

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 23 November 1999

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

YUMBARRA CONSERVATION PARK

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia praying that this Council will consider and support the reclamation of the central part of Yumbarra Conservation Park, being section 457 north out of hundreds, county of Way (Fowler), to allow mineral exploration and mining access, was presented by the Hon. Caroline Schaefer.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:
By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Petroleum Products Regulation Act 1995—Report of an Inquiry into the Cost of Record Keeping to comply with the Petroleum Subsidy Scheme.

QUESTION TIME

HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about allegedly stolen documents.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Members of the Council would be aware of the ongoing controversy regarding whether the \$18.2 million stage 2 redevelopment of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium was required by SOCOG for South Australia to host Sydney 2000 Olympic soccer matches. Despite requests by the opposition and by the parliamentary Public Works Committee, in addition to a refusal by the committee to endorse the project, the government has refused to release the documents which prove or refute the government's claims that stage 2 was a SOCOG requirement. Late last year, the Ombudsman was forced to advise the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing that a formal summons under the Royal Commissions Act would be issued if there were further delays in responding to the Ombudsman's request for the reasons for denying the opposition access to certain Hindmarsh stadium documents. The Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has been rather coy in his answers to questions by the media about the project and is yet to confirm—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: No; it's truth, actually. The minister has yet to confirm that he has sighted the documents in question. Last week, we had the almost bizarre spectacle of the Olympics minister, Hon. Joan Hall, revealing that documents relating to Olympic soccer had been stolen from her private car on Monday 8 November 1999, a short time after the opposition lodged FOI applications to gain access to the documents, and the Democrats and the opposition placed motions on the *Notice Paper* regarding an investigation by the Auditor-General into the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium redevelopment. It is unclear from Minister Hall's answer to media inquiries which documents or copies of

documents were stolen and whether entry to her vehicle was forced. The opposition has been advised that original ministry of recreation and sport files—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the honourable member get to it.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The opposition has been advised that original ministry of recreation and sport files were passed on to the Hon. Joan Hall with the direct authority of the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing for an as yet undisclosed purpose. My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Given that the Council has requested that the Treasurer request an examination and report by the Auditor-General into dealings related to the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium redevelopment project, will the Treasurer now:

(a) ensure and give a guarantee that all documents relating to the redevelopment are impounded immediately and handed over to the Auditor-General;

(b) ensure that a full list of the documents allegedly stolen which relate in any way to soccer at Hindmarsh is provided to the Auditor-General and to the parliament?

2. Will he investigate how and for what purpose the Hon. Joan Hall came to be in possession of documents relating to soccer at Hindmarsh, given the minister's repeated recent claims that she has no responsibility for matters relating to Hindmarsh stadium; and in particular whether the content of the documents was known to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing and whether the documents had been in his possession, power or control at any time prior to their being passed on to the Hon. Joan Hall?

3. Will he advise whether the documents or dockets related to soccer at Hindmarsh allegedly stolen include any originals of correspondence or file notes; and, if original documents are missing, are copies of these documents in existence and, if so, who has them?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): There are some huge assumptions, together with a good dose of snide innuendo, in the honourable member's question. I am not at all surprised, given that this is the last sitting day. I have every confidence that the Auditor-General will undertake his task assiduously and get hold of all the documents that he requires. I am also confident that, should he have any concerns about not getting access to documents, he will make it quite known to the parliament about his inability to get hold of particular documents—should that ever be the case. I can assure the honourable member that I do not intend to conduct a separate Treasurer-led inquiry into the sorts of issues that the honourable member would want me to.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As I said, I do not intend to set in place a Treasurer-led inquiry to undertake the sorts of functions that the honourable member is requesting. The parliament has requested of the Auditor-General a particular task. I am sure that he, within the legal parameters allowed him by the act, will undertake the task that has been asked of him and that, in due course, he will report. If he has any particular concerns I am sure that he will report them, and the parliament or the executive arm of government can then respond, having heard those concerns. The honourable member ought to allow the Auditor-General to undertake his task and then make a judgment when he is in a position to make a report or, indeed, if at any stage he indicates a concern he, together with the rest of us, can respond as we see fit at that time.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I have a supplementary question: will the Treasurer seek answers from the minister in relation to the last three questions concerning the fate of those documents?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As I said, I do not intend to conduct a Treasurer-led inquiry in relation to these issues.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, I am happy to have a discussion with the minister, but by the time the answers come back—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Auditor-General will be conducting an inquiry. I will not be able to report back to the parliament until the end of March, anyway. I would hope that the Auditor-General has concluded his inquiry well before then. I am not sure why the Hon. Mr Holloway is whipping himself up into a lather, wanting me to—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am happy to speak to my colleague, if that will make him happy—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am happy to speak to my colleague, but I am just suggesting that—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will present replies when the parliament resumes. I would hope that the Auditor-General has concluded his inquiry into this issue well prior to the end of March, so that when the parliament resumes at the end of March we are likely to have a report from the Auditor-General on all these issues.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank the Hon. Mr Roberts for his assistance in answering these questions: it is always welcomed. I am not sure of the relevance of his interjection but, nevertheless, it is welcomed. I am happy to take up the issues with the Minister for Tourism. As I said, by the time the replies come back to the parliament I hope we have received a definitive response from the Auditor-General not just to those particular questions but, more importantly, to the total inquiry that he has been asked to undertake. As I said, if he has any concerns that documents have gone missing or copies are not available or whatever else it is, I have never known the Auditor-General to be reluctant to express a point of view in relation to an issue such as that. I am sure that on this issue he would not be reluctant to express a view, should those circumstances ever eventuate.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, in both his capacity as Attorney-General and representing the Minister for Police, a question about the allegedly stolen documents.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I refer to the questions asked earlier by my colleague regarding the documents allegedly stolen from the Hon. Joan Hall's private car. The opposition has been advised that the car in question is a late model Mitsubishi Pajero believed to be fitted with a car alarm. The opposition has also been advised that no glass was broken when, allegedly, a thief broke into the vehicle.

In the recent past, when government ministers have believed that minor government consumables and government information have been stolen, the police anti-corruption branch has been called in to investigate. The disappearance of a large number of government documents and dockets

from a private car raises serious questions regarding the security of such documents. My questions—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Well, she's only a baby—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Well, you should be very careful about your government documents. They can be stolen from all sorts of cars, and they should not be hanging around outside pubs late at night, should they?

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Redford!

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: My questions are:

1. Will the minister say whether the police anti-corruption branch has been asked to investigate fully the alleged theft; if not, why not?

2. What are the cabinet protocols for the security of government documents and dockets when they are in the possession of persons who are not from the ministries to which the documents pertain and have taken the documents or dockets away from government premises, and has the Hon. Joan Hall breached any of these protocols?

3. Were there any signs of a forced entry to the Hon. Joan Hall's four-wheel drive vehicle—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:—and was a car alarm fitted and armed?

