

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 24 November 1998

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The **PRESIDENT**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: 2 and 53.

SCHOOL FEES

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

I. Would the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training please list which public schools charge above the legally enforceable level for materials and services?

II. Would the Minister please provide a list of each public school in South Australia and the total amount per student which is charged for the materials and services levy?

III. What is the total dollar amount outstanding from the materials and services levy, school by school, for all public schools in South Australia, including both metropolitan and country schools?

The **Hon. R.I. LUCAS**: The Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training has provided the following information:

I. Regulation 107A provided for a legally enforceable limit for each school as listed in the schedule to the regulation with a maximum limit of \$205 for secondary students and \$154 for primary students. Whilst several schools request amounts above \$205 and \$154 these payments are voluntary and the parents are under no legal obligation to meet these additional amounts. The list of schools requesting these voluntary payments is tabled for information (Attachment 1).

II. & III. See Attachment 2.

Attachment 1

Schools Requesting Voluntary Payments

| | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| ABERFOYLE HUB PS | EASTERN FLEURIEU SCHOOL | MORPHETT VALE HS |
| ADELAIDE HS | EDITHBURGH PS | MT GAMBIER HS |
| ALBERTON PS | EDWARD JOHN EYRE HS | MYLOR PS |
| ALFORD PS | ENFIELD HS | NAILSWORTH PS |
| ALLENDALE EAST AS | ENFIELD PS | NORTH ADELAIDE PS |
| ANDAMOOKA PS | EVANSTON PS | NORTON SUMMIT PS |
| ANGASTON PS | FAIRVIEW PARK PS | NORWOOD MORIALTA HS |
| ANGLE VALE PS | FINDON HS | NORWOOD PS |
| ATHELSTONE J PS | FLAGSTAFF HILL PS | NURIOOTPA HS |
| ATHELSTONE PS | FLINDERS PARK PS | NURIOOTPA PS |
| AUBURN PS | FRANCES PS | OAKBANK AS |
| BALAKLAVA HS | FULHAM GARDENS PS | PALMER PS |
| BALAKLAVA PS | FULHAM NTH PS | PARA HILLS EAST PS |
| BANKSIA PARK HS | GEORGETOWN PS | PARACOMBE PS |
| BANKSIA PARK PS | GLEN OSMOND PS | PARADISE PS |
| BEACHPORT PS | GLENELG PS | PARINGA PARK PS |
| BELAIR SCHOOLS | GLENUNGA INTERNAT HS | PENONG PS |
| BELLEVUE HEIGHTS PS | GLOSSOP HS | PLYMPTON PS |
| BIRDWOOD HS | GOLDEN GROVE HS | PORT NOARLUNGA PS |
| BLACKWOOD PS | GOLDEN GROVE PS | PROSPECT PS |
| BLANCHETOWN PS | GOODWOOD PS | PT LINCOLN HS |
| BOULEROO CENTRE HS | GRANGE JPS & PS | PT LINCOLN JPS |
| BORDERTOWN HS | GRANT HS | RAPID BAY PS |
| BORDERTOWN PS | GREENOCK PS | ROSE PARK PS |
| BOWDEN-BROMPTON CS | GREENWITH PS | SALISBURY EAST HS |
| BRAEVIEW PS | GUMERACHA PS | SEACLIFF PS |
| BRAHMA LODGE PS | HACKHAM EAST PS | SEATON HS |
| BRIDGEWATER PS | HALLET COVE SCHOOL | SEAVIEW DOWNS PS |
| BRIGHTON PS | HALLETT COVE EAST PS | SEAVIEW HS |
| BRIGHTON SS SCHOOL COUNCIL | HAMILTON SS | SETTLERS FARM PS |
| BROWN'S WELL DIST AS | HAPPY VALLEY PS | ST AGNES PS |
| BURNSIDE PS | HAWTHORNDENE PS | ST LEONARDS PS |
| BURRA COMMUNITY AS | HEATHFIELD HS | STRADBROKE PS |
| CAMBRAI AS | HEATHFIELD PS | SUTTONTOWN PS |
| CAMPBELLTOWN PS | HENLEY BEACH PS | TANUNDA PS |
| CARLTON PS | HENLEY HS | TEA TREE GULLY PS |
| CEDUNA AS | HIGHGATE PS | THORNDON PARK PS |
| CHARLES CAMPBELL SS | HINCKS AVENUE PS | VALE PARK PS |
| CHRISTIES BEACH HS | KADINA MEMORIAL HS | VICTOR HARBOR HS |
| CLAPHAM PS | KANGARILLA PS | VICTOR HARBOR PS |

Attachment 1

| Schools Requesting Voluntary Payments | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| CLARE HS | KARCULTABY AS | WARRAMBOO PS |
| CLEVE AS | KENSINGTON CENTRE | WEST BEACH PS |
| COL LIGHT GDNS PS | KEYNETON PS | WEST LAKES SHORE PS |
| COMPTON PS | KILPARRIN T & A UNIT | WIRREANDA HS |
| COOPER PEDY AS | KYBYBOLITE PS | YANKALILLA AS |
| COONALPYN PS | LINDEN PARK JPS | |
| COROMANDEL VALLEY PS | LINDEN PARK PS | |
| COWELL AS | LOCK AS | |
| CRAIGBURN PS | LOCKLEYS NTH PS | |
| CRAIGMORE HS | LOCKLEYS PS | |
| CROYDON HS | MAGILL PS | |
| CURRAMULKA PS | MARRYATVILLE HS | |
| DARLINGTON PS | MEADOWS PS | |
| DAWS ROAD HS | MITCHAM PS | |
| DERNANCOURT PS | MODBURY HS | |

Attachment 2

| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| ABERFOYLE HUB PS | 154 | 6 | 9597.6 |
| ABERFOYLE PARK HS | 200 | — | 23891.2 |
| ADELAIDE HS | 205 | 238 | 6204.5 |
| AIRDALE PS | 130 | — | 970 |
| ALBERTON PS | 135 | 5&10 | 2797 |
| ALDGATE PS | 154 | — | 0 |
| ALDINGA PS | 115 | — | 3708.85 |
| ALFORD PS | 95 | 15 | 0 |
| ALLENBY GDNS PS | 135 | — | 0 |
| ALLENDALE EAST AS | 154/190 | 30 | 0 |
| AMATA AB S | 0 | — | 1200 |
| ANDAMOOKA PS | 110 | 23 | 45 |
| ANGASTON PS | 140 | 16 | 1772 |
| ANGLE VALE PS | 154 | 16 | 900 |
| ARDROSSAN AS | 130/170 | — | 0 |
| ARDTORNISH PS | 154 | — | 570 |
| ASCOT PARK PS | 110 | — | 2860 |
| ASHFORD SPS | 120 | — | 0 |
| ATHELSTONE J PS | 154 | 25 | 0 |
| ATHELSTONE PS | 154 | 25 | 0 |
| AUBURN PS | 105 | 20 | 0 |
| AUGUSTA PARK PS | 95 | — | 4210.21 |
| BALAKLAVA HS | 200 | 35 | N/S |
| BALAKLAVA PS | 154 | 6 | 0 |
| BANKSIA PARK HS | 205 | 60&140 | 5686 |
| BANKSIA PARK PS | 154 | 1 | 716.5 |
| BARMERA PS | 110 | — | 240 |
| BASKET RANGE PS | 154 | — | 120 |
| BEACHPORT PS | 135 | 35 | 280 |
| BELAIR SCHOOLS | 154 | 31 | 0 |
| BELLEVUE HEIGHTS PS | 154 | 16 | 790 |
| BERRI PS | 105 | — | 2200 |
| BIRDWOOD HS | 205 | 55 | N/S |
| BIRDWOOD PS | 95 | — | 544.5 |
| BLACK FOREST PS | 140 | — | 366 |
| BLACKWOOD HS | 205 | — | 2056.65 |
| BLACKWOOD PS | 154 | 6 | 0 |
| BLAIR ATHOL PS | 130 | — | 0 |

| Attachment 2 | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
| BLAKEVIEW PS | 118 | | 627 |
| BLANCHETOWN PS | 80 | 18.80&24.15 | 0 |
| BLYTH PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| BOOBOROWIE PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| BOOLEROO CENTRE HS | 200 | 65 | 708 |
| BOOLEROO CENTRE PS | 125 | — | 0 |
| BORDERTOWN HS | 160 | 30 | 0 |
| BORDERTOWN PS | 136 | 26 | 0 |
| BOWDEN-BROMPTON CS | 205 | 55&70 | 8002 |
| BRAEVIEW PS | 154 | 1&11 | 0 |
| BRAHMA LODGE PS | 130 | 10 | 2222 |
| BRIDGEWATER PS | 154 | 26 | 0 |
| BRIGHTON PS | 154 | 61 | 4530.5 |
| BRIGHTON SS SCHOOL COUNCIL | 205 | 165 | 2500 |
| BRINKWORTH PS | 130 | — | 6 |
| BROADMEADOWS PS | 100 | — | 563 |
| BROMPTON PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| BROWN'S WELL DIST AS | 90 | 20 | 0 |
| BURNSIDE PS | 154 | 51&111 | 4023 |
| BURRA COMMUNITY AS | 140/160 | 40 | 0 |
| BURTON PS | 110 | — | 5945 |
| BUTE PS | 106 | — | 0 |
| CADELL PS | 90 | — | 180 |
| CALLINGTON PS | 130 | — | 0 |
| CAMBRAI AS | 125/180 | 40 | 38 |
| CAMDEN PS | school closed | — | 78 |
| CAMPBELLTOWN PS | 154 | 11 | N/S |
| CARLTON PS | 110 | 35 | N/S |
| CEDUNA AS | 130/150 | 50 | 5200 |
| CHALLA GARDENS PS | 145 | — | 0 |
| CHARLES CAMPBELL SS | 205 | 95 | 11239.05 |
| CHRISTIE DOWNS PS | 125 | — | 0 |
| CHRISTIES BEACH HS | 195/205 | 55&85 | 45000 |
| CHRISTIES BEACH PS | 130 | — | 2832 |
| CLAPHAM PS | 154 | 31 | 4000 |
| CLARE HS | 205 | 122.50&150 | 0 |
| CLARE PS | 120 | — | 0 |
| CLARENDON PS | 130 | — | 348.5 |
| CLEVE AS | 150 | 55 | 1910.77 |
| CLOVELLY PARK PS | 120 | — | 0 |
| COBDOGLA PS | 100 | — | 250 |
| COL LIGHT GDNS PS | 154 | 50 | 0 |
| COMPTON PS | 135 | 20 | 0 |
| COOPER PEDY AS | 145/205 | 15 | 10535 |
| COOK AS | 45 | — | 0 |
| COOMANDOOK AS | 125/205 | — | 1721 |
| COONALPYN PS | 130 | 20 | 0 |
| COORABIE RS | 80 | — | 0 |
| COORARA PS | 135 | — | 4334 |
| COROMANDEL VALLEY PS | 154 | 50 | 841 |
| COWANDILLA PS | 125 | — | 2233.2 |
| COWELL AS | 95/140 | 35 | 540 |
| CRAFERS PS | 130 | — | 300 |
| CRAIGBURN PS | 154 | 66&86 | 650 |
| CRAIGMORE HS | 170 | 50&90 | 760.85 |
| CRAIGMORE PS | 115 | — | 1000.5 |

| Attachment 2 | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
| CRAIGMORE STH PS | 115 | — | 4037.5 |
| CROYDON HS | 175 | 30&50 | 11197 |
| CROYDON PS | school closed | — | 0 |
| CRYSTAL BROOK PS | 125 | — | 280 |
| CUMMINS AS | 150 | — | 155 |
| CURRAMULKA PS | 90 | 20&50 | 0 |
| DARKE PEAK PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| DARLINGTON PS | 150 | 40&70 | N/S |
| DAVOREN PARK PS | 110 | — | 1812 |
| DAWS ROAD HS | 205 | 157&343.50 | 22714.85 |
| DERNANCOURT J PS | 154 | — | 1266.5 |
| DERNANCOURT PS | 154 | 45 | 0 |
| DEVITT AVENUE PS | 150 | — | 0 |
| DIREK PS | 115 | — | 0 |
| DOVER GDNS PS | 130 | — | 0 |
| EAST ADELAIDE PS | 150 | — | 1710 |
| EAST MARDEN PS | 154 | — | 800 |
| EAST MURRAY AS | 70/100 | — | 0 |
| EASTERN FLEURIEU SCHOOL | 150/205 | 105 | 6183.8 |
| ECHUNGA PS | 135 | — | 0 |
| EDEN HILLS PS | 140 | — | 75 |
| EDITHBURGH PS | 110 | 36 | 0 |
| EDWARD JOHN EYRE HS | 165 | 50 | 8340 |
| EDWARDSTOWN PS | 150 | — | 0 |
| ELIZ PK PS CHIC | 100 | — | 0 |
| FREMONT-ELIZABETH CITY HS | 170 | — | 11072 |
| ELIZABETH DOWNS PS | 110 | — | 1908 |
| ELIZABETH EAST JPS | 110 | — | 0 |
| ELIZABETH EAST PS | 110 | — | 605 |
| ELIZABETH GROVE PS | 100 | — | 1917 |
| ELIZABETH NTH PS | 97 | — | N/S |
| ELIZABETH PK PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| ELIZABETHSPS | 135/165 | — | 1458 |
| ELIZABETHSTH PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| ELIZABETH VALE PS | 90 | — | 2850 |
| ELLISTON AS | 110/140 | — | 440 |
| ENFIELD HS | 170 | 5 | 0 |
| ENFIELD PS | 120 | 10 | 0 |
| ETHELTON PS | 140 | — | 1177 |
| EUDUNDA AS | 110/130 | — | 2413.7 |
| EVANSTON GDNS PS | 140 | — | 2350 |
| EVANSTON PS | 154 | 1 | 4235 |
| FAIRVIEW PARK PS | 154 | 164 | 910.75 |
| FERRYDEN PARK PS | 110 | — | 1155 |
| FINDON HS | 205 | 75 | 8474.5 |
| FISK STREET PS | 106 | — | 0 |
| FLAGSTAFF HILL PS | 154 | 36 | N/S |
| FLAXMILL PS | 125 | — | 2222 |
| FLINDERS PARK PS | 150 | 20 | 1477 |
| FLINDERS VIEW PS | 115 | — | 0 |
| FORBES PS | 135 | — | 2453 |
| FRANCES PS | 110 | 20 | 0 |
| FRASER PARK PS | 110 | — | 731 |
| FREELING PS | 115 | — | 690 |
| FULHAM GARDENS PS | 154 | 1 | 2600 |
| FULHAM NTH PS | 154 | 46 | 0 |

| Attachment 2 | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
| GAWLER EAST PS | 140 | — | 3512 |
| GAWLER HS | 185 | — | 10942 |
| GAWLER PS | 140 | — | 5175 |
| GEORGETOWN PS | 60 | 10 | 0 |
| GEPPS CROSS GIRL HS | 185 | — | 0 |
| GEPPS CROSS PS | 120 | — | 1000 |
| GEPPS CROSS SENIOR | 100 | | N/S |
| GERANIUM PS | 126 | — | 0 |
| GILLES PLAINS PS | 106 | — | 0 |
| GILLES STREET PS | 154 | — | 5995 |
| GLADSTONE HS | 183/203 | — | 1477 |
| GLADSTONE PS | 90 | — | 70 |
| GLEN OSMOND PS | 154 | 86 | 1824 |
| GLENBURNIE PS | 130 | — | 0 |
| GLENCOE CENTRAL PS | 139 | | N/S |
| GLENELG PS | 154 | 70 | 0 |
| GLENUNGA INTERNAT HS | 205 | | N/S |
| GLOSSOP HS | 150 | 50&77.50 | 0 |
| GLOSSOP PS | 106 | — | 0 |
| GOLDEN GROVE HS | 205 | 140 | 0 |
| GOLDEN GROVE PS | 150 | 10 | 0 |
| GOODWOOD PS | 154 | 31 | 1091 |
| GOOLWA PS | 154 | — | N/S |
| GRANGE JPS & PS | 154 | 26 | 3218.2 |
| GRANT HS | 205 | 50&57.50 | 0 |
| GREENOCK PS | 120 | 5 | 0 |
| GREENWITH PS | 150 | 10 | 0 |
| GUMERACHA PS | 154 | 6 | 3000 |
| HACKHAM EAST PS | 154 | 6 | 257 |
| HACKHAM STH PS | 130 | — | 1463 |
| HACKHAM WEST PS | 130 | — | 1568.5 |
| HAHNDORF PS | 140 | — | 926 |
| HALLET COVE SCHOOL | 154/205 | 40 | 10297.4 |
| HALLETT COVE EAST PS | 154 | 6 | 404.4 |
| HALLETT COVE STH PS | 154 | — | 1330 |
| HAMILTON SS | 154/205 | 25/75/225 | 0 |
| HAMLEY BRIDGE PS | 130 | — | 0 |
| HAMPSTEAD PS | 115 | — | 0 |
| HAPPY VALLEY PS | 150 | 20 | 4680.5 |
| HAWKER AS | 100/123 | — | 0 |
| HAWTHORNDENE PS | 150 | 30 | 2448.5 |
| HEATHFIELD HS | 205 | 45 | 5175.3 |
| HEATHFIELD PS | 154 | 31 | 1839 |
| HECTORVILLE PS | 140 | — | 126 |
| HENDON PS | 106/120 | — | 1446 |
| HENLEY BEACH PS | 154 | 6 | 0 |
| HENLEY HS | 205 | 45 | 5267.4 |
| HEWETT PS (new school) | 140 | — | N/S |
| HIGHBURY PS | 150 | — | 3972 |
| HIGHGATE PS | 154 | 56 | 0 |
| HILLCREST PS | 130 | — | 2979 |
| HINCKS AVENUE PS | 105 | 16 | 3043.15 |
| HOLDEN HILL NTH PS | 140 | — | 855 |
| HOUGHTON PS | 150 | — | N/S |
| INDULKANA AB S | 0 | — | 0 |
| INGLE FARM EAST PS | 130 | — | 2214 |

| Attachment 2 | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
| INGLE FARM PS | 125 | — | N/S |
| JAMESTOWN HS | 205 | — | 2400 |
| JAMESTOWN PS | 120 | — | 0 |
| JERVOIS PS | 120 | — | 257.25 |
| JOHN PIRIE SS | 180 | — | 2500 |
| KADINA MEMORIAL HS | 205 | 5 | 4650 |
| KADINA PS | 130 | — | 848 |
| KALANGADOO PS | 120 | — | 0 |
| KANGARILLA PS | 154 | 21 | 69 |
| KANGAROO INN AS | 145/190 | — | 517.15 |
| KAPUNDA HS | 185 | — | 2000 |
| KAPUNDA PS | 140 | — | 1746 |
| KARCULTABY AS | 125/185 | 25 | 0 |
| KARKOO PS | 85 | — | 0 |
| KAROONDA AS | 125/165 | — | 0 |
| KARRENDI PS | 138 | — | N/S |
| KAURNA PLAINS SCHOOL | 110/170 | — | 4000 |
| KEITH AS | 119/160 | — | N/S |
| KEITHCOT FARM PS | 140 | — | N/S |
| KELLER ROAD PS | 130 | — | 758 |
| KENSINGTON CENTRE | 110/205 | 10 | N/S |
| KERSBROOK PS | 125 | — | 426 |
| KEYNETON PS | 100 | 30 | 225 |
| KIDMAN PARK PS | 150 | — | 4352 |
| KILBURN PS | 106 | — | N/S |
| KILKENNY PS | 130 | — | N/S |
| KILPARRIN T & A UNIT | 205 | 40 | N/S |
| KIMBA AS | 130/145 | — | 160 |
| KINGSCOTE AS | 120/165 | — | 0 |
| KINGSTON C S | 150/175 | — | 0 |
| KINGSTON ON MURRAY PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| KIRTON POINT PS | 154 | — | 5485.45 |
| KLEMZIG PS | 130 | — | 0 |
| KONGORONG PS | 120 | — | 218.5 |
| KOOLUNGA PS | 85 | — | 80 |
| KOONIBBA AB S | 40 | — | 0 |
| KULPARA PS | 75 | — | 0 |
| KYBYBOLITE PS | 135/140 | 30 | 0 |
| LAKE WANGARY PS | 100 | — | 45 |
| LAMEROO REGIONAL CS | 150/205 | — | 1341.71 |
| LARGS BAY PS | 140 | — | 4607 |
| LARGS NORTH PS | 115 | — | 933 |
| LAURA PS—COUNCIL | 116 | — | 0 |
| LE FEVRE HS | 185 | — | 3025 |
| LE FEVRE PENS PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| LEIGH CREEK SOUTH AS | 135/140 | — | N/S |
| LENSWOOD PS | 150 | — | 514 |
| LIGHT PASS PS | 115 | — | 58.88 |
| LINCOLN SOUTH PS | 110 | — | 424 |
| LINDEN PARK JPS | 150 | 70 | 2170 |
| LINDEN PARK PS | 150 | 70 | 4221 |
| LITTLEHAMPTON PS | 150 | — | 1500 |
| LOBETHAL PS | 146 | — | 677.5 |
| LOCK AS | 150/160 | 5 | 0 |
| LOCKLEYS NTH PS | 154 | 24 | 601 |
| LOCKLEYS PS | 145 | 11 | 2535 |

| Attachment 2 | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
| LONG STREET PS | 130 | — | 300 |
| LONSDALE HEIGHTS PS | 135 | — | 1722 |
| LOVEDAY PS | 100 | — | N/S |
| LOXTON HS | 140 | — | 0 |
| LOXTON NTH PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| LOXTON PS | 110 | — | 855 |
| LUCINDALE AS | 132/197 | — | 0 |
| LYNDOCH PS | 140 | — | 1792 |
| LYRUP PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| MACCLESFIELD PS | 142 | — | 773.5 |
| MADISON PARK PS | 140 | — | 0 |
| MAGILL PS | 154 | 46 | 8400 |
| MAITLAND AS | 154/164 | — | 0 |
| MALLALA PS | 110 | — | 1729 |
| MANNUM HS | 155 | — | 0 |
| MANNUM PS | 120 | — | 1446.5 |
| MANOORA PS | 90 | — | 0 |
| MANSFIELD PARK PS | 122 | — | 1046 |
| MARDEN S C | 205 | — | 10178 |
| MARION PS | 140 | — | 41 |
| MARRYATVILLE HS | 205 | 240 | N/S |
| MARRYATVILLE PS | 154 | — | 1260 |
| MCDONALD PARK PS | 130 | — | 2200 |
| MCLAREN FLAT PS | 125 | — | 49.75 |
| MCLAREN VALE PS | 143 | — | 4229.05 |
| MCRITCHIE CRES PS | closed | — | 200 |
| MEADOWS PS | 140 | 16 | 2334.25 |
| MELROSE PS | 106 | — | 0 |
| MEMORIAL OVAL PS | 140 | — | N/S |
| MENINGIE AS | 150/180 | — | 3920 |
| MIL LEL PS | 130 | — | 0 |
| MILBROOK PS | 130 | — | 0 |
| MILLICENT HS | 160/180 | — | 4500 |
| MILLICENT NORTH PS | 140 | — | 0 |
| MILLICENT SOUTH PS | 120 | — | 3122 |
| MILTABURRA AS | 120/140 | — | 0 |
| MINLATON AS | 110/150 | — | 0 |
| MINTABIE AS | 110/170 | — | 0 |
| MINTARO/FARRELL FPS | 110 | — | 0 |
| MITCHAM GIRLS HS | 180/200 | — | 11697 |
| MITCHAM PS | 135 | 63 | 2000 |
| MOANA PS | 135 | — | 981.5 |
| MOCULTA PS | 105 | — | 0 |
| MODBURY HS | 205 | 85 | 345 |
| MODBURY PS | 140 | — | 677.5 |
| MODBURY SPS | 130/170 | — | 0 |
| MODBURY STH PS | 154 | — | 0 |
| MODBURY WEST PS | 150 | — | 3221 |
| MONASH PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| MOONTA AS | 130/190 | — | 0 |
| MOORAK PS | 83 | — | 0 |
| MOOROOK PS | 100/105 | — | 50 |
| MORGAN PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| MORPHETT VALE HS | 205 | 15 | N/S |
| MORPHETT VALE SOUTH PS | 130 | — | 1317 |
| MORPHETT VALE-EAST PS | 145 | — | 1500 |

| Attachment 2 | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
| MORPHETT VALE-WEST PS | 154 | — | 1252 |
| MT BARKER HS | 205 | — | 0 |
| MT BARKER PS | 140 | — | 4022 |
| MT BARKER SOUTH PS | 135 | — | 29.5 |
| MT BRYAN RS | 90 | — | N/S |
| MT BURR PS | 145 | — | N/S |
| MT COMPASS AS | 154/180 | — | N/S |
| MT GAMBIER EAST SCHOOLS | 110 | — | 945 |
| MT GAMBIER HS | 205 | 45 | 0 |
| MT GAMBIER NORTH JPS | 130 | — | 0 |
| MT GAMBIER NORTH PS | 130 | — | 1370 |
| MT PLEASANT PS | 140 | — | 350 |
| MT TORRENS PS | 110 | — | 110 |
| MULGASTREET PS | 150 | — | 0 |
| MUNDULLA PS | 115 | — | 0 |
| MUNNO PARA PS | 123 | — | 1663 |
| MURPUTJA AB S | 0 | — | N/S |
| MURRAY BRIDGE HS | 200 | — | 6541.18 |
| MURRAY BRIDGE NORTHSCHOOLS | 105 | — | 0 |
| MURRAY BRIDGE STH PS | 115 | — | 0 |
| MYLOR PS | 154 | 16 | N/S |
| MYPOLONGA PS | 110 | — | 303 |
| MYPONGA PS | 130 | — | 195 |
| NAILSWORTH PS | 154 | 1 | 1016 |
| NAIRNE PS | 145 | — | 1290 |
| NANGWARRY PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| NAPPERBY PS | 110 | — | 281.25 |
| NARACOORTE HS | 170 | — | 0 |
| NARACOORTE PS | 150 | — | 0 |
| NARACOORTE STH PS | 135 | — | 0 |
| NARRUNG PS | 115 | — | N/S |
| NEWTON PS | 154 | — | 1080.05 |
| NICOLSON AVENUE JPS | 130 | — | 900 |
| NICOLSON AVENUE-COUNCIL | 130 | — | 1000 |
| NOARLUNGA DOWNS PS | 115 | — | 800 |
| NOARLUNGA PS | 130 | — | 583 |
| NORTH ADELAIDE PS | 154 | 36 | 686.25 |
| NORTH HAVEN PS | 140 | — | 8204 |
| NORTH INGLE PS | 130 | — | 233 |
| NORTHFIELD PS | 115 | — | 1048 |
| NORTON SUMMIT PS | 150 | 20 | N/S |
| NORWOOD MORIALTA HS | 205 | 165 | 0 |
| NORWOOD PS | 154 | 6 | 1854 |
| NURIOOTPA HS | 205 | 0 | 4670 |
| NURIOOTPA PS | 154 | 1 | N/S |
| O B FLAT PS | 154 | — | 0 |
| OAKBANK AS | 154/205 | 1 | 15135 |
| ONE TREE HILL PS | 145 | — | 250 |
| ORROROO AS | 135/190 | — | 0 |
| O'SULLIVAN BEACH PS | 115 | — | 115 |
| OWEN PS | 130 | — | 0 |
| PADTHAWAY PS | 135 | — | 0 |
| PALMER PS | 130 | 20 | 0 |
| PARA HILLS EAST PS | 154 | 11 | 933 |
| PARA HILLS HS | 200 | — | 5850 |
| PARA HILLS JPS | 130 | — | 520 |

| Attachment 2 | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
| PARA HILLS PS | 130 | — | 602 |
| PARA HILLS WEST PS | 125 | — | 1015 |
| PARA VISTA PS | 120 | — | 480 |
| PARA WEST ADULT CAMPUS | 205 | — | 0 |
| PARACOMBE PS | 144 | 12 | 0 |
| PARADISE PS | 154 | 26 | 0 |
| PARAFIELD GARDENS HS | 205 | — | 800 |
| PARAFIELD GDNS JPS & PS | 130 | — | 3998 |
| PARALOWIE SCHOOL | 125/185 | — | 9476.5 |
| PARINGA PARK PS | 150 | 10 | 0 |
| PARKSIDE PS | 150 | — | N/S |
| PARNDANA AS | 110/170 | — | 325.32 |
| PASKEVILLE PS | 90 | — | 0 |
| PENNESHAW AS | 125/140 | — | 500 |
| PENNINGTON JPS | 110 | — | 900 |
| PENNINGTON PS | 95 | — | N/S |
| PENOLA HS | 150/170 | — | 0 |
| PENOLA PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| PENONG PS | 110 | 50 | 170 |
| PETERBOROUGH HS | 200 | — | 595 |
| PETERBOROUGH PS | 106 | — | 530 |
| PIMPALA PS | 130 | — | 316 |
| PINNAROO PS | 120 | — | 0 |
| PIPALYATJARA ABS | 0 | — | 675 |
| PLAYFORD PS | 115 | — | N/S |
| WILLIAM LIGHT | 154/205 | — | 870 |
| PLYMPTON PS | 140 | 50 | 542 |
| POINT PEARCE ABS | 0 | — | N/S |
| POONINDIE PS | 154 | — | 0 |
| POORAKA PS | 120 | — | 2500 |
| PORT AUGUSTA HS | 140/160 | — | 16526.75 |
| PORT AUGUSTA WEST PS | 150 | — | 550 |
| PORT KENNY PS | 95 | — | 0 |
| PORT NOARLUNGA PS | 154 | 6 | 4568.5 |
| PORT PIRIE WEST PS | 120 | — | 450 |
| PRICE PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| PROSPECT PS | 154 | 6 | 540 |
| PT ADELAIDE PS | 110 | — | N/S |
| PT BROUGHTON AS | 120/180 | — | 0 |
| PT ELLIOT PS | 140 | — | 517 |
| PT GERMEIN PS | 102/103 | — | 112 |
| PT LINCOLN HS | 185 | 15 | 8460 |
| PT LINCOLN JPS | 150 | 30 | 0 |
| PT LINCOLN PS | 125 | — | 0 |
| PT LINCOLN SPECIAL S | 30 | — | 0 |
| PT NEILL PS | 60 | — | 0 |
| PT VINCENT PS | 100 | — | 92.5 |
| PT WAKEFIELD PS | 125 | — | 0 |
| PT. PIRIE SPS | 130 | — | N/S |
| QUORN AS | 100/150 | — | 785 |
| RAMCO PS | 105 | — | 0 |
| RAPID BAY PS | 135 | 55 | 0 |
| RAUKKAN AB S | 100 | — | 0 |
| REDWOOD PARK PS | 150 | — | N/S |
| REIDY PARK PS | 154 | — | 1531 |
| RENDELSHAM PS | 140 | — | 185 |

