said earlier—and I will wind up my remarks on this point—and as the Hon. Nick Xenophon pointed out, this legislation is needed. It puts a bit of accountability, responsibility and honesty back into government. If that is all it does, the legislation should be supported for that reason alone. I look forward to hearing contributions from members on both sides of the Council on this piece of legislation.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (MENTAL INCAPACITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 8 July. Page 974.)

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I support this Bill, and my contribution will be very brief. This Bill is identical to a Bill that was introduced into this place back in October 1994. I spoke to it on 26 October 1994 and I will repeat what I had to say there. There has been a tendency particularly on the part of the Government in the areas of stress or mental incapacity (and they do not necessarily mean precisely the

same thing) to attempt to deny WorkCover's responsibility for those matters. It must be recognised that, although stress and mental incapacity are injuries that perhaps cannot always be seen in a psychological sense (it is easy enough to see a broken arm or a cut off finger), it does not make those injuries any less real. They are just far more difficult in terms of diagnosis, although clearly some physical injuries, for example, back injuries, also present some difficulties in relation to diagnosis. Once one takes the view that they are legitimate injuries—and I do—I would argue that they need to be treated in exactly the same fashion as any other injury. As I said earlier, the Government has clearly tried to treat those sorts of injuries differently. It has tried to remove responsibility of workers' compensation in areas of stress and is opposing lump sum compensation in this area. Clearly, I do not share that view.

I believe that what the Opposition is doing is correct and, from a philosophical position, I support what it is doing and therefore support the Bill. That Bill, which is the same as the one we are currently debating, was passed by this place and went to the other place, where it failed. The numbers in the Lower House have changed, so I think it is worthwhile for this matter to be addressed again, and I hope that in this case it will pass not only in this place but in the House of Assembly as well.

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

PROSTITUTION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 1 July, Page 910.)

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I indicate that I will support a Bill that will deal with prostitution and its decriminalisation. The history of the prostitution Bills that have been introduced into this Chamber and another place by a number of members over the period that I have been in this Council indicates to me that discussions and negotiations will go on as the introduction period for the Bill moves forward. Amendments are generally drafted by various members and I will certainly be looking at those amendments. There is a numbers gathering exercise towards the end of the proceeding and the mover of the Bill as a private member tries to decide whether to proceed with the Bill or let it lapse, depending on its level of support. I believe that it is the intention of the mover of this Bill is to progress it through all the stages and try to produce legislation which deals with the realities of the circumstances in which prostitution is dealt with in this State and which at least looks at a realistic structure and form for prostitution to be regulated and decriminalised. Although I do not agree with all of the Bill (and I may have a word with the mover of the Bill later), I will certainly support the intentions of the Bill before us.

If we look at those people who support the decriminalisation and regulation of prostitution, we will see that there are some strange bedfellows—if you will pardon the pun. If we look at those people who are opposed to it, we see that there is a strange conglomeration of interests. Those who have traditionally opposed the decriminalisation or the regulation of prostitution are generally those who fall into two or three categories. The first category involves those people who have a moral objection to supporting any recognition of prostitution on the basis that if you recognise it legislatively you must

recognise it morally. I would argue that that is not necessarily the case, that you could make two groups of people in that first category.

Some people do not believe in prostitution morally and believe that it should not exist, but in reality we know that from time immemorial it has existed. Those people who do not believe in it morally but acknowledge that it does exist think that there ought to be some regulation and controls on prostitution. I do not think that those people who would be offended by some of the Bills in relation to decriminalisation and regulation would be too offended by the protections that are in this Bill for those people who legitimately operate within the prostitution industry itself.

I guess that the first consideration for most of us who support regulation in this area is for the prostitutes themselves, for those women who operate in the industry and who need the protection of legislation to safeguard themselves from violence and dishonesty, and, I guess, the nature of the industry in which they operate, the exploitation and so on. There are facets of the Bill that not only protect the prostitutes in their day-to-day operations but also protect children from exploitation. The Bill tries to discourage larger brothels and to encourage smaller brothels which can be operated without the criminal element that tends to get in control of brothels once they grow to the point where the rewards of prostitution are significant. Prostitution, depending on whose analysis one follows or reads, tends to gather around it lawbreakers and criminal elements who exploit not only the people who work in the industry but those who support and use it, that is, the males, who can be blackmailed. With some legislative protection we may be able to minimise the blackmailing that goes on at present.

Being realistic, it does not matter what legislation we have in relation to prostitution because we will not be able to protect all the people working in the industry at all times. Regardless of the policing that goes on to protect a regulated and decriminalised industry, the reality is that there will still be vulnerable people in the industry, but at least this Bill goes some part of the way to minimising the attacks that might occur on the people working in the industry.

It does not matter what legislation we write, there will always be those who will set up brothels, whether they be large or small, who will not comply with the legislation and try to get around it. At least this legislation sets up a framework and, hopefully, will give some sort of lead to our law enforcers to enable them to work in a more practical way with a legislative framework that regulates and decriminalises.

At present the prostitution industry could be seen as a corrupter of our law enforcement agencies in a lot of cases, where brothel owners and others are always on the lookout for those who would be corrupted within our enforcement agencies. Traditionally, brothels have been used as information gathering centres for our enforcement agencies and there has always been a level of corruption that crosses over from that information chain back to those—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: You make them sound like they've got computers—information centres!

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: They are centres of a lot of information: a lot of information goes through. If you talk to people who have to dig out information within the criminal societies you will find that brothels are one of those areas police use to dig up that information. Sometimes it is gathered in a legitimate, legal way and in other cases it is gathered illegitimately and illegally. It is the same as enforcement agencies working in hotels and other areas

where people congregate to get information on potential lawbreakers, criminal elements, and so on. Hopefully, the legislation encourages the break-up of larger brothels into smaller sex industry accommodation and makes it a little more—

The Hon. Sandra Kanck: It still won't.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: This Bill won't. No, I suspect that there will be amendments introduced which do that and which I will be looking at. Hopefully, more control will be placed in the hands of those people who operate as prostitutes in smaller operations, which will be able to break the control that pimps and others have on those in the industry. The Bill tries to regulate the percentage that prostitutes are able to earn, if they have more control themselves and, hopefully, that percentage will be 100 per cent. If they are working inside a brothel I think there are some references to minimum percentages able to be earned.

The Bill contains provision for regular medical checks and attention, and that is an important clause that I think has been in most of the Bills that have been introduced in both Houses, to enable health checks on prostitutes working in the industry, whereby they can avail themselves of regular checks for the prevention and spread of diseases, in particular AIDS.

Some clauses in the Bill will affect advertising and other rights. There is a lot of hypocrisy at the moment about advertising. One will find articles in national dailies condemning prostitution in the columns of the news and then find that within their advertising columns there are as many advertisements as you want—

The Hon. A.J. Redford: You're not criticising the media for hypocrisy?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Yes—advertising the prostitutes, their telephone numbers and the brothels. There is an industry operating out there. Whether it is in Victoria, South Australia or New South Wales and whether or not it is operating under a legislative framework, the realities are that it exists. I think it is time that, as legislators, we recognise the existence of the industry and the trade, that we provide a legislative framework that tries to minimise the corruptive elements from dominating the industry, that we try to give as much power as possible to the prostitutes—not that prostitutes in society do have much power—and that we at least give them the ability to make informed decisions about whether they want to work in medium sized brothels or in smaller brothels with partners. The legislation does not push those as options but, if there is an amount of legislative protection, then perhaps we might see a different form of prostitution in society.

In Victoria, when its legislation was introduced, it certainly changed the nature and function of brothels. The legitimising of larger brothels in Victoria brought with it a different community attitude to brothels. Where you have demand and supply, it tends to be matched but I have not seen any figures as to the number of prostitutes operating in Victoria since that legislation and perhaps the Bill's mover might be able to supply me with figures. Most of the arguments put forward by the anti prostitution lobby suggest that, once you legitimise prostitution, then the number of people operating in the industry will increase and the number of potential corruptive elements to bring young people into the industry increases. If the Bill's mover has figures on that, I would be interested. My own view is that the best way we can minimise the number of people who may be corrupted or encouraged to enter prostitution is to provide them with legitimate work.