4. Which documents and/or dockets were allegedly stolen, and which are still to be recovered?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): It sounds as though members opposite want to become detectives. From the way they are going, it could be said that they might emulate the pink panther.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Not the pink pussy cat, the pink panther.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Attorney-General is on his feet. He may address the question.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon Mr Davis!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: As far as the first question is concerned, I would not expect the police anti-corruption branch to be invited to become involved. There is no suggestion that ordinary police—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: All I have heard is what I have read in the press. Those stories in the press, which may or may not be accurate, indicate that there was a break-in to a motor vehicle. Why would you want to call in the police anti-corruption branch to investigate such a break-in? Break-ins to motor vehicles clearly come within normal day-to-day policing operations.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I leave the police to do their own policing, which they are trained to do. We all may like to second guess what the police do regarding an investigation and think that we know better than they about the way in which they respond, but ultimately they are charged with the responsibility of administering and enforcing the law and embarking upon investigations of the sorts of offences which the media and the opposition assert have occurred. I do not know whether it occurred or whether it did not occur, because I have not sought—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Ron Roberts!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: —a report from the police. This is an operational matter—and that is where it will rest. As far as cabinet protocols regarding documents are concerned, I think a giant leap forward has been made in the imagination of the opposition to suggest that these are so-called cabinet documents. If they were government documents, I can only say that I take bags of work home and frequently—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: No, I have no idea.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I take bags of documents home and frequently they are dockets which have come from other agencies and other ministers. I know that my cabinet and ministerial colleagues do the same. There are not enough hours in the day to do the work that is required. So, you take them home and you do them at night, early in the morning and on weekends. There is nothing unusual about having the dockets of a different agency. They may well be in one's possession for purposes which have been properly documented.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: You have been here for 20 years. Have you ever left documents in your car?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have been lucky enough not to have to worry about it. The times I have been in this place and not in government I have been in opposition. Not many people have documents of very great significance in their car when in opposition, or at least they will not acknowledge it. If they do acknowledge it, they will not acknowledge where they got them from. All I can do is take on notice the question that the honourable member has raised. If it is possible to provide the information when Parliament next resumes, I will endeavour to do so, but we have to recognise that these sorts of assertions fall within the category of operational issues and I would not seek a report from police about the way in which they undertake their responsibilities in respect of those operational issues.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I ask a supplementary question: will the Attorney also assure this place that the same procedures in relation to these documents were adopted in regard to the alleged missing documents from the office of the Leader of the Opposition, Mike Rann, concerning the water contract?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: That raises a bit of interesting history, does it not?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has asked his supplementary question.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Not just the documents, either. I will take the question on notice.

MOBILONG PRISON, ESCAPE

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Attorney-General a series of questions about the Mobilong prison break.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I understand that the vigilance of South Australia Police has resulted in the recapture of the two prisoners who escaped yesterday morning from the medium security prison at Mobilong. It appears that they escaped with a degree of ease. Both were

convicted murderers. One of the escapees, Gary Grant Shaw, was convicted of murdering a 26 year old woman in 1995 while on parole for the manslaughter of his girlfriend and was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment for this offence. The talkback lines have certainly been running hot with the classifications given to that prisoner and the reasons why he was in a medium and not a maximum security prison.

The other escapee, Henrik Orlob Villumsen, was convicted of murdering a 48 year old man and his 74 year old father in Port Augusta in 1995 and was sentenced to 28 years' imprisonment. Both escapees had, as at yesterday morning, served only four years of their lengthy sentences. In 1985 South Australia was the first state in Australia to respond to the United Nations declaration on the rights of victims of crime by introducing our own charter of rights for victims. That meant that all agencies in dealing with victims of crime must do so sympathetically and they must be kept informed at all times of proceedings surrounding their case.

An honourable member: If they so wish.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: If they so wish. I believe that they would want to know whether the people who had been convicted of those murders were on the loose; what steps were being taken for their recapture; and their whereabouts.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The interjector from the other side says that some do not want to know, but I can assure members that, from the information given to me by telephone this morning, the victims of one of the cases—I cannot say for the other case—certainly would have liked to be informed immediately and would have liked to know whether some protection could be provided for them and their families. It has now been well established that yesterday's Mobilong prison escape came as a terrible shock to the victims' families mainly because they had no idea that the prisoners had been downgraded in status and moved out of the maximum security Yatala prison. So, it is clear that that protocol was not adhered to. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. What are the reasons given for these two maximum security prisoners to be downgraded in status after serving only four years of their life sentences?
2. Why were the families of the victims not told that the prisoners were being downgraded in status and moved to a medium security prison?
3. Why have no responsible government agencies yet contacted these families and informed them of the details of the escapees or offered them counselling and police protection until the prisoners are recaptured; and when will this happen?
4. Is the charter of rights for victims introduced by the former Labor Attorney-General (Hon. Chris Sumner) still in place and being practised and, if not, why not?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): A charter is in place and it is complied with. This government certainly gives very great support to ensuring proper support for victims of crime. There has been no review of either the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act or the rights of victims and the way in which those rights are recognised across government and in the private sector for at least 10 years, so earlier this year I established a review of services provided to victims. One report has been published, the stage 1 report, in about May, June of this year, I think—the middle of the year, anyway—and that has a number of recommendations about how we could better provide support to victims of crime.

Some aspects of that report are already being implemented. The remaining recommendations have been subject to consultation with various agencies that will be affected by the report and we are currently conducting a survey of victims. In respect of the charter of victims' rights, or the declaration of victims' rights, it does provide that, if victims so wish, they can be placed on the register with the Department of Correctional Services to ensure that they are kept informed of significant events within the criminal justice process affecting their particular case or in relation to the offenders who might be subject to sentence.

I do not know, first, whether the victims were on the victims' register. If they were not on the victims' register, that would suggest that they had not indicated a wish to be kept informed but, until there has been a proper investigation and report, I do not think it profits anyone by speculating on whether or not they were on the register and why they were not notified of the change in status or the escape. The Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services has indicated publicly an anxiety to ensure that we get to the bottom of this as soon as possible. The Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Correctional Services has also been speaking publicly about it because, ultimately, he has responsibility as the Chief Executive Officer for the way in which administration occurs within the correctional services system.

The minister has expressed concern about the escape and has indicated publicly that he will make the information available when the inquiry has been conducted and the report has been received by him. All I can do is take on notice the questions raised by the honourable member and provide information. If it is not in the public arena by the time we resume, he will get it then. But I would expect that well before then—hopefully within the next few days—we will have a better idea as to why this happened, how it happened and what the failings were.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The PRESIDENT: I recognise in the gallery the presence of the former Premier of Victoria, the Hon. Joan Kirner, and I welcome her to the dignity of the South Australian Legislative Council.