| Attachment 2 | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
| RENMARK HS | 145 | — | 550 |
| RENMARK JPS | 105 | — | 0 |
| RENMARK NORTH PS | 106 | — | 218 |
| RENMARK PS | 105 | — | 193.4 |
| RENMARK WEST PS | 154 | — | 0 |
| REYNELLA EAST HS | 205 | — | 23889.9 |
| REYNELLA EAST PS | 152 | — | 1648.5 |
| REYNELLA PS | 130 | — | 6972.5 |
| REYNELLASTH PS | 130 | — | 940 |
| RICHMOND PS | 150 | — | 0 |
| RIDGEHAVEN PS | 140 | — | 1539.75 |
| RIDLEY GROVE PS | 110 | — | 2486 |
| RISDON PARK PS | 130 | — | 815 |
| RIVERDALE PS | 120 | — | 305 |
| RIVERLAND SPS | 106/165 | — | N/S |
| RIVERTON AND DIST HS | 145/155 | — | 340 |
| RIVERTON PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| ROBE PS | 122 | — | 0 |
| ROBERTSTOWN PS | 101 | — | 0 |
| ROSE PARK PS | 154 | 46 | 0 |
| ROSEDALE PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| ROSEWORTHY PS | 125 | — | N/S |
| ROXBY DOWNS AS | 154/160 | — | 0 |
| S.ASECONDARY SCH LANG | 30/50 | — | 0 |
| SADDLEWORTH PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| SALISBURY DOWNS PS | 125 | — | 2178.5 |
| SALISBURY EAST HS | 205 | 35 | 21423.95 |
| SALISBURY HS | 205 | — | 32160 |
| SALISBURY HTS PS | 150 | — | 5435 |
| SALISBURY J PS | 130 | — | 2960.9 |
| SALISBURY NORTH PS | 120 | — | 1075 |
| SALISBURY NORTH-WEST PS | 104 | — | N/S |
| SALISBURY PS | 130 | — | 3000 |
| SALISBURY PARK PS | 150 | — | 5364.5 |
| SALISBURY S-E PS | 150 | — | 0 |
| SALT CREEK PS | 110 | — | N/S |
| SANDY CREEK PS | 150 | — | 0 |
| SCOTT CREEK PS | 145 | — | 390 |
| SEACLIFF PS | 154 | 21 | 1000 |
| SEAFORD 6-12 SCHOOL | 154/205 | — | 9627.5 |
| SEAFORD PS | 140 | — | 2444 |
| SEAFORD RISE PS | 135 | — | 2572.2 |
| SEATON HS | 200 | 25 | 1500 |
| SEATON PARK PS | 120 | — | 0 |
| SEAVIEW DOWNS PS | 150 | 20 | N/S |
| SEAVIEW HS | 205 | 35 | 0 |
| SEDAN PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| SEMAPHORE PARK PS | 140 | — | N/S |
| SETTLERS FARM PS | 140 | 7 | 3000 |
| SHEIDOW PARK PS | 145 | — | 2937 |
| SMITHFIELD PLNS HS | 170 | — | 10837 |
| SMITHFIELD PLNS PS | 100 | — | N/S |
| SMITHFIELD PS | 110 | — | 540 |
| SNOWTOWN AS | 150/205 | — | 0 |
| SOLOMONTOWN PS | 130 | — | 0 |
| SOUTH DOWNS PS | 110 | — | N/S |

| Attachment 2 | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
| SPALDING PS | 100 | | 0 |
| SPRINGTON PS | 126 | — | 0 |
| ST AGNES PS | 154 | 21 | 0 |
| ST LEONARDS PS | 154 | 21 | N/S |
| STANSBURY PS | 103 | — | N/S |
| STANVAC PS | 135 | — | 727 |
| STIRLING EAST PS | 154 | — | 0 |
| STIRLING NORTH PS | 150 | — | N/S |
| STRADBROKE PS | 154 | 80 | 0 |
| STREAKY BAY AS | 130/170 | — | 1127 |
| STUART HS | 150 | — | 0 |
| STURT STREET PRIMARY | 110 | — | 0 |
| SURREY DOWNS PS | 150 | — | 660 |
| SUTTONTOWN PS | 154 | 6 | 0 |
| SWALLOWCLIFFE SCHOOLS | 100 | — | 224.25 |
| SWAN REACH AS | 95/115 | — | 225 |
| TAILEM BEND PS | 110 | — | 343 |
| TANTANOOLA PS | 130 | — | 25 |
| TANUNDA PS | 154 | 1 | 0 |
| TAPEROO HS | 180 | — | 18000 |
| TAPEROO PS | 95 | — | 4750 |
| TARLEE PS | 80 | — | 0 |
| TARPEENA PS | 120 | — | 567 |
| TEA TREE GULLY PS | 154 | 6 | 0 |
| TEROWIE RS | 85 | — | N/S |
| THE HEIGHTS HS | 150/200 | — | 0 |
| THE PINES PS | 125 | — | N/S |
| THE THEBARTON SC | 205 | — | 1272.5 |
| THORNDON PARK PS | 154 | 21 | 0 |
| TINTINARA AS | 55/70 | — | N/S |
| TORRENSVILLE PS | 136 | — | N/S |
| TRURO PS | 124 | — | 0 |
| TUMBY BAY AS | 125/145 | — | 200 |
| TWO WELLS PS | 140 | — | 1290 |
| UNDERDALE HS | 205 | — | N/S |
| UNGARRA PS | 95 | — | 0 |
| UNLEY HS | 205 | — | N/S |
| UNLEY PS | 154 | — | 4135 |
| UPPER STURT PS | 150 | — | 426 |
| URAILDA PS | 150 | — | N/S |
| URRBRAE AGRIC HS | 200 | — | 6074 |
| VALE PARK PS | 154 | 41 | 310 |
| VALLEY VIEW SS | 200 | — | 7960 |
| VICTOR HARBOR HS | 205 | 25 | N/S |
| VICTOR HARBOR PS | 154 | 26 | 12903 |
| VIRGINIA PS | 130 | — | 925 |
| WAIKERIE HS | 170/195 | — | 1528 |
| WAIKERIE PS | 103 | — | 1707.5 |
| WALKERVILLE PS | 154 | — | 6315.3 |
| WALLAROO MINES PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| WALLAROO PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| WANDANA PS | 110 | — | 399 |
| WAROOKA PS | 150 | — | 0 |
| WARRADALE PS | 150 | — | 1972 |
| WARRAMBOO PS | 85 | 10 | 0 |
| WASLEYS PS | 110 | — | 0 |

| Attachment 2 | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| School Name | 1998 Materials & Services Charge | 1998 Voluntary Contributions | 1997 Uncollected School Fees |
| WATERVALE PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| WEST BEACH PS | 154 | 46 | 1149 |
| WEST LAKES AQUATIC CENTRE | 0 | — | 0 |
| WEST LAKES SHORE PS | 154 | 46 | 8158 |
| WESTBOURNE PARK PS | 150 | — | N/S |
| WHARMINDA PS | 87 | — | 0 |
| WHYALLA HS | 150 | — | 4235 |
| WHYALLA SPS | 95 | — | 0 |
| WHYALLASTUART JPS | 90 | — | 865 |
| WHYALLASTUART PS | 90 | — | 1745 |
| WHYALLA TOWN PS | 125 | — | 1217.4 |
| WILLIAMSTOWN PS | 130 | — | 840 |
| WILLSDEN PS | 110 | — | N/S |
| WILLUNGA HS | 200/205 | — | 11358.5 |
| WILLUNGA PS | 150 | — | 258 |
| WILMINGTON PS | 110 | — | 0 |
| WINDSOR GARDENS HS | 205 | — | 4846.75 |
| WINKIE PS | 100 | — | 0 |
| WIRRABARA PS | 106 | — | 0 |
| WIRREANDA HS | 205 | 49 | 6000 |
| WOODCROFT PS | 135 | — | 8377 |
| WOODEND PS | 145 | — | 0 |
| WOODSIDE PS | 140 | — | N/S |
| WOODVILLE HS | 205 | — | 2884 |
| WOODVILLE PS | 140 | — | 5321 |
| WOODVILLE SPS | 143/205 | — | 0 |
| WOOMERA AS | 140/180 | — | 0 |
| WUDINNA AS | 130/170 | — | 788.75 |
| WYNN VALE PS | 154 | — | 0 |
| YAHL PS | 140 | — | 16 |
| YANKALILLA AS | 154/205 | 40 | 4573.2 |
| YORKETOWN AS | 150 | — | 0 |
| YUNTA RS | 95 | — | 0 |
| Totals | | | 924267.37 |

N/S—school did not submit details

SPEED CAMERAS

53. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:** Is the South Australian Government considering investing in shares in the new Victorian technology company, Poltech, which manufactures a digital speed camera that employs laser technology rather than the radar used by existing analogue speed cameras?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Treasurer has provided the following response:

In so far as the Treasury and Finance portfolio is concerned (including the Department of Treasury and Finance, Funds SA and the Motor Accident Commission), I am advised that the answer to the question raised by the honourable member is 'No'.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Adelaide Convention Centre—Report, 1998

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

Reports, 1997-98—

Industrial Relations Advisory Committee
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Advisory Committee
SA Country Fire Service

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

Reports, 1997-98—

Native Vegetation Council
Northern Adelaide and Barossa Catchment Water Management Board

South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council
South East Catchment Water Management Board
Reserve Planning and Management Advisory Committee
Wildlife Advisory Committee

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

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report, 1997-98—
Erratum of the Financial Statements
Regulation under the following Act—
Development Act 1993—Schedule 2—Zones.

NAPPAMERRI TROUGH

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I seek leave to table a ministerial statement from the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development in the other place on the granting of petroleum production

licences to SANTOS within the Nappamerri Trough.

Leave granted.

QUESTION TIME

DRINK DRIVING

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about drink driving laws.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I refer the Attorney to a recent Supreme Court ruling regarding police blood testing procedures for motorists caught drink driving as reported in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 21 November. In this case the motorist had been convicted of being over the limit; however, he is purported not to have been advised by police of the significance of obtaining a blood test to substantiate a breath analysis reading. Upon verbally advising the offender of his right to have a blood test, the police then explained in writing the legal implications of not proceeding with the test. In his deliberation, Justice Olsson said:

One wonders what is the point of giving the notice if the recipient is not given an opportunity to read it before making an election.

The judge also raised the issue of language and literacy as possible barriers to alleged offenders accurately understanding the written police notice. As a supporter of random breath testing, which is a significant measure in the fight against our climbing road toll, and not wanting to see the random breath test laws brought into disrepute by what might be a problem with the actual wording of the Act, I ask the Attorney the following questions:

1. How many cases in South Australia will be affected by this court ruling?
2. What action is the State Government undertaking, if any, given the court's decision?
3. Does this case have any connection to a recent case in Victoria where the police practice of using police cars as booze buses has been declared illegal by a Supreme Court judge?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: As I indicated on the weekend, it is a case at which the Crown Solicitor, the police, Office of Road Safety and others in Government are looking. I certainly will be considering it when I receive advice from officers. It is premature to be speculating as to what decisions may be taken in relation to that decision. It may be, for example, that the advice is to appeal; it may be that there is other advice in relation to legislative amendment, but, whatever the case, when the advice—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: Those laws are a shambles.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The laws are not a shambles. I mean—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is a question when you seek to define action which must be taken to establish an offence there will always be people trying to find ways around it.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: If the Hon. Ron Roberts wants to throw some stones, he has to be party to this, too, because he has been a member of the Parliament which has considered these laws. Did he raise these issues at the time? No. Did any

member of the Opposition raise these issues? No. In terms of working through the legislation when it is before the Parliament, it is all very well for the Hon. Mr Roberts to start throwing stones about the way in which the courts interpret the law—we may disagree with the interpretation—but the fact is that at the time we are enacting these laws you cannot foresee every possible interpretation of what the Parliament is enacting in good faith.

Frequently, on these sorts of issues, there is a bipartisan approach. So, let us not get into the business of throwing stones about court decisions which occur on these sorts of statutory provisions. Let us try to work constructively to deal with the issues as they arrive. If the honourable member wants to raise an issue when a Bill is before the Parliament, that is fine by me. I do not have a problem with that. He does it all the time on other issues of much higher political moment than this. Let him give due consideration to these sorts of issues as well as those which might have an element of political drama attached to them, albeit ideologically in line with or opposed to his point of view, as the case may be.

The fact is that we know these cases occur from time to time. We always hope to win them. We always work towards winning them. If we do not win them, we look at them and decide whether or not we should appeal and what action should be taken. That is the course of action that is occurring at the moment. When a decision has been taken, I will let the Parliament know.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: As a supplementary question, given the concern that only a written advice by police is admissible in a court case, is the Attorney aware that the police have been instructed to be very careful to provide that written advice?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I do not have that information readily available, but again I will add it to the list of questions and bring back a reply.

MEMORIAL DRIVE

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Administrative Services a question about the lease arrangements for the proposed Memorial Drive Tennis Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: A recent article in the *Advertiser* on the hearings of the Parliamentary Public Works Committee inquiring into that redevelopment reported that a senior Government valuer had attempted to cancel his planned appearance to give evidence on the likely value of the land. All members of this Council would be familiar with the legislation from the last session that made it possible for this development to go ahead, and that legislation was supported by the Opposition.

However, the Opposition is concerned to read reported comments that this public servant was instructed not to appear by his superiors, which he later said involved the Administrative Services Minister. Section 28(2) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 clearly states:

The powers of each committee include the power to send for persons, papers and records.

My questions to the Minister are:

1. What instructions were given to the officer in question, and why were such instructions given?

2. Who was involved in the issuing of such instructions? In particular, was the Minister involved, as reported in the *Advertiser* article of 12 November 1998?

3. Does the Minister believe it appropriate for any Minister to involve themselves in or interfere with the workings of committees of this Parliament that are carrying out their statutory duties?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I am pleased that the honourable member has raised this issue because it provides me with the opportunity to explain the circumstances concerning the attendance before the Public Works Committee of an officer of the Valuer-General's section. The honourable member said in her opening that the Act provides that parliamentary committees have the power to send for witnesses, papers and the like.

The case to which the honourable member refers was not one in which the parliamentary committee had sought the attendance of a witness. What happened was that, on the day before the meeting of the Public Works Committee, the Chairman of that committee sought to speak with a valuer and was put through to a particular officer. The Chairman then said that he wanted the public servant involved to attend before the committee on the following day, and faxed a statement to the officer requiring his attendance at 10 o'clock that following day.

It is important to note that this was not a case where the committee had met or even considered the question of the particular officer's attending before it; it was a case where the Chairman, of his own volition, took it upon himself to speak to a public servant without speaking to the Chief Executive Officer or any superior officer of the officer involved, and certainly without speaking to the Minister.

Without the authority of the committee, the Chairman sought to summon this officer to appear before the committee. When I became aware of this fact, I ascertained the precise circumstances and was very concerned that it appeared that the committee had not followed the well-established, time-honoured convention which is embodied in a written circular and which has been in operation for a number of years and is referred to in the Cabinet Handbook, and which is also well known, I would have thought, to all members of both Houses of this place: that is, that the appropriate procedure when a public servant is sought to be called before a parliamentary committee is for the officer's superior and/or the Minister to be advised.

Accordingly, a letter was written to the Chairman by the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Administrative and Information Services, indicating that the appropriate procedure had not been followed. The written circular also requires that adequate and appropriate notice be given of the requirement to attend before committees. That is for the very sensible purpose of enabling appropriate research to be undertaken, information to be ascertained and all who ought to be informed to be informed of the situation. Once again, that procedure was not followed and, accordingly, the Chief Executive Officer wrote to the Chairman saying that the particular officer would not be attending on that occasion and that, first, the committee itself should resolve to call anyone and, secondly, due notice ought to be given to the officer and his superiors. That notice was delivered to the Chair of the committee.

Subsequently, it transpired that the officer was present within the environs of the Parliament and he was personally summoned by the Chairman to attend before the committee.

I very much regret that the Chairman took that step. In my view, he ought to have followed the established protocol and given appropriate and due notice. There was no interference with the working of any parliamentary committee on this occasion, and I take full responsibility for any instructions that were given to any officer in relation to this matter.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE, EVIDENCE

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Information Services a question about evidence given to the Economic and Finance Committee.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It was reported in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 21 November that the Information Services Minister had sent advice to the Premier's Chief of Staff on Tuesday 17 November that evidence to be provided by a witness to the following day's Economic and Finance Committee was 'not damaging to the Government'. This advice was accompanied by a letter from that witness. The witness later confirmed that she had met with the Minister for Information Services the night before giving evidence to the Economic and Finance Committee in relation to the Motorola contract. Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice* states that any tampering with a witness, either directly or indirectly—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Just listen please—in regard to the evidence to be given before either House of Parliament or any committee of either House is a breach of privilege. Further, it states that corruption or intimidation need not be an essential ingredient in this offence.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Corruption now, is it?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: No, if the Hon. Angus Redford had been listening he would understand the context in which it was used. My questions to the Minister for Disability Services, the Ageing, Administrative Services and Information Services are—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: You didn't listen to the question. Mr President, could I have some protection from interjections? If I can reread the question, I will be happy to do so.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Just proceed with your explanation.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: My questions are:

1. Will the Minister confirm that he advised the Premier's office that the witness's evidence to the Economic and Finance Committee was not damaging to the Government?
2. Why did the Minister consider it necessary to meet with the witness prior to her giving evidence to the committee and to consider the evidence to be provided to the committee?
3. How can the Minister defend his actions in communicating with a witness on her evidence to a parliamentary committee in light of established parliamentary practice and the Erskine May finding to which I just referred?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister is on his feet.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The well established convention in this Parliament is that any officer in the Public Service who is required to give evidence to any parliamentary committee should advise the person's superior and/or, in

appropriate cases, Minister. That is well established practice: it is contained in a Commissioner's Circular that has been around for many years. I deny emphatically any suggestion of tampering with any witness or any evidence given to any parliamentary committee. I have a better understanding of the proprieties in relation to the way witnesses are to be handled than has, I suspect, the honourable member or any of those opposite. There is absolutely no impropriety in any of my dealings with any person who gave evidence to any parliamentary committee.

The situation in relation to the matter to which the honourable member refers was that, after a witness had received from a parliamentary committee a request for information and after the witness had written a response to the committee and despatched that response to the committee, I was given a copy of the response. There was absolutely no impropriety in the witness's furnishing me with that response: it was entirely proper. It is not a question of evidence being given in some oral sense to the committee: it is a written response to a written series of questions. What I did with that is a matter of my own concern: it is not a matter for the honourable member. Whether or not I gave it to any other Minister in the Government is a matter of no moment. There is no impropriety if I had done so—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Whether I gave it to one, two or any other number of Ministers, I do not propose to say: it is not relevant to any issue. There was no opportunity to tamper with the evidence, and there was no intention to do so. Nothing at all was done that could in any way be construed as altering, coercing, intimidating or otherwise dissuading a witness from giving appropriate evidence to the committee. In my view, there is a misunderstanding on the part of those opposite as to the proper function and relationship between the Executive and parliamentary committees. There is an appropriate separation between the two, but the suggestion that in some way the Ministers, the Government and the Executive should be divorced from the processes of parliamentary committees is in my view, and based upon my reading of Erskine May, an unreal and artificial distinction that does not exist.

The honourable member mentioned Erskine May in his preamble to the question. I have had a look at Erskine May on this, and Erskine May speaks of the practice in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom. Certainly, in the United Kingdom it is the practice for Ministers and senior officers within the Public Service to be aware of and familiar with the evidence given by their officers. Furthermore—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: Yes. Furthermore, it is suggested in Erskine May that the appropriate practice is for information to pass through the Executive before it is tabled in parliamentary committees.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I have a supplementary question. Why did the Minister give the information to the Ministers he alluded to? Does the Minister agree with me that the committees he referred to are subject at all times to the will of the total Parliament and that the Executive officers of the Parliament—the Cabinet—serve in their role of oversight without their ministerial hats on, that they have oversight simply as members of Parliament?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The first part of the honourable member's question assumes something to which I did

not assent. It was an entirely hypothetical question when he asked me my particular—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON:—reason for doing something which I may or may not have done. I do not share the honourable member's opinion that parliamentary committees have some overriding oversight over the Executive Government of the State. That is a misunderstanding of the constitutional traditions.

ROBE TERRACE

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to ask the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning a question about road widening and redesign in Robe Terrace, Medindie.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: My interest in this matter relates more to the threat to the parklands than to the exact configuration of the redesign for Robe Terrace. However, I have been advised that residents on Robe Terrace are pressuring—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Struggling residents.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: They are struggling in this case. They are trying to persuade those who are making the decision—and I understand that they have had a friendly reception from the Walkerville council—to take a slice off the parklands so that the redesign of Robe Terrace will be a very expansive redevelopment. It is intended to have a bike track, two lanes of traffic travelling west, then a median strip, including a turning lane, then two traffic lanes moving east, a bike track, then a separator between the main road and a service road for the residents of Robe Terrace, with parking bays and a footpath.

I am advised that 40 metres already in Transport SA title is perfectly adequate for this appropriate redevelopment. However, there is pressure from the residents of Robe Terrace that they deserve a wider service road and a wider separator, and to accommodate that they want to take a slice off the parklands. Not only is that part of the parklands at risk but also there is the reconfiguration of the intersections at Northcote Terrace, at least, and others possibly west of that, which will almost inevitably require the cribbing of parklands.

The final point I make is that I have noted and have been informed that there is a 66kV line on the Transport SA land and that there would be pressure for that to be moved at the expense of Transport SA if it is persuaded by the pressure and what I regard as the very parochial self-interest argument of the residents of Robe Terrace. My questions are:

1. Will the Minister give us an assurance that there will be no loss of parklands under any circumstances down the stretch of Robe Terrace currently under review, and if possible a net gain so that the parklands could come out and embrace that 66kV line?
2. Will the Minister undertake to check what cribbing of parklands is planned or calculated to be taken on the reconfiguration of the Northcote Terrace and Robe Terrace intersection?
3. Will the Minister indicate at this point, and if not now later, when these plans will be finalised? When will it be determined precisely what will happen?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I can advise the honourable member immediately that at no time during any of my discussions with Transport SA, the Walkerville council or in correspondence with residents has it been suggested that there would be a loss of parklands. If that is a current claim by some residents, I will explore the issue further.

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am saying that never at any time has that been suggested to me. I have always been assured about the road reserve, to which the honourable member referred. What Transport SA has been discussing with the council, and what in fact the council has been pushing for for some time, is the extension of Fitzroy Terrace and Mann Terrace, which both include service roads, to be properly linked with improvements to Robe Terrace to accommodate a service road and separator, as the honourable member has said. It is the goal to ensure the completion of that ring route at the north and eastern part of our city at the extreme of the parklands. I will get further detailed advice for the honourable member and bring back a full reply.

CLASSIC ADELAIDE CAR RALLY

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning a question about the Classic Adelaide Car Rally.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Members would be aware that over the weekend the Classic Adelaide Car Rally was held in the Adelaide Hills and involved many classic cars. My questions are:

1. Can the Minister advise what arrangements were in place for compulsory third party insurance to cover the rally vehicles using public roads so as to comply with the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act?

2. Did the Government provide any financial assistance by way of subsidies or grants for the staging of the event and, if so, what was the amount provided?

3. Can the Minister advise the total number and nature of road accidents which have occurred and been reported at the T-junction of Lobethal Road and Fox Creek Road over the past four years?

4. Is the Minister in a position to advise the Chamber whether the participants of the rally are covered by any form of public liability or comprehensive insurance?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will have to get advice on those specific questions. I should be able to get that advice promptly and provide a reply to the honourable member tomorrow.

CHRISTIES BEACH TREATMENT PLANT

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, representing the Minister for Environment and Heritage, a question about the Christies Beach sewerage treatment plant.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: Mr Ledson, the Manager of the Christies Beach sewage works, is reported as saying that a massive sewage spill followed a power failure during a storm on 22 September 1998. Mr Ledson also said that the plant usually had a backup power system but that that had

also failed and that ETSA had not notified the sewerage treatment plant that its electricity had been cut off. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Did the dumping of 10 000 tonnes of sewage into the Gulf St Vincent from the Christies Beach sewerage treatment plant on 22 September 1998 breach any licence under the United Water operation at the Christies Beach plant?

2. Was the plant unmanned at the time of the spill and what action has the EPA taken?

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

BANK CHARGES

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about bank charges.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Today's *Advertiser* reports that the Commonwealth Bank will increase bank charges such that over the counter withdrawals will now carry a \$2 fee (or a 33 per cent increase) and that withdrawals from automatic teller machines will attract a 60¢ fee, which is also a 33 per cent increase. The article further states that the five major banks picked up more than \$10 billion last year from non-interest income. A cursory look at the charges made by the major banks outlined in today's newspaper would indicate that all the major banks are now charging similar fees.

While watching television last night I also noted that the Commonwealth Bank—which, I must say, in one of the greatest exercises in futility I have seen—sought to justify these new charges. An article in the *Financial Review* dated 19 March 1995 referred to a Prices Surveillance Authority recommendation that basic bank products be made available to lower income earners. That recommendation appears to have gone by the wayside. Indeed, on 5 February 1997 the *Australian* described banks as 'rapacious rogues' and predicted a substantial growth in bank income arising from bank charges. *Choice* magazine in February this year described the conduct of banks as 'robbing customers'.

Another *Advertiser* article in July this year indicated that scout groups, fund raisers, sports clubs and other non-profit organisations that are ANZ Bank customers would be slugged commercial fees. Indeed, a cursory research of the press clipping service in the Parliamentary Library would indicate that banks have collectively, step by step, sought to increase drastically the range of charges on customers for so-called services. At the last Federal election the Coalition announced that its proposed goods and services tax would not be applied to bank charges and that it would go down the path of abolishing inefficient and indirect taxes such as FID, debits tax, stamp duty or marketable securities, stamp duty on business sale transfers, stamp duty on mortgages, loan security documents and cheques.

It would seem that the banks are seeking to take up where the State Governments left off following last Friday's Premiers' Conference: what the Government's give to the consumer on the one hand the banks take with the other. It seems to me that the State Governments may have an effect, or it is possible for them to have an effect, on the attitude of consumers and the banks. It may well be possible for the State Government to facilitate the payment of wages to our thousands of public servants on the State payroll to either organisations or businesses which do not have these out-

geous charges or, alternatively, pay them in cash. Why should the banks profit off the backs of our hard working public servants. In the light of the foregoing, my questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Can arrangements be made to enable public sector employees to avoid excessive bank charges?

2. Is it possible for public sector employees to be paid in cash or, alternatively, deposit their wages into credit union accounts or other accounts which do not attract such charges?

3. What is the purpose of removing complex taxes on businesses and individuals as outlined in the Coalition's policy if banks merely intend to replace them with bank charges?

4. Why is it that the States should give up their right to impose bank taxes if the banks are merely going to collect the taxes for their own selfish benefit?

5. What does the State Government pay to banks in terms of charges and to which banks are these charges or payments made?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank the honourable member for his comprehensive set of questions. It will not surprise the honourable member that I do not have the answers to those questions with me in the Chamber. I am happy to take advice on those questions and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

TAXIS AND HIRE CARS

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning a question about taxis and hire-cars.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Today's *Advertiser* states that one of Adelaide's major taxi companies has launched an aggressive campaign against the relaxing of restrictions on hire-cars during Christmas. From today taxis in the Adelaide Independent fleet are displaying blue stickers slamming blue plate hire-cars as 'scab cabs'. In fact, slogans state:

Blue plate scab cabs; blue plate cheap entry; blue plate erosion of income; blue plate enough is enough; say 'No' to blue plates.

The company is refusing to send out samples. Apparently the only way a person can obtain one of these stickers is to be a cab driver working for the taxi company.

My office has received a number of calls today informing me that people (and the taxi drivers are assuming that they are inspectors) are ordering taxi drivers to remove the stickers from their car. One caller stated that he was ordered to remove the stickers from his car and that the instructions had come from the Minister for Transport. On 19 November—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: That is what they are telling them. On 19 November, in answer to my question about whether the Minister would review her decision in relation to blue plates, she said:

I can certainly ask the PTB to look at this matter again.

Following my question without notice of last Thursday, will the Minister be intimidated by this campaign and back down from her promise to have the PTB look at giving hire-cars extra days during the festive season?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The honourable member has really—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:—either deliberately or by the people who have informed him—distorted the issues. First, I am not a person to be ever intimidated by taxi drivers, hire-car operators or the honourable member himself. I have asked the Passenger Transport Board, as I indicated last week, whether it would again review the situation. I indicate that, some weeks ago, the Taxi Industry Advisory Panel and representatives of the PTB discussed the matter. The Taxi Industry Advisory Panel did not support 4 p.m. on 19 December as a date that hire-cars could be hailed.

The PTB, nevertheless, went ahead and approved, for the first time, the hailing of hire-cars on that day. I indicated in an answer to the Hon. Trevor Crothers that the PTB must strike a balance between what is required by this Parliament and the exclusive operation of taxis, in terms of being hailed for work, and the booking requirements of hire-cars. The Hon. Mr Cameron wants to upset that arrangement. Essentially the honourable member would be asking the PTB to defy that which the Parliament had set down and established as the working arrangements for those two industries and which we had confirmed subsequently in stricter regulations to clarify the role of the two industry groups.

I highlight that since 1994, however, every New Year's Eve the Passenger Transport Board has provided for hire-cars to be hailed for work. That has been a longstanding practice in terms of New Year's Eve. That practice has been extended on this occasion to Friday 18 December when the PTB, I think quite rightly, believes there will be a very big demand in the city, either as a result of work parties or late night shopping and that this should be trialled.

When I heard the member for Peake, Mr Koutsantonis, speaking on the radio this morning, I immediately remembered a press release that was issued by the Hon. Carolyn Pickles on 8 November. I was rung by the media at the time—that is, after the honourable member had issued the press release—and I was very pleased to see that she had said that—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes, but you support allowing hire-car drivers to seek fares in the same way—I think she means, although she does not have that in the press release: I think the word 'same' has been deleted—as taxis. I am pleased to see her support for the hailing of hire-cars at that time.

However, on this occasion the PTB has considered that there should be one further day. The honourable member's question clearly highlights that there are a range of views on this: from the Hon. Ms Pickles, who wants to just have New Year's Eve, to the Hon. Mr Cameron (former shadow Minister for Transport), who would probably like open slather for at least four—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: No, the four weeks.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: No, the Hon. Mr Cameron said to operate four Fridays and Saturdays before Christmas; that is what the honourable member argued last week.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Don't misrepresent me.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am not—on the four weeks before Christmas, the Fridays and Saturdays. I am not misrepresenting the honourable member; I am quoting the honourable member from *Hansard*. The honourable member said:

Surely it is only sensible to permit hire-cars to operate [on a hailing basis] the four Fridays and Saturdays before Christmas.

So, between the extremes of the current shadow Minister for Transport and the former shadow Minister for Transport for the Labor Party, I think the PTB has reached the right compromise at this time.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: Does the Minister agree, then, with the view of the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, that of the Hon. Terry Cameron, or, a third view, namely, that of the member for Peake, Mr Tom Koutsantonis, who has described as unfair the passenger transport initiative to allow hire-cars?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Actually, I—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have not called the Minister yet. I now call the Minister for Transport.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am sorry, Sir; I am just very keen to keep Question Time moving so that the Democrats can have their full entitlement to questions, if that is possible.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The President calls the honourable member when they get to their feet.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am sorry, Mr President; I will be very brief. I do not hold the view expressed by any of those Labor or former Labor Party members. I share the view of the PTB, that is, that New Year's Eve and Friday 18 December are appropriate for the testing of public response and for that to be reviewed. As I say, there is a proliferation of ideas. Certainly within the Labor Party there seems to be a muddle of ideas between what the shadow Minister wants and what the backbencher, Mr Koutsantonis, wants. It is worthwhile now having the contribution also of the former—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: —shadow Minister for Transport; we always welcome his interest in these matters.

TRANSPORT, HILLS

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about the review of the fare structure for Adelaide Hills passenger transport services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: The continued delay in the introduction of an equitable fare structure for the Adelaide Hills passenger transport services is a considerable source of discontent for people in the Hills region. Before the last State election, the Minister promised to consider the issue as part of a general review of the Passenger Transport Act, and in response to a question I asked on 21 July the Minister indicated at that point that she anticipated tabling the review within the next week and hoped:

... either then or a little later, to outline options that the Government is actively considering through the Passenger Transport Board to bring some equity and fairness to the situation of people living beyond Aldgate in terms of public transport fares.

When the review was tabled in Parliament on 13 August it merely restated what everyone already knew, namely, that the situation for Hills passenger transport fares was inequitable. In a ministerial statement issued on the same day, the Minister indicated that she expected to receive the board's recommendations in September and, in a response to a question a few weeks ago by the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, the Minister indicated the report had been received but that any considerations of the issue would now have to fit into the cycle of budget considerations of Cabinet. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Will the Minister indicate when the next round of budget considerations will be and what the time frame for implementation of any recommendations will be from the next round of budget considerations?

2. If the considerations are not favourable, does this mean that the people of the Hills will continue to get second-class treatment?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As the local member, the Premier (Hon. John Olsen) and I have stated, a new arrangement will apply from the start of the next school year in 1999. That is still the Government's intention. So, it is important that this matter be considered promptly by Cabinet, and I believe it will be very shortly.