Certainly, we are moving into a very difficult period in terms of the application of technology and the elimination of work as we know it. I have seen recent figures on employment and unemployment. In some corners of the metropolitan area up to 40 per cent of young people are now out of work in some suburbs. Therefore, there is greater responsibility not just for Governments but for industry and the community as well to try to work together to maximise opportunities for young people. Unfortunately, as we go into a more advanced technological society, and with economic rationalists operating at the moment, those opportunities for young people are minimised. It does not necessarily mean that those people who are unable to find jobs, full employment or part-time employment in society, will find their way into prostitution. If you add unemployment and homelessness and couple that with physical and child sexual abuse, then that is a formula for a drift into prostitution. I will not continue for long, other than to indicate that I will be looking at the amendments that will be put forward as the Bill progresses through the Council. Certainly, I will be talking to the mover between now and when the vote is presented.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: On this issue or will there be others?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I will talk to the mover on anything the mover wants to talk to me about. My relationship with the Hon. Terry Cameron is a warm and friendly one, just as it is with you, Mr Redford. As to any private member's Bill that you would like to introduce on any subject, my door will always be open for discussion on it. I understand the Hon. Sandra Kanck will be moving amendments and I suspect that other amendments will be moved as well and I look forward to them.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: The Bill we are debating today is modelled largely on a Bill incorporated in the majority report of the Social Development Committee's investigation into prostitution which was released in August 1996. Members may recall that, when I spoke to the report at that time, I made clear that I supported the majority position as it was the most progressive of the three other views, besides my own, on that committee. My view and that of the Democrats is that the best way to deal with prostitution is to decriminalise it rather than to legalise aspects of it, as this Bill does. Had I not sided with the Hon. Terry Cameron and former MLC, Hon. Bernice Pfitzner, the reactionary views of the remaining three members of the Social Development Committee might have prevailed as the majority position of the committee.

I made no secret of the fact that I was supporting that model because I thought it might have had some chance of getting through Parliament. I remind members of this now because I want to ensure that there is no confusion about my position. I will support this current attempt to reform prostitution laws but, if and when we reach the Committee stages, I will be moving amendments. The Democrats have a long-held policy of support for the decriminalisation of prostitution. When I joined the Party 20 years ago that policy was already in existence. We are the only Party represented in this Parliament which has developed a policy on prostitution. The first Bill introduced into the South Australian Parliament to relax prostitution laws came in 1980—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: You have got one? The last I knew you had a conscience vote on it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: It will be interesting to see what happens when it comes to a vote. The first Bill that dealt with prostitution laws came in 1980 from the then member for Mitcham, Democrat Robin Millhouse. That Bill almost passed, except it was defeated by the casting vote of the Speaker. The Hon. Ian Gilfillan, a current member of the Democrat parliamentary team, introduced legislation in 1991 and it was this legislation which was referred to the Social Development Committee, resulting in that committee's report in 1996. When that report was brought down a number of women working in the prostitution industry expressed great concern to me about the Bill that we incorporated with the report. As I said, the Bill is primarily the basis of the Hon. Terry Cameron's Bill. Some working prostitutes believed then and still believe that this Bill will make things worse. There are others who think that things cannot get much worse than they currently are.

How bad are things at present? Most South Australians would be unaware that the act of prostitution itself is not illegal under South Australian law. In the main, people are charged with being on premises known to be frequented by prostitutes. This discriminates against those prostitutes who work in brothels, whilst escort workers are left largely undisturbed by the police. The policing of brothels in turn tends to cause women to move into escort work or even street work, rather than brothel work, which is more dangerous.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: It's more dangerous.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Exactly. This is unfortunate because, from an occupational health and safety standpoint, it is better that these women work in brothels. There is less chance of women being beaten up or having men abscond without paying and there is more chance from a health point of view that STDs are kept at bay by the wearing of condoms. Given that no Government anywhere in the world has managed to stamp out prostitution, we should be looking at the best ways to manage it. As far as I can see, and based on all the information given to the Social Development Committee, brothels are the best way to do this.

In South Australia, as I say, the police target the area of prostitution that is the safest for the prostitutes and probably the healthiest for the clients, that is, brothels. There are regular raids from the police and when these occur the police take away condoms and any safe sex literature that might be available for clients to peruse because that is able to be used by police as evidence that the premises were being used for the purposes of prostitution. These actions are counterproductive as it merely shifts the trade from the brothels to escorts or the streets. When the Social Development Committee was taking evidence, I recall asking one of the police officers from Operation Patriot how much of the police department resources would be needed to stamp out prostitution. The answer, that even if you turned 100 per cent of the resources over to that task you would still not stamp out prostitution, was very revealing.

There are a number of things about this Bill which I do not like, including compulsory medical examinations, the extra powers that are given to police, and the way in which the Bill discriminates against women who might be operating their business from their own home. In relation to the testing for STDs, the Social Development Committee received overwhelming evidence that women working in the prostitution industry are freer of STDs than most women of dating age. They are currently reporting to STD clinics of their own volition and the process of making this compulsory will

remove quite a deal of the good natured willingness with which sex industry workers now approach this matter. Testing may prove only one thing: that at the time of the test the worker was clear of particular STDs. The day after the test is taken, it could be that the woman is exposed to one of the STDs. All that the clearance certificate can guarantee is that on the day, at the time the test was taken, the health practitioner was able to say that the woman concerned was given a clean bill. But this may give a false sense of security. I know that the AIDS Council of South Australia put out on media release in relation to this matter, and I quote Mr Cousins, President of the AIDS Council, who said:

Clients of sex workers are more likely to try to bargain for unsafe sex if they think a test means workers and clients cannot transmit infections. This is particularly dangerous where the sex worker is the receptive partner in unprotected intercourse. We have recently heard of examples of clients offering both male and female sex workers \$1 000 extra not to insist on a condom being used in such instances.

I will certainly be interested to hear from the Hon. Terry Cameron at some stage in the future, when this or a similar Bill reaches Committee stages, about what he envisages in his proposed code in clause 27: for instance, which of the STDs will be tested for. It is quite clear that not all the diseases around can be effectively tested for and, again, the AIDS Council media release makes that comment, and I quote:

It cannot provide a guarantee against warts, herpes or a number of other sexually transmitted diseases.

I am also very concerned at the extra powers given in this Bill to authorised persons—which obviously means police. As far as I am concerned, the police should not be raiding brothels any more than they should be raiding pokie lounges. The Hon. Terry Cameron and I were at odds on this matter back in 1996 and we obviously remain so. The police already have enormous powers under the Summary Offences Act and I see no good reason for them to be given still more. In case members are not aware of the powers that police have, section 67 of the Summary Offences Act gives the Commissioner the power to grant a general search warrant, as the Police Commissioner thinks fit, lasting for up to six months. Unless there be any doubt about what that search warrant entails, and why I do not believe the extra powers given this Bill are required, subsection (4) provides:

The member of the police force named in any such warrant may, at any time of the day or night, exercise all or any of the following powers:

- (a) the member may, with such assistants as he or she thinks necessary, enter into, break open and search any house, building, premises or place where he or she has reasonable cause to suspect that—
 - (i) a felony or misdemeanour has been recently committed or is about to be committed;
 - (ii) there are stolen goods;
 - (iii) there is anything that may afford evidence as to the commission of a felony or misdemeanour, or
 - (iv) there is anything that may be intended to be used for the purpose of committing a felony or misdemeanour;
- (b) the member may break open and search any cupboards, drawers, chests, trunks, boxes, packages or other things, whether fixtures or not, in which he or she has reasonable cause to suspect that—
 - (i) there are stolen goods;
 - (ii) there is anything that may afford evidence as to the commission of a felony or misdemeanour; or
 - (iii) there is anything that may be intended to be used for the purpose of committing a felony or misdemeanour.
- (c) the member may seize any such goods or things to be dealt with according to law.

I consider that those powers are so extraordinary that there is absolutely no reason for any extra powers to be given.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Absolutely; there is just no justification for giving the police extra powers in this current Bill. When we were putting together the Social Development Committee report back in 1996 I remember on one occasion the Hon. Terry Cameron, at my behest, telephoning Operation Patriot officers about this section of the Summary Offences Act and asking why they wanted more powers, because that is what they had argued to the Social Development Committee. They were unable to give him a better reason for that, other than they could not be seen to be using the powers under the Summary Offences Act too often. So, when we get to Committee stages you can be concerned that I will—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: No, it does not, not normally. When we do get to the Committee stages, I will be moving to delete parts of clause 41.

Another matter of concern I have about the Bill is the discrimination that will operate against women who work from their own home. Quite a lot of women operate as prostitutes from their home and, apart from the odd example that gets some media attention, usually the neighbours do not have a clue that it is happening because it is managed with discretion by the woman concerned.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: It's not illegal now.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: It is illegal if it is on premises known to be frequented by a prostitute and, therefore, the police could go in there. The Hon. Terry Cameron can address this later, but my interpretation is that the legislation before us will create a situation where these women who are acting quietly and discreetly will be forced into a position where they will have to act illegally while another group of prostitutes will have the blessing of the law. It seems to me that, if there is any evidence to support the often made claim that organised crime is involved in prostitution, then having the small one and two person operations is the way we should go to keep out organised crime.

I received a letter from Dr Ronda Sharp, the Director of the Research Centre for Gender Studies at the University of South Australia. She says:

Clearly, the location of brothels is a sensitive issue within the broader community. Yet it must be acknowledged that perceptions regarding the extent to which inner city or suburban brothels actually increase public nuisance or cause affront to the community are generally unfounded. This is particularly the case where women work quietly from their own home or a rented premises. As such, the need for strong legislation in this area is questionable, particularly where it ignores important distinctions between smaller and larger operations and where South Australia already has existing legislation to deal with issues relating to public nuisance.