OLDER CITIZENS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Ageing a question about aged care places.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I understand that the commonwealth Minister for Aged Care, the Hon. Bronwyn Bishop, recently announced that a further 7 000 aged care places are to be allocated across Australia. I am also aware that a number of aged care facilities in regional South Australia have been anxious to secure additional places. My questions are:

1. Is the minister able to indicate when places will be allocated to South Australia?
2. Is he able to indicate which aged care facilities in this state will receive allocations?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON (Minister for the Ageing): The commonwealth minister has just announced, much to the relief of many South Australian aged care facilities, the 1999 aged care approvals round. South Australia has received

over 450 new places, together with \$1 million of capital grants going to four separate organisations. I am delighted to see that a number of rural and regional aged care providers have been successful in their applications for places. I am also delighted to see that those responsible for the allocation have included a range of allocations, not only residential places but also community care packages. Members will be aware that those packages enable people to remain in their own homes, as most older people wish to do, with the appropriate level of support from an aged care provider.

I was particularly delighted that the Country Home Advocacy Project Inc. (CHAP), which operates from Nuriootpa, has been successful in obtaining an allocation of 30 community care packages for its region, which extends into Yorke Peninsula and the lower Mid North, as has the Barossa Village Inc., and those packages will be much welcomed in that area. The Hills, Mallee and southern region has been successful in securing a number of additional places and packages, as has the South-East. The commonwealth has also recognised the importance of culturally specific services, and the Netherlands Australian Aged Services Association will receive 20 new aged care packages, together with a grant of \$50 000, to be applied in metropolitan Adelaide. The Orroroo and District Health Service Inc. will receive a residential care grant of about \$790 000, which will be of great benefit to the area.

I know that the honourable member takes particular interest in the services provided to the Riverland in South Australia, so I am pleased to advise that Renmark Paringa District Hospital will receive 20 community care packages for the Riverland.

I believe that the commonwealth has fairly allocated these additional places across South Australia, not only in geographic terms but also in terms of the various service types. We do work closely with the commonwealth to ensure that appropriate services are provided for older people not only through the residential care approvals round but also through the home and community care program where we have allocated over \$75 million this financial year.

NORTH WESTERN ADELAIDE HEALTH SERVICE

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Administrative Services a question about the North Western Adelaide Health Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: In yesterday's *Advertiser* on page 78 there were invitations to tender for various government services and supplies. Under the Department of Human Services, there were nine invitations to tender for various items of medical equipment. Flinders Medical Centre required an MRI (magnetic resonance imaging) scanner; the Women's and Children's Hospital also required an MRI scanner as well as a robotic pipetting system; and the Royal Adelaide Hospital required an angiography unit. The cost of such equipment runs into millions of dollars. The MRI and angiography equipment is important in the effective diagnosis of disease and other disorders such as heart conditions. The government has acknowledged the need for equipment turnover to keep up with the latest in medical technology. Our other major public health service, the North Western Adelaide Health Service consisting of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Health Service, according to the tender invitations, requires only a dishwasher. Yet,

according to a staff member at QEH the hospital is waiting to replace an outdated and much needed ecocardiography unit. Yet this does not appear on the list of tender invitations in the paper.

An article in the *Saturday Advertiser* highlighted that people in the northern and western suburbs were 60 per cent more likely to die from poorly treated heart disease than people who live in the central and eastern suburbs. The North Western Adelaide Health Service also does not have MRI scanning equipment. This is despite repeated requests for the past three years. MRI equipment is acknowledged to be the latest in diagnostic imaging and would assist the North Western Adelaide Health Service with diagnosis for its specialty renal equipment, as well as the increasing demand on other medical services such as orthopaedics.

It is curious, given that the North Western Adelaide Health Service provides health services for 40 per cent of South Australia's public health population and approximately 55 per cent of non-insured people in this state, that it has been neglected in the government's latest invitation to tender for major medical equipment. My questions are:

1. Why is there an absence of any major medical equipment tender for the North Western Adelaide Health Service?
2. Why is there no invitation to tender for an ecocardiography unit for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?
3. Given the percentage of South Australians who access services from the North Western Adelaide Health Service, why is there no MRI scanning equipment to be tendered for at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or Lyell McEwin hospital?
4. Does the government plan to downgrade both the QEH and Lyell McEwin hospital services by not supplying major medical diagnostic equipment?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON (Minister for Administrative Services): The tender advertisement that appeared in Saturday's paper was placed at the direction of the accredited procurement unit of the Department of Human Services, and my colleague the Minister for Human Services has ministerial responsibility for that unit, so I will direct the bulk of the questions to him and bring back an appropriate response.

However, I think that a couple of points ought to be made. It is a matter of some positive note that the South Australian health system is seeking additional equipment. We do maintain in this state a world-class, first-class health system which is required to be constantly updated and which is updated with the purchase of the latest equipment to enable that service to be maintained. The honourable member suggested, I think, that the North Western Adelaide Health Service supplies 40 per cent of the South Australian public hospital population. I would be very surprised if, in fact, that is the appropriate figure, bearing in mind the substantial other services which apply not only in the Royal Adelaide Hospital but also in the south of the city.

I know from my experience as Minister for Disability Services that it is certainly true that those in the north-west do tend to suggest that they are under provided for in the way of certain services. However, in my own area of responsibility, careful studies have shown that the western suburbs of Adelaide and the western metropolitan region are well provided for with respect to human services when compared to some other areas—and, indeed, in the HACC program the priority areas for the development of new services are to the south of metropolitan Adelaide. So, the cry that one often hears from the north and the west that they are under provided for is one that, in my own experience, is not supported.

I think the general inference of the honourable member's question is that, by some positive action of government, the North Western Adelaide Health Service is being under provided for with new equipment. That is certainly not the government's policy, which is to ensure that appropriate services are delivered across the whole of the state.

PACIFIC POWER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The 1998-99 annual reports of five out of the 10 New South Wales state-owned electricity companies were tabled in the New South Wales parliament last Thursday. In its annual report, Pacific Power reported hedging contract losses in excess of \$100 million as a result of a Victorian Supreme Court decision. These are well known. Integral Energy, another state-owned agency, acknowledged that it had inadequate risk management, which led to losses of some \$48 million, with a further \$30 million of losses on agreements yet to be brought into account. Energy Australia reported that it had lost 30 to 40 per cent of its large customer base and warned taxpayers of further risks and further reductions in returns. Delta Electricity reduced its output by 12 per cent and its return on equity was about 5.3 per cent on its capital. When one compares that with a return of 6.5 per cent on commonwealth 10 year bonds, which are risk free, that puts the risk in some perspective. The New South Wales Liberal opposition has called for resignations and is considering calling for the establishment of a parliamentary committee over the results. Perhaps Michael Knight could be shifted to Pacific Power.

The editorial of the *Financial Review* of Saturday 20 November reports that consumers in New South Wales, in their capacity as taxpayers, have a much bigger bill than they expected. It reports that the size of the Pacific Power loss is big enough to have an impact on the state's finances and has underlined the risks of state governments remaining in the deregulated electricity business. The editorial continues:

... that as many as a dozen government-owned distribution companies in New South Wales are in danger of being out of their commercial depth. Return on equity for the New South Wales generators had already fallen over the past three years from 15 per cent to 5 per cent before the latest Pacific loss.