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (29 October).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The following is a list of successful applications for open space grant funds 1998.

| Council | Project | Amount \$ |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| METROPOLITAN OPEN SPACE SYSTEM (MOSS) GRANTS | | |
| Holdfast Bay | Patawolonga | 20 000 |
| | Kingston Pk | 10 000 |
| Marion | Warriparina Reserve | 50 000 |
| Onkaparinga | Pt Willunga Ck Land Purchase | 45 000 |
| | Aldinga Scrub Washpool | 147 500 |
| | McLaren Vale Visitor Centre | 20 000 |
| Pt Adelaide Enfield | Roy Marten Park | 20 000 |
| Salisbury | Little Para River Land Purchase | 150 000 |
| Tea Tree Gully | Dernancourt Aquatic Reserve | 40 000 |
| West Torrens | Kings Reserve | 50 000 |
| SA Water | River Torrens Linear Park | 200 000 |
| Minda Homes Inc | Craigburn – Land Purchase Instalment | 260 000 |
| Mitcham | Brownhill Creek—Land Purchase | 250 000 |
| TOTAL MOSS | | 1 262 500 |

REGIONAL OPEN SPACE ENHANCEMENT SCHEME (ROSES)

| | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| Adelaide Hills | Stirling Linear Park | 43 500 |
| Alexandrina | Ramindjeri Coastal Strategy | 15 000 |
| Barossa | Lyndoch Village Green | 20 000 |
| Burnside | Olympic Sports Field | 50 000 |
| Cleve | Yeldulknie Reserve | 7 000 |
| Elliston | Locks Well Lookout | 5 100 |
| | Talia Caves Reserve | 12 000 |
| Forestry SA | Mt Crawford Forest | 8 600 |
| | Kuitpo Forest | 11 400 |
| Goyder | Redbanks Reserve | 10 000 |
| | Worlds End Gorge | 10 000 |
| LeHunte | Mt Wudina Reserve | 21 500 |
| Mt Barker | Mt Barker Linear Res Land Purchases | 110 000 |
| Mt Gambier | Cave Gardens Redevelopment | 20 000 |
| Renmark Paringa | Renmark Entrance | 50 000 |
| Streaky Bay | Doctors Beach Reserve | 9 000 |
| Unley | The Orphanage Land Purchase | 300 000 |
| | Forestville Reserve | 30 000 |
| Victor Harbor | Soldiers Memorial Gardens | 15 000 |
| Whyalla | Whyalla Wetlands | 48 700 |
| | Civic Park Arboreta | 26 400 |
| Yorke Peninsula | Daly Head Coastal Reserve | 10 000 |
| TOTAL ROSES | | \$833 200 |
| Overall Total | 35 Grants | \$2 095 700 |

RAILWAYS, GRANGE

In reply to **Hon. G. WEATHERILL** (28 October).

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In relation to the six week closure of the Grange railway line to accommodate arrangements for the Holden Australian Open Golf Tournament, TransAdelaide will provide a fully accessible bus service at a cost of \$33 624. This initiative by TransAdelaide will ensure that the people who would ordinarily use the rail service, have an effective, alternative bus service.

CORRUPTION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about corruption.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I am aware of an article by Terry Plane in today's *City Messenger* which leads him to a conclusion that there is plenty of work in South Australia for an independent commission against corruption, with the emphasis on 'independent'. I understand that a few days ago the Hon. Ian Gilfillan indicated that he would be supporting the establishment of an independent commission against corruption. Will the Government support any moves for the establishment of an independent commission against corruption in South Australia?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am tempted to answer it quite simply and say 'No,' and that is, of course, the answer. However, it is important to develop the reasons for that. I must confess that I was somewhat surprised to see the article in the *City Messenger* which sought to build up a scenario which would enable Mr Plane to conclude that there is plenty of work in South Australia for an independent commission against corruption.

One of the surprising issues to which he refers and which seems to form part of the basis for his arguing for the establishment of an independent commission against corrup-

tion is the fact that the DPP actually provided me with a minute in relation to the issue that was raised in the Parliament last week.

If one looks at that article, all I can suggest is that maybe the DPP might consider taking some legal advice to determine whether or not the article is defamatory of the DPP, because Mr Plane concludes in respect of that particular matter that it is all too cosy. That suggests impropriety, and quite obviously that is defamatory, particularly when—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Not the way the article is written. The way it is written, it is clearly directed towards building up a case which includes the way in which the DPP responded last week—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: —and an issue upon which I did make some response in answer to a question by the Hon. Mr Holloway, as I recollect. There is in fact nothing in the article to which Mr Plane refers that would suggest that we need an independent commission against corruption. He is trying to allude to a possible misleading of Parliament being a basis for an independent commission because he refers to the Ingerson matter. He refers also to the Anderson report. He also talks about the water and sewerage systems and a story about the privatised management being the subject of improper tampering with the tender process. He seeks to draw all those sorts of innuendos from a number of factual situations, ultimately issues which are matters for the Parliament and not issues which raise the question of corruption.

If one thinks about it and looks at what has happened in other jurisdictions in relation to bodies like independent commissions against corruption, criminal justice commissions or whatever, one would have to recognise that they have very wide powers. They have wide powers to obtain informa-

tion; they remove the protection against self-incrimination; they have wide search and entry powers; and, all in all, they have much broader powers than our police have. Yet, when one hears periodically about attempts to widen police powers, there is always, quite rightly, a genuine concern about broadening those powers.

If one looks at the police powers to deal with issues of corruption which might be alleged, one sees that they are already very wide. They have power to engage in telephone interception under the Federal Telecommunications (Interception) Act. They have power to install listening devices under the Listening Devices Act. They have power to search and they have power to question. All those powers in the past have been regarded as adequate to deal with allegations of corruption, whether they are at the public or the private level, and sufficient to get to the facts.

If members on the cross benches or opposite want to go down the path of an independent commission against corruption, they have to do so in the full knowledge that there will be very wide ranging powers. In effect, there will be no accountability, and there will be no sense in which there will be protection against abuses of individual rights when they go about their work.

I have said, from Opposition, when this was an issue prior to the 1993 election and when the Hon. Mr Sumner opposed the establishment of an independent commission against corruption, that the Liberal Opposition at that stage also opposed its establishment.

In government, we have not given any consideration to it. I have seen a couple of newspaper reports, but I can feel fairly confident that the Government would not wish to support the establishment of an independent commission against corruption. I must confess that I cannot believe that members opposite would want to support the establishment of such a commission if they look at the wide ranging powers which would have to be given to such a commission, and when they objectively consider the role of the Anti-Corruption Branch at the moment and our South Australia Police and their powers in getting to the truth.

In summary, I am concerned about the article written by Mr Plane. He is at liberty to write it, of course, but he also has to withstand any particular challenges which anyone may make to the innuendo which is implicit in it, if not a direct conclusion which can be drawn about impropriety.

I am also concerned about the proposition made by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan and indicate that certainly I do not support it and I do not believe the Government would ever want to support the establishment of such a commission in South Australia.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: As a supplementary question, is the Attorney-General aware of the fact that the former Royal Commissioner, Mr Fitzgerald, now regrets recommending the establishment of a criminal justice commission in Queensland and believes that the establishment of an Upper House in Queensland would have been better?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am certainly aware of that view. I do not think anybody has any doubt that an Upper House in Queensland would certainly help to improve government in that State. Those who advocate the abolition of the Legislative Council in this State need look only at the experience in Queensland. I think any fair-minded and sensible person would see that, notwithstanding the difficulties which we are currently having and which previous Governments have had with the Legislative Council and its

approach to legislation, there is no rational basis upon which to argue for its abolition in this State.

Sometimes I rather wish that, in dealing with legislation, the Council might deal with it in the same manner in which we used to deal with it. I do not want to go back to the past, but on the basis that Governments, of whatever political persuasion, always got their budget and budget legislation through, without the sorts of games that are being played, particularly in the Senate, one would hope that views might mature about that, rather than continue to be particularly obstructive on a number of issues in respect of budget and election policy.

So far as Queensland is concerned, I am certainly aware of what the former Royal Commissioner is now concerned to express publicly, and I agree with that view. The fact is that there is no need for an independent commission against corruption in this State and, even if there were, one would have to think very seriously about the powers that might be given to such a commission, considering also that the National Crime Authority has very wide powers and can work in conjunction with State law enforcement agencies if a reference is ultimately given to it to assist in getting to the bottom of anything which might have the connotation of corruption about it.

TORRENS ISLAND POWER STATION

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: Can the Treasurer confirm that the Government and/or its advisers have documents, information or advice which indicates that, if the proposed Pelican Point Power Station is operational by about November 2000 as planned, there is a possibility that the Torrens Island Power Station will have to be converted in whole or in part from gas to oil fuel because there will not be sufficient gas pipeline capacity to fuel both? Secondly, what are the environmental and cost implications, including the cost of producing electricity, if Torrens Island needs to revert to oil fuel generation?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am happy to take advice on that. In relation to the first question, based on the information available to me—and I will certainly have it checked—the answer to the question with respect to ‘in whole’ is ‘No,’ if that was the import of the honourable member’s question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No. The Hon. Sandra Kanck knows it, so she can stand up and answer the question. The honourable member has put around this furphy since she visited Torrens Island that there is not enough gas left in South Australia. She is entitled to that view—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Have you checked that?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, we have, and it is wrong.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Definitively wrong?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes. I am told that Torrens Island for quite some time has used a combination of both gas and oil in various circumstances, so the part answer to the honourable member’s question with respect to ‘in part’ is ‘Yes,’ and that has been the case for quite some time, but not as a result of the Pelican Point decision. I am happy to take advice for the honourable member and bring back a reply as soon as I can in relation to that.

The Hon. NICK XENOPHON: As a supplementary question, can the Treasurer direct his answer to the question of gas pipeline capacity—not the actual gas reserves but actual gas pipeline capacity?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will direct my answers to whatever questions the honourable member directs by way of substantive question and then supplementary question. So, whatever the honourable member addresses to me I will certainly address. If that is the way he has framed his question and supplementary question I will be happy to respond in that way.

CHILD ABUSE

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): I seek leave to table a ministerial statement issued today by the Hon. Dean Brown on the subject of the economic cost of child abuse and neglect in South Australia.

Leave granted.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT (SERVICE CONTRACTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 November. Page 240.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the second reading. This Bill arises from a series of recommendations made in a review of the operations of the Passenger Transport Board by consultants Bronwyn Halliday and Mark Coleman. It relates specifically to the size of contracts tendered by the Passenger Transport Board. The current provision under the Passenger Transport Act provides that service contracts for the provision of public transport services should not require the use of more than 100 buses. This has effectively determined the size and delineation of contract areas and has led to some negative consequences. The review of the Act recommended an improved means of controlling contract sizes other than the existing 100 bus limit, and the Opposition supports this amendment.

The Bill proposes that contracts should be awarded in accordance with a set of principles, which are outlined in the Bill. These are:

- that service contracts should not be awarded so as to allow a single operator to obtain a monopoly, or a market share that is close to a monopoly;
- that sustainable competition in the provision of public transport services should be developed and maintained;
- that the integration of public transport services should be encouraged and enhanced, and that service contracts should support the efficient operation of passenger transport services and promote innovation in the provision of services to meet the needs of customers.

The Minister will note that, whilst I am prepared to support the legislation, I have filed an amendment to ensure that a level of public accountability and transparency is included in the contract process and the application of the principles. The amendment will state that within 14 days of awarding a contract the Passenger Transport Board must forward to the Minister a report addressing a number of issues, which include:

- how the principles apply to the awarding of a particular contract;
- identification of the successful contractor;

- the terms of the contract;
- the regions and routes of operation under the awarded contract; and
- information on the amounts payable by the PTB to the contractor for their services.

Upon receiving the report the Minister must then lay the report before both Houses of Parliament.

The other issue I have concerns with is in relation to application of the first principle, in particular the wording, '... or a market share that is close to a monopoly. . . ' Given that TransAdelaide currently operates 75 per cent of the market, how will this definition apply? Can the Minister provide any advice in relation to the wording in the Bill, and what does the Minister consider to be a market share close to a monopoly? And is she able to give advice that TransAdelaide will be able to retain the 75 per cent monopoly share which it currently enjoys? I have distributed this Bill widely to unions and interested persons. Apart from some minor issues which I have outlined in my second reading speech, nothing significantly opposing this was raised. The Opposition supports the second reading.

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

TRANSADELAIDE (CORPORATE STRUCTURE) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 28 October. Page 50.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the second reading. This Bill seeks to corporatise TransAdelaide with the aim of maximising TransAdelaide's business opportunities by providing a commercial framework for its future. First and foremost, I would like to say that the Opposition continues to support public ownership of TransAdelaide. We will be seeking assurances from the Minister that the Government is committed to the ongoing public ownership of TransAdelaide. We do not want to see this corporatisation as a first step on a slippery slope of privatisation by stealth. As part of our normal consultation process we consulted widely with interested groups and all the unions that were relevant to this legislation. No significant objections to the Bill were raised, but there were some questions which I will address as we go through the second reading.

The first amendment that I would like to discuss is in relation to the proposed TransAdelaide board. The Opposition believes that a representative of the United Trades and Labor Council should sit on the PTB to best serve the interests of TransAdelaide workers. Considering the changes to the culture and structure that are being proposed in the Bill, it seems only appropriate that an employee representative have a voice in these deliberations. We also want some assurances about the selection criteria for members of the board, especially the level of expertise in the field its members have. The performance charter with the PTB, particularly in relation to the community service and the integration of services, will be another concern.

I must take issue with some of the claims made by the Minister in her report on the Bill. She claims that:

Over the past five years our [that is, the Government's] single-minded goal has been to provide more South Australians with greater access to more transport services for every dollar spent by passengers and taxpayers. . . Savings have been realised without compromising

existing services, new services have been introduced. . . and we have arrested the decline in patronage that has plagued public transport since 1982.

I take issue with the Minister on that statement. Public transport fees went up 7 per cent in the last State budget, despite the fact that the number of people using public transport is continuing to fall. The most recent annual report of the PTB, June 1998, shows that bus patronage has decreased 1.8 per cent, train patronage has decreased 1.3 per cent, regular fare patronage has decreased by 2 per cent and concession fare patronage has decreased by 1.5 per cent. Patronage in regional city bus services has also declined by 5.5 per cent. It seems to me that these are real issues of concern. I am unsure how the corporatisation of Trans-Adelaide will help turn around these worrying figures, but we can only hope.

The Minister's own figures state that patronage actually increased during the last Labor term of Government, in 1990-91 peaking at 56.86 million journeys (or 77.60 million boardings). We can compare these figures with those from 1996-97: dropping to 44.86 million journeys (or 60.14 million boardings). If the Minister has more recent statistics, I would be pleased to see them, but let us not muddy the waters any more on this issue.

My second amendment, which I will address in more detail in Committee, is about keeping the Government honest. While the Minister may have stated her intention to keep TransAdelaide publicly owned, we all know what this Government is like when it comes to keeping election promises, and we are about to debate a Bill that is a breach of an election promise. The amendment will state that the Crown or TransAdelaide must not enter into a sale-lease agreement unless the agreement has been approved by a resolution passed by each House. For drafting reasons, the amendment is quite complex. However, its purpose is to ensure that the Government cannot subvert the correct and appropriate parliamentary process.

The issue of workers' entitlements and conditions was also raised by one of the unions, and that issue is also uppermost in my mind. Some of the bus drivers to whom I have talked in recent times are very concerned about their personal future, particularly with all the changes that are going on. Will the Minister give an assurance that workers employed by TransAdelaide will not suffer any diminution of their terms and conditions as a result of this Bill?

A proposal was put to the Opposition that we should seek to amend the transitional provisions of this Bill along the lines of the South Australian Water Corporation Act but, having sought advice from Parliamentary Counsel, my understanding is that no employees will be moving from one area to another. However, I would like an assurance from the Minister about the future of the workers and reassurance for the union that wrote to me that there would be no effect on the terms and conditions of employment of the workers as a result of this legislation. With those comments, I support the second reading.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC (PROOF OF ACCURACY OF DEVICES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 18 November. Page 211.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the second reading. The Bill before us sets out to reduce the frequency with which police speedometers are tested. The current testing is undertaken every 14 days. The proposal before us is to extend that to every three months. In supporting this Bill, I note the different testing periods; for instance, Victoria and New South Wales test their vehicles only upon purchase, whereas Western Australia tests every three months. Given that the provision in the existing Bill was first introduced 60 years ago, it is reasonable to suggest that since then technology has advanced, resulting in far more accurate and reliable speedometers. I agree with the Minister's statements in her second reading explanation, highlighting the importance of accurate police vehicle speedometers. This is especially the case, given the tens of millions of dollars collected by the State Government in revenue from speed cameras and fines. I support the second reading.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MINING ADMINISTRATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 18 November. Page 215.)

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: My contribution will be brief. This Bill enables several administrative amendments to be made to the Mining Act 1971 and the Opal Mining Act 1995 to establish a mining native title register. The proposal before the Council seeks to have the native title provisions introduced in 1996, provided that the proponents wishing to explore a mine on land subject to native title must negotiate mining native title agreements with the holders. If an agreement cannot be reached or if there are no parties with whom to negotiate, the parties may seek a determination in the Environment, Resources and Development Court to enable exploration or mining to proceed.

The Bill also provides for the parties to nominate whether the terms of the agreements should be kept confidential or be available to the public for viewing. The Mining Registrar will be required to keep a register for public inspections which will include: details of the land involved; the exploration authority to which it relates; the parties bound by the agreement; and any other information that may be prescribed by regulation. Details required to be kept confidential may be inspected only by persons authorised under the Act. Other proposed amendments in the Bill include: allowing the mineral resources group to charge fees for services provided to the public and, where possible, to have full cost recovery; a scaling system of fees for advertising based on the size of exploration licence area sought (the larger the area applied for, the higher the advertising fee to be imposed); and removing an anomaly in the Mining Act for the charging of rental for exploration licences and introduction of fees to cover administration procedures in assessing and preparing safety net deeds. When enacted, the Bill will also remove certain fee anomalies to provide a more consistent approach to both the Mining Act 1971 and the Opal Mining Act 1995. At this stage, I support the second reading.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 19 November. Page 239.)

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I rise once again to speak to the adoption of the Address in Reply and welcome the opportunity to comment on the State of South Australia. We are very nearly at a crossroads in the history of this State. We have to decide where we want to go as a society. Do we want to continue down the present track of an increasingly polarised society of haves and have-nots, or do we want to live in a society where each person is valued for what they can contribute? In my previous Address in Reply contributions, I listed extensively the internal infighting of the Liberal Party in this State. Whilst I could easily once again spend considerable time listing its latest intrigues, I believe that the people of South Australia have already passed their verdict on Liberal Party disunity, at the last State election. I remind members of the Government that they have three years to go before the next election, and they will be surprised at how quickly it will come around.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: To reply to the Hon. Mike Elliott's interjection, I do not intend to discuss the internal machinations of the Liberal Party or the Labor Party or, I might add, of the Australian Democrats.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Because you don't know anything about it.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: That is not quite true. When you are the Secretary of a Party, you get information from all over the place, and I would be more than happy to pass on to the Hon. Michael Elliott who was giving me information about the Australian Democrats for seven years. One has only to look at the huge falls in the membership of both of the major Parties to see that people are becoming a little sick and tired of both of them. The number of people who are turning to alternatives has grown exponentially as a result of their political game playing.

To turn to a more serious matter, let me say that when we have three generations of unemployed in some families, when we have hospital waiting lists that force patients to wait unacceptable times and when our mental health services have almost collapsed—I could go on—we need to say 'Enough is enough.' I will take a few moments to outline the role I see for myself and the role I intend to take as an Independent member of the Legislative Council. I believe that the Legislative Council is a House of review and that it should not be used to frustrate the Government's agenda *ad hoc*.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Or rubber stamp it.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Or rubber stamp it, for that matter. I also add that this will be my attitude no matter who wins the next State election, whether we end up with a Labor Government, a Liberal Government or, heaven help us all, a Democrat Government. I do not intend to frustrate its mandate although, if the Australian Democrats win office, I suggest that I would have quite a few amendments to whichever portfolios the Hon. Sandra Kanck looks after.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: You will support all my stuff, though.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I generally find myself agreeing with quite a lot you have to say. It is one of your colleagues that I find myself disagreeing with.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I always tell you when I agree with you. It is not my intention to frustrate the mandate, no matter who is elected, even if it is a Democrat Government. As someone who has studied polls and watched political polling for many years, I can say that somebody ought to have a very close look at the number of seats that are now within striking distance of the Australian Democrats.

The Hon. Sandra Kanck: We have.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: My advice is more to the major Parties rather than to you. One has to go to the end of the pendulums to find all the marginal seats that we will have at the next State election.

The Hon. Sandra Kanck: Don't tell them, Terry.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I am sure that they can work it out for themselves.

The Hon. Sandra Kanck: They didn't work it out in Mayo.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Only their arrogance stopped them from working it out in Mayo. However, I will not give an open cheque to measures that I believe in good faith will be detrimental to the working people in this State. By 'working people' I mean our blue and white collar employees, our small business people, our farmers, our retired pensioners, people out of work, etc. To put it quite simply, my attitude to any legislation that comes before this Chamber will be based on the question whether the legislation is in the best interests of South Australia and its people, and I am committed to a number of important criteria: will it be good for our community; will it help get our State moving again; will it in any way impact on the unacceptably high number of unemployed; will it look after the battlers in our community, particularly those who lack a political voice in our system of government; and, finally, plain good common sense.

My decisions will not be based on outdated ideology, narrow sectional interests or a cargo cult sense of false dawns. Over the last eight years, the sense of hope and pride that the people have had in South Australia has slowly ebbed away. The sense of excitement and the dreams for the future we once had in this State have all but disappeared. In many areas where we once led, we now trail badly. We need to regain our confidence and our can-do spirit as a community and as a State.

Progress needs to involve us all: workers, employers, the young, the old, the rich, the poor, all South Australians, employer representatives, representative organisations and trade unions. In fact, it needs to be all encompassing and to include every section of our society. It is not good enough these days to work harder. South Australia must work smarter. That means getting the very best out of our educational institutions so that we can get our children and young people ready for the future, to position ourselves to reap the benefits of the highly technological world of the new century in this part of the world. After all, the Asia-Pacific area contains the bulk of the world population and, despite the current Asian economic crisis, in the short to medium term it will return to being one of the fastest growing economic engine rooms in the world.

If the currencies of countries such as Thailand, South Korea and a number of other South-East Asian countries are any guide, as are their stock markets, we are already seeing the first signs that, although they have a long way to go, those economies are putting in place the remedial economic measures which should see their economies turn around in the not too distant future. I believe that it is imperative to move

quickly to position ourselves to reap the benefits of our stable political, social, environmental and economic advantages that we enjoy here in Australia.

During the next period of time, that is what I am committed to working and fighting for: getting this State moving again; getting jobs, particularly for our young people; and putting back a bit of pride and respect for our community and its institutions. In other words, I will be trying to leave the people of South Australia with a view that they do have a future in South Australia.

I should like to talk about the economy in general and then discuss a few aspects of the economy. The most recent data available show the national economy is slowing down. Building activity and home loan approvals point to a deterioration in business and consumer confidence as the offshore economic woes spread to Australia. The December quarter Commonwealth Bank 'Prospects' report has shown the forecasted growth to be around 2 per cent for 1998-99, not a bad effort when one considers what has been happening with all our neighbours. In Australia, the outlook is uncertain, with forecast growth of about 2.5 per cent for the same period. Lower global economic growth and safe haven buying are pushing down interest rates so, while a severe recession is unlikely in Australia, the economy will slow with a possible decline in investment spending likely.

The Commonwealth Bank report asserts that the national unemployment rate will rise to between 8 per cent and 8.5 per cent over the next year with inflation sitting at around 2.5 per cent. Businesses have been urged to prepare for a serious economic slump in the next six months, with the local economy poised to buckle under the Asian meltdown. Access Economics, in its latest five year outlook, has warned industries competing in domestic markets against Asian imports that they should assume the crash position. That appeared in the *Advertiser* on 10 August 1998. Chris Richardson from Access Economics believes that the trade position will continue to deteriorate as domestic demand is driving imports, which could result in the worst trade balance for decades.

Those sectors that are likely to face the most difficulties are export oriented, such as tourism and import-competing manufacturers. Mr Richardson went on to warn that the combination of lower exports and a resilient local economy could create Australia's worst trade balance for more than 20 years. The growth in Australia's major trading partners will be far slower than the Federal Government estimated in the May budget. With six of Australia's eight largest export markets already in recession, any more reform fumbles in Japan could be an absolute disaster for the Australian economy.

Access Economics is forecasting GDP growth among Australia's major trading partners of just .4 per cent in 1998-99 compared with the Government's forecast of 1.75 per cent—quite a disparity (*Financial Review* 10 August 1998). The report also warns that 'a second wave' of financial turmoil could engulf Asia—although I think that that is looking less and less likely—and that the US economy could begin to run out of steam at the same time as Asian economies come back on line, once again causing more problems in Australia. Two new surveys of business confidence conducted by the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Victorian Employers' Chamber of Commerce and Industry indicate that companies remain very worried about the domestic impact of the Asian melt down (*Financial Review* 10 August).

I now turn to the current state of the South Australian economy—and what a sorry state it is. Business investment as a proportion of output has decreased marginally over the past six months with business investment levels edging down during 1998 (*Advertiser* 28 October). Underlying inflation has measured only 1.6 per cent during the past 12 months—well below the Reserve Bank's stated objective of 2 per cent to 3 per cent, giving another clue as to how difficult trading conditions are in South Australia, particularly for small business and retailers.

A slump in building work on non-residential properties was a disaster for the local building industry over the past 12 months. Figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that the total value of building work in the three months to the end of June was \$343.2 million—down 16 per cent on the same period last year (*Advertiser* 28 October). Of real concern is a recent survey of company directors by accountants KPMG which showed that 57 per cent of company directors expect business conditions to deteriorate and only 7 per cent expect an improvement in the performance of their companies (*Advertiser* 2 October).

Business investment is the key driver of long term growth. Here the news is modest. Business investment is increasing as a share of output nationally and locally, but South Australia lags the national share by a large margin (BankSA 'Trends' April 1998). Manufacturing investment has been essentially flat and investment in other industries has fallen away (South Australian Centre for Economic Studies July 1998). Private new capital expenditure for the March quarter 1998 was 38.4 per cent lower than for the March quarter 1997 (ABS Economic Indicators 1307.4: July 1998).

Of real concern is the latest business expectation survey from economists Dunn and Bradstreet. South Australian manufacturers reported that forward orders have fallen since March and show no signs of improvement (*Advertiser* 17 July). The quarterly report found that the rate of growth in the September quarter is likely to be the weakest of any time in the past two years. Expectations for growth in sales, orders, employment, inventories, investment and profits all showed a large decline. Overall business profits are expected to fall by 1 per cent over the next quarter while operating incomes are expected to rise 1.1 per cent in the short term and 2.7 per cent over the longer period (*Advertiser* 27 June).

Small business is also less optimistic, expecting no change in operating income and a moderate rise in operating expenses culminating in a 7.3 per cent profit slump. A recent survey of business shows that it has suffered its biggest fall in more than a decade and most companies expect growth in sales and profits to dry up (*Australian* 17 July). Many business operators, particularly in the wholesale sector, are no longer counting on a rise in profits this year—expectations for higher profits nearly halved from 43 points to 22 points, again the biggest decline in more than 10 years. The survey indicates that the rate of growth will be weaker than at any time in the past two years. The National Australia Bank's June business survey states that businesses are at their most pessimistic since the early 1990s, at the beginning of the last recession.

New ABS figures show that Australia's record run of negligible inflation could be finished. Inflation is set to climb marginally in 1998 and could climb even further in 1999 because households are yet to feel the impact of higher prices caused by the fall in the Australian dollar—although over the past two weeks we have seen the Australian dollar climb back up to a high of 64.6¢ against the \$US which is somewhat

encouraging. Average annual prices increased for the first time in 12 months with a .6 per cent rise in the three months to June. The Federal Government has now lowered its forecast growth rate of 3 per cent to just 2.75 per cent, and South Australia is in even worse shape with a predicted growth rate of 1.5 per cent—not even enough to keep unemployment at current levels.

New Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that South Australia's recent export trends are the weakest of all States. South Australia's overseas exports have fallen from a peak of \$5 billion while national exports continue to edge up. Between March 1997 and March 1998 the value of merchandise exports, where the final stage of production occurred in South Australia, fell by 2.3 per cent (ABS Economic Indicators). New Bureau of Statistics figures show that, during 1997-98, exports to South-East Asia, the Middle East and the United States all slumped. Whilst there have been some bright spots, particularly with wine exports, the full effects of the Asian financial crisis are only now beginning to be felt.

Cereal exports in South Australia fell from \$745 million to \$527 million and the car sector slumped badly with shipments reaching only \$479 million, down by \$178 million. Any national slow down induced by slower East Asian growth will tend to flow through to South Australia via lower interstate exports. On the other hand, the value of imports to South Australia has risen by 18 per cent when compared with the same time last year. The major commodities imported were machinery, manufactured goods, road vehicles and accessories. If these imports were mainly associated with machinery and manufactured goods there might be some reason to be hopeful but they are not (ABS Economic Indicators 1307.4: July 1998).

The full effects of the Asian economic crisis are yet to be felt by South Australia and we are facing a future of slow income growth and uncertain job futures. Access Economic's five year business outlook contains an alarming message for the Australian economy. It has warned that economic growth of Australia's major trading partners, mainly Asian countries, would slump to the lowest levels in 20 years—about a quarter of the rate before the onset of the instability (*Advertiser* 20 April). The Asian crisis will cut into South Australian business profits and employment with unemployment likely to rise even further, notwithstanding the decrease announced in the last figures where unemployment fell from 9.9 per cent to 9.2 per cent.

The effects of the Asian crisis could linger for up to five years and it does have a real potential to drag South Australia into recession. With the economic and political situation in Indonesia being a real concern, even worse is that the Japanese economy is in trouble. Figures show that Japan will be lucky to achieve zero growth this year and its credibility has been massively damaged. Japan's ability to drag itself from a protracted economic slump will be a key factor in determining South Australia's economic fate. Mr Acting President, at this point it is interesting to note that, approximately 20 months ago, you raised with me in your office the problems of deflation and the problems that Japan would face. I do not know into what crystal ball you were looking at the time but I checked my old diary—

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T. Crothers): Divine wisdom.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: —and it was 20 months ago when you first raised the matter with me. I thought I would check that because every time I come to your office you

remind me what you said so long ago. South Australia has lost almost 23 000 jobs—including 16 000 employing females—over the past 12 months. South Australia is the only State to record a fall in job numbers since July last year, with 15 100 part time and more than 7 700 full-time jobs disappearing (*Advertiser* 12 October).

It has been a particularly gloomy year for female employment with 11 900 jobs being lost for women in the 12 months to September 1998. In the same period, the number of women employed part time fell from 142 100 to 130 600, a decline of 8.1 per cent (*Advertiser* 3 November). South Australia was the only State where more females dropped out of the job market than entered it during the period, giving it the lowest female labour force participation rate in Australia. This jobs crisis will be compounded over the next few months as thousands of school leavers and university graduates flood the employment market. The situation has not been helped by the Government's continuing to slash public sector jobs over the past 12 months. According to the Commissioner for Public Employment, in the past 12 months 1 001 public sector jobs have been lost.

The Howard Federal Government continues on its slash and burn public employment policy, and more than 300 Federal public servants in South Australia alone will lose their jobs under a shake-up of Centrelink services. That is 5 000 jobs in Australia and 300 in South Australia. This is in addition to the 200 jobs that have been lost over the past two years. The Federal Government's claim that this will improve the efficiency of its services for the unemployed is beyond belief. Many of these will be in regional and country centres which have already been hit hard over the past three years.

The unemployment rate currently stands at 9.2 per cent in South Australia compared with 7.7 per cent for the national average. Once again, we still have the highest rate on mainland Australia. From memory, we have now held that title for three years in a row. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, a fall in South Australia was a result of a shrinking labour market with a percentage of people looking for work falling .2 per cent to 63.4 per cent (*Advertiser* 13 November). Depressingly, the unemployment figures for our southern suburbs show that Aldinga and O'Sullivan Beach have teenage unemployment rates between 31 per cent and 34 per cent.