There is one aspect of the Bill which has received criticism from some of the people who have written to me about the Bill and exhorting me to vote against it, that is, in relation to planning powers. This is one aspect of the Bill that I support quite strongly because, generally, it will keep local government at a distance. I believe this is very much justified on the basis of the experience of both the Victorian and New South Wales jurisdictions.

In Victoria, the situation is such that local government can reject the applications and, at that point, if the person submitting the application so desires, they can lodge an appeal with the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. So, only those people who have money can go the full course and lodge an appeal in order to set up a brothel. Again, it means

that the small one or two person operation falls by the wayside and, again, those women become part of the illegal operations in Victoria when they were perfectly happy in the first place to be part of the legal system. If anything can cause organised crime to be involved, it is that sort of situation where only those with the money can set up brothels.

Despite some misgivings about this Bill, I indicate support for the second reading. In the longer term I will support passage of some form of legislation to improve the current situation in regard to prostitution in South Australia.

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

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION ACT

Order of the Day: Private Business, No. 14: Hon. A.J. Redford to move:

That the principal regulations under the Technical and Further Education Act 1975, made on 28 August 1997 and laid on the table of this Council on 2 December 1997, be disallowed.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I move:

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day discharged.

RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL LEASES (TERM OF LEASE AND RENEWAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 July. Page 978.)

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I rise briefly to indicate my support for the Bill introduced by the Hon. Ian Gilfillan. I do not propose to restate the contributions of both the Hon. Ian Gilfillan and the Hon. Carmel Zollo. I find myself substantially in agreement with the positions they have put. At the outset, I congratulate the Hon. Ian Gilfillan on introducing this legislation, and I note that the Hon. Mike Elliott has introduced similar legislation to this Council in previous years.

The Bill contains a number of overdue reforms that will bring some equity into what many would see as the current disparity in commercial relations between landlords and tenants with respect to commercial and retail leases. I do not propose to touch on any of those matters to any great extent, but the right of renewal, which is a concern of many retail tenants, has been addressed in a fair and equitable fashion in the Bill.

The other provisions of the Bill refer to the disclosure statement. It is an obligation of the lessor to provide this to the lessee in the case of entering into a lease arrangement, and this appears to be an overdue reform as well. The cooling-off period for the lessee is another reform that will be welcomed by small businesses in this State that enter into lease arrangements.

Overall, this Bill provides a number of important protections for lessees. I am disappointed that the Government has chosen to oppose the Bill. I note that the Attorney-General was particularly critical of the right of preference provision, which I regard as a key component of this Bill. I naively thought initially that a Bill such as this, which would give a measure of certainty and fairness to thousands of small retailers and small businesses in this State, would have been attractive to this Government, as small business is its natural core constituency. However, I was obviously wrong.

I believe that this Bill will encourage small businesses to invest in retail shopping centres and that it will increase employment in the retail sector because it will give that measure of certainty. I am very pleased to support it.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I thank members who contributed to this debate, in particular the Hon. Carmel Zollo and the Hon. Nick Xenophon. I also express my appreciation to the Attorney-General who, in his normal way, applied himself diligently to it, although opposing it as a measure—

The Hon. Sandra Kanck: Did he get excited about it?

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I do not think he is particularly excited about it yet, but perhaps he will be in the Committee stages. I shall address a few remarks to the Attorney's contribution, because in my view his speech, as reported in *Hansard* of 8 July, is remarkable more for what it does not say in this very interesting and important area of commercial law than what it does.

The Attorney does not deny that injustices and abuses of power are occurring in retail leasing. He did not deny that such injustices and abuses of power are permitted or sanctioned under the existing Act, nor did he deny that retail lessees have legitimate grievances and are being, to use the euphemistic phrase, 'screwed to the wall' by landlords who have eliminated their commercial risk by placing it all on to their tenants. Nor did the Attorney-General deny that landlords are making profits on their outgoings over and above the rent and hiding the extent of these profits. An example of that is the on-charging at a profit to the landlord of the supply of electricity.

When the Attorney-General spoke about the actual issues involved in these amendments he confined himself to one principle, namely, 'the general principle that legislation should not affect already negotiated commercial arrangements'. I would like to speak about a different principle which has been given effect recently in Commonwealth statute law, namely, that no-one should be subjected to 'unconscionable conduct'. The Commonwealth Trade Practices Act and the South Australia Fair Trading Act have long contained those provisions which provide consumer protection. But, on 1 July this year, changes to the Commonwealth Trade Practices Act extended that protection to small business so that larger or stronger firms cannot deal harshly or oppressively with small or weaker firms, a situation which, to do him credit, the Attorney-General does not deny is occurring.

This statutory provision will operate to overturn contract provisions where those provisions are harsh or unconscionable, but it will take a test case, or perhaps many test cases, in the courts to extend the operation of this basic principle. It will take many years for case law to accumulate. In the meantime, the injustices and oppression are continuing here in South Australia. It would be a long time before we could get relief if we relied purely on the Commonwealth Act.

I share the Hon. Nick Xenophon's observation that my Leader and colleague, Hon. Mike Elliott, has been previously proactive in this area of legislation. This Bill will offer immediate protection to those who are suffering and exploited: the small retailers of South Australia.

The Attorney's support for the status quo and the sanctity of existing harsh contracts has been likened previously in this Chamber by the Hon. Mike Elliott 'to someone who supports an end to domestic violence but wants to apply that ban only to new marriages'. That may appear to be a somewhat bizarre analogy.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: Obviously, it has hit a raw nerve, because a man with a reasonably acute legal mind is so immune to justice that he spends his energies defending the perpetuity of blatant injustices. The Democrat Bill seeks to extend the provisions of the Act to all shops and commercial premises, whether or not they are in a shopping centre. In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General states:

That is not acceptable to the Government and the Government will not support it.

However, he gives no reasons for this position other than to say that 'it was never intended that the scheme would operate' outside shopping centres. I cannot understand why retailers in shopping centres and retailers outside shopping centres should be afforded two different levels of protection and justice under the principal Act. What is the difference? Are they a different species? If they still suffer under the same injustice why should not the legislation move to protect both categories? It is a matter of justice, fairness and consistency.

The Attorney-General places great store by the fact that the provisions of the existing Act were 'achieved through lengthy and detailed industry consultation', and the Government ended up endorsing only so much as 'the industry itself could agree to'. Whilst I, too, place great store by consultation, one cannot expect that laws which remove rights from the powerful and which strengthen protection for the less powerful necessarily will be endorsed across the entire industry. It would be surprising indeed if large landlords and property owners were happy to see their retail and commercial tenants given the sort of protection that residential tenants take for granted.

To endorse only those provisions to which large landlords will agree therefore is, I believe, an abrogation of the role of Government to act in the best interests of the community as a whole and, in particular, of small business. The Government's opposition to these amendments certainly reinforces the existing community perception that the Liberal Party is the Party which supports big business. These measures will not disadvantage big business and landlords of good intent who are prepared to run an efficient business and operation because they will apply to all: it will be an even playing field. It is a win-win situation which removes the injustices that have been allowed to continue for far too long.

A recently filed additional amendment by me to this Bill changes sections 15 and 19 of the principal Act, abolishing the use of bank guarantee and requiring instead the use of a security bond of an amount equivalent to no more than four weeks rent. Part 10 of the principal Act envisages something called the Retail Shop Leases Fund, the purpose of which is to administer the Retail and Commercial Leases Act. The fund is to receive security bonds paid by lessees and is to use the income derived from investment of the fund for a variety of worthwhile purposes.

The Act identifies these purposes as mediating disputes; educating lessors and lessees about their rights and obligations; funding programs designed to improve the management of business in this State; and for the benefit of lessors and lessees in other ways approved by the Minister. I repeat 'funding programs designed to improve the management of business in this State'. In short, the purpose of the fund is very similar to that of the Residential Tenancies Fund, which collects security bonds from residential tenants and applies

the income derived from that fund to similar worthwhile purposes.

I assume that the Residential Tenancies Fund is operating as it was intended—I have no specific information on that—but the Retail Shop Leases Fund is, in fact, a gigantic failure—a hoax. The overwhelming majority of landlords do not even bother to collect any security bonds or forward them to the Commissioner to be applied to the Retail Shop Leases Fund. For security, they use bank guarantees instead.

The reasons for this are obvious to anyone who inquires. For one thing, there is no limit in the Act to the extent of a bank guarantee that can be demanded by a landlord. Furthermore, bank guarantees can be and are called up at the landlord's discretion without needing to prove any breach of lease conditions. The bank guarantee can be used virtually to hold a knife to a small retailer's throat for the term of the tenancy. It certainly has the effect of removing from the landlord any commercial risk associated with the selection or rejection of tenancy at the original opening up of the lease arrangements.