In its final paragraph the editorial states:

After missing out on realising that amount of privatisation revenue [referring to the Victorian experience], the state's taxpayers can perhaps only console themselves that the operating losses which are just starting to emerge will hopefully [and I emphasise 'hopefully'] not look so bad.

My questions are:

1. Does the minister agree with the sentiments set out in the editorial?
2. Does the minister have any advice to offer to Mr Egan and the New South Wales government in relation to risk management?

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As my colleague the Hon. Mr Davis interjected, we were very surprised that the Hon. Paul Holloway did not ask this question last Friday or today because this is the Hon. Paul Holloway's model of electricity business governance. It is not just the Hon. Paul Holloway

who supports this model but also Mike Rann and Kevin Foley, and indeed—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, not the whole Labor Party. John Hill is playing a cagey game. He has not been out there. It has been Mike Rann, Kevin Foley and Paul Holloway who have been very strongly pushing this line that governments need to retain control of the electricity businesses in the national market and, when questions are raised about the risks of the national electricity market, the question that comes from the Hon. Mr Holloway, Mike Rann and Kevin Foley is: what risks? We will continue to generate \$300 million a year from our electricity businesses if we continue to control them here in South Australia.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Would you trust Mike Rann—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: You are not being fair. Paul Holloway—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Didn't he? Well, he can stand up and distance himself from Mike Rann and Kevin Foley if that is the case. I have not heard him do so yet, but if that is the case we look forward to his distancing himself from his leader and the shadow Treasurer.

A number of members were sent copies of an earlier very detailed *Financial Review* story on this Pacific Power court case. I know that considerable concern was expressed by a number of people about the implications of that case for governments' continuing involvement in the running of electricity businesses. Sadly, many of the concerns flagged in that original *Financial Review* article have now come true as a result of this decision by Justice Gillard in the Victorian Supreme Court. That respected *Financial Review* commentator, Ivor Rees, in his analysis piece on Friday, said:

New South Wales taxpayers will end up losing hundreds of millions of dollars as a result of yesterday's shock decision in the Pacific Power case in the Victorian Supreme Court.

Further on in his article, he said:

If the first 15 months are anything to go by, losses over the remaining terms of the contracts could easily be between \$300 and \$400 million.

The Hon. A.J. Redford: They've only brought a hundred into account.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The article continues:

However, the actual losses will depend on spot market prices.

The Hon. Angus Redford informs the Council that at this stage the annual report has brought to account only \$100 million of expected losses.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, the Hon. Mr Redford is a very astute member. All members should acknowledge that. It highlights for governments, and for oppositions frankly, the considerable concerns and the considerable difficulties in terms of running government-run businesses in a competitive and cutthroat national electricity market. This was just but one series of decisions in terms of hedging contracts written between one government business in New South Wales and a private sector business in Victoria. It is the sort of concern that people have been trying to highlight for two years now with the Australian Labor Party. It is the sort of concern that a number of their colleagues privately will recognise but are not prepared to recognise publicly by way of their support for the position that the government has adopted.

What it means is that, in the case of New South Wales (and just this particular decision), the taxpayers of New South Wales are the ones who will have to pay the ultimate cost.

We have much analysis and criticism from the opposition and the minor parties in this chamber, and the Independents, in terms of the impact on taxpayers of the regulatory and restructuring models that the government has undertaken in South Australia. However, there is forever some sort of blind spot from all of the opponents of privatisation in recognising the real and genuine risks involved in competing in this market.

I think the Labor Party sought to portray this as just people crying in the darkness in terms of concerns, that these concerns were not genuine, they were not real, they would never happen to businesses, that our businesses in South Australia would not be exposed to this sort of risk, and that the taxpayers of South Australia could be assured that the budget would continue to get this \$200 million to \$300 million a year each and every year, which has been included in the analysis the Labor Party has done, the analysis that the Independents such as the 'No Pokies Only in Hotels Party' candidate, Hon. Mr Xenophon, have done, as well as the Australian Democrats—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:—and the New South Wales government, and indeed others. In their analyses they continue to insist—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As the Hon. Mr Cameron rightly indicates, this is just one series of decisions by one company. This is not the end of it. This is just one series of decisions made by one company. New South Wales has a large number of electricity businesses. I have indicated before the impossibility of any minister being left permanently in the position that I am currently in, where I have three supposedly independent competing generators, competing with each other in the competitive market. That is the same position that Michael Egan, New South Wales Treasurer, has. It is the same position as the Queensland—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Ten businesses; I am not sure how many generators he has, but he certainly has a number of generators as well competing. What we have—and this is a view that I share with the former Auditor-General of New South Wales, Mr Tony Harris—is that there is no known system of governance where a minister of the crown can satisfactorily manage the inherent conflicts of having competing government owned generators within the public sector competing with each other against private sector competition at the same time.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The inherent naivety of the position of Labor Party members in relation to this is demonstrated by that particular dilemma, and a willingness, sadly, to just close their eyes and their ears and to hope that it will all go away. The taxpayers of South Australia, and the taxpayers of New South Wales for that matter, just cannot afford for their governments to adopt that sort of an approach. All I can say, in concluding, is that this state and this parliament and the people are actually indebted to the courage of members like the Hon. Mr Cameron and the Hon. Mr Crothers whereby this sort of situation, gladly, has been averted in South Australia, where, to a very large degree, the risks involved in relation to the operation of these businesses will now be the responsibility of private sector operated companies.

POLICE UNIFORMS

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Police, questions about the police officers' requisition system.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The November *Police Journal* contains a letter from a Gawler police officer regarding the current state of the police uniform requisition system. It is a rather long letter, but I need to read it into the *Hansard* record. It states:

... What a poor state of affairs the uniform requisition system is. Now I am fully aware of the need to wear a neat, clean uniform to work so as to show the professionalism of SAPOL. Unfortunately, due to the great uniform requisition system we have I am afraid I will be reduced to wearing second-hand clothing to work.

Yes, SAPOL is a very professional, progressive organisation. As I sit here and write this I am in a position where my uniform shirts have actually fallen apart. The material has given way and they are in no way serviceable.

I have completed the correct PD form to order new uniform items as per general orders and have waited patiently for the delivery of my new shirts. Unfortunately, whilst I wait, I am forced to wear one old remaining shirt, which is about three years old and itself is not serviceable. Owing to the forces of nature and weight gain, this shirt no longer fits. It is now at least one size too small, bordering on two sizes too small and I cannot do up the top button. In turn, I have to wear a tie with the collar still open. Yes, we all know how professional that looks. I contacted State Apparel to inquire on the progress of my requisition, which is already 1½ months old.

I was told that they had no items in stock and there was still approximately another four weeks wait as the supplier was having difficulties actually supplying the goods. I pleaded my case but, unfortunately, they cannot give what they do not have. Great—I am left with only one shirt which is just a tad too small. Should I have to wear the same unserviceable shirt every day? I think not. What is the solution? Either wear plain clothes, claim the plain clothes allowance and go off the road away from my normal uniform patrol duties; or be forced to wear secondhand clothing passed on to me from workmates. It is not really good enough, is it?