The Centre for Economic Studies has adopted a gloomy attitude towards the State's falling jobless figures by predicting that employment will shrink by .5 per cent within six months and that unemployment could rise to over 11 per cent (*Advertiser* 13 November). The centre's figures go against the official Government budget forecast of a 1 per cent employment growth by predicting a negative .5 per cent growth by June next year.

According to Professor Walsh from the Centre for Economic Studies, the worrying signs for the South Australian economy were a slowing in the growth in retail sales and new capital expenditure and that the sales of new cars and new building approvals have peaked. Professor Walsh, in the latest November 1988 briefing from SACES, is scathing in his criticism of the State Government's economic strategy stating (and I must have read this in three or four articles):

I don't want to sound like a cracked record, but I have to say, once again, all the recent initiatives are indicative of—and in turn potentially suffer from the lack of—a clear, comprehensive, overarching State economic development strategy statement.

I agree wholeheartedly with Professor Walsh's statement, and it is a point that I have been pushing for a number of years now. It is time that we had a clear and comprehensive State economic development strategy statement from the Government. The Government really is all over the place with its economic policies and strategies and it shows—and I will revisit that later with a quick analysis.

With regard to globalisation, the Government appears to have little or no real understanding or analysis of the potentially negative impacts of globalisation and it has simply opened the door to try to get as much international investment capital as possible. The Government has ignored warnings regarding investment attraction and continues to use an open chequebook policy to attract companies *ad hoc* to South Australia. Despite the acceptance around the world by Governments to 'a shared commitment and economic vision between the public and private sectors' to be a crucial success factor, this Government has continued to argue that market forces should be allowed to determine the major industries and economic activities in South Australia.

Treasurer, if the evidence over the past five years is any indication of how the strategy of relying on market forces has worked in South Australia, I suggest that, if you have not had a good look at the state of the South Australian economy scene lately, you should do so soon. Quite frankly, the Government's approach to attracting investment, keeping it here and building our skills base for long-term employment opportunities in South Australia is not working. This type of thinking can be self-defeating, as it forces firms to cut down on research and development, training and long-term investment and instead to compete on the basis of prices and products in direct competition with less developed Asian countries where wage costs can be up to a tenth of what they are in South Australia.

Although it has been widely accepted for some time now that South Australia should move its base for competition from one of price to one of quality service, speed and image, and from mass markets to niche markets, the Olsen Government has continued to rely primarily on offering whatever subsidies or tax breaks are necessary in order to attract investment to South Australia. This can be self-defeating, as I have said before. It can lead to Dutch style auctions with investment being footloose and temporary. The recent case of Galaxy is a good example.

However, I am pleased that the Government is finally getting the message on unemployment and accepting how serious a concern it is for South Australians, and we might begin to see the first steps by this Government to address what has really been a blight on the economy in South Australia over the past seven or eight years.

The way in which we have institutionalised youth unemployment in South Australia makes me ashamed to call myself a parent, and makes me even more ashamed to say that I am a member of the South Australian Parliament, when up to one-third of our young people live in a society where they cannot get meaningful work. Unfortunately, many of them have dropped out of the work force and they just do not even bother to apply for jobs these days.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Centrelink has been a lot of help!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Centrelink has been no help whatsoever, as the honourable member has correctly pointed out. The Government, in response to calls for a job summit, has decided to hold a series of workshops. Well, I guess we could not call them a job summit, could we? They had to be

given some other name, so, rather than have a single job summit, it would appear that we are now going to hold a series of workshops. Whilst I believe in the approach being offered by the Labor Party in relation to the nature of unemployment, that problem would have been better served by a job summit than a series of workshops. However, I will not condemn it out of hand. At least it will give people and organisations an opportunity to have their say on how best to create new jobs in South Australia.

Unemployment and job security are the number one issues for most people in this State, and I was pleased to hear the Premier state that, in his opinion, he will be judged at the next election on his record on unemployment. Well, he had better get cracking because we still have the highest unemployment on mainland Australia. Unemployment is a blight on our society. It affects tens of thousands of families, and I do not think there would be one person in this Parliament who either does not know someone who is directly out of work or does not have someone within their extended family who is out of work. Unemployment has become such a scourge in our society that it now impacts on everyone.

It affects families across all income levels, residential and age spectrums. I noticed with interest a recent article in the *Advertiser* in which the IMF has criticised Australia's failure to lower unemployment and tariffs. The IMF has said that jobs stand out as the most challenging economic problem and suggested that unemployment benefits be cut after a time to encourage jobless Australians to look for work. That is one suggestion that I hope—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: They don't have to get elected, do they?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: No, and it shows in their statements. One only has to look at some of the prescriptive measures that the IMF forced upon Indonesia to see what happens to its advice. One could be forgiven for suspecting that the IMF announced its increases on petrol, heating oil and diesel oil in order to get rid of President Suharto. I was in Jakarta at the time these measures were increased, and quite frankly they sent a shudder of fear through the entire community. That is the kind of advice the IMF is handing around—advice which directly triggered off or acted as a catalyst to trigger off what was a mini revolution that occurred back in May.

Getting back to the prescription about cutting unemployment benefits, that is one suggestion that I hope the Howard Federal Government has the good sense to ignore. It is saying that the unemployed have only themselves to blame for this situation, and if they would only try harder they would find employment. Quite frankly, the jobs are just not out there. As to all this nonsense and rubbish that people go on with that the unemployed queues are full of dole bludgers, drug addicts and people who will not work, I can accept that that might apply to some of them, but I suggest that is a real minority.

It has always puzzled, confused and bemused me the way in which the Conservatives look at this question of unemployment. Their answer to it is, 'The jobs are out there; why can't people go out there and find them?' I would like you to go out and tell that to the tens of thousands of young boys and girls aged between 15 and 20 years of age who are out there in the community at the moment trying to find work. Is it any wonder that our young people turn to drugs or crime when a third of them are out of work?

I do not mean out of work for just a few months. I am referring to some young people who have not had a decent or proper permanent job since they left school. That is, young

kids who left school at the age of 15 or 16, and who are now 19 and 20, have not been able to find one permanent job. There is now a trend by employers to offer casual or part-time employment. Full-time jobs in our society quite frankly are disappearing.

The IMF even suggested that the unemployed should be cut off from the dole after a period of time and left to fend for themselves. I cannot think of a more callous and unrealistic suggestion to help solve unemployment. Unemployment is a problem which our society as a whole has to address. It is no good any one section of society pointing to the young, for example, and saying, 'Look, it is all their fault. They should go back to school so that they can get a decent job.'

One only has to look at the under-utilisation of graduates that come out of TAFE and the universities now to see that keeping all our kids at high school until they have completed their matriculation and sending them all off for two, three or four years of tertiary education will not solve the problem at all. It just shifts the problem from an unskilled area to a skilled area. But that is the IMF's prescriptions for you: increase the misery of our unemployed and force hundreds of thousands of decent Australians off the dole, and that can only mean that things such as crime and drug usage will increase.

Youth unemployment has received a lot of media attention. Unemployed people aged over 40 are often the most difficult to get back into the work force and are more likely to remain long-term unemployed. I must say that it does not matter whether you have qualifications or no qualifications: if you are a male over 45 years of age and looking for a permanent job, your chances are not good at all.

The recent moves by the Howard Federal Government to cut retraining programs and to outsource the Commonwealth Employment Service has been a disaster for the unemployed, particularly the over 40s, who rely heavily on the retraining programs to help them reskill and get ready for the work force. It is unacceptable in any society that people aged 40 are to be thrown onto the scrap heap and considered unemployable. It is an enormous waste of a society's skills and experience.

I urge this Government—and I know it is aware of the problem—once again to go back and look at this question of youth unemployment and, in particular, to look at the problems, particularly of the long-term unemployed males aged 40 years and over.

Turning to small business, as at 30 June 1998, 63 100 small and medium-term businesses employed about 210 000 people in South Australia and provided almost half of the State's private sector jobs. It is estimated that those enterprises produce a total of 45 per cent of our State's gross domestic product. The importance of small business means that their prosperity directly affects the health of the whole South Australian economy. They are also a seedbed for innovation and provide the foundation from which emerging technologies and larger businesses grow.

Over the last 12 months, the small business sector has simply been marking time under this Government with flat conditions well entrenched. Small business support for the State Government has plunged to its lowest level since the final days of the Arnold Labor Government in October 1988, and I would suggest to the Government that, if it wants to get any answers or some of the reasons why its vote fell over 9 per cent at the last State election, it need go no further than the small business community. I would suggest that its

support amongst the small business community is the lowest I have ever seen it.

The Yellow Pages' small business survey shows that only 8 per cent of small businesses approve of the State Government's policies, while 20 per cent do not and for 70 per cent they are having no impact. Those figures are taken from the *Yellow Pages Small Business Index*, August 1998.

Another survey undertaken by the Small Retailers Association brought to light the concerns of many small businesses, including 44.2 per cent saying that current economic conditions have resulted in a decline in their businesses; and 61.3 per cent stating that poker machines have had a negative influence and have impacted on profits. I will say more in a couple of weeks about poker machines, the AHA and the disgraceful campaign that it is running. I did intend to do that today, but time does not permit me to do so. If anyone believes that small business does not have a view about poker machines, all I can suggest is that you are not talking to them.

A total of 59 per cent of small business oppose the introduction of a GST, with just 23.9 per cent willing to vote Liberal and 17.4 per cent willing to vote Labor at the next State election. I guess that can only be considered good news for the Australian Democrats, because that means that nearly 60 per cent of small business in this State are looking for someone other than Labor or Liberal to vote for.

This Government has consistently been unable to reconcile the contradictions between the big business interests which influence it and the small business constituency which the Liberal Party erroneously assumes is its own. I believe that this Government has failed to adequately protect small business from exploitation by big business in commercial transactions, where there is a total disparity in their relative size and strengths; for example the retail tenancies legislation and the Fair Trading Act.

Time and again small businesses have brought to my attention their concern over the increasing stranglehold that the major shopping chains have on the market. I guess I can say, Mr President, now that I do not belong to any political party, that from my observations and from the way that I look at it, it was the Australian Democrats who picked up the concerns of small business some five or six years ago. The Labor Party has followed on behind it, but from my observation—and maybe it is the arrogance of being in Government—the Government is still to learn that, as far as small business is concerned, the Government is on the nose.

The situation in relation to small business versus big business is that we have a situation which is unhealthy, anti-competitive and, I believe, contrary to the long-term public interest. I have been concerned for some time now that many small businesses operating in South Australia do so at a substantial disadvantage because there is a material inequality in bargaining power between them and big business. As I have said before, this Government takes the small business vote for granted yet, whenever the choice has been between small business and the big corporations, the big corporations win every time.

This is an area which needs urgent action and it is one in which I will be taking a greater interest over the next 12 months. I hope to reintroduce my Bill with amendments to the Fair Trading Act. I hope to be putting legislation before Parliament next year in relation to the proliferation of shopping centres and their expansion which continues unabated in this State. I believe that before any more shopping centres are allowed here in South Australia an

impact survey ought to be done on how they are going to affect not only the local community but the local small business community.

I have stated many times before in this place that the public health sector is in crisis. First, I state at the outset that I believe that a health care system is a fundamental expression of social unity. Equal status in confronting the common experience of illness and death should be paramount. I might add at this point that I do not belong to any medical health benefit fund. I would go to a public hospital, although the way they are being run down it makes one wonder whether one ought to go out and join a medical fund system.

In 1996 I outlined the social costs of the reductionist strategies implemented by the first Brown Government and the continuation of these strategies by the Olsen Government. I informed members that the leadtime would be lengthy before cuts to services would be reflected in service delivery. We are five years down the track and they are now becoming increasingly apparent.

The Government claimed that the contracting out of the management of Modbury Hospital would produce significant savings to taxpayers. Healthscope itself promised a saving for the Government of \$6 million. We always get the announcement on how much money is being saved, but the Government is very slow to come forward with any kind of proof whatsoever that these savings have been made. In fact, to the contrary: Modbury Hospital has proved to be a financial millstone around Healthscope's neck. The hospital is experiencing a financial crisis. It is already negotiating with the Health Commission for assistance with a budget bail-out package (*Advertiser*, 10 November 1998).

Unfortunately for those who live in the northern and north-eastern suburbs, maximising profits is not a concern to ensure an efficient and effective duty of care. Profits, I believe, should not be the driving force in health care delivery. As a result of Healthscope's pursuit of profits more jobs will be lost as a private management firm sets out cutting casual and agency staff in order to save \$300 000 from their budget. Staff morale is at an all-time low and they continue to operate under stressful conditions and uncertainty regarding service delivery.

Services are being slashed and beds are being closed in order to reduce a potential budget blow-out. The emergency surgery service has recently been cut in half as this funding crisis continues. Seven and a half hours of emergency surgery has been cut, reducing the service from a seven day a week, 7 a.m. to 10.30 p.m. service to a six day service, from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. Well, the voters out there in the north and northeast have only three more years to wait before they express their displeasure about what is going on at Modbury Hospital.

To add to this, the post acute community care program, run in conjunction with other agencies, faces abolition. Elderly people leaving hospital will be most affected by this cut. If Government members do not realise that they are already on the nose with the elderly about some pretty poor decisions by the Federal Government over the past two years, then once again they have had their heads in the sand. Now only a basic nursing and showering service will be offered for a limited period of two weeks. In contrast, patients previously had the option of nursing care, a 24 hour emergency service, and household help for patients was offered for up to eight weeks. These cuts will result directly in post acute patients being without vital help around the home.

This is clearly another example of profiteering at its worst. Even the Auditor-General in his report criticises the Health-

scope contract. The Government seems to have realised its big mistake in contracting out the management of Modbury. Recent comments made by Minister Brown rule out further outside contracts for the management of this State's hospitals. Well, you cannot accuse the Government of being quick learners can you? People in the northern suburbs are not alone when it comes to reduced services. The western suburbs residents are also feeling the burden of the Government's lack of concern for this State's public hospitals.

Queen Elizabeth Hospital has undergone massive cuts to its budget over the last five years. If that is not enough, the future of the hospital is yet to be determined. Recent reports highlight the hospital's plight, as it desperately tries to function within a limited budget. For example, in order to save nearly \$100 000 of its budget, one day a week has been cut from the outpatients' clinic. These rolling closures will affect at least 1 000 patients in the areas of respiratory, diabetes, neurology, rheumatology, kidney, cardiology, skin and asthma. This translates into 55 days being lost over the next seven months, including three weeks over the Christmas period. These closures are unprecedented and are another example of the mismanagement by the Government of the State's public hospitals. The lack of funding for public health in this State is unacceptable.

As we have seen over the last few weeks, mental health is another area of grave concern. Three senior mental health executives have resigned in the last month. They argue that the system is either dramatically underfunded or funding is incorrect or inappropriate. At present, no-one has the overriding responsibility for mental health. The system is disintegrating before our eyes. For example, we see ineffective functioning of the 'acute crisis teams', the 24-hour emergency services to patients in acute crisis.

Patients and their families are becoming increasingly worried and uncertain about where or who they can turn to. For anyone with a mental illness or with a loved one who has a mental illness this can be and is becoming life threatening (*Advertiser*, November 1998). In fact, crisis team callouts have risen by 65 per cent. In February last year, teams had made 4 984 contacts, which had risen to 8 694 in December of the same year. Even the Minister agrees that demand will only increase, but we see public mental health in an appalling state. Structural problems in mental health urgently need to be addressed. Funding is inadequate and it seems as though the Minister does not know whether he is coming or going. One can only hope that he is going.

The closure of the Glenside Hospital is a classic example. First it was on the agenda; now it is being reviewed. Uncertainty surrounds mental health, which is detrimental to those with a mental illness and their families. So far we have seen the death of two patients as a direct result of ward closures at Glenside Hospital. It would seem that the only way to get any care at present within the public mental health system is for a patient to be at crisis point, but it is often too late, with many patients crying out for help, but ending in suicide.

As I have asked repeatedly, what kind of society do we live in if Governments can let this continue? The very core of our society is being eaten away as this Government devolves its duty of care to protect people as families and communities (Auditor-General's Report, June 1998). This Government is plagued by an obvious lack of planning and a coherent long-term strategy in mental health policy. They were the two main criticisms I had of the Dean Brown Liberal Government when he was Premier of this State, that is, that there was no coherent long-term planning or strategy in

relation to the South Australian economy. Whilst I can see a bit of improvement in this area, it is certainly lacking in mental health. Policy changes are acceptable if research and planning is evident and sufficient funding is allocated. However, this is not the case and has not been the case since the election of the Liberal Government in 1993. I believe this needs to be addressed right across the spectrum of human services.

In relation to education, the Hon. Mr Olsen has often been quoted as saying that the Government is seeking to position South Australia as the clever State. I am still waiting for our computers. In this State the confidence in our public education system is steadily waning. The Liberal Government seems intent on maximising the bottom line at all costs. It is rationalist economics gone mad. In September this year, the Government announced a further saving of \$3 million a year from the education budget. How did it do it? What clever answer did it come up with to further reduce the education budget?

Minister Buckby announced that the school year would be progressively shortened over the next two years by a total of one week. Has he not seen the latest figures on students in South Australia completing their matriculation? The figures have been declining rapidly ever since this Government got into Office. Quite frankly, the situation is ludicrous—although I bet not too many families are laughing. Many two income families—and there are a lot of those in the community at present—and sole parent families struggle to provide child care during the Christmas school holidays as they juggle their own annual leave. Parents' finances will be stretched even further as they are forced to find extra money for child care services or are forced into leaving their children on their own at home.

Families have to pay not only additional school fees as they find schools being forced to increase fees but for a reduced school year. With the Government intent on fixing school grants over the next three years, schools have no choice but to raise parent contributions. If you are really worried about the education budget, you could always save more money by keeping the children home permanently. The changes that have taken place in our education system and reducing the school year will have a direct impact on younger children who will miss out on that extra week of learning, reading and writing basics which, according to the Government, are essential. Older high school children will also miss out on the vital help they need to look for jobs. At the same time as schools are trying to assess their financial and staff needs for the next school year, we have the Minister linking the pay and work conditions of teachers with the unconditional acceptance of further funding cuts to education. Many schools are not able to inform parents where their child will be placed in 1999 or who their teacher will be—more uncertainty for families.

Since this Government has come to office, we have witnessed hundreds of millions of dollars being ripped out of public education. It now wants to strip the budget by another \$100 million over the next three years. Where will this all end? Many children with learning difficulties or special needs will be directly affected, with programs such as flexible staffing and special education funding being conditional on teachers' accepting a wage offer which includes the Government's debt reduction strategy. This would likely affect early intervention, literacy support, special education and technology programs. This flies in the face of a teacher's top priority and Government responsibilities to ensure students

achieve their full potential—just another reflection of the Government's intent to cut costs at the direct expense of student learning.

To further add salt to the wounds, from 1999 schools will face an increase of students returning to school as Federal Liberal Government policies come into force. Changes under the common youth allowance scheme mean unemployed people under the age of 18 years will no longer qualify for benefits unless they are engaged in full-time education or training. As a result of this, over 1 000 students are expected to be forced back into the school system next year. Most of these students have been out of the system for some time—some for as long as three years—and they will need special programs as the standard SACE will not work for them. There will inevitably be an overburdening of teachers and resources which will result in the reduction of the quality of education for all students.

As members can see by these examples, public education in South Australia has been reduced to a poor state. South Australia once led the nation. It is now at an average level or trailing the country in the education stakes, on many of the indicators. The people of South Australia deserve better. If we truly want South Australia to be the clever country, governments need to provide sufficient resources to ensure that we retain and maximise the benefits of a high quality public education system.

It is estimated that 1.8 million or 11 per cent of the population live below the poverty line. This includes 600 000 of our children, and this should be a cause for concern. The gap between the rich and the poor is increasing as many families face the threat of losing their jobs. One has only to go into the streets of Adelaide of a night time to see that homelessness is on the rise. It is a fact that unemployment—particularly long-term unemployment—generates poverty and hopelessness. Without adequate employment through full-time employment, many families fall below the poverty line.

Recent unemployment figures serve to highlight the increase in part-time employment and the decrease in full-time work. As many members would agree, if you do not have a full-time job, you are devalued in our society. In a market economy, income is a significant determinant of the ability of an individual to reach their aspirations. In general, levels of income correlate closely with wealth, home ownership, health status, education attainment, employment and social status. However, poverty is a complex social issue which goes beyond the level of income. Poverty can be linked to social isolation, and personal, family and community difficulties. Thousands of South Australian families are living on the edge. Poverty and unemployment remain unresolved, while at the same time essential services are being reduced. Many people in metropolitan and regional South Australia are hurting as a result of this Government's reductionist social and economic policies.

In conclusion, South Australia faces great difficulties. The challenges that lay ahead of us here and the decisions—and many of these decisions will be tough and painful—that we will need to take to enable us to progress to get South Australia moving again I am afraid will not be easy ones. However, history shows that South Australians are used to adversity. In the past, we have shown that we can work together to overcome the most difficult of obstacles. It will take a lot of faith—faith in ourselves, our skills, our talents, our institutions, our ability to solve the problems that we face

together, and in our political institutions that have been severely attacked and worn away over the past few years.

The Hon. P. Holloway: I note that you didn't say, 'Faith in the Government'.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I said faith in all Government institutions. I was about to conclude, but I am quite happy to talk about the faith that the people of South Australia have not only in the Government but in the Opposition. However, I can see that members are anxious for me to conclude. At the end of the day, we do not enjoy some of the natural advantages that other States do and we do have a geographical disadvantage. That has not stopped us in the past and it should not stop us in the future. If there is one thing on which every member of this Council would agree with me, it is that we want to get South Australia moving once again.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I wish to make some comments in this Address in Reply debate and, as is traditional, I congratulate His Excellency the Governor on delivering his speech to the Parliament, although I do not welcome as warmly the content of it because such speeches are written by the Government. I want to make some comments about the economic circumstances facing the country, and the Hon. Terry Cameron addressed that matter in his speech. Today I heard the Prime Minister say that we have the best economic circumstances for generations. I think they were the words he used. I am a bit worried when people make that sort of comment, because similar things were said in 1929, just before the Great Depression, and I am sure that people said it in the late 1980s, before that recession.

However, it indicates that the economy of this country has certainly been transformed over the last 20 years, and a lot of those decisions were made by the previous Labor Federal Government. Our ability to cope with the Asian financial crisis is due in no small measure to the restructuring and the financial decisions that were taken under the Hawke Government. The floating of the dollar and other fundamental decisions have enabled us to deal with those problems. Indeed, it was interesting to note that, when the Prime Minister came to office just over two years ago, he conceded that the economy that he inherited was in good shape.

I turn now to the fishing industry. Members will recall that, in a speech earlier this year, I referred to the history of the pilchard fishery and what I thought were some of the events in that fishery which required attention by the Government.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Since the Treasurer has talked about the Hon. Ron Roberts, I remind the Council that the Hon. Ron Roberts mentioned the St Vincent's Gulf prawn fishery in his Address in Reply speech, and he spoke about the mismanagement of that fishery. The decisions about which he spoke came about because of some political deals entered into by this Government. They were well outlined by the Hon. Ron Roberts. I would like to speak today about the pilchard fishery because both fisheries have much in common. They reflect what I believe is fairly fundamental mismanagement, and that goes back to some political interference in the fishery, and I will say more about that later.

These last few months have seen an interesting pattern emerge. I have taken an interest in the pilchard fishery and I have commented in the past on practices which in my opinion were detrimental to the fishery and to South Australia

as a whole. On 9 July this year, I detailed to the Council the recent history of the South Australian pilchard fishery and my concerns for its future. In the past, those concerns have been dismissed by the Minister. These concerns, which are shared by pilchard fishermen, relate to the quota system introduced by the Government this year, which allows members of the Australian Tuna Boat Owners Association the chance to enter the fishery, thereby competing with the pilchard fishermen for feed for their own tuna farms.

At the time that action was taken, I questioned the process by which the decision had been made, and to this day I have not received a satisfactory answer. The justification for this extra allocation was made on the basis that the total allowable catch for this year was increased from several thousand tonnes in the previous year to 11 500 tonnes. The reason for the low tonnage in the past was a result of the pilchard fish kill which occurred in 1995. This year, both the department and the Minister were confident that such an increase could be justified, thereby allowing an increased participation in the fishery.

I will not repeat my concerns on this occasion relating to the deal that was done between the Government and the Tuna Boat Owners Association, which I believe led to this agreement. I am referring to what was discreetly called the memorandum of understanding entered into between the Liberal Party and the tuna boat owners prior to the 1993 election. My concerns on that matter are on the public record, but I believe that the situation bears further scrutiny, given the recent catastrophic fish kill, which has decimated—or even worse—the pilchard fishery. The full tragedy of the pilchard fish kill has yet to impact on the South Australian fishing industry. This kill is approaching epidemic proportions, and I noticed in the *Australian* last week that a figure of 100 000 tonnes was mentioned, but whether it is as high as that I do not know. Certainly a vast number of pilchards have been killed by this epidemic.

The cause of this kill has been identified as the same virus that caused a similar number of deaths in 1995. However, we have been told that the source of the virus might not be identified for some time. Fisheries Director Gary Morgan, who is, I am told, the only public servant authorised to speak on the fish kill, has from the start played down the threat to the South Australian fishing industry. Early reports quoted Dr Morgan as stating that fears that a virus had caused the kill were unsubstantiated. That appeared in the *Advertiser* on 9 October this year. Later he put the cause of the deaths as a cold upswelling of water from the Southern Ocean. That was on 13 October. Eventually Dr Morgan accepted what had been suspected from the start, that a virus had caused the massive pilchard fish kill.

My concern has been that this fish kill was a repeat performance of the 1995 kill. At that time, an unidentified virus was discovered to be the cause. According to departmental documentation from that time, there was concern that:

A pathogenic organism may have been introduced into the local pilchard population from the introduction of imported pilchards.

That comes from a Management Plan for the Experimental Pilchard Fishery, South Australian Fisheries Management Series Paper No. 13 from November 1995. This report was one of a number that was conducted to try to find the cause of the 1995 fish kill. I am astounded that three years later we are no closer to finding the cause of the fish kill and pilchard fishermen are suffering once again because of it.

When it became apparent that the 1998 fish kill was turning into a serious threat to the industry, I called on the Government to investigate the potential that a foreign source was responsible for the kill. That was not an idle point-scoring action on my part. The reports that I will deal with later in greater detail raised great concern that the source of the 1995 fish kill could be exotic. Upon making this request, I was immediately attacked by the Minister who accused me, via a press release on 21 October this year, of a lack of understanding of the industry. He also stated that we must determine the reason for the pilchard deaths, a statement with which I wholeheartedly agree. It appears that the Government has been saying one thing but doing the opposite.

The Minister also accused me of calling for a ban on imported pilchards. I have never made that call because I am well aware of the impact that it would have on the local industry. However, I have consistently asked for an investigation of imported pilchards to take place so that they could be included or eliminated as a possible cause of the disaster. I was astounded by the Minister's personal attack, because my call for an investigation into imported pilchards as a source of the virus was a valid one, backed up by the local industry and later carried out by the department. While early tests have shown no virus in imported stock, the tests are very restrictive; therefore the results are limited. I might add that there has been little information by the Government in relation to what tests have been undertaken. Indeed, there has been a veil of secrecy—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: That is right. A veil of secrecy has been drawn over this matter by the Government. I have since called on the Minister to carry out more detailed research on the imported pilchard stock. Some weeks ago I raised with him a series of questions relating to the testing and as yet I have not received any response.

The situation soon turned farcical. Dr Morgan has been reported as trying to make the fish kill into some kind of bonanza for pilchard fishery research. He stated that until now 'nobody has been prepared to look at similar kill-offs around the world as being caused by a virus'. Perhaps Dr Morgan and his department have not taken that step, but I believe that other countries, such as South Africa which has experienced similar kills, have been investigating a virus as the cause of such kills.

This fish kill will have a devastating effect on the industry, not just in South Australia but interstate. I am sure that members would be well aware that reports have surfaced from Victoria and Western Australia, where those States' industries are now seeing the fish kill spread into their waters just as it did in 1995. Our Minister and department continue to try to play down this catastrophe. Dr Morgan was reported recently as calling it 'just a natural event' (*Age*, 29 October). Such comments lead us no closer to the source. In Parliament recently the Minister, in answer to a question, stated (*Hansard*, 27 October):

I take the opportunity to put on the record facts about this serious issue which is of concern not just to the fishermen but to the public in general and to correct some of the speculation and unsubstantiated information which has been put around concerning what is happening with pilchards.

I am not quite sure what the Minister meant by 'speculation and unsubstantiated information', but if he means concerns expressed in the media about the cause of the pilchard deaths being foreign or calls on the Government to act quickly

perhaps he should read his own statement a bit more carefully. In that same answer the Minister states:

It [the Consultative Committee on Emergency Animal Diseases] is... looking at the possibility that it [the virus] was introduced through an agent such as ballast water or aquaculture feed, through the import of pilchards or that it is a further outbreak as a result of what happened in 1995.

It appears, therefore, that the calls for an investigation into the cause of the pilchard fish kill being of foreign origin is at least being taken seriously by other Governments. In a press release dated 21 October 1998 the Minister called the link between the deaths and imported pilchards 'unsubstantiated'. I do not disagree, but it is important that every possible cause of these deaths be thoroughly investigated, and that is what this Government has been most reluctant to do.

I take this opportunity to consider in more detail the reports released after the 1995 fish kill and compare their findings. The Interim Report on Pilchard Kills in Australian Waters, dated 26 June 1995, was prepared by the Pilchard Mortality Task Force coordinating group in response to the widespread pilchard deaths in 1995. This group looked at possible causes of the deaths and was not able to rule out what it termed 'an exotic pathogen' (page 5). Possible scenarios for the deaths therefore included the introduction of a pathogenic organism in imported pilchards (page 16). It is my understanding that the final report of the Pilchard Mortality Task Force is currently being completed, some three years after the original kill and in the midst of a new kill.

A further report looking into the deaths, but taking a wider picture of the industry, was the Report of the National Task Force on Imported Fish and Fish Products, which was released in December 1996. I might point out that this task force arose directly as a consequence of the original pilchard kill. The terms of reference for this report included an examination of the 'nature and extent of reliance by Australian fishing and aquaculture industries' on imported fish products. The report found (page 1):

Unlike the situation for traditional commercial animals where quarantine is based on many years of studied and progressive development, Australia has to date imposed very few quarantine restrictions on the importation of dead aquatic animal product.

The report recommended (page 138):

That support of research into development of products such as artificial feeds for farmed tuna or artificial rock lobster baits, designed to replace imported aquatic products associated with disease risk be continued.

It was apparent that the threat of a virus originating in imported stocks was being taken seriously, although we should also look carefully at the Federal Government's response to this report. The Federal Government's response looked at each of the report's recommendations in turn and accepted most of them. Importantly, it accepted the recommendation as stated above. However, I am not aware of this type of alternative to imported fish stocks being advanced in the industry.

The response stated that while there was a recognition that improved knowledge of what is entering Australia would assist in the effective management of aquatic imports it was believed that AQIS already had effective screening procedures. Fundamentally, the report stated:

AQIS believes the existing tariff codes do not allow the gathering of sufficiently specific information to assist it with the longer term development of fish import policies based on an assessment of the risks involved.

While the Government accepted the recommendations set out in the national task force's report it does not appear that action on these recommendations has furthered the investigation of links between disease of local stock and the introduction of imported stock.

In October 1997 the Australian Bureau of Agriculture and Resource Economics conducted a review into the 'Economic Effects on Australian Southern Blue Fin Tuna Farming of a Quarantine Ban on Imported Pilchards'. ABARE looked at the question of banning imported pilchards due to the concern that imported pilchards may have been to blame for the 1995 fish kill. The report stated (page 1):

Two possible disease pathways to the aquatic environment are the use of imported frozen pilchards as feed for tuna farmed in sea cages and their use as bait in longline tuna fishing, recreational fishing and the rock lobster industry.