Therefore, the intent of the Act to create a Retail Shop Leases Fund and apply the proceeds to the benefit of the industry has been almost entirely circumvented by landlords. To give an idea of the extent to which security bonds are ignored or are irrelevant to the industry, I have made some calculations based on the data that I have been able to obtain in this area.

The Department for Administrative and Information Services estimates that the capital value of commercial properties in South Australia is \$10.194 billion. Assuming that 70 per cent of these properties are leased, and assuming a return of 10 per cent on investment (both of which we regard as conservative assumptions), rents from these properties would be approximately \$713 million per annum.

Security bonds representing four weeks rent from all leased commercial properties in South Australia therefore would be \$54.89 million (approximately \$55 million). So, if every leased property contributed to this fund, as the Act clearly envisages, there would be in excess of \$50 million to invest for those goals outlined in the Act. In reality, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs' Annual Report for 1996-97 reveals that the fund is administering only \$1.1 million, just 2 per cent of what it could or should receive. This total is insufficient even to administer the Act. So, the fund runs at a loss, which must be made up by the Attorney-General's Department.

So, not only is the business community getting no benefit from this fund but also it is actually draining funds from general taxpayers which should have been used for other purposes in the Attorney-General's Department. One can see, I believe, that from the presentation of my Bill and support for it and the amendments there are various areas which are critical to be amended if we are to have a thriving and prosperous small retail industry in South Australia. If it thrives, members can be sure that the principals (the landlords) will continue to invest and develop where needed in South Australia.

I encourage members to support this legislation. I look forward, as is usually the case in this place, to a productive and energetic Committee stage in which I as the promoter of the Bill will be prepared to look in a helpful manner at any amendments that are put forward. I hope that we can come to a conclusion eventually to pass legislation which will be satisfactory to all aspects of the retail and commercial sector of South Australia. I commend the Bill.

The Council divided on the second reading:

AYES (11)

Cameron, T. G.	Crothers, T.
Elliott, M. J.	Gilfillan, I. (teller)
Holloway, P.	Kanck, S. M.
Pickles, C. A.	Roberts, T. G.
Weatherill, G.	Xenophon, N.
Zollo, C.	

NOES (8)

Davis, L. H.	Dawkins, J. S. L.
Laidlaw, D. V.	Lawson, R. D.
Lucas, R. I. (teller)	Redford, A. J.
Schaefer, C. V.	Stefani, J. F.

PAIR(S)

Roberts, R. R.	Griffin, K. T.
----------------	----------------

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

REPUBLIC

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.J. Elliott:

- I. That Australia should become a republic with an Australian citizen as Head of State; and
- II. That the concurrence of the House of Assembly to this motion be requested.

to which the Hon. Mr Stefani has moved the following amendment—

- I. Leave out all words after 'That' and insert the following:
'this Council congratulates the Federal Liberal Government for organising the Constitutional Convention;
- II. That following a referendum to be held in 1999 and, if passed by the required majority, this Council is of the opinion that Australia should become a republic with an Australian citizen as Head of State; and'

(Continued from 1 July. Page 917.)

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I support the motion before the Council as amended by the Hon. Julian Stefani. It is worth noting that the move towards the republic in Australia was given an opportunity for an airing by the initiative of the then Liberal Leader, the Hon. Alexander Downer, when he suggested that a constitutional convention should be held. That was subsequently adopted by the John Howard when he became Prime Minister. Despite cynicism that accompanied public comment about the practicality of a constitutional convention there is no doubt that it was a great success. It is worth remembering that the passage to Federation in the late nineteenth century was also accompanied by similar conventions, under the leadership of Alfred Deakin and South Australia's own Charles Cameron Kingston. This is not a clear-cut matter, but it is interesting to see that over a period of time the people of Australia have increasingly supported the notion of a republic, and I want to put on record that I am one of those people.

It is significant, however, to look at one aspect of the argument for a republic from the view of someone who is not an Australian—someone in another country viewing Australia and their expectations of what an Australian Head of State should be. I refer to a very persuasive article published in the *Age* on 9 January this year written by Mr Richard Woolcott, who was a former head of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. He was a member of an advisory panel on the Federal Liberal Government's recent white paper on foreign affairs and trade and he is a well respected consultant to a number of companies on overseas and issues. In this article he wrote:

All my experience in a career spanning 40 years, which has included representing Australia in Europe, Asia, Africa and at the United Nations, has left me in no doubt that Australia's economic interests and its international standing will be enhanced by having our own Australian Head of State.

He then makes a telling and irresistible point when he notes:

When our Governors-General have sought to travel abroad, our diplomats have, on occasions, been embarrassed because of the problems associated with having them received as real Heads of State. I could give a number of examples, but two will suffice. When Sir Ninian Stephen was Governor-General he felt obliged to defer a visit to Indonesia because President Suharto took the view, correctly, that the Queen was Australia's Head of State, not the Governor-General. When Bill Hayden was Governor-General and was to attend the 50th anniversary of the UN with a number of Heads of State, American security authorities were not sure of his status and the level of protection he should be afforded in New York. So guess where they went for advice? The British embassy in Washington. Its answer to the Americans was, quite properly, that our Head of State was the Queen.

Mr Woolcott's article continues:

I also remember seeing on television in New York a report of our bicentenary. The Opera House and Sydney Harbor sparkled in the sun and I felt a glow of pride. But that feeling was diminished when I found myself explaining to a confused American ambassador to the UN, of Cuban ethnic origin, why Prince Charles, the heir to the English throne, was giving the main address on this historic Australian day, rather than our Prime Minister.

When representing Australia at an Antarctic conference in Madrid in 1987, I dined with some prominent Spaniards. What struck them as curious about Australia was that, despite considerable migration from many countries, it still had the Queen of England as its Head of State. I recall one in particular saying that Spain, like Britain, had ruled a large colonial empire overseas but no Spaniard or former colony of Spain would now imagine such a connection with the Spanish throne.

I want to pick up on that point and make the obvious remark that, of Australia's population of 18.5 million people, some 8 million people were either born overseas or have one or more parents who were born overseas; in other words, 42 or 43 per cent of our population either was born overseas or has one or more parents born overseas. That reflects what has undoubtedly been one of the great achievements in this world, not only in this nation, in the past 50 years, namely, a remarkable and successful migration program, where we now have more than 100 nationalities residing in Australia. That of course underscores the argument of Mr Richard Woolcott and the puzzlement that exists, certainly in diplomatic circles and, I suspect, not only there, in people who are overseas. The article continues:

Some nations, such as Denmark and Japan, are able to define their nationhood by their common ethnicity. Australia as a multi-ethnic settler society cannot do that. Some nations, such as Italy and Israel, underpin their nationhood with a common religion. Australia, as a home to many religions, cannot do this either.

Australia, like other settler nations, needs a clear national focus. The US and, in our region, Singapore, are both multi-ethnic settler republics. Each has its own Head of State. In a society like Australia it is indisputable that the Queen is of declining relevance to a growing number of Australians. Our own ceremonial President could provide a new and unifying focus for all sections of our increasingly diverse community.

He also makes the point that some aspects of the British monarchy are contrary to Australian values that we seek to project internationally such as equality of opportunity and religious tolerance. He makes the point again, which is in disputable:

The Monarch occupies the throne of England on the basis of heredity, not merit. The King or Queen of England must be an Anglican and mandatory preference is given to male descendants over females. Such outmoded restrictions on the occupant of the British throne, who is constitutionally our Head of State, are

completely outside modern Australian egalitarian thinking and the values and practices we advocate.

The article concludes:

Australia's international standing and national identity, and its wider political and economic interests, can only be advanced by the establishment of an Australian republic with our own Head of State. I know, too, that the overwhelming majority of those who represent Australia overseas—not only the young generation but those of my generation—share these views.

It is to be hoped that these so far underrated foreign and trade policy aspects of the debate will be given the weight they deserve at the Constitutional Convention—

this article having been written, of course, in advance of that convention—

Like APEC in 1989, the Australian republic is an idea whose time has come.

The article articulates very clearly views which are hard to argue against, and there is an aspect of this debate that is not given enough attention, namely, how other people see Australia in the context of who is our Head of State. As we can see from one of Australia's most senior and respected diplomats, there is that continual puzzlement about how the Queen is our Head of State and how it has led on more than one occasion to diplomatic embarrassment, and how on occasion it has led to the Governor-General having to withdraw from an overseas function because he is deemed not to be a Head of State.

Quite clearly, the time for a republic has come, and it would be no more appropriate to see that occur than at around the time we celebrate the centenary of Federation. Already there are moves to celebrate that centenary in various ways—through a Centenary Federation Fund, an allocation of money to each Federal electorate and a variety of capital works projects and festivals, and no doubt with publications to note the history of the centenary of Federation. If this referendum is to be held in 1999 and passed by the required majority of voters, that is, a majority of voters in a majority of States, then it may well be that Australia will become a republic at the time we celebrate the centenary of Federation. I support the amended motion.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I have been a long time supporter of Australia's becoming a republic. It is not something that I have gone to the wall over at any stage because to me it is seen to be an inevitability. I have not taken that committed step of joining the Australian Republican Movement but I have, however, donated to the cause to make sure that the message that it has is getting out. Because the monarchists conduct a very emotional campaign at times and are capable of getting themselves a cheap headline every now and then I have thought it important enough to donate.