If we are to be a professional, motivated, progressive organisation let's get the basics right. Let's at least equip the troops with clothing so that we can at least look the part. As my old cricket coach said to me years ago: always dress to look the part. If you look like a cricketer, you feel like a cricketer and you play good cricket. Maybe the same should apply to SAPOL.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Mike Rann opened the batting but he hasn't scored yet.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I will not acknowledge that interjection. Most South Australians would agree that we have one of the best forces in the nation but I am sure that the morale of our officers is not advanced by their being forced to look like raggedy-anne scarecrows. My questions, therefore, are as follows:

1. Is the Attorney aware of the current unsatisfactory situation with the requisition system, and does he think it appropriate that our police officers should be forced to wear secondhand shirts?

2. If not, and in order to keep our officers suitably attired, will he order an inquiry to ensure that problems with the requisition system are quickly sorted out?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I am sure that the Police Commissioner would have already seen the letter, be acting upon it and, if necessary, preparing a response.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! We have had the question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I would expect that the minister has already read it, too. I will refer the matter to my colleague and bring back a reply.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Emergency Services, a question about the application of the levy rates for the emergency services levy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I have been contacted today by a constituent advising me that he has received an account for the emergency services levy. From the information given to me by my constituent, it appears that the current levy system is based on the valuation coding used by the Valuer-General to establish various property valuations, including the value of properties rented or occupied by the government. I am informed that the coding on government occupied buildings is designated by code number, which places the land-use factor into the category of 'other' under the emergency services levy system. This means that the land use factor for government occupied buildings is .5.

Unfortunately, other strata title offices in the same building, which have been given a different coding by the Valuer-General, are automatically rated as 1, namely, as commercial buildings under the land-use factor of the emergency services levy. The constituent who contacted me believes that the way in which the emergency services levy has been applied, using the coding system adopted by the Valuer-General, is discriminatory and unfair. He further believes that this discrimination and unfairness is further exacerbated by the government's recent announcement to reduce the levy rates on buildings classified as 'other', which reduces the rate from .001675 to .000875. My questions are:

1. Will the minister explain why strata title offices in the same buildings are required to pay different levy rates?

2. Will the minister advise why the emergency services levy is being charged on a coding system used by the Valuer-General which has the effect of creating discrimination on the amount charged?

3. Will the minister undertake a review of the rating system to make the emergency services levy more equitable and fair?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): If the honourable member wants to give me the information I can get it checked. My understanding of the reason for the distinction is that, in relation to government property, a flat amount is being paid by the government to cover all government owned property so that whatever coding given to government property is—for the next couple of years at least—irrelevant to the amount which the government is paying to cover its own properties. My recollection is that it is about \$11 million, but I will get the amount checked and if it is inaccurate I will correct it in the next part of the session. As far as I am aware, the flat rate that the government is paying, which covers schools, hospitals and all other government property, has been designated as a flat rate because, frankly, it was not possible within the time to properly identify the value of a lot of the government property, much of which is vacant Crown land and therefore not required to be valued. We took the view that a lump sum contribution was the appropriate way to go, which means that you do not distinguish between government properties and their different uses to get different codes and ratings. That is

where it is at the moment. I will get the answer checked and if there are any inaccuracies I will bring back some additional information.

CHAUFFEURED STATION WAGONS

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

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I provide the following information in response to the honourable member's question without notice asked on 28 October 1999 and letter of 9 November 1999 regarding the Passenger Transport Board's (PTB) policy in relation to the use of station wagons by small passenger vehicle operators:

1. At no time has the PTB stated that station wagons are inappropriate to be used as small passenger vehicles.

The Passenger Transport (General) Regulations 1998 require that a vehicle used for small passenger vehicle metropolitan and traditional accreditation must be 'within a higher quality class of vehicle recognised by the board'.

In general terms, a vehicle commonly known as a station wagon would not be permitted as an acceptable vehicle unless it meets the higher quality standards.

The two most commonly used vehicles within the small passenger vehicle traditional and metropolitan vehicle categories are the Holden Statesman sedan and Ford Fairlane sedan. Both vehicles meet the 2.8m wheelbase specification as required in the Passenger Transport (General) Regulations and both are considered to be a 'higher quality class' of vehicle.

Holden and Ford do not produce a Statesman or Fairlane model as a station wagon. The only available station wagons to be manufactured by these companies are the Commodore station wagon, the Falcon station wagon and the Fairmont station wagon. None of these vehicles are considered to be in the 'higher quality class' of vehicle and none meet the 2.8m wheelbase specification.

2. The PTB has not received any complaints from consumers arising from an inability to access a station wagon vehicle from small passenger vehicle operators. Meanwhile, customers can assess other options from small passenger vehicle operators including the use of trailers, high quality people movers and the use of specific luggage transport vehicles.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Terry Roberts.

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan: How many questions can the Hon. Terry Roberts have?

The PRESIDENT: I do not know; I do not keep a tally on how many he has.

MOBILONG PRISON, ESCAPE

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question on the Mobilong gaol break.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: According to the correctional services minister speaking on radio yesterday, \$3 million has recently been spent upgrading the technical monitoring equipment at Mobilong. It apparently did not extend to placing a simple alarm speaker in the prison officers' toilet facilities. My questions are:

1. Is it true that the prison officer in the control room yesterday morning was the only fully trained officer at Mobilong on that shift?

2. Why is there only one officer assigned to the control room at Mobilong prison; and for how long has this been the practice?

3. How many fully trained prison officers were on guard in the entire prison at Mobilong at 5.30 yesterday morning; and why did they all fail to hear the alarm and see the events unfold on the internal video monitoring system or detect a double escape through any other means?

4. Given the recent technological upgrade at Mobilong, why is there no alarm speaker in the prison officers' toilets?

5. Will the Attorney-General agree to make public all the findings (that do not compromise internal security) of an internal inquiry being conducted by the correctional services department into this latest breakout from Mobilong?

6. Will the Attorney-General guarantee that all the control systems in the entire state prison system, including the staffing levels, are Y2K compliant and that preparations have been made for any oversight or emergency should the systems fail at one minute past midnight on 1 January?

7. Does the action replay of the events actually work?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I will take the questions on notice and bring back replies.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question about the escape at Mobilong.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: News reports indicate that murderers Gary Grant Shaw and Henrik Orlob Villumsen spent 30 minutes yesterday morning scaling—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The time for questions has expired.

INDUSTRIAL AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (WORKPLACE RELATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice.

Although it might depart from the standing orders, I indicate that the motion will enable me to restore to the *Notice Paper* as a lapsed bill the Industrial and Employee Relations (Workplace Relations) Amendment Bill, a course of action in respect of which I believe I gave notice last Friday for today but about which there seems to have been some misunderstanding and it appears as a notice of motion for next year.

Motion carried.

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

That the Industrial and Employee Relations (Workplace Relations) Amendment Bill be restored to the *Notice Paper* as a lapsed bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The PRESIDENT: Have you been misrepresented?