The report recognised that the possibility of the virus being introduced into Australian waters could 'not be rejected' (page 2). The report eventually found that, if a ban was put in place, while pilchard fishers were projected to be better off, the 'total economic welfare of tuna farmers and related industries could be reduced' (page 22).

By the same token, the report also found that the possible negative economic effect of such a ban would have to be balanced by the potential for further damage to the local fishery if such a ban was not placed on imported pilchards. The report saw that a 'partial' ban may be the best possible outcome as it would exclude 'only those uses where the pathway for disease transmission is assessed to be significant'.

Finally, I wish to refer to a report which takes a very direct position on the possible connection between the 1995 fish kill and imported fish stocks. A report from the Fisheries Department of Western Australia titled 'Environmental and Biological Aspects of the Mass Mortality of Pilchards (Autumn 1995) in Western Australia', dated October 1997, takes a very critical look at the Interim Report of the Pilchard Mortality Task Force. This report makes a far stronger conclusion than any report mentioned so far. Its conclusion states (page 3):

The most likely cause of the massive mortalities of pilchards in Australia during early 1995 was from a novel herpes virus to which the Australian pilchard population was naive and whose origin was, therefore, most likely to be exotic.

There is no suggestion made that this conclusion should be read as a possible cause amongst many other possible causes. This report lays the blame on what it sees as the 'most likely' cause, given the evidence available—that of an imported virus.

The report makes comparisons with the findings of the Interim Report of the Pilchard Mortality Task Force and finds the interim report wanting on many levels. Where the interim report gives a possible cause of the 1995 fish kill as (page 87) 'activation by environmental factors of latent infections of virus... already present in the pilchard population' the Western Australian report can find no evidence of such a cause. However, it states that—and I point out that this is like the 1998 fish kill—the disease was rapid and progressive, and fatal. The Western Australian report found that this was consistent with (page 88) 'fish exposed to a novel pathogen for which they have no previous experience or resistance'.

Further, the Western Australian report considers the interim report's suggestion that the fish kill was caused by phytoplankton. The Western Australian report directly

contradicts this possibility, stating that there is no relationship between the kills and phytoplankton.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Are you the shadow Minister for Agriculture?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Primary Industries, yes. The Western Australian report took exception to the interim report's suggestion that, while an imported disease could not be discounted, there was no evidence for or against the implication of an exotic pathogen (page 89). On the contrary, the Western Australian report stated that there was ample evidence that a pathogen was involved in the mortalities. The Western Australian report looked carefully at each possible cause of the 1995 fish kill and could only conclude that the cause was exotic.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Indeed, the Hon. Legh Davis is correct: the Hon. Ron Roberts does know a lot about this. I suggest that the Hon. Legh Davis read the Hon. Ron Roberts' Address in Reply contribution, particularly as it relates to the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery. The honourable member might then learn just how badly that fishery is managed, because it is very similar to the story we are telling today about pilchards.

Even after this report had been released—after earlier reports could not discount imported pilchards as the cause of the 1995 kill—the Minister still had the nerve to play down this possible cause—going out of his way to implicate my concern into some kind of conspiracy of speculation and unsubstantiated information. The fact is that the Minister and his department have not even been able to bring themselves to concede that imported pilchards may have been a cause of the fish kill. No-one is saying that they are, but this Government could not even concede in the early days, despite all the evidence that I have just given, that it was a possibility. Only after the production of overwhelming evidence has it even conceded that it is a possible cause.

The most consistent conclusion from reports released so far is that an exotic pathogen was the cause of the virus that killed many thousands of fish in 1995. I certainly will be interested to read the pilchard mortality task force's report when it is finally released. I fail to see how this current fish kill could not have been prevented, given the amount of time and money put into researching the causes for the previous kill. How much more damage will the local industry suffer before the cause of the 1995 kill is discovered?

I am also concerned about the lack of information being provided to the industry by Fisheries SA. I understand that the Western Australian Fisheries Department (Fisheries WA) has briefed local commercial fishermen at least twice on the spread of the virus and its impact on their industry.

This brings me to the present day and the current situation in the pilchard fishery, further complicated by the recent fish kill. While we are awaiting a decision on the 1999 pilchard quota, it is obvious that the fish kill will dramatically reduce the number of pilchards and therefore the quota. The question will be, 'How will this affect the industry? Which fishers will be disadvantaged?' The Australian Tuna Boat Owners Association (ATBOA) is a powerful organisation, and I have no doubt that it will be working on behalf of its members to gain the best possible outcome. ATBOA will not take kindly to being removed from the fishery after working so hard, ever since the 1993 memorandum of understanding, to be included. This uncertainty will cause further trauma for the local pilchard fishermen.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: That was unlawful.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Yes, indeed it was unlawful, as my colleague points out. This serious issue facing the fishing industry must be resolved decisively. Until now the Minister has apparently chosen to take a hands off approach, allowing the participants to decide amongst themselves how the pilchard quota will be divided. This extraordinary arms-length approach must end, especially in the current circumstances and especially when the responsible body has been loaded in one particular direction. Our local fishing industry will be in dire straits if decisive action is not taken soon by the Minister. I certainly await with interest the recommendations of the pilchard fishery working group in relation to the 1999 pilchard quota.

More importantly, the industry and I will be keen to receive further reports on the cause of the 1998 fish kill. We should be able to expect updates from the Minister on a regular basis, but I will not hold my breath. Why is it that the Western Australian department and its officers can communicate with their fishermen to advise them what is going on, whereas in this State there is an absolute veil of secrecy. As I said earlier, I understand that only the head of the department has been able even to make comments on this matter. What a contrast with other States that communicate with those involved in the industry and whose very livelihoods are affected by some of these events.

I wish to touch on a very recent case which relates to this matter and the World Trade Organisation, which was raised in a question by the Hon. Ron Roberts last week. Canada brought a complaint against Australia's decision some years ago to ban imported salmon. This decision was challenged by Canada through the World Trade Organisation on a number of grounds, one of which was that Australia's policies on importation were inconsistent, in that, whereas Australia had banned the importation of dead Atlantic salmon for human consumption, imports of pilchards were permitted, even though the evidence was that some of these posed a much greater threat to this country's fishing industries than did the imported Atlantic salmon.

Indeed, that apparent hypocrisy in this country's position on the import of Atlantic salmon resulted in Canada's complaint being upheld by the World Trade Organisation on 6 November. Australia has been given 30 days to respond to the decision. Going through that evidence, it is interesting to note that one of the scientific experts who was advising the panel which made this decision made the following comment:

... we have many examples where fish diseases have been transmitted with the movement of live fish. . . two examples. . . are, I think, particularly relevant, where marine fish species are now seen as a major risk for movement of fish diseases when used in feeding aquaculture species. Australia is certainly familiar with the pilchard epizootic that occurred. . . and while I do not think scientifically proven. . . there seems to be at least some supposition that that agent may have been introduced by the use of raw marine fish from the Southern Hemisphere, in South America (Dr Winton, page 226).

The panel made specific comment about the lack of consistency in Australia's quarantine rules, calling the different measures 'most egregious' (or outstandingly bad). This is my concern: while it is convenient to ban one species to ensure economic benefits to a local industry with no regard for World Trade Organisation regulations, the possibility that another industry could be destroyed because of an imported species is either ignored or played down by quarantine officials and Government departments alike. So, we are experiencing a rather unhappy episode within the pilchard fishery in this State and, indeed, within many other fisheries.

What do we do about this? Clearly, this episode raises many issues in relation to quarantine, which is a Federal responsibility. I believe that the national task force report, which is a very good one, relating to these issues gives us some guides about where to go. We need the Federal Government to be serious about implementing the recommendations of that task force and providing the resources to the relevant authorities to ensure that they can deal with these issues.

Clearly our quarantine laws, as they relate to marine species, are well behind those laws that relate to land based animals. A lot of work and research needs to be done in a very short time if we are to minimise the risk that is posed by diseases transmitted from other marine species.

The lesson to be learnt is that we clearly need more openness on behalf of the South Australian department and the Minister. As I have said earlier, a veil of secrecy has been thrown over the handling of this entire episode, and I think that we can understand why that might be. Of course, if it were to be revealed that the source of this virus was due to some importation of fish, then of course it could give rise to questions of liability that might result in massive costs. Indeed, if it were to lead to some ban on imported pilchards, huge costs would be involved to the tuna industry in this State.

It is for those very reasons that I have been cautious in my calls for action to be taken by the Government. I have not said that we should ban the imports of pilchards at this stage, and particularly since the current tuna feeding is over for this year. However, we cannot ignore the fact that this may be a cause. We must do everything we can to establish what has been the cause of this pilchard fish kill so that we can take the proper action in the future. What we do not need is a Minister who puts his telescope up to his blind eye like Lord Nelson and refuses to see the obvious in front of him.

I will also make some comments about other aspects of fishing policy because I believe that, at present, there is much unhappiness within certain sections of the fishing industry of this State, and the cause of them goes back to much the same reason. I believe that, in many ways, the management of fisheries is too Party-political and, if one looks at the way in which decisions have been taken in certain fisheries, one can well understand why those sectors of the industry are very unhappy with the current management.

One case to which I will refer briefly relates to the fishing management committee representatives of the marine scale fishing industry. A number of complaints have been made about the means by which representatives of the fishers in the marine scale fishery have been appointed as their fishing management committee representatives. The first two FMC representatives were selected by a committee of three and a number of concerns have arisen over the several years since that appointment was first made about the way in which those appointments were made.

Indeed, I attended the AGM of SAFIC (South Australian Fishing Industry Council) on 29 September at which a direct question was put to the Director and/or the Minister by one of the fishermen at that meeting. He asked when these fishing management committee positions would be advertised for marine scale. A clear commitment was given at that meeting (which I attended) by Gary Morgan, the Director of Fisheries—and, presumably, it was with the Minister's agreement because he was present at the meeting—that the positions would be advertised by November this year. Apparently, within a week of 1 November, that promise had been broken.

I have heard from fishermen who discovered, first of all by some rumours, that the FMC positions had been extended rather than some consultation being sought about advertising for those positions. That has now been confirmed. Is it any wonder that there is considerable distrust particularly in that sector of the fishery with the Minister and the Director when at the annual general meeting of SAFIC they were promised that these positions would be advertised, only to find out that that had not taken place? That almost sums up the way in which the fisheries of this State have been managed over the five years since the Liberal Government came into office.

As I said at the beginning of my speech, many of the problems which occurred in the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery and to which the Hon. Ron Roberts referred in his Address in Reply contribution and the problems to which I have referred to today and on previous occasions in relation to the pilchard fishery were a result of deals done by the Liberal Government, particularly those done prior to its election. And, in my view, it has tainted the management of fishery to this day.

I believe that the first priority that is needed for the fishing industry of this State is a restoration of scientific principles as the basis for fisheries management. What is urgently needed is that the management of these fisheries be depoliticised.

I will raise on a later occasion a number of other issues in relation to fisheries management. The management of fisheries in this State is in a mess and we urgently need to do something. As a final comment, though, I refer to aquaculture. In that area we have seen that the Development Assessment Commission committee that was looking at aquaculture projects has been disbanded by this Government. This means that previous decisions that were considered by that committee apparently are now being resubmitted and reheard, and this means that people who had a reasonable objection to them or had taken an interest in them now have to put their cases completely again.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Yes, perhaps if they had things would have been a bit different. However, a lot is wrong within the fishing industry at the moment, and what it needs more than anything else is some openness, some frankness and, more urgently than anything else, some depoliticisation because, if that does not occur, some enormous dissension will arise in that industry in the very near future. Although I will certainly say more about some of these fishing industries at a later date, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I support the motion, and I will focus on points contributing to or culminating in our current state of affairs. In the 1989 State election the ALP won government without a popular vote. In 1991, the State Bank collapsed. In 1992, Premier Bannon resigned. In 1993, the State Liberal Party won by a landslide majority. The Opposition Leader at the time, the present Premier (Mr Olsen) must really believe that there is a God because, if in 1989 he won the election by between 53 and 54 per cent, history might have shown that it could have been Premier Olsen who had to resign in 1992 and it was the Labor Party that had a landslide victory in 1993—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: We would have done something about the State Bank, though, George. We were asking questions in May 1989 about the State Bank. Are you trying to rewrite history?

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I am absolutely thrilled that the Hon. Legh Davis has interjected because, no matter what you read either in *Hansard* or the newspapers to try to find out what the agreement was when the Adelaide Bank amalgamated with the State Bank, one must ask what the agreement was and who agreed. The Labor Government, the Liberal Government and the Democrats did so, in order to stop Treasury interfering with a private enterprise and without the con man who was running it. The honourable member knows that as well as I do. If the honourable member asks his Premier about it, that Premier will tell the honourable member that, without any shadow of doubt, he was a very lucky man. The honourable member can ask him that because I have already asked him myself.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Weatherill has the call.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: In 1993, the Liberal Government set up the Commission of Audit. The first thing mentioned by Premier Brown about the report of the Commission of Audit on 3 May 1994 related to a \$10 billion black hole. I do not know why this \$10 billion figure keeps coming into the matter, but a \$10 billion black hole was talked about. It was just like the Howard Government in 1996, when there was an alleged \$10 billion black hole, and there was such an outcry in relation to the newly elected Hawke Government in 1983. Such was the crisis in government that the momentum was used to defend everything that the Liberal Government did, even though the then Premier pledged to rebuild, reduce debt and restore standards of key Government services and regain public respect for the institution of Parliament. We all know that there is not a lot of respect for the institution of Parliament by the people out there who vote for us.

The then Premier said that South Australia had a clear choice between restoring an affordable and efficient public sector relevant to the present and future needs of South Australians or of maintaining a public sector which has become inefficient and a growing burden and drag on South Australia's economy and social well-being. Mr Brown prefaced this with the statement that he and his Government had a continuing commitment to consultation and equity. Well, he kept his word, I must say, because with respect to TSPs throughout the public sector, the number of Public Service full-time equivalent positions has decreased from 103 300 in 1991 to 76 391 as at 30 June 1997. The Education Department, amongst others, has been gutted, with a brain drain on service provisions. The first—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: You reckon? Who writes yours?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L.H. Davis: I write my own.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I knew there was a problem. The first and greatest number of people to receive targeted severance packages were those employees in the over 45 years of age bracket. There is supposed to be no discrimination against age in South Australia at the present time, but it seems that everybody who turns 45 is unemployable.

I now want to talk about privatisation for privatisation's sake. We have had promises galore from the former Infrastructure Minister, Mr Olsen, such as 60 per cent of Australian ownership, millions of export dollars and cheaper water. Well, the results do not show that. We see 100 per cent

foreign ownership, \$180-odd million profit leaving Australia in one recent year, and prices going up, with an average increase of 25 per cent. In February 1997, the cost of the first 136 kilolitres of water increased by 43 per cent. This is what privatisation does. They do not privatise these things and buy into these things unless they will make a profit. The only person who pays for that is the average punter out there, and we all know that.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: What about the Commonwealth Bank, Qantas and Telstra?

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: The wrong thing again: I agree with you. With respect to the governance and arrogance of the City Council, the last leap of the then Premier Brown was to attempt to sack the Adelaide City Council. On 24 November 1996, the *Advertiser* headline read, 'Council sacked by end of year.' It should have read, 'Brown sacked by his mates at end of year.' Amongst other things, we have seen a cold blooded power lust. Reporters repeatedly present the quagmire of paranoia and non-communication with Government ranks. *Hansard* bears testimony to the use of leaks in white-anting their own Government. At every second step we expected a leadership challenge, while the Premier used his soldiers to consistently cover his rear end. Little did he know that some of his soldiers might rat on him.

I refer now to the State election. With its lies and larceny, it was the most public humiliation in what must have been the greatest number of seats lost by a one term Government. As to the Bovver Boys budget in 1997-98—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Are you talking about Pat Conlon here now?

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: No, we are talking about your group. The Premier and Treasurer were accurately depicted on the front page of the *Advertiser* as thugs, holding lengths of timber in a threatening manner: we sell ETSA or your pocket cops a beating!

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: That is what it says—read the *Advertiser*. And the *Advertiser*, according to the Hon. Legh Davis, is never wrong!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I turn now to strategies to attract businesses to South Australia. In particular, I refer to Motorola. We are yet to learn if the House of Assembly will unequivocally support Mr Olsen in the face of allegations that he misled Parliament over the lack of process by which Motorola won a multimillion dollar contract. This is remarkable, after Mr Olsen said on 6 July 1995:

It is absolutely critical—and the Leader should know this and understand it—that the integrity and probity of the bidding system is kept at the highest level.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Why don't we have a commercial break; seek leave to adjourn, and we will get you another speech writer?

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: No, it is fine. This is going well.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Are you happy with this?

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: Yes. It is hurting like hell. It must be—you keep interrupting.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. George Weatherill will stick to the script, please.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I was going to seek leave to include it in *Hansard* without reading it, it is so good! South Australia lost almost 23 000 jobs from October 1997

to October 1998, more than 16 000 of which employed females. Recent cases of downsizing include Clarks Shoes, Channel 9—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Could you downsize this speech of yours?

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: No, this is going all right. They also include Perry Engineering, Malco Pty Limited, Australian Submarine Corporation Engineering, Berri Limited and Brighton Cement. The Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Women's and Children's Hospital had 114 redundancies with a cost to the Government of \$2.5 million. There were 101 TAFE redundancies at a cost of \$5.5 million. The total number of redundancies for 1997-98 in the South Australian Public Service was 885, with packages amounting to \$35.5 million. Teachers fear for 1 000 jobs which are affected by proposed budget cuts. On 3 May 1994, former Premier Brown stated:

I am sure South Australians would be prepared to pay more for an important service like education if there was demonstrable evidence that the much higher cost guaranteed much better education standards and facilities for our children.

South Australian school retention rates dropped by 25 per cent in the past five years. It was the sharpest drop of all States, and was most prevalent in the semiskilled and unskilled households.

We suffered an epidemic of depression, especially significant amongst our youths. It was a tragedy brought on (at least in part) by the neglect of this Government, and shown in the education system, the work force, the health system and the hopelessness of this Government, and it was felt in the hip pocket mostly by average and below average income earners.

In relation to poverty, South Australia has three of the four poorest areas in Australia, with the nation's highest metropolitan jobless rate (12.8 per cent) in Adelaide's north. There has been an 80 per cent increase in poverty Australia-wide since the 1970s. Almost half the welfare agencies are swamped and turn people away. Sixty-five per cent of welfare agencies experienced increased demand for help over the past six months: 46 per cent were turning away more low income and disadvantaged people without providing assistance; 23 per cent were not coping with current demand; 56 per cent said that their resources were stretched; 20 per cent have had to decrease their level of service; 25 per cent have had to ask staff to work more unpaid hours; and 44 per cent of agencies are pessimistic about their future.

In relation to health, 20 per cent of South Australians think that health services range from poor to very poor. Miserable, penny-pinching, cost cutting exercises inconveniencing up to 1 000 patients a month at the QEH alone by delaying appointments—only to save \$100 000—indicate a hospital system dramatically under-financed. With hospital budget blowouts, service deterioration and staffing redundancies, the deterioration continues. The mental health system is in turmoil, with resignations and sackings, all pointing to under-financing and ignorance. Occupational health and safety receives scant attention, with the number of claims relatively stable although there have been more than six times the number of road accidents, and the Government wants to do away with uniform regulations, with specific industries devising their own standards.

Violence suffered by the community, both domestic and otherwise, was experienced by 23 per cent of women and 12 per cent of men, and there is a backlog of child abuse cases in the Federal Court. On the subject of crime, theft appears

to have risen, with violent robberies in August 1998 double the average and the number of armed robbery victims seeking counselling with the Victim Support Service increasing by 34 per cent during 1997-98. Robberies with violence have increased by 60 per cent, while the theft of motor vehicles has increased by 44 per cent in one year. The increase in house breakings is seen as being tied to drug habits, and there may well be an increasing drug culture in our young Aboriginal population.

The Attorney-General and Minister Brown signed an agreement over a year ago recognising the need for action. Thus far, no meetings have been set up with the Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee, and there are no plans to curb Aboriginal deaths in custody. These figures are a damning indictment on this Government. I could go on and on for the next two hours about the problems that people in the community are putting up with, but I would just like to turn my attention to some of the comments that the Hon. Terry Cameron made today about his concern over unemployed people in South Australia. He seemed very concerned about unemployed people. I wonder how many people he can get jobs for if he allows the legislation to go through selling ETSA and Optima. I do not think there would be too many jobs out there.

I find his comments about support and the trade union movement very difficult to understand when he is absolutely destroying the Electrical Trades Union by his actions in this place. The only credit that Mr Cameron will ever get from me is that he has the distinction of being the only Party Secretary in South Australia who has ratted on the Labor Party—and not only in Australia but, I would say, in the Commonwealth and in the world. He would be the only person ever to have done what he has done to a Party of which he was the Secretary.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I thank all members for their contribution to this debate. This is one of the very few opportunities that members in this Chamber have to wander far and wide without fear of being brought back to the subject matter of the legislation or motion at hand. They are able to address a variety of issues, some of which might have a direct relationship to the work of the Parliament while others might be just a comment on a variety of other issues occurring at the time in the broader community throughout Australia or the world, as some members have commented during their contribution. It is not possible for me in the time available to respond directly to comments made by all members, but I did want to respond to a handful of issues that have been raised by a number of members during this contribution.

I congratulate members on their contributions. I did not have the opportunity to hear all the speeches although I heard a majority but, having read through all the speeches, there were some excellent contributions to the Address in Reply debate on this occasion. A number of members have clearly done a lot of work in terms of their preparation for the debate. A couple of issues that the Hon. Carmel Zollo raised in her contribution struck a chord, not only with me but with, I presume, most members of Parliament. In her contribution she asked:

Why are politicians' conditions of employment always described as 'perks', for example, but a 'salary package' elsewhere in society? One is often made to feel a sense of shame for being elected to Parliament, rather than experiencing the honour and privilege of representing the interests of our fellow South Australians.

And she made other comments of that nature. That is a huge issue for all of us as members of Parliament. I know from my brief time in Parliament—I should not say 'brief'—from my 16 years in the Parliament. It is a very long brief! In the greater history of time, of course, it is just a brief portion, but in those 16 or so years we have seen a significant reduction in the esteem with which people hold members of Parliament and the Parliament as an institution.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It must have started about 16 years ago, the Hon. Terry Roberts suggests! I am not sure whether or not there is direct correlation, but it is an important issue for all of us as members of Parliament. Many of us who have been here for a good period of time tend to grow a thick skin but, in the end, that is not the solution. It might be evolution, but it is not the solution to the problem. But the poor regard in which members of Parliament are held is not felt just by members of Parliament, who perhaps grow a thick skin and become more immune or protected from the criticisms as the years go by, and who may be less sensitive to that criticism.

However, members' friends and families in particular always find it difficult. Enormous credit should go to Val Griffin, the Hon. Trevor Griffin's wife, for her letter to the Editor. I know members of Parliament and their spouses or partners—regardless of their political complexion—privately applauded her willingness to speak out on behalf of her Trev. As I said to the Hon. Trevor Griffin, I do not know anyone else who calls the Hon. Trevor Griffin 'Trev'. I must admit that he never struck me as a Trev. I have a vision of a Trev as being rather more burly than the Attorney, wearing a blue singlet, perhaps with a V.B. in hand.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Or an accent.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I don't know about an Irish accent. Nevertheless, he would be a little larger than our Attorney-General. Again, my congratulations to Val. I have known her for many years, and she spoke out on behalf of her husband. However, she was really speaking out collectively on behalf of the species of politicians. It is time for members and their partners and friends to speak out. It is one of those strange things. It is a bit like teachers. If you ask most people about teachers, they are generally critical of them as a profession. However, if they happen to know their own son's or daughter's teacher on most but not all occasions they will think more highly of their son's or daughter's teacher.

That generally tends to be the case with criticism of politicians. More often than not—and, again, this is not always the case—people will criticise our politicians for being bludgers and a variety of other things. However, if they happen to know the politician—for example, it may be their local member or someone with whom they have worked—it is a different story. That is true, whether they be a Liberal or a Labor politician. There is no ready solution. In her contribution, the Hon. Carmel Zollo did not even attempt to put forward a solution to the problem. However, she readily identified a problem not just for members, their partners and their families but for the Parliament as an institution. If people cannot at least treat the Parliament as an institution and members of Parliament generally with some degree of respect for the difficult task they seek to undertake, our society and community are the poorer for that.

I do not intend to go into all the causes for that. Many of us will appreciate the increasing closeness and interrelationship between the media and their pervasive coverage of politics. Television is a particularly good example of this,

given the instantaneous nature of its coverage and the criticisms conveyed within it. Something might happen in Queensland and be broadcast nationally a minute later. That broadcast might criticise what a politician did, and that serves to sully us all in terms of politics and the Parliament. I congratulate the Hon. Carmel Zollo on what she has said. I am sure she, in her way, will seek to do what she can, as all of us in our way will seek to do what we can, to attempt to lift the level of esteem at which the community holds the Parliament as an institution.

The Hon. Carmel Zollo also made some comment about excessive levels of executive packages for State and Federal public servants. The only comment I would make in relation to that is that all Oppositions are attracted to making fairly easy criticism. I know the Opposition has compiled a number—and I do not have the number with me—of people in the public sector generally who are earning salary packages of more than \$100 000—and shock-horror there are now 100 or 200. A significant number of those, probably 30 of those—the increase from this year to last year—came in with the preparing of ETSA and Optima for the national electricity market, where we were seeking not only to attract but also to retain a range of senior executives within their organisations so that they can compete in the national electricity market.

The bottom line is that it is an easy criticism for Oppositions to make. All Oppositions will make those criticisms; that is part of the political cycle. In the end, the reality is that we have to accept that, given the nature of our semi-government businesses, statutory authorities or our big agencies such as Human Services which are now controlling budgets of \$2.5 billion a year, we have to pay our senior public servants and statutory officers at a level that is greater than \$100 000 as a total salary package. It is an easy headline to say shock-horror we now make such payments to an extra 40 senior executives, fat cats or whatever pejorative expression you might like use to describe our senior public servants.

We as members of Parliament are sensitive to what we see as unfair criticism, and let me assure the Council that the senior executives of our public authorities, our statutory authorities and our departments are also sensitive to the criticism that they feel is unwarranted and unfair. Yet here they are trying to manage a \$2.5 billion budget or, if its education, a \$1.5 billion budget. Sure, they are paid more than \$100 000, or as a chief executive they might be paid more than \$200 000. However, ultimately you get what you pay for. If we continue to attack our senior public servants and, in effect, bolster the criticism of the media and the community that these people are fat cats—

The Hon. Carmel Zollo interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I did read the rest of what you said. I am not saying that the Hon. Carmel Zollo called them fat cats but that she, in her contribution, identified a criticism of the excessive salaries paid to the corporate executives and the generosity of executive packages, including those for senior State, Federal and local government public servants. That is the comment I am making. I am not suggesting the honourable member used the phrase 'fat cat'. However, others do, and they feed on the criticism that in some way anyone who is being paid more than \$100 000 in terms of a total salary package is in some way being disproportionately remunerated by the taxpayers for the job that they are undertaking.

The Hon. Carmel Zollo interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On that issue I am quite happy to have a discussion with the honourable member. When the

Prime Minister of the country is being paid \$180 000 for helping to run the country and you compare that with the executive packages of people both in the public and private sectors, that is a sad indictment of the feeling towards parliamentarians' pay and the Parliament as an institution. I do not intend to extend the commentary in relation to salaries. I stand up as a member of the Government and place that on the public record for those who want to criticise our chief and senior executives. I do not suggest that the Hon. Carmel Zollo has made a meal of this. However, Kevin Foley, Mike Rann and a number of others continue to make a meal of the fact that a significant number of public servants are being paid more than \$100 000.

As always, I read the Hon. Trevor Crothers' contribution (and I feel comfortable describing the Hon. Trevor Crothers as Trev)—

The Hon. T. Crothers: Big Trev!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, T.C. or whatever. All of those descriptions, and others.

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, T.C. the senior. Even T.C. the junior would recognise that and bow to your being described as T.C. the senior. As always, I enjoyed the honourable member's contribution to the Address in Reply. He was able to wax lyrical across a whole variety of issues, talking about the GST, compulsory education, sovereignty, and assorted other issues—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: But not voluntary voting in unions.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No—including the Democrats and the Republicans, and Tony Blair. I must admit I had not heard this, so I was intrigued when I read the Hon. Trevor Crothers' contribution on the notion of political correctness. I will read it again for the public record for those who did not hear his contribution. It reads:

When John Howard was first elected he said, 'There will be no more political correctness.' I inwardly cheered as I had had enough of political correctness. I used to nearly weep when I saw vociferous minorities being rewarded by various Federal Governments with big slabs of 'keep quiet money' whilst the long-suffering, silent majority of Australians went without. John Howard's position, however, on political correctness was short lived. Indeed, during the lead-up campaign to the last election we saw Prime Minister Howard trading politically correct blows with some of the best in the business, and what's more, he won the contest. Oh, how the mighty have fallen!

As I said, I was intrigued by the Hon. Mr Crothers' observations on political correctness because it is unusual for a member of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia to be quite so frank, as the Hon. Mr Crothers has been in some recent speeches, both on the sale of our electricity assets and now in the Address in Reply debate, demonstrating his willingness to tilt at the windmills of correctness that have been outlined by some members of his own Party and Governments of both persuasions.

The Hon. Ron Roberts contributed another six or seven pages on raw prawns. I confess that I did not read all of his contribution again, but I hasten to say that I think I have read it before and heard the contribution on a couple of previous occasions. It might have been topped and tailed a bit.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: What is the word for plagiarising your own speeches?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am not sure. We cannot accuse him of pinching anyone else's speech: it was all his own work. It had just been mixed and mashed. Obviously he was caught short, he had a speech that he needed to give, he grabbed one of the old ones and had another go at it. We are delighted to see a rival emerging from within Labor Party

ranks as the raw prawn or fish expert. The Deputy Leader (Hon. Paul Holloway) has struck out.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes. He is striking out on his own path in terms of the fishing industry, and we are looking forward with great interest to the next three years to see the Hon. Ron Roberts and the Hon. Paul Holloway trading fishing blows when trying to establish their own credibility in relation to that issue.

I want to address a number of issues from the Hon Mr Cameron's contribution today. I acknowledge his passionate interest in the important area of unemployment, which is his No. 1 priority. I assure the Hon. Mr Cameron that, as the Treasurer in this Government, I share that passion for Governments at least attempting as best they can to do whatever they can to tackle the problems of unemployment in South Australia and nationally. We are the first to acknowledge that we can do a fair bit as a State Government, but we cannot act alone. We need support from the community, from business and from unions and, of course, national and international factors will be important factors to be considered in any overall solution for unemployment.

I agree with the honourable member's observations and criticisms in some part in relation to the IMF report that he was talking about. He made an observation that the report recommended that one of the solutions was to take people off unemployment benefits after a certain period. Most Australians would accept that, if people were not genuinely looking for work, there would need to be tougher restrictions in terms of unemployment benefits, but all of us know of young and older Australians who valiantly attempt to find employment, and it would be a travesty of justice to penalise or punish those South Australians and Australians, if they were unable to find employment, by taking away their benefits.

The Hon. Mr Cameron made some comments in relation to economic policy. He was critical somewhat of the Government's reliance on market forces. If it were true that this Government was relying solely on market forces as a response to unemployment, I would agree with his criticism. But I reject the notion that I as Treasurer or indeed this Government is adopting a policy of saying that market forces will fix the problem. On the other hand, the Labor Opposition and, in a small part, the Hon. Mr Cameron too, have been critical of the targeted incentives that this Government has used in the last five years to try to attract and retain major employers in South Australia. Opposition members and Mr Cameron mentioned the dilemmas and problems we had with the incentive package with Australis.

If we were a Government that adopted a hands-off attitude, relying completely on market forces, we would not engage in targeted incentive packages as we do and we would let the marketplace determine it, and as a Government we would not use taxpayers' money to try to assist companies not only like Australis but the successes like Westpac, BT and Motorola, which the Government has successfully attracted to South Australia and which are providing significant numbers of jobs.