I intend to move an amendment to the motion moved by my colleague the Hon. Michael Elliott. I do not accept the amendment that has been moved by the Hon. Julian Stefani. His amendment, I believe, has turned what was a non-Party political motion into a Party political one, and for that reason I will not support it. What I will attempt to do is remove that Party politicisation from the motion but still take into account what the Hon. Julian Stefani is suggesting.

I know that last year the Government established a committee to look at this issue and it did report with some recommendations. I commend the Government for having taken that initiative at that time. What I think we need to do now is to go the next step and to make some decisions. We have some recommendations but we do not have some decisions. We would look very stupid if, in 1999—which I

remind members is only six months off, and if the referendum was held in some 18 months time that is not far away—Australians decided to have a republic at a national level and we still had a royal Head of State here in South Australia.

The important distinction is that, with the committee that the Government established, recommendations were made. We need to go the next step and now make some decisions that will be in place, assuming that the Australian people will vote to support the setting up of a republic for Australia, which I strongly support. So, at this point I move to amend the Hon. M.J. Elliott's motion as follows:

After paragraph I—Insert:

IA. That following a national referendum to be held in 1999, and, if passed by the required majority, this Council is of the opinion that South Australia should also adopt republican structures and that the South Australian Government should initiate a process to decide what changes would need to be made in South Australia.

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

CROYDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Carolyn Pickles:

That this Council—

1. Calls on the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training to acknowledge criticisms by the Ombudsman that the final report to the Minister of the Upper West School Cluster Review did not reflect dissenting views, that documents presented to the Minister contained inaccuracies, that the Co-Chairs of the Croydon Primary School signed the final report on misleading advice and that grave doubt exists as to the extent of consideration given to the Croydon minority report;

2. Acknowledges the significant campaign by the Croydon Primary School Council and parents and friends to save the school and advance the educational opportunities of their children; and

3. Condemns the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training for closing the Croydon Primary School.

(Continued from 1 July. Page 926.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to thank members for their remarks on this motion and acknowledge the comments that time has long since gone by when this was relevant, but we should always remind ourselves of the situation and that Croydon Primary School is no longer. I would also like to thank the Hon. Mr Elliott for his contribution, and for his support of the motion. The honourable member in his contribution pointed out that the closures of the Croydon Primary and the Croydon Park Primary Schools had no educational merits. The argument that closing Croydon Primary would result in increased enrolments and enhanced curriculum opportunities at other schools in the cluster simply did not eventuate and the closing of Croydon Primary resulted in a majority of students transferring to schools outside the local cluster.

One would wonder whether the Minister or his department ever actually considered where the children would enrol if the school closed. The Hon. Mr Elliott also noted the loss of the position previously occupied by the Croydon Primary School Aboriginal Education Worker and pointed out that the Government had failed to honour the promise that savings from the closures would follow the students. The closure of the Croydon Primary School did not deliver improved educational outcomes for the school community and in retrospect the decision to close the school was a poor decision made by the former Minister as part of his four year obsession with cutting expenditure. I would also like to refer to the contribution by the former Minister for Education and

Children's Services and now the Treasurer. This was one of the most cowardly speeches one would ever wish to hear. In his attempt to deflect attention from the real issue and his decision, the former Minister told the Council how he, and only he, was able to make such profound decisions. The Minister said:

I was the only person who was able to look at the weighing of the factors which governed my decision regarding the closure of Croydon Primary School.

The Minister even explained his extraordinary powers of perception as to what is best for other people by telling the Council how he had also closed the Sturt Street Primary School against the advice of his department, and against the wishes of the Sturt Street School community and the Adelaide City Council.

The decision to close Sturt Street was not a flash of genius on the former Minister's part but a pig headed reaction to the public outcry over his secret plan to close the Gilles Street Primary School. Let us remind ourselves about what has happened to the Sturt Street Primary School. Professor Cliff Walsh was certainly right when he told a meeting of prominent South Australians that some members of the Liberal Government were in danger of going blind from a form of self flagellation. I suspect he had the former Minister for Education and Children's Services and now Treasurer in mind. I described the former Minister's contribution as cowardly for good reason. After both the former Minister and the Premier refused to change the decision to close Croydon Primary School, the parents of children attending the school decided, and did so within their democratic rights, to make this an election issue.

And did they not do it effectively? I bet the former Minister is still smarting about how effective their campaign was. I would also bet that all those Liberal members who lost their seats in the western suburbs will never forgive him. It came as little surprise that the former Minister should use this place to vilify the parents and pay them back by accusing them of being used in a political campaign by Ms Janet Giles, the President of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Education Union. The former Minister accused Ms Giles of hating anything to do with John Olsen, himself or the Liberal Party, and of taking decisions that, and I quote 'harmed the cause of the Croydon Primary School'. Is the Minister seriously suggesting that if it were not for Ms Giles he would have changed his mind and kept the school open? What a despicable suggestion.

While I am not aware of whether Ms Giles hates John Olsen or the Liberal Government, as suggested by the Minister, I do know that Ms Giles is the mother of two children who attended the Croydon Primary School and who participated in the public campaign against the closure in that capacity. That was her democratic right. For the Minister to come in here and vilify Ms Giles and other parents who were arguing for their school to remain open was a cowardly act and one for which the Minister should be ashamed. This was not a campaign being run by extremists. It was not a campaign being run against the public interest. It was a campaign being run by mums and dads and their kids to save their local school, the same kids that the Premier ran away from during the election campaign in another cowardly act.

The issues associated with the closure of Croydon Primary School have been well canvassed. The former Minister says that he hopes that this will be the last motion and he hopes that the issue will go away. Of course, this will not be the case and for many elections to come people in the western

suburbs will remember how the former Minister for Education and Children's closed their school. I loved the former Minister's *mea culpa* about how he spent nights unable to sleep and tossed and turned worrying for hours about having been censured by myself and the Hon. Mr Elliott for his dastardly deeds. While I cannot speak for the Hon. Mr Elliott I want the Council to know that I have never lost a minute's sleep on the Minister's account.

The Council divided on the motion:

AYES (11)

Cameron, T. G.	Crothers, T.
Elliott, M. J.	Gilfillan, I.
Holloway, P.	Kanck, S. M.
Pickles, C. A. (teller)	Roberts, T. G.
Weatherill, G.	Xenophon, N.
Zollo, C.	

NOES (8)

Davis, L. H.	Dawkins, J. S. L.
Laidlaw, D. V.	Lawson, R. D.
Lucas, R. I. (teller)	Redford, A. J.
Schaefer, C. V.	Stefani, J. F.

PAIR(S)

Roberts, R. R.	Griffin, K. T.
----------------	----------------

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.45 p.m.]

PORT ADELAIDE FLOWER FARM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. L.H. Davis:

That the report of the Auditor-General on the Port Adelaide Flower Farm be noted.

(Continued from 26 March. Page 693.)

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: It is over three years since I first raised the matter of the Port Adelaide Flower Farm and the matter of the flowers that ate Adelaide. Unlike the Australian Democrats, the research on this matter was thorough and accurate, and in fact the—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Was it 1 000 hours?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: It was not 1 000 hours; I did not need 1 000 hours. I am not quite as slow witted and slow working as the Democrats. Members will recall, albeit that it is after dinner, that I did make three modest speeches on this subject. The Hon. Terry Cameron, in his brief three hour and 20 minute rebuttal of the points that I made, quite clearly did not have his heart in it. One can understand that, because when the matter was referred in quite unprecedented fashion to the Auditor-General by the then Treasurer, the Hon. Stephen Baker, the Auditor-General investigated the very serious allegations I made during the course of my speeches in 1995 and, in fact, confirmed every fact of substance that I raised.

Indeed, in 450 pages the Auditor-General canvassed many issues. It was interesting that some issues were unable to be canvassed, and my only conclusion was that some of these matters could not be properly addressed because the information was no longer available. It may not come as a surprise to some members opposite that my sources for much of the information that I made public came from deep within the bowels of the Port Adelaide council and that the shredding machines at the council did see some activity during the course of 1995, but I will not say any more than that.

What was concerning to me—and I would hope to members opposite, notwithstanding their apparent jocularity—was that the Auditor-General found that I had underestimated the losses suffered by the Port Adelaide council. I had been modest in my estimate of \$4.1 million; in fact, it had ballooned beyond that to about \$4.3 million. Of course, that was reflected in the fact that the debt burden carried by the long-suffering ratepayers of Port Adelaide was extraordinary. As members might recall, ratepayers in suburbs such as Semaphore were paying higher rates on properties with much lower capital values than those residents in eastern suburbs such as Hazelwood Park whose capital values were many times those of the Port Adelaide suburbs.