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Yes, I have.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: On 21 October 1999 the Treasurer made a ministerial statement in this chamber in respect of a media release that I had issued earlier that day. At the time, the Treasurer indicated that he intended to make further comment—and I have been waiting for that to happen—but as a calendar month has elapsed without any further comment I will take this opportunity to address the Treasurer's statement. The Treasurer's concerns were twofold. First, he took exception to the use of my phrase and the headline of my media release that he had been 'caught

with his pants down'. I confess that I was a little surprised at the Treasurer's objection to my use of that phrase.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I thought that as a former Minister for Education he might have recognised and indeed appreciated a metaphor when he saw one. I certainly never expected my words to be taken quite so literally. The Treasurer claimed that if the situation had been reversed this might have attracted charges of sexism, and I assume he was pointing that at me. I want to make it clear that I believe that what is good for the goose is good for the gander and that if indeed such a statement had been attached to me I would not have been offended. Nevertheless—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will be heard in silence.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Nevertheless, as the Treasurer was offended, I unreservedly apologise for any hurt that I might have caused him by using that particular phrase.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: He was very sensitive about it.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I noticed that. The second component of the Treasurer's complaint about my statement is without foundation. The Treasurer claimed that my inclusion of the interest paid by the electricity businesses to Treasury as income to the state is misleading. He stated that the interest goes to the banks and financial institutions and, hence, cannot be classified as income to the Treasury. However, in attacking me, he left unsaid the fact that back in the financial year 1996-97 the state government transferred \$450 million—

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I rise on a point of order, Mr President. This is not a personal explanation. The honourable member is debating—

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: —a substantive issue. It is not suggested that—

The PRESIDENT: Order! To which standing order are you referring?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I am saying that debating the issue is not the subject of a personal explanation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. Sandra Kanck to put her points for and against without debating the issue.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: During his ministerial statement, the Treasurer cast some doubts on my capacity to be able to make statements about economic and financial issues. Therefore, it is important that the statements that I made in my media release which he attacked are clarified so that the Treasurer understands what I said. Back in 1996-97, the state government transferred \$450 million of non-commercial sector debt to the electricity industry—

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I rise on a point of order, Mr President.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Well, maybe you would. I ask the Hon. Angus Redford to put his point of order.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Standing order 173 provides, first, that a member may explain matters of a personal nature—this does not fall within that category—and, secondly, standing order 175—

The PRESIDENT: Order! That's your opinion.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Well, let me put my point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Put your point of order without stating an opinion.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Well, I am, Mr President. Standing order 175 provides:

... may again be heard, to explain himself in regard to some material part of his speech on which he has been misquoted or misunderstood. . .

It says nothing about debating something that someone might have said earlier.

The PRESIDENT: Order! No-one has referred to the correct standing order. Standing order 173 provides:

By the leave of the Council, a member may explain matters of a personal nature although there be no question before the Council; but such matters may not be debated.

I ask the honourable member to say where she disagrees with the statement made by another member. That is all she can do in a personal explanation. The honourable member cannot debate the matter.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: The point which I was trying to make and on which obviously I cannot elaborate is that the Treasurer said in his ministerial statement that basically I erred by including interest in the calculations that I set out in my media release. Therefore, I cannot explain why it would appear that he has got it wrong. I guess that, under these circumstances, the misrepresentation that he made in his ministerial statement remains on the record.

YUMBARRA CONSERVATION PARK

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Diana Laidlaw:

That this Council requests His Excellency the Governor to make a proclamation under section 43(2) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 that declares that rights of entry, prospecting, exploration and mining under the Mining Act 1971 may be acquired and exercised in respect of that portion of Yumbarra Conservation Park being section 457, north out of hundreds, County of Way (Fowler).

(Continued from 16 November. Page 425.)

The PRESIDENT: I refer to a number of questions which were asked of me during question time on 16 and 18 November by the Hon. Ron Roberts concerning the motion on the Yumbarra Conservation Park moved by the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning. He asked: what is the earliest date under the act that this proclamation can be agreed to, and what is the earliest date that this resolution can be passed?

The notice of motion was moved by the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning on Wednesday 29 September and appeared on the *Notice Paper* on Thursday 30 September. Section 43 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 provides:

(5) A proclamation under this section in respect of land constituting a national park, a conservation park, the Belair Recreation Park, the Para Wirra Recreation Park, the Katarapko Game Reserve or the Coorong Game Reserve (except a proclamation revoking a previous proclamation) must not be made unless—

(c) the proclamation is made in pursuance of a resolution passed by both houses of parliament.

(6) Notice of a motion for a resolution under subsection (5)(c) must be given at least 14 sitting days before the resolution is passed.

This requires that it be 14 clear days and excludes the date of the giving of the notice and the date that the resolution is passed. Therefore, in calculating the number of days and the additional sitting days of Friday 19 November and Tuesday

23 November, the Legislative Council should not in my view finally vote on the resolution until Tuesday 23 November 1999.

The Hon. Ron Roberts further asked on 16 November whether I could explain the legal ramifications and any precedent, if one exists. The chair can only give advice on the matters raised by the Hon. Mr Roberts. It is not for the chair to explain the legal ramifications of the Council's action. Finally, the Hon. Ron Roberts asked whether I would be advising His Excellency the Governor of all that advice before such time as he is asked to make the proclamation. My answer is that, no, I will not be doing that because the President does not advise His Excellency the Governor.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I rise to support the resolution before the Council. I am well aware of the time of the year, and I am aware of the fact that members are anxious to adjourn, so I have made my speech as short as is humanly possible. The town of Ceduna is located on the far West Coast of South Australia on the scenic shores of Murat Bay on the Great Australian Bight, approximately 800 kilometres from Adelaide and 1 900 road kilometres to Perth. The town is the major regional business centre of the far West Coast on Eyre Peninsula. The Eyre Highway or National Highway 1 passes directly through Ceduna, with approximately 400 000 tourists passing through the town each year.

Ceduna has a total population of 3 559 and an indigenous population of 799 (or 22 per cent) and has been described as one of the most complex multicultural communities in Australia. Currently it has a relatively young population with 50 per cent under the age of 30 years. Ceduna currently has an unemployment rate of 9.7 per cent, according to the Eyre Regional Development Business and Skills Audit undertaken in December 1998. Aboriginal unemployment is much higher, as is youth unemployment. This figure is up from 7 per cent in 1996, against the statewide trend, which has seen unemployment ease here in South Australia.

These unemployment figures do not take into account the 188 Aboriginal participants in the Community Development Employment Program, that is, work for the dole. This scheme, which was developed to combat the debilitating effects of entrenched unemployment targeting remote communities with limited or no employment prospects, has been successful in developing a sense of pride in community and culture and has formed the basis for the acquisition of greater skills employment and enterprise development. It has done little to increase the income levels for Aboriginal people.

I have had significant representations made to my office and also made to the office of the Hon. Trevor Crothers. Those representations fall into two categories. The first category involves about 150 letters that I received from people that I would, for want of a better title, classify as 'concerned environmentalists', who wrote to me urging me not to support the deproclamation.