Another of the Hon. Mr Cameron's comments which I will address related to mental health. I acknowledge the increasing community concern about mental health and I want to make some brief comment about mental health amongst young people and the correlation with young people, particularly young men, and suicide. In those days in Opposition when we had more time to address particular issues of interest to

ourselves rather than our own portfolio responsibilities, youth suicide and, in particular, the reasons why so many young men attempt suicide and sadly in many cases succeed was of particular interest to me. It remains a particular interest and concern and I follow with interest some of the developments. For example, I know that on the West Coast there is a very interesting model with the doctors and schools in the Tumbly Bay area. I follow that program with great interest as I do a number of other programs that have been undertaken.

I know it is a very difficult area and that it is very easy to be critical. I will not add to the cavalcade of criticism of Governments because I know that the Government, the Minister, and the senior officers are endeavouring to do their best in what is an increasing dilemma and problem. I know about young people, their experimentation with drugs and the concerns that families have in trying to get support as young people experiment with drugs. As members know, some drugs, particularly marijuana, can lead to increased depression among some young people and there is a link with schizophrenia and the use of marijuana.

It is an important issue as to how community services and Government provide support, not just to the young person but to the parents who struggle during that difficult period. As members know, many a parent pulls their hair out (if they still have some) or rubs their shiny pate (if they do not) worrying about what they can do as parents with a young person of 13, 14, 15 or 16 as they go through that first stage of experimentation with drugs, with adolescence, experimenting with sexuality and discovering their own sexuality, and peer group pressure. It is important for Governments, departments and agencies that work with Governments to look at the range of services that can be provided to assist not only the young person but also the families.

We can assist parents to recognise the signs in their own young people early enough to try to do something about it. We can assist them to find places where they can go to talk about the situation if they are worried and to work through what they can do as parents. In the end, parents know that sometimes there is nothing they can do with their own young person, but somebody else can. It might be a priest, an uncle or aunty, an older brother or sister, but there must be somebody that a young person can talk to if it is not mum or dad.

It is that sort of thing—whether we are doing enough—that I think Governments have a responsibility to address. When a young person gets into trouble does the Government provide the services that allow a family that wants to assist to put that young person into treatment and not into a prison or wherever. If a young person needs or wants assistance, are they able to get not only medical and clinical assistance but also counselling—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Exactly. Unless that service and assistance is provided, sadly, the problems that we see with young people—depression and experimentation with drugs—will continue to lead to more of them attempting to take their own lives and more and more deaths. As many of us know, recorded suicides do not indicate the true level of suicide of young people within our community. There is a very healthy suspicion that many of the single vehicle road accidents and other accidents may be a result of young people, young men in particular, attempting to take their own lives, and sadly successfully in many cases.

The last issue I want to address is that of opinion polling. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from 6.2 to 7.48 p.m.*]

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Before the dinner break I was addressing briefly the important issue for many members of this Chamber and the Parliament, namely, mental health problems and, in particular, the interrelationship of young people and youth suicide. I wrap that up by saying that I think the Government would argue that it is doing a considerable amount in endeavouring to tackle this problem. However, we would be the first to acknowledge that there is much more that not only the Government but the community need to do in terms of trying to tackle this most important issue.

I think there is much that we need to look at in terms of providing support not only to the young person but also to the family, and in particular to the parents of young people who are troubled and experiencing peer group, family and other pressures. As I said, in many cases it is not the parents who are in the best position—even though they might sometimes think they are—to be the wise counsel for the young person going who is experiencing those problems; and sometimes the paid Government social welfare worker or counsellor is not the appropriate person, either, although they can be of assistance. As I said prior to the dinner break, it might be another trusted adult; it might even be an older brother or sister; or it might be a friend or a next door neighbour. In the end, in terms of establishing networks and support, a young person requires someone in whom they place great trust and faith to whom they can speak freely and frankly.

Some receive that support and they are lucky to have, perhaps, a young person of their own age who is an older person in terms of their social outlook. They might be more mature and experienced and can provide that wise counsel. Not all young people are that lucky, and it is important to have that sort of support network for young people experiencing these problems.

My two concluding issues relate, first, to opinion polling. I want to place on the public record my concerns at what I see as the differential treatment to opinion polling in South Australia. I will give two recent examples of opinion polls that measured public support, or otherwise, for the Government and the Opposition in South Australia. At the end of September an opinion poll was published by Newspoll and printed prominently in the *Australian* of the day, and it purported to show a very significant drop in voter support for the Liberal Government and a very significant increase in support for the Labor Party. That particular poll—which, I guess, is fair enough, because it did show a significant movement—carried the following banner headlines on page 2 of the *Australian*:

Olsen leads a Lib nosedive.

An article written by Matthew Abraham stated that Premier John Olsen's leadership had entered a twilight zone after a dramatic slump in personal and Liberal Party support in the latest Newspoll, taking Liberals to a record low and putting the ALP ahead in South Australia for the first time in seven years. I will not read the rest of the article. I do not quibble with that. An opinion poll was conducted by the Newspoll organisation which purported to show a significant drop in support for one Party and a significant increase for another. That needs to be reported and reported prominently. I might quibble, however, with the journalist's particular interpretation, but he is entitled to make that judgment, even if those

of us within the Government might disagree with the emphasis that he placed on it.

Similarly, a few days later in the *Advertiser* (I think that it might have been the following day), an article written by Phillip Coorey was headlined:

Voters desert Olsen in new poll.

Again, without going through all the detail, that headline on page 2 of the *Adelaide Advertiser* highlighted very prominently the fact that support for the Government had hit new depths, with the poll showing that Labor would have won easily had an election been held the previous month.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Phil is off to Canberra and we wish him all the best.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We certainly wish Phil the very best in Canberra. Certainly, I have no criticism of Phil Coorey for this particular article. Again, he reported a poll which had been conducted and on which he placed his own interpretation. That then led, over the coming days in the newspapers and the printed and electronic media, to a series of articles and stories which highlighted the fact that there had been this significant drop in voter support for the Liberal Party and the Liberal Government. Again, I will not go through all the detail of that.

I was therefore delighted when I read the *Bulletin* poll which was published this month and which showed a very significant increase in support for the Liberal Government and a very significant decrease in support for the Labor Opposition. Having read that result in the *Bulletin*, I was anxiously looking forward to the *Adelaide Advertiser*, the *Australian* and other media outlets to see similar headlines of 'Big boost in Olsen popularity' and 'Government support'. I think the poll showed a 6 per cent to 6½ per cent increase in support for the Liberal Party. In two Party preferred terms, the Liberal Party polled 51.5 per cent and the Labor Party 48.5 per cent.

I anxiously looked to the *Advertiser* and the *Australian* for equal treatment because, as I said, I can understand how the first poll was treated quite prominently and then interpreted. If a poll were to move significantly the other way I am sure that, in the interests of fairness, the media would treat the poll in a similar fashion. I must admit that when I read the *Advertiser* I did not see the article at all. I commented 24 hours later how I was surprised that the *Advertiser* had not reported the significant turnaround in voter support for the Government, as recorded in this particular opinion poll. I was told that I was wrong: that there had indeed been a story in the *Advertiser*. I therefore went back to the *Advertiser* to find that story and, sure enough—

The Hon. T. Crothers: It was in the sports section.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, it was not in the sports section. It was nearly there, though: it was almost in the comics and entertainment section. There it was, buried on page 22 of the *Adelaide Advertiser*, about three columns deep under a small heading that read, 'Liberal support lifts'. There was certainly no interpretation of a boost in support for Premier John Olsen as a result of this opinion poll and no indication of a significant turnaround of any form or nature being reported by the *Advertiser*. I then waited anxiously for reports from the electronic media, because I am sure that the electronic media does not just wait for the *Advertiser* and the *Australian* to decide what is a news story in Adelaide. However, I could not find much of a reference, if any, on the radio or on television in terms of reporting the opinion polling.

The premise that I leave with members and the media in this town and State is that personally, as one member of the Government, I do not quibble with opinion polling results being reported and then interpreted, if need be. However, I do think that, in the interests of fairness and reasonableness, if an equivalent opinion poll is produced that might happen to indicate an increase in support for the Premier and the Liberal Government, that report, too, should be printed and published in either the *Advertiser* or the *Australian* or announced in the electronic media.

With those remarks, I again thank all members for their contribution to the Address in Reply debate. We will be visiting the Governor tomorrow at 4.15 p.m. to present the Address in Reply. I know that all members look forward to what is an important tradition of the Parliament and Legislative Council as we respond to His Excellency the Governor's speech delivered at the opening of this particular parliamentary session.

Motion carried.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (OFFENSIVE AND OTHER WEAPONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 November. Page 212.)

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I support the second reading and acknowledge the comments made by the Attorney-General in his second reading speech on this issue. I note that since 1985 the Leader of the Opposition has been rabbiting on about knives incessantly and I think he started raising this issue way back when he was a backbencher. I know from previous performances on other issues that this is just yet another hysterical performance based solely and wholly on political opportunism, aided and abetted by that bumbling, stumbling shadow Attorney-General, who, I understand, will be replaced in the unlikely event that members opposite win Government by the member for Elder—in the unlikely event he wins his seat.

I do not know how the Labor Party continues to put up with some of the performances of Michael Atkinson MP, member for Spence. I shudder to think that illustrious people such as Len King and Don Dunstan, who do have some intellect—perhaps I do not agree with their views—have to put up with the sort of nonsense and drivel from the member for Spence's mouth on all sorts of law and order issues, aimed specifically at the audience of Bob Francis and 5AA. One might imagine that, come the next election, the Law Reform Commission will be set up by then Attorney-General, Michael Atkinson, and obviously the chair of that Law Reform Commission will be Bob Francis, and then we will have a lot of fun.

Getting to the specific concerns that I want to raise in this Bill, I note that section 15 of the Summary Offences Act currently refers to two principal offences: first, the carrying of an offensive weapon without lawful excuse, which attracts a \$2 000 fine and a six month period of imprisonment; and, secondly, the manufacture, sale, distribution and supply dealing in possession of or use of a dangerous article, which allows for an \$8 000 fine and a period of two year's imprisonment. In the latter offence it must be shown that the dangerous article was in the possession of the accused person without lawful excuse.

I will not go through the history of the development of this legislation; however, in summary, the important aspects of

this Bill will, first, increase the fine for the carrying of an offensive weapon by \$500; secondly, decrease the fine by \$500 and imprisonment by six months in relation to dangerous article offences—and I understand they will be re-categorised; and, thirdly, create a new offence of possession, sale, use of or otherwise dealing with a prohibited weapon, and that attracts a maximum \$10 000 fine and a maximum period of imprisonment of two years.

There is a provision in the Bill in relation to exempt persons because the Bill recognises that there are occasions when it might be appropriate for people to have in their possession a prohibited weapon, and in that regard the Bill sets out people who are exempt in relation to the possession of a prohibited weapon.

Some of the people who fall within that category include: a person who has possession of or uses a prohibited weapon for the purpose of conducting his or her business or in the purpose of his or her employment; a member of the police; a member who has possession of a prohibited weapon for the purposes of a museum or art gallery; a person who has possession or uses a prohibited weapon for the purpose of the course of providing a lawful form of entertainment, in the course of participating in a lawful and recognised form of recreational sport; for the purpose of an official ceremony that reasonably requires the possession or use of a prohibited weapon; and a person who uses a dagger for religious purpose.

There is also a general provision in relation to exempt purpose that gives the Minister power to exempt people (or a class of person) by regulation. I cannot say that this has been an easy issue because, on occasions, there are quite legitimate and lawful uses of knives and other items which might be deemed to be offensive.

It is interesting to note that the existing schedule of dangerous weapons carries quite a list. The existing schedule includes a hunting sling, a catapult, a pistol, a crossbow, a blowgun, a knife belt, a flick knife, a ballistic knife, a knuckle knife, a dagger, a swordstick, knuckle duster, self protecting spray, self protection device and an antitheft case, which, I understand, is a case which, if you pick it up, emits an electric shock. I also understand from briefings I have received from the Attorney that items to be added to this list will include nunchakus, shruikens throwing knives, throwing stars and articles that conceal knives. I am not sure how the Attorney proposes to distinguish between a dangerous article and a prohibited article, and I would be interested to know whether there will be some sort of general policy that will be adopted in terms of attempting to distinguish between what is a dangerous article and what is a prohibited weapon.

I can see that there are occasions where a self-protection device quite legitimately carried around by people that causes no long term damage, or a self-protection spray that falls into the same category, might perhaps fall into the question of being a dangerous article rather than a prohibited weapon, in that people are allowed to carry them so long as they do not use them other than for a lawful purpose. As it is, when we deal with legislation in the context of the sort of hysterical environment created by the current shadow Attorney-General, there are, on occasions, people who are caught up in the hysterical net. Indeed, I received a letter from Mr David Stacy of Henley Beach who wrote to me on 11 November following some newspaper reports about the introduction of this legislation. He said:

Thank you for the information regarding the amendments to the Summary Offences Act.

He did that in response to the fact that he rang me and I sent him a copy. The letter continues:

I read the data and am still concerned that it does not include provision for collectors of items which I believe are pending inclusion on the prohibited list.

In the past I have purchased items such as a Bowie knife, 145th Anniversary Smith and Weston Bowie knife which is a numbered collectors' item. This knife is displayed in a frame on the wall in my study along with Franklin Mint collectors' knives, which I believe have the potential to be included as prohibited weapons, subject to the interpretation of the Act. As an aside, the study is deadlocked when the house is vacant.

I fear that the category of collectors' items is not included in the amendment and as such items such as these would have to be surrendered. Additionally the sale of such items between collectors is not addressed unless it is included under the ministerial exemption clause.

The knives addressed in the preceding paragraphs are all subject to interpretation of the Act which is not specific enough (in the data supplied) to assure me that I will be within the boundaries of the law by retaining these items.

Your attention to my inquiry is appreciated and I look forward to a favourable response in support of the law-abiding citizens of South Australia who may collect items which a very small minority misuse.

I have some sympathy with Mr Stacy. This is not a situation of dealing with guns where danger is caused simply by the use of guns, on many occasions without any intent. Generally speaking, one would find it difficult to imagine a situation where someone who holds a knife in the circumstances described by Mr Stacy might be placing other citizens in South Australia at risk.

I am not advocating a licensing system for knives, although that might be a good system for causing employment in the public sector but, in the Firearms Act, which was dealt with only two short years ago, there is a provision for collectors' licences, and it seems to me that, if in fact we can recognise the role of a collector in relation to the use of guns, that ought to be recognised in relation to this legislation. In that regard, I assume that the Attorney-General, being the very reasonable man he is, will consider making collections in certain circumstances exempt by way of regulation.

In that regard, I would be most grateful if the Attorney could advise me how he proposes to deal with knives that are the subject of a *bona fide* collection. I would be grateful if he would explain, if it will be done by way of regulation, the sorts of principles to be followed in promulgating those regulations. Other than that, I have no problem with this Bill. It has been well thought through. There have been many meetings. It has been difficult, particularly in the light of some of the hysteria, as I alluded to earlier, from the Leader of the Opposition and the current shadow Attorney-General, but I think we have reached a stage where we have a reasonable piece of legislation. I commend the Bill.

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

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CONTAMINATION OF GOODS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 November. Page 240.)

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I indicate the Democrats' support for the general thrust of this Bill. It is well intentioned and, with that in mind, we give our wholehearted support for it. Real or threatened contamination or sabotage

has the potential to be a very serious crime and ought to be punished as such. If there are deficiencies in the law which can prevent adequate prosecution of this crime, then we will be pleased to assist in amending them.

I wish to qualify this general thrust of support by raising two points. These have aroused my curiosity since looking at the Attorney-General's second reading speech, and I hope he can at least discuss the matters I raise if not satisfy my concerns entirely. The first relates to the attempts by the Model Criminal Code Officers Committee (MCCOC). I believe the intention of the committee is to develop model criminal laws to achieve uniformity and greater justice throughout Australia while updating some of our more antiquated statutes.

Therefore, I am surprised to see the Attorney-General departing from the recommendations of the MCCOC in relation to the contamination of goods because of what are perceived to be deficiencies in our laws regarding extortion, blackmail and economic sabotage. I would have thought that the Attorney-General's preferred course of action would be to remedy these other laws first or perhaps at the same time in order to achieve a result consistent with the proposed national model, always assuming that the MCCOC model is, indeed, best practice.

However, I would also indicate that, from time to time, the Attorney and I have shared a recognition that South Australian statute should be able to stand on its own. We do not by rote automatically take on board just for the sake of uniformity, and I do not believe that we should. I may get an explanation in the Attorney's summing up of the debate as to whether this is a catch-all with the intention that there will be amendments to other legislation later or whether we are following a different path to the recommendation of the MCCOC and, if so, why. I will leave that open for explanation by the Attorney when he sums up the debate, if he would like to.

There is another area where there could be a slight problem, and I think it may mean a more detailed interpretation of the actual Bill itself. Apparently it has very broad scope, with possibly severe penalties for crimes which might not necessarily have warranted such a response. For example, irresponsible youths who place rocks on train lines intending to damage the train certainly deserve to be punished, and I expect that existing statutes allow for appropriate sentences. But the Bill may leave them exposed to gaol terms of up to 15 years. At least, that is how I read my interpretation of the potential of the Bill where an 'act prejudicing public health or safety' is to include 'interference with a transport or communications system in a way that prejudices or could prejudice the safety of the public'.

Proposed section 260 would make that an offence attracting a gaol term of up to 15 years if it is done with the intention 'to cause loss or harm to another'. The Attorney-General may care to expand on that again to clarify whether these offences could be interpreted more broadly so as to leave those engaging in what sometimes may be just school pranks liable to long gaol terms.

Briefly referring to the Bill itself, the significant clause is proposed section 260. It points out:

A person is guilty of an offence if the person commits an act to which this section applies intending—

(a) to cause prejudice, to create a risk of prejudice, or to create an apprehension of a risk of prejudice, to the health or safety of the public; and—

and this is worth noting—

- (b) by doing so—
- (i) to gain a benefit for himself, herself or another; or
 - (ii) to cause loss or harm to another; or
 - (iii) to cause public alarm or anxiety.

Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 15 years.

Although some of the wording I have read would indicate there has to be intention, I am not yet convinced that, as the Bill reads, proposed section 260(1) embraces intention. It could cause public alarm or anxiety, but it may not necessarily have been done with the intention of doing that. I feel that the anticipated and desired extent to which this legislation will go at least needs to be clarified.

I will be very interested to hear the Attorney's summing up. He may well be able to allay my fears on that, and we have the Committee stage to follow. I look forward to either of those two occasions when we can pursue this further. I would conclude by indicating the Democrats' support for the second reading of the Bill.

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

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX (SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 18 November. Page 220.)

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Opposition supports this amendment to the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Act 1984, facing the reality that we no longer have the Grand Prix since the Victorians moved in during the chair moving exercise prior to an election and that that race is now residing in Melbourne. The Government has replaced that race, which was a great international drawcard for Adelaide and South Australia generally, a great advertising forum for our State as a builder for other events here and for continuing visits by people who got a taste of South Australia and Adelaide through the Grand Prix. Unfortunately, that event no longer resides in Adelaide. The Opposition congratulates the Government for having secured the V8 Sensational Adelaide 500 event, which should in some part replace the visits from interstate, intrastate and overseas although, I suspect, not to the same stage as the Formula One race did.

The Government needs to change the original Act to include the V8 Sensational Adelaide event to allow the board to negotiate with AVESCO (the Australian V8 Supercar Company Limited), the body responsible for negotiations with the new board, and to change the financial reporting period, since the event is to be held over a three day period in April. That is an administrative act, which the Opposition supports. The consultation process, which I understand the shadow Minister in another place carried out to his satisfaction, took place with some of the stakeholders—the Adelaide City Council, the UTLC and some of the residents near the track—and I understand that, although there were some outstanding negotiating items, there was a general acceptance that these items would be negotiated without too much bother.

I did have a contact who expressed some concern about the late notification that the Adelaide City Council received. It could have led to some repairs that were made to a particular section of the track being either postponed or put off altogether, so that the expenditure of the Adelaide City Council during that period may have been saved. I have not

checked with the Adelaide City Council, nor has anyone from the Council rung me. If the Minister takes that on board as a complaint by another body rather than a complaint from the Adelaide City Council, it is something he might follow up. When special events are to be put on, it is important that we do not rush in to the administrative processes and procedures without consultation, because there are sensitivities of organisations and individuals within the metropolitan area and within the State generally that need to be consulted.

The Opposition and, I think, all Adelaideans and South Australian residents want to see special events occur. They want to see their State and city put on the map, but they want it done in a way that enables full discussions and negotiations to be carried out so that sensitive matters of noise pollution, changes or impediments that may be placed in relation to, in this case, track alterations or developments (and the Hon. Mr Gilfillan will probably speak on incursions into parklands) may be taken into account and talked through with our residents, so that we get as many people on side as possible in order that special events can be enjoyed by all our citizens in the best possible way, with the least amount of conflict.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I oppose this Bill. The Democrats want to make plain that, as so often, the opposition to the Bill is based on the location of the event and not on the event itself. The actual Grand Prix event was magnificently staged, but its long-term desecration of the ethos of the parklands is still with us. We are still suffering from that. That is why it was not even considered, apparently, as a substantial hindrance to proceeding with this now to have a V8 event taking place in the same location where we had firm undertakings that, when the Grand Prix event was terminated and there were funds in hand, the track would be removed and the Victoria Park parklands amenity would be restored. But all that just fell by the wayside. There was never any sincerity in that promise.

There was plenty of time to have acted on it, but it was always held in abeyance in the hope that something would crop up. Of course, something has cropped up (although I do not believe that Mallala is all that excited about the fact that there will now be a competing event in the parklands). We put up with the Grand Prix in that location for 11 years partly because it was a world class event, it brought the world to our doorstep and the economic spin-offs were said to be huge. My attitude to it was not the same, because I always objected to the alienation and degradation of public parklands. However, I believe that the great majority of South Australians either enjoyed the race or reluctantly put up with it because of its scale, its city-wide party atmosphere or some other perceived benefit. So it is with the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Act.

This Act gives great power to Executive Government to override the jurisdiction of local government to fence off and put up buildings on parklands and many other powers, such as to override the Noise Control Act. These are not the sort of autocratic powers that South Australians would normally support, but I submit that they put up with this extension of Executive power in the same spirit and for the same reason that they, reluctantly or otherwise, supported the Grand Prix. However, in seeking an extension of the Grand Prix board's powers, it seems to us that the Government is making two big assumptions. In the first place, it is assuming, I think unwisely, that the same public goodwill or lack of antagonism that existed towards the Grand Prix will exist in respect of

any other motor sport event that it wants to conduct through city streets or park land.

Secondly, although this is a consequence of the first assumption, in all Government propaganda about the proposed supercar endurance race it has been assumed that an ongoing public subsidy for this event will not be needed because there will be support from sponsors and the public to ensure that the event will run at a profit. That is very reminiscent of the song sung for many years regarding the Grand Prix, with a whole lot of spurious arguments being brought up to try to show how much in equation the State benefited financially—although the Government was propping it up to the tune of many millions of dollars. Time will tell whether either of these assumptions is correct.

However, what we have to deal with now is this Bill. The Bill provides that the autocratic and anti-democratic powers used during the Grand Prix event would become available to the Executive Government in respect of any future event that has the support of a Minister. It means that virtually any event that uses a motorised vehicle or vehicles can come within the ambit of this legislation. Regardless of whether this event stands or falls, if we allow the Bill to pass, each year we will leave that area of the parklands vulnerable to a series of events of a similar duration and impact as the Grand Prix had on the lifestyle of Adelaidians.

I cannot emphasise that enough because it appeared to us—and by ‘us’ I mean those of us who care and revere the parklands—that the tide was turning and that the authorities of local government, the Adelaide City Council and even this place were beginning to see how irreplaceably precious the parklands are and their potential as a world status feature. Professor Judith Brine, who is running for the Adelaide City Council, at a meeting in North Adelaide the other night re-endorsed my view and that of the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association that the parklands qualify for world heritage listing. How exciting that would be; it would be a unique achievement for this city. However, how much will it be put in jeopardy if those who are making the appraisal can see a series of assaults on the integrity of the parklands? This is a major one but it is only one of a profusion of assaults that come from all angles.

The Chamber knows of the Democrats and my staunch opposition to commercial enterprises being put on the parklands. We have just seen a national wine industry centre put in the parklands, and there is enormous pressure for a commercial leisure centre to be placed in the parklands. It is so depressing that we do not learn from history. The chapter of history that contains the erosion of the parklands should be there as a classic example for us to stop, pause and reverse. We must remember the hollow promises made; for example, the old bus depot grounds that were to be returned to parklands. All these things were done apparently with an awareness that the parklands are irreplaceable and that they hold an incomparable status as an icon for this city. The Grand Prix was lost; it went to Melbourne. The promise was that the paraphernalia, the bric-a-brac and all the intrusion into the parklands would be bundled up and removed. Yet here comes what we always suspected—it was just a deceit, a smokescreen. Tragically, every year this Bill will sentence Adelaide—until such time as there is a Parliament with enough sense to reverse it—to a substantial erosion of the amenity, quality and general status of the Adelaide parklands. We will oppose the Bill at the second reading stage and seek a division on it.

However, I must repeat that our opposition is to the location of the event. It is almost inevitable that, whenever we stand up to defend the parklands, those who want to denigrate our position seek to portray us as opposing the event. I can only say again and again that our opposition is not to the event; the event is fine. For heaven’s sake, let us not continue this pressure to diminish the quality and standing of our irreplaceable parklands. What could have more impact than a four or five day exclusion of access to the parklands and the impact of the noise of motor vehicles racing in them? I cannot think of anything more dramatically in contrast to what the parklands should be. The Democrats oppose the Bill.

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

STAMP DUTIES (SHARE BUY-BACKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 November. Page 241.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I thank members for their indications of support for the legislation. The Government would have been disappointed if there had been any opposition. We welcome members’ indications of support.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

ELECTRICITY CORPORATIONS (RESTRUCTURING AND DISPOSAL) BILL

In Committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It is appropriate for me to make some opening remarks on this clause, given that it has been something like 3½ months since I made my contribution in the second reading debate on this Bill. In that time the Bill has expanded to a great extent. What started out as an 18 page Bill when we debated it in August has had added to it 51 pages of quite substantial amendments. Indeed, they are not the end of it, either. I understand that the Government will put forward a number of other amendments, as well as those that other members and I will table at some stage of the debate.

When going over the history of this debate, the most appropriate place to start is just before the last election when the Premier made a promise that he would not sell ETSA. That promise was quite clear and unequivocal. The promise was repeated by the Australian Labor Party and by the Democrats. So, all political Parties in this State went to the election in 1997 promising the people of South Australia that they would not sell the Electricity Trust. Well, we know what happened. Shortly after the election, almost as soon as the writs were returned, the Government changed its mind and decided that it would sell the Electricity Trust.

The Australian Labor Party’s position was then and is still now that it is opposed to the sale of the Electricity Trust, and that includes a lease, and I will say more about that in a moment. The Bill was introduced in June in another place and it finally arrived here some 3½ months ago. The vote was taken at the second reading stage and the Government

promptly adjourned debate on the Bill, and we know why it did so.

Had we proceeded to debate the Committee stage at that time, one of the first amendments on file from the Hon. Nick Xenophon sought to introduce a referendum should the Government wish to proceed with the sale. The Government knew that, if that clause passed at that stage, it would have been the end of the Bill because it did not want a referendum. Instead of debate, the Government decided not to proceed with the Bill, and then we had a select committee, the report of which I assume we will debate this evening or tomorrow.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It was supported by a majority of this House.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Yes, the select committee was, but I cannot say much about the report at this stage because it has not yet—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: The move for a select committee was supported by a majority of the Council.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Yes, indeed, the Hon. Legh Davis is correct in that there was majority support, but it was not supported by the Opposition, and I believe that our position was and will again be vindicated, and I will say more about that at the appropriate time.

The select committee was established and the whole process was delayed. Now the Government has come up with its latest proposal, and that is to proceed with a lease. I want to put on record the Australian Labor Party's position. We have always opposed a sale. We regard a 97 year lease or a 99 year lease—whatever it might be—exactly the same as we do a sale. If members speak to anyone in the commercial world and look at the price of it, they will find that they regard it as essentially the same thing. After all, who will be around in 99 years to pick it up?

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Mike Rann said he would support it. Haven't you seen his press release?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I think the Hon. Legh Davis had better read it. Perhaps I should read it into the record for him so that he can understand it. The Labor Party's position has therefore been quite consistent. We have opposed the sale and we oppose a lease because essentially it is the same as a sale.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: You opposed a referendum, and now you support it.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: No, we didn't.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Is that consistency?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I wish the Hon. Legh Davis would be quiet, because I could perhaps correct him on a number of matters. He is quite wrong about the referendum, and let me deal with that matter first. The Labor Party has never said that it would oppose a referendum. Indeed, let me read out to the Hon. Legh Davis what I said in this Chamber when we were discussing the select committee.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members on my right will have every chance to contribute to the debate in due course, so they should keep their contributions until then.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I made the following point on Wednesday 2 September, when we were debating this select committee proposal:

Recognising that the numbers could exist in this Council for a referendum on ETSA and Optima, we countenance that. We are very relaxed about fighting a referendum on this issue. We are very confident that we would win.

That has been our position all the way through. The Hon. Legh Davis is leaving; his battery does not like this. We did not have the referendum—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: —because the Bill was withheld by the Government. It did not want to proceed to debate the clause because it thought it might get up. It knew that once it did so the Bill would be history. That is why we did not have a discussion then on the referendum. Anyone who looks at the record will see that. Now that we have dealt with that misunderstanding by the Hon. Legh Davis, let me return to the other position in relation to a lease.

It is the view of the Opposition that this hybrid model that the Government appears to have come up with—25 years plus three renewable 24 year leases—is the same, as far as we are concerned, as a 97 year lease, and we will treat it in exactly the same way. We do not see any benefit in it at all. The hybrid structure that is proposed under clause 11A of the Bill—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members will have every opportunity to enter the debate.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Clause 11A of the Bill, which contains the Government's new proposals, is, in the view of the Opposition, as bad as, and maybe worse than, a straight out 97 year lease. Let me place that on the record. Our position will be consistent. Our position will be the same as it has been throughout this debate. Our position will be the same as we put to the people of this State before the last election. We are opposed to the sale or lease of ETSA and we will not be party to it.

The Leader of the Opposition has made quite clear today that we will not go along with these hybrid structures. When we make our final decision we will make quite clear that we will, if we proceed with this hybrid structure, be voting on a 97 year lease. This is it: this is the vote. As far as we are concerned, if this vote is carried it will be on a 97 year lease for the electricity assets of this State, and we will respond accordingly. Let that be absolutely clear: that is the position that we will take on this Bill. That is where we have come from in this debate.

Some 12 months on from the last election the position of the Opposition has not changed. The Government has gone through all sorts of twists, turns and somersaults, but at the end of the day what it is trying to do through this measure is effectively get through the sale of ETSA. Everyone should be clear about it: when we come to vote on this Bill at the end of the debate that is what it is about. Let there be no doubt about it. There will be plenty more debate on this Bill, so I will not continue much longer. I wish to put it in perspective because—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Obviously the Hon. Angus Redford has not got the point, so maybe I do need to go on. A 99 year lease is every bit equivalent to a sale. If you do not believe me—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: If the Hon. Angus Redford does not believe me, he should go out and ask people in the world of commerce what is the difference between a 99 year

lease and a sale, and if he does he will know. That is exactly the point that has been made by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Well, after 99 years down at the cemetery I do not think too many people will be coming back for seconds.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Obviously, with 51 pages of amendments to this Bill (and we have not even started the first clause yet), it will be a lengthy debate. No doubt we will have plenty of opportunity during the debate to go over these measures again and again. At this stage I will let others have a say and we will discuss the other issues in more detail later.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I want some clarification from you, Mr Chairman. We have here two advisers to the Treasurer, and I am not certain of the citizenship status of those advisers. I believe that one of them may be a United States citizen. If that is the case, is it appropriate for a non-Australian citizen to be advising our Minister on the floor of this Parliament?

The CHAIRMAN: I will not go into a lengthy discussion, but my advice is that there is nothing improper about whomever acts as the Minister's adviser on the floor of the Chamber.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Mr Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member referring to that point?