Notwithstanding the modest language that is traditionally used by officers in his position, the Auditor-General was quite clearly scathing of the principal architect of the project, the Chief Executive Officer of Port Adelaide council, Mr Keith Beamish, who was not only the CEO of the council which he ruled with an iron rod but also the Chief Executive Officer of the Port Adelaide Flower Farm.

The Auditor-General confirmed that not enough financial information was made available to the council and that not enough attention was paid to detail. The Auditor-General was unable to establish, as I had alleged, the fact that right from the start the flower farm was managed badly. There were allegations that the cost of the stock bought from IHM and Dr Brian Freeman was at the very least 50 per cent higher than it should have been in the market place, that no proper management plan was in place, that the site chosen was totally inappropriate (given it was badly degraded and subjected to howling gales and salts) and that it required above-ground cultivation, adding dramatically to the cultivation cost of the kangaroo-paw and other Australian natives.

The council made no attempt to monitor the performance of IHM, which was run by Dr Freeman. No evidence of the inherent risks associated with the project was given to the council. For four years the council tried desperately to restructure the flower farm. The last, greatest and most extraordinary attempt in this respect involved the issue of a prospectus where they sought to raise as much as \$9.6 million for assets which just months later sold at fire sale for \$113 000—plus a block of land at Penola.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: In the face of this howling gale and these overwhelming facts, the Hon. Terry Roberts bravely soldiers on with an interjection and says that it was my fault. Well, the Auditor-General did not say that, and if the honourable member is yet to read the report as it was tabled late last year I would be pleased to lend him my copy; but the Auditor-General was scathing—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Did you read it all?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I absolutely did.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Every word?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Yes, I did. For the Hon. Terry Roberts to suggest that the scheme foundered because of the allegations raised in the Parliament by me is preposterous and scandalous and would obviously be subject to defamatory action if it was repeated outside this Council. The Auditor-General—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Roberts!

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Department of Agriculture had a written report advising against the suitability of the site, and that information was ignored. The Port Adelaide council

had been refused vital financial and statistical information regarding the performance of the flower farm. The only councillor at Port Adelaide who showed concern about this was vilified by his fellow councillors.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: They refused to second his motions requesting information, yet it was he who blew the whistle in the Council and in public. He was the fearless one, the one whom members opposite should have admired and supported. However, as is common in the case of whistle-blowers, he was despised, ignored and reviled by these people. The ratepayers of Port Adelaide should be grateful that his persistence and bravery paid off.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: Rats in the ranks.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Hon. Ron Roberts raises the phrase 'rats in the ranks', and that reminds me of a memorable program that I saw on the ABC about Labor Party politics in New South Wales. It was called 'Rats in the Ranks'. I watched this program and I thought of the Hon. Ron Roberts because I remembered what he said as he fought against the rats in the ranks in his Party: 'I spit in the face of your offer.' So, I understand how he can speak so feelingly about rats in the ranks in this Council today because his scars have yet to heal. I can understand why those scars have not yet healed.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Don't keep it to yourself—tell us!

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I'm talking about his scars.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: I have no scars.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: You still have the stitches then. This motion was a very good example of how—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members have had enough to say.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: This Opposition is yet to apologise for the \$3.15 billion lost because of the State Bank—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: I'm sorry!

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: We have a 'Sorry Day' coming on, with the Hon. Mr Cameron being the first to make history. I want it noted in *Hansard* that the Hon. Terry Cameron is the first Labor member since 1991 to apologise for the \$3.15 billion in losses suffered by the taxpayers as a result of the Labor Party's negligence and unprofessional behaviour while in government under the leadership of Premier John Bannon. What disturbs me is that, having apologised for that, the Hon. Mr Cameron and his colleagues cannot bring themselves to recognise that deep in the Labor heartland of Port Adelaide, their very roots, a massive fraud was perpetrated on ratepayers.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: They think this is funny; they do not take it seriously. Every page of the Auditor-General's report is dripping with damning facts against the Labor leadership. Every page of the Auditor-General's report on the flower farm is dripping with damning facts about the lack of leadership, professionalism, management and financial expertise that was associated with the flower farm and the Perce Harrison Environmental Centre. If that prospectus had been registered—and it was on the verge of being registered until I made my allegations in the Parliament—the people

involved may well have suffered actions for professional negligence being brought against them.

In my view, that is how serious the matter was. That view was shared, as members might recall, by senior staff at ABN Amro who supplied me with their views on the prospectus and also subsequently, whilst the Auditor-General's inquiry was being conducted, by other people who had knowledge of the requirements of prospectus law. I am delighted to see that the Auditor-General's inquiry into the Port Adelaide Flower Farm backs up in every way the serious allegations which I made at the time.

Over the years, from the time the farm was founded in the late 1980s, for the most part, the Port Adelaide council continued to deny the serious disquiet and concerns of many of its ratepayers. When these matters were raised by me in the Parliament, they angrily continued to deny the reality. Even when the Auditor-General's report was tabled last year and publicity was given to it, those councillors, who then belonged to the amalgamated Port Adelaide Enfield Council, continued to deny rather remarkably the reality of what was one of the greatest losses, if not the greatest loss, suffered by any local government body in South Australia's history.

The Council divided on the motion:

AYES (12)

Davis, L. H. (teller)	Dawkins, J. S. L.
Elliott, M. J.	Kanck, S. M.
Laidlaw, D. V.	Lawson, R. D.
Lucas, R. I.	Pickles, C. A.
Stefani, J. F.	Weatherill, G.
Xenophon, N.	Zollo, C.

NOES (2)

Cameron, T. G. (teller)	Roberts, T. G.
-------------------------	----------------

PAIR(S)

Griffin, K. T.	Crothers, T.
Redford, A. J.	Holloway, P.
Schaefer, C. V.	Roberts, R. R.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

ELECTORAL (ABOLITION OF COMPULSORY VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 July. Page 1044.)

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: Before I place my position on this Bill on record I would like briefly to acknowledge the presence in the Gallery of Dr Graham Craig, a consultant psychiatrist friend of mine who has been observing the proceedings for the past few minutes and I am sure that—

The PRESIDENT: Before someone takes a point of order, I point out that it is not the practice of the Council to refer to anyone in the Gallery. On odd occasions the President may acknowledge visitors to the Gallery but generally it is not acceptable.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: I am living and learning, Mr President, and I will not do it again. I rise to place on record my position on this Bill. Twelve months ago I would have been inclined to vote for the Bill. I feel uncomfortable with the current position which compels the attendance of a citizen to a polling booth. I admire and respect the Attorney's persistence with this Bill and I understand the principles behind it, but in the past few months I have had cause to rethink my position. The clincher for me came when I visited the United States last month which, as all members are aware,

has a system of voluntary voting with a less than 50 per cent voter turnout for Presidential elections and much less than that for elections in non Presidential years.

As attracted as I was initially to the theory and principles behind voluntary voting, the consequences of voluntary voting in the United States and the potential consequences in our State compel me to oppose this Bill. There are a number of factors that cause me to reach this conclusion. First, compelling a citizen to attend at a polling booth is not an onerous requirement of participation in a democracy. It strengthens the legitimacy of Government and its citizens' stake in our Government. We accept the other responsibilities of citizens such as that the obligation to pay taxes needs to be compulsory to try to ensure fair and universal contributions by citizens, who in turn are eligible to enjoy the benefits of Government expenditure derived from that revenue on the basis of that same citizenship.

Recent years have seen an increase in voter disenchantment with the political process, and this has resulted in volatility of electoral preferences and a degree of instability in Government. A Bill must be judged on both its intent and its likely outcome. In the present political climate, to remove compulsory voting is to invite citizens to distance themselves even further from the political process. I strongly believe that this will further erode the legitimacy of Government and will result in the stake of ordinary citizens diminishing.

While the present law may seem onerous to some citizens, it reminds all of us of our stake in Government, that Government ultimately belongs to all of us and that we have an obligation to shape and direct it. The current law requires citizens to consider the political issues and this in turn puts greater pressure on Parties to respond to concerns that may otherwise be less strongly articulated. I see that this Bill, if passed, would encourage ever greater levels of apathy and disenchantment.

When I was in the United States recently I spoke to a group of 100 or so delegates at a conference and, in the course of question time, I let slip that in Australia voting is compulsory at both the State and Federal levels. To my amazement the delegates broke out in spontaneous applause. I was appalled to find that voluntary voting in the United States results in huge sums being expended by the major Parties in getting their preferred constituents out to vote. Political Parties, rather than spending money articulating issues, spend millions in busing voters on election day. I was also told that some Parties spend money encouraging people not to vote.