However, the other category of correspondence that I received included a petition of over 700 signatures from residents in Ceduna and, in total, over 1 000 letters, all from local people—people from Eyre Peninsula and upper Spencer Gulf—and all supporting the benefits that a proposition such as this could bring to the area and pleading that their young people are kept in their own home town.

I would like to read just a couple of those letters onto the record. The first letter is from a Mr Darren Coote from Ceduna. I will edit his letter slightly; I am sure he will not

mind. I will be leaving out just one reference he made. The letter states:

Dear Sir,

Upon receiving your letter regarding mining in Yumbarra National Park . . . I have lived here in Ceduna all my life, with our family dating back several generations. My great-grandfather has the local front bar named after him at the Community Hotel.

I am employed with my father in the family building business, and am a qualified carpenter/joiner. In the early 1980s my father employed four full-time people with the odd casual labourer. We now work together with one labourer depending on the size of the job. Since I started my apprenticeship in 1986 we have always been very busy (thankfully, touch wood!) even in drought times.

Ceduna as a town hasn't grown but facilities and infrastructure has got better.

But the only way this town will and can survive is through the advent of mining. The greensies can be concerned if they mine the whole park, but at 0.65 per cent—

I will then delete what he says they can do—

Our town's livelihood is at stake and it would be a shame that such a beautiful area as this could become a ghost town. When it comes to politics. I don't really care from which party you come but I put my trust in the local member to do the best they can for my area. Thank you for reading this short letter and I hope this project can go ahead for us, and the state's economy in general. . .

I would also like to read another letter because it summarises the views of much of the correspondence that I have received. I refer to a letter from Peter and Judy Bett from Ceduna which states:

Dear Terry,

We write as long-term residents of Ceduna asking you to support mining in Yumbarra National Park. We have seen the downturn in economies of rural towns on Eyre Peninsula and see mining as a real hope for improvement to this community in the future. We have five children (grown up) of whom three have had to move away from home to secure employment, one works here and the other can only find temporary work.

We believe mining companies are now very responsible towards the environment and the advantages to this area far outweigh the negatives.

I think those two letters sum up the general views that were expressed to me by the more than 1 000 residents who wrote to me. What they are talking about is the fact that Ceduna (as with most rural areas in South Australia) is currently experiencing economic recession as a result of the poor productivity of marginal farming country and low international produce prices—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: As the Hon. Legh Davis says, 'These are areas which have high unemployment.' The Ceduna area, which has traditionally relied on farming for its economic well-being, suffers from economic recession as a result of the poor productivity of marginal farming country and low international produce prices. This has resulted in personal and community distress, including fragmentation of families and continuing movement of its people to Adelaide and interstate centres for employment. An airborne geophysical survey discovered an extraordinary magnetic anomaly—the cause of all our problems—which was found in the Yumbarra Conservation Park approximately 30 kilometres to the north of Ceduna.

I would now briefly like to talk about the local environment in that area. There are 2 943 000 hectares of mallee represented in South Australia's far west parks: 105 100 hectares of mallee are currently excluded from mining in the far west parks central to Yumbarra. Yumbarra Conservation Park covers an area of approximately 327 589 hectares, that is, 3 276 square kilometres, or 8.2 per

cent of the 4 million hectares of sand dune mallee which forms the Yellabinna association.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Have you been there?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yes, I have, and I will come to that later. I went there with the Hon. Mike Elliott, the leader of the Democrats, and other members of the delegation. It is the experience of the local farming community that mallee of the Yellabinna association is extremely resilient and that only complete removal of mallee stumps and roots will prevent its recovery following good seasonal rains. The survey results in the report 'A biological survey of Yumbarra Conservation Park, South Australia' highlight significant findings. Within the boundaries of Yumbarra Conservation Park the following were recognised: eight plant communities, with 215 plant species, 11 introduced; 17 mammal species, four introduced; 101 bird species, one introduced; and 46 reptile species. Biological information supports the conservation and wilderness significance of the Yellabinna dune field area. Biological surveys in 1987 and 1995 within the Yellabinna dune field have both highlighted the need for increased conservation management within this significant wilderness area.

The core area of the Yumbarra Conservation Park covers a very significant north-south and east-west biogeographical transition, but the area of geological interest is unlikely to contain any species or ecological communities not also found to the east or west of the proposed mineral exploration licence areas. The greater Yellabinna dune field area—and Yumbarra Conservation Park is a small part of the four million hectares—is the most significant mallee wilderness remaining in South Australia, and the Wilderness Advisory Committee has a statutory role to advise government on such issues and should do so in relation to this area.

I would like to acknowledge the support and advice I have received from many sources over the past 12 months. First, I would like to thank the Ceduna council, including the Mayor Peter Duffy; Mark Comas, the President of the Ceduna Business and Tourism Association; Jane Lowe, the Economic Development Officer (and I almost offered her a seat in our office because she was either there or ringing us so much); Tony Irvine, the CEO of the Ceduna council; the district council of Le Hunte; Wudinna and Districts Business and Tourism Association; the Wudinna and Districts Community Directions Group; the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association; the Conservation Council of South Australia; the Spencer Gulf Cities Association, which includes the councils of Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie; and the Eyre Peninsula Regional Strategy Community.

I would also like to thank the following members from the Aboriginal communities: Mitch Dunnett (the Chairperson of the Wiranga Association), Wayne and Leonard Miller from the Wiranga Association, Kenneth Roberts, Samuel Mastrosavas, Ben Champion, Joe Miller, Oscar Richards, Bob Ware, Whisky Ware, Wanda Miller, Sue Haseldine, Lyle Ware, Gladys Miller, Joe Haines and Mercy Galstonbury. I might add briefly—and I will come back to it a little later—that I am pleased to advise, given the latest deputation from the Aboriginal communities that visited me last week, that it was in unanimous agreement that exploration should be allowed to proceed.

On the visit that I referred to when the Hons Nick Xenophon, Mike Elliott, others and I went up to have a look at the park, we had the opportunity of speaking with a wide range of people from the local community. From the farm and

business community I spoke to Mark Comas, Bevan Mastrosavas, Kym Trewartha, Paul Brown, Greg Limbert, Perry Will and Neville Alley. I also spoke with Bob Goreng from the Chamber of Mines and Energy; and from PIRSA, Ross Allen, Ian Hopton, Steve Ewen and Elliot Dwyer. You might think I have outlined a pretty exhaustive list but I could have added many others.

I also place on record my appreciation to the Minister for the Environment, the Hon. Dorothy Kotz, for answering my countless questions in relation to this deproclamation. I also place on record my appreciation for the quiet and patient advice I received from the Deputy Premier, Rob Kerin. I do place on record that at no time was I placed under any pressure by him or the government; in fact, I cannot recall ever having advised him of what my position on this would be because I arrived at it only in the past few days. But despite not knowing what my decision was, the Hon. Rob Kerin continued to handle my queries with considerable patience.