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I understand that we are talking about—

The CHAIRMAN: We are on clause 1.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, I think the Hon. Angus Redford should retract that comment about even letting women do things like that.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not hear anything from the Hon. Angus Redford this time. Usually I do, but I did not on this occasion.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I rise to put a simple person's point of view. I speak as a non-Australian born Australian citizen, if I might enter this debate. I regret that the Hon. Ms Kanck just said what she said. I think the debate is of a serious nature and we have to be taking advice from any quarter we can get it. I certainly will be, even if I have to write away to Ireland to get real expert advice.

I understand that we have before us a 25 year lease with three 24 year periods ongoing—in other words, a 99 year lease. I wonder why we are getting a lease of such duration when some of the plant that I suppose is being leased is already well on the way to retirement or semi-retirement and other newer elements will not have much more than a 25 year period of time to run and will still be able to operate in a functional sense. It seems to me that there is something much deeper about this Bill than an innocent like myself can understand; there is something there which is not yet revealed but which no doubt in the fullness of time will be revealed to all. I am very mindful, however, of the fact that in this global setting in which we live huge mergers are being effected. Today we witnessed the German Deutsches Bank and the American Central Bank talking terms of takeover.

We witnessed three of Gates' competitors in the electronic field trying to band together so as to compete with Gates and his company. It seems to me that I do not know enough yet about where the money is coming from. I do not know enough yet to know what other moneys from the same source are invested in other electricity companies that have been

sold, say, in Victoria, or will be sold in the rest of Australia. It might take 99 years to band that together, I do not know. We are about to witness a change in the electricity generating industry given the new technologies being developed.

For instance, wave power is now being pilot tested in the outer Hebrides. It was a 24 year old physics professor from my old home town who achieved that break through when he set up tidal power. At one stage the sticking point was that tidal power could be generated only by means of the incoming tide. He has now invented a valve which will allow continuous generation of electricity from tidal power. His valve will operate on both the in-coming and outgoing tides. Likewise with solar energy and, I guess, other forms of energy, such as wind energy.

With the technologies about to change fairly quickly, at least as far as electricity generation is concerned, and the fact that our plant is ageing and that we are still getting this money for that sort of lease, I ponder the question (and I understand about tax deductions and so forth): how much of the iceberg of this change in respect of the purchase by lease, which it really is, or the leasing out, of our electricity generating industry in South Australia is really hidden from view in respect of what the real thrust is?

It may be that people will say, 'Crothers is a fairly cynical fellow,' but it may well be that with what I have seen in my short life I have much to be cynical about. That is the problem I have with the whole of this matter: why are we getting such a good deal when, in fact, we really—and I say this without wishing to take the State down or any of its assets—are getting a deal above and beyond that which the plant, at face value, is worth? I simply reiterate that, from my point of view, an awful lot of what this is really all about seems to be hidden from view. It is either that or there really are fairies at the bottom of everybody's garden!

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I want to correct at once the Hon. Paul Holloway's contribution and, in particular, his suggestion that the Labor Party never has had a view against the referendum. The honourable member said that unequivocally in the debate and, if the honourable member reads the *Hansard* tomorrow it will still be there. His lips moved and I actually read them, and I heard what he said.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The honourable member's memory is so defective that he cannot remember what happened little more than three months ago. That is what he has shown all the world tonight. On Wednesday 12 August in this place I asked a question of the Treasurer (Hon. Rob Lucas) about this very matter because, on the morning of Wednesday 12 August the Hon. Mike Rann, Leader of the Opposition, was asked on Radio 5AN about his attitude to the referendum and he said, 'I think a referendum is unnecessary.' But that does not mean he is against it.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Is that what you are saying? It is unnecessary but you are not against it? Is that what you are saying? The Hon. Robert Lucas—and I will give him the page numbers because I think he should read them because he has obviously forgotten: pages 1326 and 1327—in his response to my question said that was true, and not only that but that the Hon. Mike Rann was running around Adelaide, and let me quote the Hon. Robert Lucas directly—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Well, you can check this out yourself with the journalist if you do not believe it. He said:

Mike Rann has been speaking to journalists today saying, 'We don't need a referendum. The referendum was held at the last election.'

Yet, five or 10 minutes ago the Hon. Paul Holloway was claiming in this Chamber that the Hon. Mike Rann and the Labor Party had not done a backflip. The Hon. Nick Xenophon correctly observed on ABC television news tonight that he was surprised and disappointed to see that the Hon. Mike Rann was now supporting a position that he had not supported 3½ months ago. That was the Hon. Nick Xenophon's observation, and he was absolutely right. I know you are a worm caught on a hook but stop wriggling. Just lie down and enjoy it. The honourable member is dead wrong: the Hon. Mike Rann said that it was unnecessary. He briefed Adelaide journalists on the day. Now, 3½ months later, he is saying that he is in favour of a referendum. The Hon. Paul Holloway is saying that the Labor Party is consistent. That is consistency Paul Holloway style. He was against it 3½ months ago: he is for it now? That is consistency? I rest my case.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I rise to correct the misconception of the Hon. Mr Davis to the Labor Party's position. The issue of the sale or lease has been a moving feast from day one.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: No, I am just explaining to the honourable member or any other member who has a misconception about the Labor Party's position. The issue of sale or lease has been a moving feast from day one. The Government and the negotiators have not been able to put together a package that has been able to get through the Parliament. Parliament is made up of two Chambers. The Government was able to get through in the Lower House the issues it wanted to get through because, in the cold light of day, it had the numbers. In the Upper House the numbers were not there to pass the principles by which the Government wanted to sell the power generators and the transmission lines. That is the reality of it.

A strategy was developed by the Government to buy some time. The time strategy was developed with the Hon. Mr Cameron and the Hon. Mr Xenophon in the form of setting up a select committee. The Opposition opposed this on the same grounds that it opposed the proposition being put forward in this place, namely, that the Government did not have a mandate to sell because it had not announced its intentions to the electorate at the time of the election. The Opposition was to oppose the setting up of the select committee on the ground that the issue should be settled in Parliament. If the Government could get the numbers in Parliament to put through either a sale or a lease then the Opposition would have to put up with that. That is how democracies work. If the Government was prepared to go to the people on a referendum in the spirit which the Hon. Nick Xenophon put forward, then we would have accepted—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I am talking about the negotiating stages that the Government had at its disposal if it was going to use Parliament to get the issue of the sale through using the parliamentary processes. As the Hon. Mr Holloway said, I will make a contribution when that matter is before us. However, we went into the select committee with the same position as we went to the people when the Government made its announcement. Our position was that no other committee of the Parliament would

determine the outcome in relation to the sale or lease, that it would be Parliament's role to determine that position.

That is where we are now, and it is not for anyone to make any other assumptions in relation to our position. As I understand it, we still have options open to us in relation to the debate because it is still subject to this Chamber's negotiations and debate as it always is. This is where we are now. I cannot understand why people are getting excited about the debate. I think we should press forward with the proposition that is on the Notice Paper and let us see how the discussions, the debate and the negotiations turn out. Our position has not changed and, if there is a proposition to put up a referendum, then as an Opposition we will have to examine that.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I want to pursue this issue of the advisers on the floor of the Chamber. I know that members of the Government want to kick goals and they will not look at this in terms of the precedents that are being created at the present time—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: He is a South Australian.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: No, he is an American citizen.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Then in that case I do not think he should be allowed—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Yes, I definitely would kick Murdoch out; give me half a chance. I consider that other precedents are involved in this; that is, at least one of the people advising the Minister at this stage is not a public servant. I understand that, in the past, the practice of this Parliament has been to allow onto the floor of this Chamber the advisers who are employed within the department as public servants. So, not only do we have the issue of a person who is not an Australian citizen being on the floor of this Chamber but we also have an adviser who is not a public servant.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: So?

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: If members believe that that is okay, that is fine, but I think members should be aware of the precedents being created here. I know of legislatures in the United States where lobbyists are allowed onto the floor of the Chamber during debate, and when you allow precedents—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: When we allow precedents such as this simply because the Government wants to get free goals we are going to open up things in a dangerous way in the future. Nevertheless, I know that the Government will not see reason on this.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: This is not desperate stuff; this is looking at precedents and, if you think that precedents do not matter, then you need your head read, Mr Davis. I want to look at the issue of what we are doing tonight with this legislation. We have a piece of legislation that is 18 pages long. It contains 24 clauses, two schedules, and each of the schedules has six clauses. Added together that gives a total of 36 clauses. In terms of the Government amendments that we have before us, of those 36 clauses only seven of them remain unscathed in the process of dealing with these amendments. I think this raises major concerns about whether the Government knows what it is doing.

The Bill was originally introduced into the House of Assembly in March. It came to us in July and either late July or early August the Government put 40 pages of amendments on file. Now when the Bill was restored a couple of weeks ago to the Notice Paper, the Government put 45 pages of amendments on file and now we have consolidated amendments of 51 pages.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: The point I am making, Mr Davis, is that the Government clearly did not know what it was doing. It had a Bill that effectively had only 24 clauses plus two schedules and it has felt the need to put on file 51 pages of amendments. It makes it an extraordinarily difficult task for any person—and particularly members of the public who are trying to follow what is happening in this—to look at the framework of a Bill, which is what this is, and then try to attach 51 pages. To me it shows that we have the Government making legislation—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: You can have briefings, you know that.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I am very much aware that I can have briefings. Briefings are not the factor in this. The factor in this is that the Government has never had its act together on this. It made a decision that it was going to sell ETSA and then it decided afterwards how it was going to happen. I know yesterday when we got six extra pages of amendments that, in a short space of time (in less than 24 hours) even those extra six pages were amended by the Treasurer and his advisers. It shows members just how much this is being done on the run. I believe that what we have here is a legislative shambles and I am quite convinced that, when this Bill goes through in whatever form it does, within a very short space of time, we will have amending legislation back here because the Government will have found that there are shortfalls in what it has come up with.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I want to respond briefly to the comments made by the Hon. Sandra Kanck. I did not intend to enter the debate; I thought the Hon. Trevor Crothers said it all, but the Hon. Sandra Kanck decided to have another go. I want to state my personal view. I do not care who the advisers are that any of the Ministers bring in here. I do not care whether they are Americans, Afghan camel drivers or where they come from. If the appropriate—

The Hon. Sandra Kanck interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: What a nonsense that statement is. That just further underlies the honourable member's gross stupidity at times. Anyway, as I said, I do not care whether the advisers that the Ministers bring in are Americans or where they come from. I would only hope that, whatever advisers the Ministers bring in here—and I would suggest that they do it out of their own self-interest—they are people who have the necessary expertise ready to handle any or all of the questions that we might throw at the Minister from across this side of the Chamber. If the Hon. Sandra Kanck is talking about some kind of embargo on advisers coming into this Chamber because of their nationality, then I must say I am utterly surprised by her comments and I could only imagine that Pauline Hanson would probably be very proud of what she has just said. The second statement raised by the honourable member was: are all of the advisers public servants? If the honourable member is suggesting that Ministers can only bring in public servants to advise them, again I suggest that is another nonsense—

The Hon. Sandra Kanck: It is the first time it has happened.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I do not care whether it is the first time. I am just expressing my personal view that I would hope that, whomever the Ministers bring into this place to advise them during the Committee stage when we fire questions at them, they have the answers for us. That is the only test that I will be placing on the advisers, not whether they are male, female, American, Australian, public servants or employed in private enterprise. If the advisers are not able to provide the Minister with the answers to the questions that I put to him, that is the time when I will be criticising him, not beforehand.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: What we are seeing tonight is the final act in one of the greatest farces that has ever been played out in this august place. This story goes back further than the point to which my colleague the Hon. Paul Holloway referred. This goes back some time before that to when Dean Brown was the Premier of this State—this is the bloke that you fellows knifed—and that was when we first started getting a snippet that the Government was going to sell the State's silver. That is when we first started. Dean Brown, the man who came in here with the greatest majority of all time, whom you knifed, was starting to do this.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Dean Brown's premiership was in tatters, and they brought in Mr Action Man, John Olsen. He actually started to do some things. First of all, he solved the teachers' dispute. After two years of the Treasurer, then the Minister for Education and Children's Services, trying to get through to the teachers, John Olsen came in and fixed it up. That was a good thing. That is when he started to go bad, because from then on he decided to put that person in charge of selling ETSA.

The Opposition went to the people of South Australia and said that the Government would sell it. The Government emphatically said it would not sell it. Then we get to the real farce, when the Hon. Nick Xenophon came to this Parliament. After a few months, and following emphatic denials that they would do it, within 20 minutes of telling their own Caucus, Government Ministers trotted into this Parliament with a Bill that was an absolute shambles when it arrived. This Parliament has a responsibility to the people of South Australia. This Opposition has a responsibility to the people of South Australia, and this Parliament has a responsibility to peruse all proposals for Government spending.

The predecessors of these people, led by the Hon. Tom Playford—your icon—many years ago, when he made ETSA a statutory authority, showed you people what parliamentary responsibility was all about. He tried to run it through the Parliament and he—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: When was that?

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: In 1946. You were running around in short pants, and you have not grown much since then either. He showed them what to do. When members of the Legislative Council said, 'This is an improper way of going on about this; you ought to get some independent advice. You ought to have a royal commission,' to his credit, the Hon. Tom Playford did that.

Those members in the Legislative Council who were sceptical of this proposal were, however, statesmen enough to see the worth of the argument, based on that independent advice, based on a proper cost analysis which was there for all to see, open and public, and which was the best deal for South Australia. Tom Playford did not get exactly what he

wanted, but indeed he was a statesman and was prepared to accept it.

These people, 50 years on, with all their bright sparks behind them, did not even have enough sense to look at their own history. Did they take it to the Economic and Finance Committee? Did they put a proposal there to allow the Parliament to look at it and see if it was a decent proposal? No. These people have tried to rush it through and ended up in a great debacle, to the great embarrassment of the Treasurer and the Premier.

They were faced with an honourable man in the Hon. Nick Xenophon who said, very simply, 'When the three major Parties in this place emphatically promise something to the people of South Australia, they have a right and an expectation to have that delivered, unless there are good and cogent reasons for changing those rules.' If we sell this, according to my briefing today, we will not have the ability to have the public scrutinise the operations of the new owners, because they are saying that we are now actually handing it over to someone else. It is as if we sold it and divorced ourselves of the responsibility.

However, the Government has come in here today and said, 'We are not selling it. This is not something we have sold. This is more like a landlord and tenant situation.' We are talking about the people's assets. Has this Parliament seen any of the contracts? I am also told that after the event we will see the contracts, but what worries me about that is that we then have this other practice that has been developed with outsourcing, and I refer to this 'commercial in confidence' practice. How much will be commercial in confidence?

I understand that the Hon. Nick Xenophon and others have been advised that the contracts will be made available after they are signed. That is fine, if they are all going to be there and there will be no commercial in confidence. There will be no FOI, because you cannot get that information. What we then have is a situation where we have the first 25 years locked in. At the end of that 25 year lease, Humpty Dumpty will be broken, so there is no chance that we will put it back together again. We will see then what has happened with every other thing that has been privatised. As the contracts get worse, the Government throws more money in. We have seen this with respect to the Modbury Hospital.

The problem with that is that, by the time we get to the first end point—and I do not see anything in the legislation to satisfy this concern—will the intellectual property of the new owner of ETSA be his property or will it revert back to the landlord, the people of South Australia? That does not appear anywhere. We do not know where that will go, but what will happen, when we get to that point, is that we will have to pour in more money. It will be a *fait accompli*. Once Humpty Dumpty is broken, we will not put him back together again because the information will be gone from the people of South Australia.

This is a very simple problem to overcome. We can do it. The Hon. Legh Davis is now no longer in the Chamber, and I am actually happy about that. He challenges us about the referendum. Let us talk about that referendum. When this Bill was put on hold at the end of last session, the Hon. Nick Xenophon moved a motion in respect of a referendum. He then did not proceed with that. The debate was adjourned with the numbers. The first thing we were going to discuss was the Hon. Nick Xenophon's move for a referendum.

Let me say at the outset that I believe that the Hon. Nick Xenophon is a man of great integrity. He has been put under enormous pressure. But, in his naivety, his newness in this

place, at that point he fell for the line from the Government that we ought to set up a select committee. That select committee has met a couple of times—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: That was my idea!

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: No wonder it was no good! No wonder it didn't work!

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: It served its purpose.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: It did serve a purpose. The purpose was to fool the Hon. Nick Xenophon into thinking he could deal with honourable men, but that did not happen. I understand they have a report, but do we see the report of the select committee on the ETSA outsourcing before we handle the Bill? No, we start today, and we will introduce it tomorrow. I actually saw a member of the select committee with two pieces of paper in his hand, and he rightly and honourably was not allowed to show me, but boy oh boy, it cannot have too much in it. It is the select committee that did nothing.

It was a ploy to fool the Hon. Nick Xenophon to give this dishonourable Government the opportunity to brow beat him, cajole him, fool him and put him under enormous pressure to try to fall into line with something that is not necessarily called a sale but has a 99 year lease. The clever people like the Hon. Legh Davis would know that in most business situations, the assets are written off over about 10 years. So, they are gone 2½ times for the first stage of this operation. What we are seeing here is the absolute demise of the democratic system of parliamentary scrutiny in this State. The public has been lied to: there is no other word for it. The public has been lied to and it is being fooled.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: The Government has trotted out its parrot, the Hon. Legh Davis, to continually interject. I spent 25 years on the back of a truck with professionals, so to me he is just small meat! But he just keeps prattling on, trying to justify the unjustifiable. We see him trotting around, kissing up to Nick Xenophon and kissing up to Terry Cameron. He fooled Terry Cameron into becoming a rat. The Hon. Terry Cameron had no commitment to the sale of ETSA. The Hon. Terry Cameron jumped into bed with these people because he thought he was on a winner. I can tell the Hon. Terry Cameron and the Government: every time we have had a survey of the public, our ratings have gone up. It was the wrong issue: he hit the wrong button. But has that deterred the Hon. Terry Cameron from this course of bastardry? No, he readily adapted to the persuasive—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! You cannot all talk at once.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS:—overtures of people such as the Hon. Legh Davis, the Treasurer and his American advisers. He quickly adjusted his stance to this heartfelt desire to flog off the State's assets in complete defiance of all the people—not one of them but all the people—who voted for him at the last election. The Hon. Nick Xenophon has done a remarkable job trying to keep the Government honest. I only wish that he would apply the same vigour to the Hon. Terry Cameron, because we would not have a problem. If this Government had any decency, any guts, it would not have pulled this trick. It put off the Bill, got everyone to speak and then stalled the motion, went through this farce of electing a select committee to come up with a motion that we may use, and then just pushed it out the way.

What Government members have done is abuse the trust of the people of South Australia and abuse the processes of this Parliament. There is a thing called the overriding public

interest, which these people opposite know nothing about. The overriding public interest means that it is too important for the likes of this Government to do unilaterally. The overriding public interest in this matter is one whereby they ought to be laying out this whole proposal before the Economic and Finance Committee. Surprise, surprise: why do they not put these proposals before the Select Committee on Outsourcing? This is the select committee that we set up specifically for this purpose.

We do not need to do what a statesman like Sir Tom Playford would do, but there are modern mechanisms that can supply some independent advice to the Parliament to do what it is constitutionally required to do, that is, scrutinise Government spending and make decisions in the best interests of all the people of South Australia. This process is a farce. It makes a farce of the parliamentary system and it is an abuse of the people of South Australia.

The Hon. Legh Davis had plenty to say about a referendum. I see that the Hon. Sandra Kanck has lodged a proposal for a referendum. We have a proposal for a referendum: now we will see where we go. I have no doubt that, having gone through this process tonight, we will have another adjournment and we will go round and put the squeeze on poor old Nick Xenophon again. That is what will happen.

I can remember when the poker machine legislation went through this Parliament, and these are the people—and the Hon. Legh Davis was the critical one—who talked about the pressure that was allegedly put on Mario Feleppa. Let me divest him of that delusion right now: Mario Feleppa certainly won that round, according to anyone who actually knew what happened. Unfortunately, what we have here is an honourable man coming into this Parliament; the Hon. Nick Xenophon has come into this Parliament and put a decent—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: This is a pathetic piece of sucking up, Ron.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: The opinion of a scab has never worried me in any matter.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: If you think Nick's foolish enough to swallow this, then you're the fool.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: If he will listen to a scab, he will listen to anybody. This Government is desperate. It has no commitment. It promised the people of South Australia that it would not sell ETSA. It is desperate in that it will do anything to buy the vote of Terry Cameron and anything to fool, cajole and put pressure on the Hon. Nick Xenophon. I commend Nick Xenophon. I do not care what decision Nick Xenophon makes at the end of the day, because I have had enough to do with Nick Xenophon in the few months that he has been here to know him, despite the carping press. The members of the press at the moment are the most pathetic press that I have ever seen. All they are about doing is toadying to this lot opposite, trying to put more and more pressure on Nick Xenophon. They are saying that he cannot make a decision.

The biggest problem they have is that they have not struck anyone in the Government who has any honesty or integrity so they do not know how to handle Nick Xenophon. At the end of the day, whatever decision Nick Xenophon takes, he will still be someone that I will take the time to talk to and someone I will respect—unlike some others. Let us not be fooled about what we are doing tonight: we are abusing the confidence, the trust and the responsibility that is given to us all as members of Parliament.

I have a strong commitment to retaining ETSA in public hands, although others are not so committed. I will support

the position that I went to the people of South Australia with, that the Government went to the people of South Australia with and that the Democrats went to the people of South Australia with. All I ask is that those who are going to vote in the free and democratic Liberal Party—what a joke—who have any decency and any respect for the protocols of the Westminster system of Parliament and the history of this particular Parliament join with us and the Democrats and support this referendum, and let the people decide. We can watch them cringe: they will be down their burrows like rats down a hole.

Members opposite will not support this, because the one thing they will not do, although they talk about democracy, is practise it. They are prepared to lie for three years to the people of South Australia and then come up and use any dirty and underhanded tactic to get their own way.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That's unparliamentary. It is about time you watched your tongue.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Diddle, diddle, dum dums! Don't you like the stick? You're prepared to give it to the people of South Australia. You're prepared to belt them, but you're like the rest of them: as soon as you get the stick laid on you, you start squealing. The only people who ought to be squealing are those citizens of South Australia that this Government has abused—and it is about to try to do it again.

I hope that in the next day or two we can settle this in an honourable way. One of the honourable ways in which we can do that is to support this motion of Sandra Kanck's. Let us go back and see what guts the Government really has. I know what will happen. The people of South Australia value ETSA. People in country South Australia have a value: the problem with these people opposite is that they only have a price. What is the price of it? 'What is the value of it?' is what they ought to be asking. What is the value to a business in country South Australia that knows that it is going to get electricity at least at the same price as everyone else? What does that do for its competitive confidence? What does it do for people living in country South Australia when they know that they have an ETSA station and, if they have a problem, they can go to their MP or go and get a freedom of information document and fill it out? It is an open process.

What members opposite have forgotten is that it is not just about price, it is about value. And the people of South Australia value ETSA greatly. All these people opposite talk about is the price they are going to get for it, what they are going to do with the money to make themselves look good for the next election, and work out how much they have to pay their advisers. I have no idea what that is about. A couple of weeks ago, I asked the Treasurer 27 questions on notice. I asked, 'What are we spending on advertising? What are we spending on consultants?' We cannot get an answer. Those questions were asked in February, and we have received not one answer. The Government is hiding everything from the people of South Australia. This process really needs proper scrutiny.

It is too late for a royal commission and a select committee, but it is not too late to get the Economic and Finance Committee—and the Government has the numbers—to put it all on the table and come up with some recommendations so that it can be subjected to proper public scrutiny. At the end of the day, despite what Government members think, they do not own ETSA. ETSA belongs to all the people of South Australia. The Government will come back with commercial in-confidence stuff and no FOI. We will not be able to see the contract, because it is between the Government

and the contractor. Well, I will tell Government members who the contractor is and who is contracting it out—it is the people of South Australia. The Government is really saying to us that the people who own the asset cannot know the terms of the agreement until after it is sold.

The Government has its American advisers here. Its American advisers could have told the Government that in America there is no problem with an open process; that is the way it is. When you contract into a Government service and to the people of America, the people of America have a right to know—and they ought to know—what is involved, and it is the same for the people of South Australia. If you want to find out about the contracts for running the private prison in Mount Gambier, we are in the ridiculous position of not being able to get them. Yet I am told—and I am not computer literate—that those who can—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: That ought to lift the quality of the air in this area—can get on the Internet and find that out. This fledgling privatisation crew—these people who break their promises—is now trying to rush through this system and abuse, once again, the trust and confidence of the people of South Australia, not just in politicians but in the parliamentary and the political process in this State. They ought to be condemned. I know that they have worked hard on the Nick Xenophon today and that they have done their sums. It is marked No. 1 on the Notice Paper, marked with a circle (at 1 o'clock today) as having to be done today. This had to go through today. What have we done? We have jumped all over the place. We are dealing with the matter tonight, when there is no press and no parliamentary scrutiny. Why would you not want to do it under the cloak of darkness, if you are doing something as despicable as these people are doing?

This whole process is a joke. We have the ridiculous scenario of people running around this place saying, 'We will sit Friday, Saturday and Sunday.' I do not care if I sit until New Year's Day, because all members opposite have made their overseas trips. I am only going back to Port Pirie—up to God's country. If members opposite want to sit here until 31 December, I do not care. However, I do not believe that we ought to be rushed into—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: You didn't want to rush for the past three months, because you had not beaten poor old Nick around the head, and you had not locked in that prized rat Terry Cameron at that stage. You had not done that, but now you want to rush it through so that all your mates can get away and go on their overseas trips. Well, I am in no hurry. I am prepared to sit down and make an hour's contribution on every clause. If we go into December, I do not care about that, either. With those few remarks, I urge all members to support the Hon. Sandra Kanck's amendment, to follow the democratic process and do the honourable and decent thing—to tell the people who voted in the last election, on a commitment of the Liberal Party, the Labor Party and the Democrats, that 'There may be good reasons to change it, but we are putting it back to you, for you to make a decision about your assets in an open and honest way.' They would welcome the opportunity to see some honesty in the parliamentary process.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: This is the second leg of the referendum quinella! It seems remarkable to me that members on this side of the Chamber can remember what members opposite have said but have forgotten they have said. I do not know what this means, but it frightens me a little. I have

already demonstrated that the Hon. Paul Holloway could not even remember that his Leader, the Leader of the Opposition (the Hon. Mike Rann), had said he believed the referendum was unnecessary. Not deterred by that savaging, the Hon. Sandra Kanck put her paw in the trap, and it is about to be snapped off, because she denied that she opposed a referendum. She shook her head vociferously and said, 'I never opposed a referendum.'

I had better read to the Hon. Sandra Kanck, slowly but carefully and succinctly, an excerpt from the *Advertiser* of 12 August 1998. This reflected the debate that we had when the Hon. Nick Xenophon introduced the referendum proposal into the Parliament, and there was debate on the proposal to establish a select committee. I will quote directly from an article by Miles Kemp and Phillip Coorey, as follows:

Honourable Democrats MLC Ms Sandra Kanck said a referendum could be seen as a 'cop-out because we are elected to go through the arguments and make a decision'.

To me that does not represent a roaring endorsement for the proposition. Further, on Thursday 27 August, 15 days later, an article by political reporter Phillip Coorey, again in the *Advertiser*—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: —states that in making a response to the motion as introduced and outlined by Independent Labor MLC, Mr Terry Cameron—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Hon. Ron Roberts has had his chance to contribute.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: —regarding the establishment of a select committee which was to be debated in the Legislative Council, the Democrats' MLC Ms Sandra Kanck said that 'it was impossible to work out what it's trying to achieve. . . It's either very, very stupid or too clever by half, and I'm trying to work out which one it is.' She answers a lot of questions there. A lot of questions we had been asking ourselves quietly were answered in that comment. To add weight to those two remarks from the *Advertiser*, which I do not think were challenged in any letter to the Editor by the Australian Democrats as to their accuracy at any stage or any statement in the House, there were two news releases from the Democrats. In fact, there were two on the same day.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: Who put them out?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Mike Elliott put these out. I do not know whether this meant something, because I thought that the Hon. Sandra Kanck had the carriage of the ETSA legislation. Two press releases were put out on the one day by the Hon. Mike Elliott, Democrat parliamentary Leader. One was headed, 'Democrats move to amend ETSA motion' and the other one headed 'ETSA motion branded a farce and passed'. At no stage did those press releases give any indication, hint, whiff or clue that the Australian Democrats supported a referendum. If one reads the contribution to the debate on that select committee motion, one sees that there was not a roaring endorsement of the referendum idea.

So, sadly for the Hon. Paul Holloway, and the Hon. Sandra Kanck, they have been bundled together in a very unlikely quinella that would have paid handsomely, I would have thought. However, it brings no credit to their memory or to the standard of debate that they are trying to bring in to what is otherwise a very serious matter.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I think the Hon. Legh Davis should reflect for a moment on exactly what a referendum does and why it is needed. The purpose of a referendum is to gauge the views of the public and to seek approval from the

electors for a particular course of action. The Hon. Legh Davis has asked us to talk about honesty, so we will. There is just the little matter of an election in 1997, and on 6 September, just a few weeks before the election, the *Advertiser* reported this about the Hon. Legh Davis's Leader, in more ways than one, when it said:

The Premier has stepped into the row over the future of ETSA, ruling out private management of the corporation.

He ruled out not just a sale but also private management of the corporation. That is what he told the people of this State on 6 September 1997. That is a fact. The Leader of the Opposition made the point that we do not need a referendum. A referendum was quite unnecessary to determine what the people of this State voted for back in 1997. The Premier said that we would not have private management of ETSA. That is the point of view that the Opposition put, so of course it was unnecessary to have a referendum to determine those views. But, the Government lied.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The problem was that the Premier lied to the people of this State. I think that is a pretty serious offence. It is pretty despicable that a Premier would lie one month before an election. He lied quite deliberately. He lied to the people of this State one month before the election. If it comes to a referendum, it is this Government that needs a referendum. They are the ones who have broken faith with the people of this State. It is the democratic system that needs a referendum. It is not the Opposition that needs a referendum: it is this Government. They are the ones who went to the people promising that they would not sell ETSA. It is their integrity that is at stake. They are the ones who have to live with it.

The Opposition does not need a referendum to know what the people of this State think. We do not need a referendum to tell us how to be consistent in our views. We know what we promised the people of this State before the election, and we intend to stick by those promises. It is this Government that wants to break its word, and that is why the referendum option has come into play.

Again I make the point for the record that the Opposition never had the opportunity to vote on that referendum. I made quite clear in September when we discussed the select committee—and I quoted that bit earlier—that we were quite relaxed about facing a referendum. I made that statement on behalf of the Opposition. That was our position. We thought it was unnecessary to have a referendum to determine the views of the people of this State because we know what they are.

However, if the Government wanted to proceed to break its promise to the people of this State, as the Hon. Nick Xenophon honourably pointed out, that was the only decent course of action open to it. If it wanted to break that promise to the people of this State, the Government needed a referendum to do it.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Which your Leader was against.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Hon. Legh Davis has obviously not heard. We said it was unnecessary, and of course, it was unnecessary to determine the views of the people of this State. However, if the Government wants to break its promise and to restore some decency and integrity to the system, that is the course of action it must take. While he is digging through the *Hansard*, the Hon. Legh Davis might care to point out what was his position at that time in

relation to a referendum. He might care to examine that. The real point that needs to be made—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Hon. Legh Davis is all over the place. After 16 years in this Parliament he has managed to get distracted on all sorts of issues. We know that he has always had trouble. If it comes to attacking people on this side of the Chamber, he is very good at it. The only problem is that, when he retires from this place and leaves, after 16 years that will tragically be the only thing that is left, or perhaps a rose garden or two. He might list that as one of his achievements.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: And a bow tie, Mr Chairman.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Perhaps there are several achievements, but it is a great pity that the Hon. Legh Davis has not focused on matters of substance rather than going through some of these issues as he has tonight, and just attacking individuals rather than dealing with the issues. The Hon. Legh Davis knows that his Government went to the people; they made a promise to them a month before the election; they broke it; they deliberately lied at that election; and that will always be a millstone around this Government's neck, and this Opposition will ensure that it is a millstone that drags this Government under.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I was not going to make a contribution this evening but, as my colleagues have done so, I would like to make some brief comments. They will be brief because I have previously spoken on this Bill. This Chamber will not be surprised to hear that I think this amended legislation is a nonsense. Even worse than that, I think it is a hybrid nonsense. It is no more than a de facto sale. For the people of South Australia, I do not think it is a very smart deal. Once the lease is signed, it is gone and no subsequent Government will ever be able to afford to buy back into our smart utility. Several issues will then come into play, not the least of which is what state the existing assets will be in and the status of new assets and improved assets. One can imagine the relationship between a new Government that flags a non-renewable policy and our foreign lessees.