Finally, the views of two individuals across the border also swayed my view to oppose this Bill. The former Victorian Director of the Liberal Party and currently Federal member for the seat of Kooyong, Mr Petro Georgiou, has been a passionate supporter of compulsory voting, together with the Victorian Premier, Mr Kennett. Perhaps Mr Georgiou and Mr Kennett, two of this nation's most successful Liberal politicians, know something that this Government does not.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAMING MACHINES (GAMING TAX) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 July. Page 1054.)

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I rise to speak to this Bill largely to make some comment about the question of revenue on which this Bill focuses. This Bill demonstrates more than anything else the Government's increasing reliance on gambling as a source of revenue. Clearly the Government has set itself the goal over the past couple of years of getting a certain amount of money out of gaming machines, despite an agreement that it had struck with the Australian Hotels Association. Having not got the amount it wanted it is now going chasing it. That is really what this Bill is doing: it is the Government chasing further revenue.

I want to put what might be a novel notion. If the Government is serious about wanting to help people with gambling machine addictions its approach on tax would be to have none at all, because the tax is in fact money that is being taken out of the pockets of the users. Effectively, every time a person puts a dollar or whatever into a machine, every time they push a button, a certain percentage automatically, as part of turnover, is allocated to the Government. Every time a person pushes a button they are giving away a certain percentage, and that percentage is reliant upon the tax component.

If the Government wanted to have gaming machines as a form of entertainment what it would do is shave it down to a very narrow margin for the owners of the machines and have no tax at all. If it then had limits on the way the games were played so that people could not make big bets at any one time it would be physically impossible to lose significant sums of money. The problem we have is that every time a person presses a button a guaranteed average percentage is ripped out—the Government's tax take, plus a guaranteed take for the hotels.

It is perfectly possible to have gaming machines as entertainment which give some wins—not giant wins—but which also have what would be relatively minor losses. But that is not possible in the tax climate that we have. Frankly, we get ourselves caught up in some rather interesting debates sometimes, saying that we should allocate more of this tax to help the victims. If the Government is taxing people, which is making them victims, and it then has to use the money to help those victims, you do not have to think about it too hard to see that there is a certain amount of illogicality in that.

The real answer is to have no tax at all. If the Government is going to have gaming machines, that is what it should do. But the Government has gone past this question of what are the impacts of gaming machines on the community and the question is: what is in it for us? That is what this Bill is about: the Government is not getting enough and it wants more.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 July. Page 1046.)

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON (Minister for Disability Services): I support the second reading of the Bill. I should use this occasion to congratulate the Leader of the Government in the Council and Treasurer on his first budget. It is a budget of singular achievement—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Single achievement, was it?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Singular achievement. This budget has a number of highlights which I think are worth repeating to the Council and which I am sure members would

be most interested to hear. There is a balanced budget in 1998-99. The debt of this State has continued to fall under the capable hands of the current Treasurer. Under the budget, debt falls to below 20 per cent of gross state product, compared to the 28 per cent in 1992 when the Labor Party was in charge of the affairs of this State.

The program of the Government to extinguish the \$4 billion superannuation black hole has remained on track because of cautious measures by the Government. There was a surplus on the Current Account of \$356 million, which is a commendable achievement. The budget includes a carefully targeted capital program, up 8 per cent in real terms to \$1.243 billion—a program which supports over 20 000 direct jobs and even more indirect jobs whilst, at the same time, creating essential social and economic infrastructure.

The budget included allowance for some \$99 million, which had been announced shortly before the budget, in an employment package, which will stimulate further job growth in the face of unacceptably high levels of unemployment. The Treasurer described the budget as firm but fair. There are a number of revenue measures and increases in charges in this budget.

The previous Government not having raised taxes or charges above inflation for the whole of its term, as was promised in the 1993 election, it was appropriate for the Government on this occasion to levy additional revenue measures to ensure that the budget was balanced and that the Government's objectives laid down in relation to debt reduction and other programs are met. The community can be confident that the strategies laid out in the budget will lead to South Australia once again achieving a AAA credit rating, which will improve investor and business certainty in this State and which will lead to additional economic activity, to jobs and to the creation of further opportunities for especially the youth of this State.

The budget will have the effect of freeing up resources which are currently devoted to debt servicing, and health and education principally will be the beneficiaries of that. It is worth reminding ourselves that the economic difficulties of this State have been caused largely by the State Bank blowout in which about \$3 billion was expended not on the development of infrastructure, not on the development of social capital, not on the development of schools, roads and harbors and the like but simply to honour a guarantee to overseas investors. That \$3 billion went literally down the gurgler. We received no benefit at all from paying that money.

One reads in the papers the frequent refrain of a former Premier (Hon. Don Dunstan), who talks of the relative levels of debt in the community over the past few years. He maintains the argument that our level of debt at the moment is comparable to that which existed previously and should be no cause for concern. The point is worth making, and making again and again, that the debt about which he speaks is a debt created for the purpose of establishing infrastructure, for building Whyalla, Elizabeth, power stations and the like. The traditional borrowings of this State have been for the purpose of capital infrastructure. The borrowings we have had to undertake in recent years have been to honour a guarantee which, as a result of the neglect of the previous Government, we were required to honour.

As I said, the budget this year meets the objectives of reducing that debt so that the State can establish some headroom in the budget and give some room for progress, particularly in the fields in which I have portfolio responsibility, for the ageing and disability services in which there are

grave demands for additional services. We have an ageing population. We also have a population which by reason of that ageing and also by reason of some medical and other developments has an increasing proportion of people with disabilities requiring Government services. We have great difficulty in meeting the demand because of the budgetary pressures brought upon the State in consequence of the neglect of our predecessors. In conclusion, with considerable pleasure and pride I congratulate the Hon. Robert Lucas on his first budget and I support the second reading.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: In making a contribution on the Bill, I was not going to reflect on where we were coming from four years ago, but I have been prompted to remind the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: It is just a point of explanation. As to the level of debt to which the honourable member was referring with regard to the Dunstan lecture held recently at the Entertainment Centre, Mr Dunstan referred to the 1979-82 period of the Tonkin Government and not the infrastructure period of the Playford Government, which most members on this side are attuned to and support. If a Government is to raise taxes to build infrastructure and pump prime economies, which used to be the economic theory which most Governments worked off—including conservative ones—the Playford period could be referred to as a great socialist regime when it is compared to the economic rationalist positions now put by conservative Governments. The Playford Government did borrow money to put in place infrastructure to support growth but in the 1979-82 period we saw a hiatus when not a lot was going on in South Australia and it led to the downfall of the Tonkin Government because there was not a lot of activity in this State. The Tonkin Government's own supporters deserted the Premier at that stage and the levels of debt that the incoming Bannon Government picked up were those referred to by Mr Dunstan in relation to the debt servicing ratio that the then Treasurer had to fix up.

It is easy in periods of growth to fix up your balance of payments and pay your debt. When the State Bank fell over in the late 1980s and early 1990s, it would not have mattered who was in power at the time. The push for State Governments to try to stay in the financial stakes race was so high that every State Government was pushed into a competitive position by all the pump priming stakeholders at that time. That included the State Banks and financial organisations and insurance companies, owned or controlled or part owned and controlled by Governments, which were forced in to a position of competing with each other to try to encourage growth and attract investment that would place them in a position to minimise taxation revenues to be collected from constituents in the next decade.

Unfortunately New South Wales, which was under a conservative Government, South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia all had problems with State-owned financial institutions which speculated and which were led mostly not by Government Ministers or finance recommendations of Government but by private sector advisers who were advising Governments, which had deficient legislative measures for scrutiny, to avail themselves of the financial markets about which they did not know a lot. It was the opening up of international capital to national markets. Much of the financial advice given to Governments was deficient and the international capital markets were certainly swallow-

ing a lot of the speculative capital ventures in which Governments were involving themselves.

It certainly was not until after the investigations into the States' financial institutions that fell over that the real picture was drawn. Not only the State-owned financial institutions were affected either: Pyramid and a number of other privately owned financial institutions which had bad advice lost not only taxpayers' money but shareholder and stakeholder money as well. Certainly, it was a bad economic period for a Government to be in power and I am pretty sure that it would not have mattered if it was a John Bannon or a Dean Brown Government. Probably the same decisions would have been made by those financial institutions because the reforms which should have taken place to allow Governments a stronger economic hold were not in place because the cause and effect analysis had not been performed. It is okay for us in hindsight now to look at that and for me to make that analysis.

The Hon. R.D. Lawson interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: It was not only interstate: money was going overseas as well into bad investment strategies. I understand the role that the honourable member played in the whole of the State Bank debacle—and I will not clarify that point.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: He was well paid for his role.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: No blame can be placed on the honourable member or his contribution, but I point out that I tend to make an analysis of the period we are talking about different from his, and other people, including Don Dunstan, who have made an assessment of the State infrastructure-debt ratios make different comparisons.