I heard this morning a report on, I think, regional radio when someone was speaking on privatisation, specifically of prisons in the United States. They said that in the US privatisation was not creating any new employment; employees enjoyed decreased working rights and conditions; they were not delivering a smarter service; and there were no real savings. Also, they were very much aware of the need not to replace one monopoly with another. Governments always need to have the upper hand. That has been the case with the outsourcing of our water resources, and I do not believe that this sale or lease will do anything different in South Australia.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In responding to a number of comments that members have made, for those members in the Chamber and for those who are listening to this debate elsewhere, it is fair to say that what we have seen is an indication of the approach that the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Democrats will adopt in this debate. Sadly, it will not be a genuine attempt to try to discuss substantive and very important policy issues for the future of the State. As has been outlined by members opposite and the Australian Democrats, they will seek to filibuster and to delay. The Hon. Ron Roberts has put on the public record that he is prepared to speak for one hour on every clause just to delay the proceedings of the Committee, and not to say anything. The Hon. Ron Roberts has made quite clear what his approach to this legislation will be. I hope that members who

are present in the Chamber and members who are listening to this debate somewhere else in the building will bear in mind the approach that the Labor Party, including the Hon. Ron Roberts and the Hon. Paul Holloway, and the Hon. Sandra Kanck will adopt in relation to the legislation.

From the Government's viewpoint, we are disappointed. We have tried to engage the Australian Democrats and the Australian Labor Party in sensible debate on the key issues. It is possible genuinely to hold views on this issue which we can engage in during the Committee stage of the debate.

As has just been indicated, we will have the Hon. Ron Roberts talking about Dean Brown's Premiership, what occurred prior to the election, Party politics or internal politics within the Liberal Party, and opinion poll results: he will talk about anything other than the substantive issues in the legislation. He will call the Hon. Terry Cameron a rat and a scab to try to provoke him into a response. Clearly, he has been given a task by the Hon. Mike Rann to provoke the Hon. Terry Cameron into some form of response. It is so patently obvious. The problem with the Hon. Ron Roberts is that he lacks sensitivity. When he is given a task he always goes over the top.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Boots and all!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It's not just boots and all; he is simply not able to accomplish a task with any degree of sensitivity. He can call the Hon. Terry Cameron a scab and a rat for as long as he wants. The question I put to members is: what does the Hon. Ron Roberts' abusing another member of this Chamber by calling him a scab and a rat add to the debate on this legislation? Absolutely nothing. The Hon. Ron Roberts can waste as much time as he wants; he can call as many people as he likes liars and rats. The Hon. Paul Holloway called a member in another Chamber a liar. They can descend into personal abuse. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has set the pattern.

The Hon. P. Holloway: That's why we're here.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: 'That's why we're here,' he says. Mr President, I can assure you that I do not intend, on behalf of the Government, to play this game. I will answer the questions and I will enter into and engage in sensible and rational policy debate. If the Hon. Paul Holloway wants to descend into personal abuse and call the Premier a liar, if the Hon. Ron Roberts wants to call another honourable member in this Chamber a scab and rat and if other members want to engage in that sort of behaviour, so be it. That will not be supported by the Government or by me. I hope that other members in this Chamber who are not members of the Australian Labor Party or the Government and who listen to the debate will make a judgment about the standard of behaviour and about the endeavours of members who filibuster and drag on this debate. The other thing I have to say—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Now the honourable member says, 'You're acting like a sissy.' It will not fuss me. The Hon. Ron Roberts can keep on abusing me. Go your hardest. If that is what you want to do, that is terrific. If it makes the Hon. Ron Roberts feel good, that is terrific. He can call me what he likes. All I want to say in relation to the contribution of the Hon. Ron Roberts is that it disappoints me that he would think that the Hon. Nick Xenophon is such an idiot and is incapable of making his own decision that he could be fooled or conned, as alleged by the Hon. Ron Roberts, by me, by the Government or by anybody else. That is what the Hon.

Ron Roberts said, that the Hon. Nick Xenophon had been fooled and conned by members of the—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He's just confirmed it. That's right, that's what he said: that he had been fooled and conned into decisions.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It disappoints me that the Hon. Ron Roberts thinks so little of the intellectual capacity of the Hon. Mr Xenophon that he believes that either I or the Government, or indeed anybody else, could fool or con him into making a decision that he has not arrived at himself, a decision arrived at having made a judgment himself. I will give the Hon. Mr Xenophon the credit that he will make his judgment accordingly, and he will indicate that in this Chamber. If it goes against the Government we will disagree with it, obviously very strongly, but at least he will make the decision and it will not be because he has been fooled or conned by other members in this Chamber.

I am disappointed in the contribution of the Hon. Sandra Kanck. The best that she could come up with after three months of discussion and waiting for this debate was to attack the nationality of advisers in this Chamber. There have been other precedents in relation to non public servants on the floor of this Chamber. The honourable member is wrong in relation to that. I have to say that I do not know about the nationality even of the public servants who might have been on the floor. I must admit that until the honourable member raised the question I have never thought to ask someone whether they were Australian citizens, and only if they were Australian citizens and public servants would we entertain them on the floor of this Chamber. The notion suggested by the honourable member disappointed me and I do not intend to respond to it in any great detail other than to indicate my disappointment that that is the sort of response that she would adopt on an important issue like this.

What we have seen from the Leader (Mike Rann) down is that the Opposition has panicked today. The dogs are barking in the corridors already. I have been amazed not only at the response of the Leader of the Opposition and his quite vicious attack on the Hon. Nick Xenophon in his press statement and by what he has said on and off the record to the media today but also at what some of his advisers have been saying about the Hon. Nick Xenophon over the last six to 12 hours. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Xenophon will find out from his own sources what has been said about him by Labor Party sources in the past six hours or so, in particular people associated with the Hon. Mike Rann.

What we have seen, as I said, is a panic response from the Leader of the Opposition. The Opposition has been fighting against this for so long, since February of this year. It has sensed that it might not have the numbers in the Chamber to stop it, and all of a sudden there was a panic. There was an urgent meeting yesterday and there have been urgent discussions today to try to work out what the Opposition would do because of the dilemma it thought it was going to find itself in as a result of this debate.

We saw the response of the Hon. Mike Rann today and we will be able to address that at another stage. The Hon. Legh Davis has clearly indicated that, whereas Mike Rann opposed the referendum, all of a sudden now, after 3½ months, he is supporting it. I think the question that the Hon. Mr Xenophon and others might put to Mike Rann is, 'Where have you been for the past three or four months?' Where has the Hon.

Sandra Kanck been for the past three to four months in relation to the referendum proposal? Where have they been?

They have been on the public record opposing it, attacking the proposition originally put by the Hon. Mr Xenophon in relation to a referendum, saying it was unnecessary and a whole range of other things. The Hon. Sandra Kanck said the referendum was a cop-out, that the Parliament was here to make these decisions and that we did not need a referendum, and what do we have, as the Hon. Legh Davis has pointed out? We now have the Australian Democrats proposing a referendum. Something it described as a cop-out is now a Democrat policy in relation to this issue.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Australian Democrats and the Australian Labor Party are nothing if not infinitely flexible in terms of their policy responses. They say, 'We will not have a referendum. It is a cop out and it is unnecessary,' and now we have them supporting a referendum in this Chamber.

The only other matter I want to address is the issue of some criticism from a number of Labor Party spokespersons about the whole notion of a lease. I want to put on the public record and remind the Hon. Paul Holloway, Kevin Foley, the Hon. Mike Rann and others, who were members of the Bannon Labor Government of the 1980s, of the decisions that they supported. This Labor Party supported a 25 year lease of land, buildings and equipment at the Torrens Island Power Station. The Labor Party not only supported it but introduced it and put it into action. The Hon. Paul Holloway supported—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Labor Party never put it to an election. The decision was supported by Kevin Foley, as an adviser to the Labor Government, Mike Rann and Labor members opposite and the collective support that they provided both within the voluntary organisation and the Parliament Party, whatever role they happened to adopt. In 1987 they supported a domestic leverage lease of the Torrens Island Power Station for a term of 25 years. At the time the arrangement was entered into the Torrens Island Power Station was valued at around about \$700 million. Yet here they are, standing up in this Chamber, attacking a lease for the electricity assets and businesses in South Australia. It is all right if the Bannon Labor Government did it. A lease is all right if a Labor Government does it, but if a Liberal Government attempts to do it then, shock, horror, we cannot do it.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: So, leases are all right? We can do it? The Hon. Paul Holloway says that it is all right. Leases we can do.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: There he is; he is on the record.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He is on the record. We can do it?

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is all right; we can do that?

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: You're in government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Exactly. The Hon. Paul Holloway does not know what to do now in relation to his argument on a lease. Let me remind the honourable member of another lease that he supported.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He did not support it?

The Hon. P. Holloway: I was not here then.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He did not support it? He was against it? Let me remind the honourable member of another lease that his Government, a Labor Government, introduced: a Japanese cross-border lease of equipment at the Northern Power Station. In 1986 ETSA sold three pieces of equipment at the Northern Power Station to Japanese investors and leased them back pursuant to three leverage lease arrangements. The original cost of the equipment was just over \$100 million. In 1986 the terms of those leases were for 20 years and 21 years, which will still run to the years 2006 and 2007.

We still have leases on some of our electricity assets entered into by a Bannon Labor Government with the Japanese for periods of 20 to 21 years—a decision supported by the Labor Government. It was done by the Labor Government. Do not try to get off the hook. The honourable member has been caught in relation to this. You entered into these asset leases. It is okay for a Labor Government to enter into 20 and 25 year leases with the Japanese and everybody else, but what would the Hon. Sandra Kanck say about the Japanese? They are not Australian nationals. I am sure we would have shock, horror from the Hon. Sandra Kanck that the Japanese had entered into an agreement with the Bannon Labor Government.

The hypocrisy of the Labor Party on the issue of leases is absolutely exposed for everyone to see. It is all right for the Hon. Mike Rann to support 20 and 25 year leases but it is not all right for a Liberal Government to engage in a 25 year lease. It is not all right for a Liberal Government to enter into a 25 year lease and then say after the election, 'Someone in the Parliament can then vote on whether or not we extend it.' What hypocrisy!

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: Apples and oranges.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Apples and oranges? Yes, there is a distinction: a Labor lease is okay; a Liberal lease is not okay.

The Hon. P. Holloway: That is not the distinction.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, that is the distinction: a Labor lease is okay; a Liberal lease is not okay.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have much more detail in relation to those leases engaged in by the Australian Labor Government but, as I said, it is not my intention tonight to delay the proceedings of the Chamber. We are, after all only on clause 1. As I said, I wanted to place on the public record the hypocrisy of the Labor Party and the Labor Government in relation to this whole lease issue.

Clause passed.

The CHAIRMAN: Before moving to clause 2, reference was made in the debate on clause 1 to the advisers to the Minister. I tried to answer the Hon. Sandra Kanck's first question quite simply but other references have been made. I understand that the practice has grown up over the years. We understand that, Sir Edgar Bean who was Parliamentary Counsel in 1966, was the first person allowed on to the floor to advise the Minister because of the complexity of a Bill before the Council.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: I have not asked that. He was knighted but I do not know his nationality. That practice has grown up. The Clerk has shown me a couple of examples after 1966 where an adviser was allowed on the floor of the Chamber. It became more of a practice, and the House of Assembly adopted the same practice, although later than in

this Chamber. There are no guidelines and I think that I can say that it is purely in the hands of the members. Certainly, the Chair does not have any list of who will be coming onto the floor as an adviser or their background. As far as I am aware that has never been a requirement. As I said, I believe that how the business is conducted is in the hands of members. Is there any further discussion on this matter?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I place on the record on behalf of the Opposition that we have no objection to the Government's advisers.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: John Curtin, when Labor Prime Minister of this nation, invited General Douglas MacArthur onto the floor of the Federal Parliament. At that time he was the military adviser to the wartime Labor Government in this nation.

The CHAIRMAN: That is an infrequent occurrence that happens on the floor of this Chamber as well.

Clause 2.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Leave out this clause and insert:
Commencement

2. (1) This Act (other than section 11A and parts 2, 3 and 4 of schedule 1B) will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

(2) Section 11A comes into operation on the day on which the Act is assented to by the Governor.

(3) Parts 2, 3 and 4 of Schedule 1B will come into operation in accordance with provisions contained in that schedule.

Given the length of time that Labor members have taken in delaying this debate, clearly we will not be able to conclude debate on clause 2 this evening because there are one or two other matters to which we will need to attend before the witching hour of midnight when some people in the Chamber will leave us. I suggest that we commence some discussion, question and debate on clause 2. I have moved my amendment, but I flag that in a little while I intend to report progress before we vote on my amendment—and I will leave it for the Hon. Sandra Kanck to speak in relation to her amendment.

In speaking to this amendment, I take the opportunity of outlining the Government's preferred course. Obviously, it is up to members concerning how we proceed with the debate. The Government's preferred course will be to use this amendment to clause 2 as a test case (or test clause) for the substantive debate we are about to have on whether or not we support a staged long-term lease, which I am about to explain on behalf of the Government. The amendment provides:

This Act (other than section 11A. . .

That is a reference to one of the key clauses later on in the debate. In essence, it is a consequential amendment on the substantive clauses later on. When this Chamber has been behaving sensibly and rationally, which it does on most occasions at the Committee stage—

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will take the Hon. Mr Gilfillan's advice and certainly not endeavour to provoke anyone. On many occasions, rather than sloggong our way through every clause which might be consequential on a substantive issue, we have taken the opportunity relatively early of having a substantive debate, even though some of those consequential clauses might have particular issues of their own which need to be debated and discussed about their appropriateness. As I said, we have adopted a sensible approach on many other occasions to expedite sensibly the debate at the Committee stage. Therefore, from the Government's viewpoint, this is an opportunity not to vote this

evening but to vote some time tomorrow on this substantive issue. Certainly from the Government's viewpoint, it intends to canvass a range of issues relating to the key provisions outlined in section 11A and other related provisions which refer to the staged long-term lease. That is the Government's preferred course. It is for other members to indicate whether they are prepared to adopt that course or whether they want to adopt a course of filibuster and spoiling.

As I said, the Government's proposition, which is first outlined (albeit obliquely) in this provision, is that the Parliament will now vote on a staged long-term lease of our electricity assets. I say at the outset that a statement made by the Hon. Ron Roberts earlier was wrong in fact. The honourable member said that the Government's legislation had changed in relation to this notion of whether there was a lease or a sale available. The Government's original Bill actually includes specifically disposal by way of sale, lease, or float. I think that is an issue—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will talk about it in a moment, but that is an issue that has escaped the Hon. Ron Roberts and also some media commentators who have taken the view that, in some way, the Government has had a piece of legislation about a sale and it is now changing that to a piece of legislation about a lease. That is important because of the structure of the amendments that we will discuss during the Committee stage. It is correct to say that the Government's preferred option has been and still is for a trade sale of the electricity assets. However, the Government in its judgment is one vote short—in this Chamber, anyway—of being able to achieve a trade sale of our electricity assets at this stage. I will not go into all the detail and the background and waste time in relation to that judgment.

In essence, the Government's range of amendments is fleshing out the detail of the lease provision which is already in the Bill. The Hon. Sandra Kanck has criticised the length of the Government's amendments. I might just say by way of comment that over half of those amendments (about 25 pages or so) are all in relation to a superannuation commitment from the Government which has been sought by the unions. We have negotiated with them and, in good faith, we are putting all of it by way of amendment in legislation so that they can feel confident that it is all there. When we talk about 50 pages of amendments, to be fair we need to indicate that over half of those pages all relate to one issue and, as I understand it, it is unlikely that anyone in this Chamber will oppose those provisions. Certainly, as I understand, no-one in the unions is opposing those provisions. So there is a block of 25 pages or so of superannuation amendments. It is completely the prerogative of individual members to speak for an hour on every one of those clauses, as the Hon. Ron Roberts has indicated. That is for members to make a particular judgment about.

Some of the other amendments are because of what will be—and I concede this—a complex procedure of a staged long-term lease. Again, in the spirit of discussion and debate that we have had with some members in this Chamber—and I will explain the results of those in a moment—a number of complexities have been added to the notion of a long-term lease which we have incorporated into the legislation. Put simply, the Government's proposition is that this week we will be voting on this legislation for a 25 year lease of our electricity businesses, which is around about the same length of time that the Labor Government undertook leases for the

Northern Power Station and Torrens Island Power Station when it was all right to undertake leases.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Did they bring it before Parliament?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, we did not see those contracts tabled in the Parliament. There was no mandate from the people to undertake those leases, but I will not—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: They got Caucus approval.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: They got Caucus approval but that is not a mandate from the people.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: So, they did not get Caucus approval. There was not exactly a mandate from the people; it was not an issue at the election; there was no commitment to do it, but they undertook it. Mr Chairman, I will not be diverted. This week this Parliament will vote on a 25 year lease up front in relation to the electricity businesses. What we will also be voting on is a provision which, quite democratically, will say to the people of South Australia that after the next general election for the House of Assembly, both Houses of Parliament will have to debate and then vote upon a resolution to extend the options for a further period of three lots of 24 years for the electricity assets. In total, we are talking about a potential long-term lease of 97 years. However, it will be a matter for the Parliament of the day, irrespective of what current members of Parliament might say—and I note that the Hon. Mike Rann is saying he thinks he will do something if there is a Labor Government after the election.

I remind members that Paul Keating, as a previous Labor leader, said that the Labor Party would adopt a certain stance in relation to GST. When the next Labor leader came along after Paul Keating, Kim Beazley, exactly the opposite happened. The next Labor leader and the next Labor Caucus adopted a different approach and said that they would block the GST, whereas Paul Keating, the previous Labor leader, had said that he would let it through. I only make that point because it is important that a public commitment from the Hon. Mike Rann is no proof of the pudding either, first, that Mike Rann will still be the Leader after the next election or indeed at the time of the next election; or, secondly, that indeed he can in any way bind, as Paul Keating could not, a future Labor leader in relation to this issue.

So, at the time of the next election, the people of South Australia will be able to openly debate and discuss whether or not they want to extend the initial 25 year lease by further terms of three 24 year leases to be extended. The people of South Australia will do so in the full knowledge that all of the lease contracts, not with provisions deleted in them and blacked out, will have been tabled in this Parliament prior to the next election for everyone to look at, something which was not done by the previous Labor Government with its 25 year leases of Torrens Island and the Northern Power Station.

So, there is a commitment which will be in the legislation that the lease contracts in their entirety will be tabled in this Chamber and in the House of Assembly so that the people of South Australia and members of Parliament will be able to make their judgments at the time of the next election and when members vote on it after the next election whether or not they think these were good deals, and whether or not they believe that the lease arrangements ought to be extended.

I will be quite open and frank about it. This is an issue of great importance to the Hon. Nick Xenophon. It is consistent with the view that he adopted in relation to the issue of the possible sale of ETSA earlier. That is, he was looking for

mechanisms or processes which would allow decisions to be taken by the people of South Australia at an election or referendum. This is a proposition which allows the people of South Australia to express a view. It allows the duly elected members after the next election to vote in full knowledge of the facts.

The Government's preferred course after a trade sale would have been to vote on a long-term lease of 97 years and to conclude that particular debate this week. However, politics is the art of a compromise, and in the discussions we have had with a number of people, including the Hon. Mr Xenophon, this proposition which we believe does meet one of the key requirements of the Hon. Mr Xenophon in relation to this whole issue is therefore an important part of the Government's proposal.

In terms of the lease structure and arrangements, because this has not been done in this particular way before—there have been long-term leases, of course, but this sort of staged or structured long-term lease is probably unique; we have not been able to find or ascertain something similar—it is the collective advice of our advisory team that a significant portion of the value will be captured by the initial 25 year lease, and the best estimates at this stage from our advisory team is that approximately 80 per cent might be the ballpark figure, and that the remaining three 24 year leases which will include a component that I will call a maintenance security guarantee, and a component of renewal might be a ball park figure of approximately 20 per cent.

Those figures are not set in stone because, as part of the bidding process, all other things being equal—and there are many other factors which have to be taken into consideration; it is not just an issue of the mix and total value—if one company was to say, 'We will pay 85 per cent of our total value up front', and someone else was saying 80 per cent, clearly the company which might be prepared to bid 85 per cent as opposed to 80 per cent up front may have a competitive advantage in the consideration of the bid offers from a number of the companies.

Part of the 20 per cent that we have talked about will be a maintenance security bond or guarantee of some form. If the Parliament, after the next election, decided that it did not want to continue with this leasing arrangement, that it only wanted a 25 year lease, then at the end of the 25 year lease, the Government of the day would take back the assets and revert to Government control and ownership of the electricity businesses. In that sort of arrangement, it is important that, if it is just a clear 25 year lease, for the last five years or so of the lease arrangement there is some cover that the Government of the day will have to ensure that the owner of the lessee does not run the assets into the ground.

So, there will be a notion of moneys still held over by the Government of the day, something akin perhaps to a security bond with the Housing Trust or a house that you are renting, to ensure that that does not occur. That is an important safeguard or protection that the Government has included in the scheme of arrangement that we are talking about.

In relation to the 20 per cent component, which is not a definite figure as I said previously, the structure that is being put in place in this legislation and lease documents will entail the lessees, the businesses, actually being required to hold onto that particular amount of money. We are still working through the detail of this, but perhaps it will be put into a trust account or some sort of contractual requirement where they will hold onto the money, it would accrue interest during the period from the lease to the vote of the Parliament, and if the

Parliament votes to extend the leases that money would be paid from the businesses to the Government of the day, together with the interest that had been accrued in that period.

So, the returns to the Government will be in two stages and up front, if I can use that phrase: an initial payment and a smaller payment upon successful passage through both Houses of Parliament of the resolution after the next general election. That second payment would include the interest payment that had been accrued. A number of options were contemplated in the discussions. Ultimately that was the option that the Government believes has the best chance of success from the majority of members in this Chamber, and it is for that reason it will be part of the staged long-term lease proposal that the Government is putting to the Council.

In relation to the overall structure of the staged long-term lease, on the best advice available, the Government believes that it should be able to achieve virtually the same value as if we had engaged in a straight-out long-term 97 year lease. The principal reason for that is the lessees know that, if the Parliament in three or four years' time votes not to extend the lease, they will retain their money with the interest that would have accrued, and it will not be paid over to the Government. So, the lessees are aware that, if it is not to be an extended lease but merely a 25 year lease, they keep the money and the interest on that component of the funding. With that structure, our advisory team is of the very strong view that we can capture the equivalent value to the value of a straight-out, long-term, 97 year lease.

The Government also believes that through this staged long-term lease process we can capture virtually all the value of our electricity assets whilst retaining ownership of those assets, and remove virtually all the risk of participating in the national electricity market. Again, I state that the Government's preferred option, for both those reasons, value and liability, would have been for a trade sale, but we believe that this is a good deal for South Australians and that we can capture nearly all the value and remove virtually all the risk of operating in the national electricity market. Obviously, that is an issue that will be part of the ongoing debate when we conclude all this tomorrow afternoon or whenever we continue this debate.

I suppose the last comment that I want to make (and when we return to this tomorrow I will speak about this in greater detail) is that the Government has obviously looked closely at the whole notion of a long-term lease, and questions were put to us by the Hon. Mr Xenophon in relation to a stand-alone, 25 year lease. I guess the stand-alone, 25 year lease does take on a new perspective as of the statements today, because clearly the Labor Party has now indicated a position—as of today, anyway—that the prospects of a stand-alone, 25 year lease are not high. As of today, the current policy for the Labor Party and the current Labor Leader is that the Labor Party would support the extension, after the next general election, of the initial 25 year lease.

Potentially, that takes a little of the emphasis away from this notion of the stand-alone, 25 year lease as opposed to the long-term, 97 year lease including the three renewal periods. Nevertheless, the Government's position, on which I will expand in greater detail tomorrow, is that we have had a long hard look at this before deciding whether or not we believed that this proposition would be in the best interests of the people of South Australia. We were mindful of the comments of the Auditor-General in both his recent reports. His report of 12 months ago highlighted all the risks but did not quantify

them, and in his most recent report he made a very strong argument that the Government in its analysis should be looking at a notion of net benefit to the total public sector.

I have indicated publicly and privately that, whilst I understand that notion, there are other ways of making judgments of the net benefit of any sale process, but in the context of a debate in this Chamber I suspect that members will perhaps place greater weight on the views of the Auditor-General than of the views that I as Treasurer might put of the Government trying to engage in the sale or long-term lease of our assets.

The Government has looked at this whole notion of the long-term lease within the football park that the Auditor-General has outlined for us, that is, this notion of a net benefit to the public sector from a sale, I guess he was talking about the sale, but we are now talking about the long-term lease, of our electricity businesses.

There are a number of important points that we believe must be factored into any calculation of total benefit to the public sector. Again, we will have an opportunity tomorrow to go into some detail, but one of the key factors has to be the level of interest rates that we currently have and can expect to have in the foreseeable future. In Australia in recent times we have enjoyed an almost unprecedented period of low interest rates, although I will not be partisan by congratulating the Federal Government for having achieved that.

The last 10 year average for interest rates was about 9.75, 9.95 or so, and we are currently at 6 per cent. I do not think anyone in this Chamber could rationally stand up and argue that we can anticipate for the next 25 years (or, indeed, for the next five or 10 years) that the current interest rate level of 6 per cent will continue for that period. If they did, I do not think they could find any credible economic commentator who would be prepared to support such a proposition.

There are some who believe that the interest rates for the next six or 12 months, or maybe even 18 months, might stay at around these levels, but no-one will be prepared to predict that the interest rates will stay at 6 per cent for the next 25 years or, indeed, for five or 10 years. So, in terms of making judgments about net benefits to the public sector, one must look at the notion of risk in relation to interest rates.

In relation to the argument that we have had in terms of not selling a long-term lease of our electricity assets, as a Treasurer I can say to someone (such as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition) who might want to be a future Treasurer that the notion of having a debt of \$7.5 billion and wondering whether in two years time interest rates might be at a level 2 per cent higher in average terms, and looking at what that will do to your annual recurrent budget expenditures, is an awful prospect.

With the last Liberal Government, I lived through a period when, after the first 12 months, we were engaged in a whole series of wide-ranging cuts to the public sector. We thought we had got over the hump of balancing the budget, only to have the Treasurer indicate that our overall levels of interest rates and interest costs had increased in the previous 12 months and we had to engage in another round of cost cutting and revenue raising in an endeavour to balance the budget. We have a situation where we are massively exposed to a huge debt, and we have to factor the possible rise in interest rates into our calculations of the net benefit to the public sector.

The other thing that we must take into account is blindingly obvious. At this stage, whilst our advisers have given us a very good estimate of what they believe we will be able to

recoup for our electricity businesses, we are not going to place that on the public record, for the reasons I outlined previously. However, in the end, any analysis will have to take into account a range of potential returns to the State as a result of a long-term lease of our electricity businesses. Indeed, our thinking in relation to this issue has obviously included those calculations.

The third critical area—and, as I said, we have been thinking about many other matters as well—is obviously the issue that was identified by the Auditor-General 12 months ago, that is, the extent of risk of our electricity businesses competing in the national market. I have certainly placed on the record a number of these risks before, but I will state them again.

The New South Wales Auditor-General has forecast a 77 per cent reduction in profits from the three Government-owned generators from 1996-97 to 1998-99. Significant percentages of ETSA's and Optima's forecasts of profitability, equal to between 25 per cent and 33 per cent in the period we are talking about, are at-risk earnings. That is not to say that we can say as of today that they will lose all that; we are not saying that. However, it has been agreed by management that they are at-risk earnings, and we must bear that in mind when we are thinking and planning.

We also have to bear in mind the regulatory risk. There are those who argue that our distribution—our poles and wires—businesses are risk free; for example, our regulatory risk in Victoria and the gas industry reduction in the weighted average cost of capital (WACC) represented a 25 per cent reduction for their rates of return. I have quoted the pool trading risks before, but I will provide them again. They have resulted in major utilities suffering profit/losses varying from 30 per cent to 100 per cent in some recent examples.

I will not go into all the detail of all the risks in running electricity businesses. We have had that debate or discussion *ad nauseam* in this Chamber. The Government believes they are significant risks; the Labor Party believes they are not. The Labor Party takes the view that, even with the national market, ETSA and Optima will continue to grow, their profitability will continue to grow, and there will be no downside at all in terms of their operation in the national market. That is a view that Mr Kevin Foley and the Leader of the Opposition (Mike Rann) have put consistently, but it is not a view that this Government shares, and it is not a view with which the majority of people who think about the national electricity market would agree, either.

We might want to have an argument about whether the potential profit reduction is 20 per cent, 25 per cent or 30 per cent, and we can argue about what the level of magnitude might be, but no-one can say credibly that there will not be a downside and that it will not be significant. We are happy to engage in debate about what that magnitude might be. However, no-one is able to say absolutely what it might be. Whilst the Auditor-General has talked about it, he has not endeavoured to quantify it. That is no criticism of the Auditor-General, I hasten to say. It is a very difficult task. This is a specialised business, and I am not surprised that the Auditor-General did not see it as part of his responsibility to put figures on the sorts of risks that he identified in descriptive form last year.

That is a comprehensive proposition. I will summarise all that by saying—and I will provide some more detail on this

tomorrow—that, having done that sort of analysis and the Government's having looked at the sorts of prices, both upper and lower, that the advisers to the Government believe we can achieve for our electricity businesses, I am happy to stand here on behalf of the Government and indicate, based on that advice, that with those returns we will see a significant net benefit to the public sector for the long-term lease, and we will also see a net benefit to the public sector from, indeed, even a 25 year lease. As I said, perhaps the significance of that is a little less, given the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition today.

From the Government's viewpoint, I indicate that we are happy to report progress at this stage and to try to proceed a little more quickly, we hope, in the concluding stages of the Committee tomorrow afternoon and tomorrow evening. I conclude by saying that this Government would like to see this debate be the substantive debate. Therefore, we expect it will be a lengthy one about the arguments for and against and the questioning on the staged long-term lease. We would hope then, having voted on this provision, that the remaining debate can be more specific about the provisions, rather than our engaging in a comprehensive wholesale debate on each and every provision, as was alluded to by some members earlier in Committee.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

AUSTRALIAN FORMULA ONE GRAND PRIX (SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 285.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I thank members with the exception of the Hon. Mr Gilfillan for their indication of support for this legislation. I will comment that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan is prepared to support joggers like himself, and other soft-hoofed animals, jogging around Victoria Park and the parklands but he is not prepared to allow others to enjoy them, albeit for a brief period. Given the hour, I am not going to prolong the debate, and I suspect that we have the numbers. I thank members for their indication of support.

The Council divided on the second reading:

AYES (14)

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Crothers, T. | Davis, L. H. |
| Dawkins, J. S. L. | Griffin, K. T. |
| Holloway, P. | Lawson, R. D. |
| Lucas, R. I. (teller) | Redford, A. J. |
| Roberts, R. R. | Roberts, T. G. |
| Schaefer, C. V. | Stefani, J. F. |
| Weatherill, G. | Zollo, C. |

NOES (2)

| | |
|------------------------|--------------|
| Gilfillan, I. (teller) | Kanck, S. M. |
|------------------------|--------------|

PAIR(S)

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Laidlaw, D. V. | Elliott, M. J. |
|----------------|----------------|

Majority of 12 for the Ayes.

Bill thus read a second time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 25 November at 2.15 p.m.