At the moment, we need to consider the economic indicators, the timeframes and economic frameworks under which we operate now to determine the appropriate budget to frame. The Government in its past two budgets has formulated, in my view, a recessionary framework for this State. The general thrust in most budgets has been to increase receipts and to cut expenditure, and this current Government has increased tax increments by stealth, in some cases, using gambling, speed traps and fines, etc. It has also increased by stealth, and far in excess of CPI increases, some of the standard taxes that Governments have at their disposal. It has indulged itself in program or service cuts to reduce public services to the community, including Public Service numbers cuts, and it has also embarked on asset sales.

Normally, Governments would probably use two of those three strategies or tactics in difficult times, but they would not embark upon the three measures. But this State Government, because of its rush to use the State Bank debt as a weapon to beat the previous Government around the head, has used it far too excessively to highlight an economic folly of past times and to score political points. It has said to the people that all this pain being inflicted upon them, the increased taxes, the asset sales and service cuts, are because of the previous Government's mistakes. The people of South Australia gave up on that explanation, I would say, some two to three years ago.

There is no doubt that after the first two years of the Liberal Government's taking power the simplified argument, as put forward by the Government, was being rejected in the latter years of its term. It did not understand that; it kept saying it *ad nauseam* and we still get it today. It is a tired argument. We must move forward from that position and stop using the whip to flagellate our populace into believing that somehow or other the next Liberal Government will be

successful, based on the failure of a Government that existed in the 1980s. I am sure that its polling must be telling it that it is belting a dead horse.

I am a bit sorry that the honourable member has reflected on the 1998 budget. We are heading almost to the year 2000 and using language that, I thought, disappeared in 1992, 1993 and 1994. Unfortunately, that language still remains. As far as a re-election prospect, it augurs well for the Labor Opposition if the Government keeps going down that path. The constituents in South Australia want to see some light at the end of the tunnel. They want to see the exodus of its young people, skilled people and educated people stopped. They want to see programs put in place in this State to show that this State has a vision and that South Australia can exist as an economic unit in a competitive national climate in a difficult international climate.

Unless Governments can develop policies which give people confidence, the settings the Government has set with tax increases, program and service cuts, and asset sales in a period of recession will drive this State further into recession than the eastern States. The eastern States are being geared and operated on in a number of hot spots. The southern Queensland area, and certainly Sydney, central New South Wales, and the CBD of Victoria could all be considered hot spots. Certainly, the Western Australian economy is ticking over separately from the eastern States because in many cases it does not rely on the eastern States for its growth.

South Australia is locked into the eastern States' growth, and I think the Hon. Legh Davis raised the issue of the proposals that were being put forward based on population growth for the next 50 years. Tasmania expected massive cuts in population and South Australia was not to have any growth. The resource rich States that rely on resources development were in some cases self-insured, but States such as South Australia and Tasmania and regional Victoria that relied on manufacturing and services were going to feel the full impact of little or no growth.

That should have sent some signals to this Government before this budget was drawn up and before appropriations were made but, unfortunately, we are left with a 1990s strategy to take us into the next millennium, and we will have more of the same in the lead up to the next election. As I said, speaking as somebody who is a bit opportunistic in terms of the way Governments are shaped, I believe it certainly leaves the Opposition in a position where it may be able to get across the line, given that it needs to put forward a vision which is certainly not based on a regressive financial regime of tax increases, service cuts and asset sales. I think the people of South Australia will accept the position that we are putting forward, that is, to hold on to our assets, such as ETSA, which are generating income. Certainly, we would not have been selling off the management of the State's water: we would have been ameliorating the debt based on returns and, perhaps, some leasing arrangements—a mixture—but certainly not the massive asset sales and cuts that the current Government has embarked upon.

Most of the major funding comes from the Commonwealth for the areas of responsibility that I have in relation to the appropriation, particularly in relation to Aboriginal Affairs. Certainly, many of the responsibilities in relation to Aboriginal Affairs are important in terms of State spending and appropriations.

The cutbacks with which I have difficulty at the moment relate to employment and training programs, the funding of drug and alcohol abuse programs and community organisa-

tions which support programs for Aboriginal deaths in custody. Certainly, little or no extra moneys are being made available.

Even though during Estimates Committees the Minister indicated that she supported the idea of moneys being provided to pump prime Aboriginal youth training, education and employment programs, the information I am getting from around this State is that the moneys which are available either are not going in the right direction or not enough is being made available to make any important impact.

The other thing the State has underestimated is Commonwealth cuts to services in this State. It is one of those things that impacts upon every individual member of this Parliament, because when Commonwealth services are cut the lobbying is directed not only to members of the Government but also to Opposition members. Many Commonwealth services that have been cut, in terms of health and particularly aged care, and those matters associated with youth services, not to mention the changes to the Commonwealth services program in relation to social service delivery and support services for young people looking for work, have impacted very heavily on South Australia because of our position and because economic rationalism rules. South Australia does not get any extra service moneys.

Of course, in those areas where restructuring has been particularly hard, such as the Iron Triangle area in relation to the restructuring of transport, service withdrawal has been particularly difficult. I understand that the States are wrestling with that. The Minister for Transport has done probably as good a job as she can to bring to the Commonwealth's attention the difficulties that people in those areas face in terms of restructuring economies, but they do not have a lot of natural advantages around which to restructure. So, when there are Commonwealth cuts of the proportion that we have had particularly in rail, unless corresponding training, education and alternative employment opportunities are put in place with a sympathetic Government to administer those programs and funding, States do not have a lot of opportunity to fill those gaps.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: The horror with Port Augusta was that so few of the people employed had qualifications that were recognised.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: One of the problems with rail infrastructure in particular is that there is not a lot of flexibility in the training education programs. If you take into account the age of those people in that area, you find that they are not particularly suited to the flexibility that is required to suit other industries. We know the way in which working men and women can adjust to find new opportunities if they are there in other industries. Unfortunately, in that region there is not a lot of hope, because the infrastructure for change was not put in. As I said, the natural advantages of other geographical areas, either in the Eastern States or even in the South-East of this State, are not there. There is no wine industry, and there are no growth industries in agriculture, horticulture or secondary industries of which we could take advantage to pick up that slack.

There was a little bit of development in the mining industry of which some tradespeople with particular skills were able to avail themselves. This applies to most areas and regions around Australia. Once those places that are associated either with transport, rail and/or steel shift or move, they just move into someone else's area of unemployment and exacerbate those positions. Unless there is new growth in mineral development, we are looking at what a lot of

economists call 'rust belt' regions. The only alternatives we then have are in tourism development. Perhaps in the Spencer Gulf—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Aquaculture.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Yes. In the Spencer Gulf region, which is close to waters that can be used for aquaculture, there is some potential for growth. I must pay a tribute to those people who work in the economic development field in Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie. They have not stopped trying; they are still working to find alternatives. I take my hat off to those people who work in social welfare in those areas and who are trying to pick up employment alternatives.

Regional development is one of those areas where Governments need to take a bipartisan approach, because if the major Parties do not come to an agreement they will lose ground to One Nation, which at the moment has made a lot of inroads particularly into the conservative vote—and it will not be long before it makes inroads into the Labor vote as well. If we do not get solutions to those problems and if people do not have some hope and something to which to look forward, they will shift their allegiances. Their vote will move into what is regarded as a dead pocket and they will be used up by people who are well versed and who know what to say but who do not know how to deliver in relation to picking up the disaffected votes.

In relation to my other portfolio area of correctional services, I have already referred in this Council to the cuts that have caused the dual occupancy of cells to increase in our major prisons, namely, Yatala in the main and the Remand Centre. The cuts are impacting on the numbers of trained officers who look after the inmates. The budget cuts and staff cuts have led to increases in overtime and an accelerated use of the budget funds. If we do not maintain the number of prison officers in the system in terms of surveillance, and if we use electronic devices in prisons as an alternative to prison officers, we will not get the human contact that is required for rehabilitation.

Although I intended to make some other statements in relation to the international scene which will impact on the budget, I point out that the budget has forecast a small surplus, which I suspect will turn out to be a deficit by the time the end of the financial year is upon us, mainly because the growth figures upon which the Commonwealth and the States rely to increase their budget returns will not happen. It has nothing to do with this State in relation to its role and function in trying to attract business to this State. However, international and national forces will make this budget look a little depleted by about February or March next year.

All the optimists are talking up the economy in the lead-up to a Federal election, but even before the Federal election is called the economy is starting to stall. Most small business people, who are the first to feel the effects of recessionary slow downs, are saying that their receipts compared to those of the last financial year have not only slowed but have almost stopped.

There has been a lot of impact on regional restructuring and large central shopping centres, but most small businesses say that their takings are down compared to this time last year, in some cases by 20 to 25 per cent—and I have spoken to a cross-section of many small business people. I do not think the economy has slowed to the point where those sorts of figures will be maintained, but this economic vision that was put forward by the Government prior to the slowdown

will make receipts and the balancing of the budget as outlined by the Treasurer difficult to maintain.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 8.57 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 23 July at 2.15 p.m.