In addition to all those people, I have also looked at a whole range of studies and the select committee report which have been swirling around this matter over the past five or six years. The simple fact is that the Ceduna area of the west coast of South Australia currently suffers from sustained economic recession as a result of a number of economic and natural factors. It is experiencing a declining population and it could be facing reduced services and facilities. We have seen evidence of undesirable social behaviour and fragmentation of families as a direct result of the economic quagmire not only in Ceduna but also on other parts of Eyre Peninsula.

I can only agree with Bob Sneath, Secretary of the Australian Workers Union, when he was quoted recently as saying that the Australian Workers Union and the Australian Labor Party should be actively lobbying support for the mining development in Ceduna to proceed. There was a number of questions that needed to be answered and time does not permit me to deal with all the detail of this issue, but one of the questions that had to be addressed was: will this set a precedent? I say, 'Absolutely not.' I believe that is a convenient beat-up by the environmental lobby. Parliament is master of its own destiny and will make decisions—or should make them—based on the facts and on merit. Unfortunately, there are times when decisions are made which are designed to play politics with an issue rather than what is in the interests of our state and what will see our state grow. I also add that in relation to this deproclamation, as I understand it, if the anomaly turns out to be a useless lump of iron, then either the minister, the government or any member of this House or the other House could move to reprocure that area.

Another question that I had to deal with as I worked my way through this decision was: can exploration proceed without further damage to the environment? I think the answer to that, on all the information that I have received and the advice that I have taken, is quite clearly yes. I say yes because, according to the locals in Ceduna, it is yes, and according to the local environmentalists in Ceduna and on Eyre Peninsula the answer is yes. If you talk to the local indigenous population, that is all the communities—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I thank the Hon. Trevor Crothers for his interjection because their answer is an emphatic yes. They not only argue yes, exploration should proceed but also argue—

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Some of them—

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Hon. Mike Elliott interjects and says some of them have been to see us. Quite simply, all the Aboriginal communities up there are now supportive of exploration proceeding. The point that they kept making to us (when I say 'us' I include the Hon. Trevor Crothers, because he was present at most of those meetings) was that they have been looking after and living in that environment for the past 40 000 years, that they know the area and that they will keep a very careful eye on what happens there. And it is a persuasive factor when one looks at the arguments for and against deproclamation—that is, that the local community and the Aboriginal community, which was there for tens of thousands of years before we arrived, are all supportive of exploration proceeding. What is more, the argument that they put to us—and it is a compelling argument—is that they and their ancestors have lived in the area for thousands of years and that no-one, least of all the people in Adelaide, knows the area better than they do.

They have been involved in extensive negotiations and discussions with the mining companies. In the first instance, it was representatives of the mining companies who explained and put in writing to the Hon. Trevor Crothers and me that they had been involved in extensive discussions and had reached a final agreement with all the Aboriginal communities. When I pointed out to them that I thought there was one group which was not in favour of it, they said that that was not their understanding. The Hon. Trevor Crothers and I decided that we would check that matter with the Aboriginal communities, and we found that it is correct.

Further information which had to be considered in arriving at a final decision in relation to this matter was a perusal of the final draft proclamation, which I assume all members have read. As I understand it, this draft proclamation will be proclaimed by the Governor and it sets out tough conditions and compliance mechanisms for exploration. I invite honourable members to read that document.

Another matter that also has to be taken into consideration is that a further biodiversity study is to be undertaken. As I understand it, an independent assessor will be appointed, subject to approval by the government. That person will be employed by and paid by the company to conduct a biodiversity study whilst exploration is under way. The advice that the Hon. Trevor Crothers and I received from Dominion Mining and Resolute Mining was that, in the event that this motion was passed by both houses, they would undertake to commence that survey immediately. I point out that both the Hon. Trevor Crothers and I spent an hour and a half with representatives from both those companies and questioned them at length on a whole range of issues too numerous to bore members with here today.

I understand that a new position of scientific officer will be created, and I read that with interest in the minister's speech. So, I wrote another letter to the minister asking her whether she could clarify the role and duties of the new position of scientific officer to which she referred on 27 October on page 292 of *Hansard*. The minister replied as follows:

The new scientific officer's position will be based in the region and the main role will be to manage the environmental aspects of mineral exploration occurring in parks and reserves in the state's west. The position will be concentrating on the exploration in Yumbarra Conservation Park, if the reclamation goes ahead, and the surrounding parks and reserves.

The minister then goes on to detail at some length what the position's duties would include but not its limitations. I

understand also that companies will have to carry out an Aboriginal heritage survey, and native title issues will have to be satisfied.

I do not see those issues as being issues which should hold up this proclamation. They are all issues that can be sorted out in good time. If they are not sorted out, then nothing proceeds. On the best advice I have from the Aboriginal community, they believe there is nothing left which would stand in the way of exploration, and mining subsequently, if they prove up a mineable reserve.

I further understand that a further biodiversity study to which I have referred will have to be undertaken by the company. When the Hon. Trevor Crothers and I questioned them about how independent that biodiversity study may or may not be if it was being paid for and conducted by themselves—and I believe a legitimate weakness or criticism of the government's proposal did revolve around this further biodiversity study—information put to us leaves me quite clearly with the view that we can carry this resolution today and that a further biodiversity study can commence immediately, that it will be a complete biodiversity study and will cover the various seasons.

Additionally, along with the Hon. Trevor Crothers, I put a view to the company that that still did not satisfy our concerns in relation to independence and how the company would feel about funding an independent organisation, separate from this biodiversity study, preparing an audit of their biodiversity study. They have since written back to the Hon. Trevor Crothers and me and agreed that, if the proclamation goes ahead, they will fund and support an independent audit on this biodiversity study. I am not making this a condition of my support for this motion: I take the executives from Dominion Mining and Resolute Mining at their word. They have put it in writing, and only time will tell whether they act accordingly. I have no doubt that they will.

As I understand it, both the biodiversity study and this independent audit can proceed concurrent with exploration. In any case, if a provable ore body is discovered and it looks like they will proceed to mining, time does not permit me to go into all the detailed assessments, information studies, environmental impact statements, etc. No wonder people complain about government red tape. In addition to that, a declaration of environmental factors is required prior to exploration. If anybody would care to read this speech later, I am putting some of this information down because it is important that people can see just how many checks and balances there are. For example, the mining companies would be required to put in a declaration of environmental factors prior to a calcrite survey, and the mining companies advised us that they will be using the calcrite survey method, because it is the most environmentally friendly survey method known to us. In addition to having to put in a declaration in relation to the survey, they would then have to put in another declaration prior to drilling operations.

So, take it from me, Mr President, there are plenty of checks and balances. One could almost say—and I hesitate to do so because it will probably be quoted later on—that Yumbarra will probably be the most pampered mine that we have had in our state's history, and I guess you could argue, 'And why not?'

The Hon. T. Crothers: A role model.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Hon. Trevor Crothers interjects and says, 'A role model.' I will not keep responding to his interjections because we could be here all day. But, in our discussions with Resolute Mining and Dominion Mining,

it is their desire, if we do proceed to mining, for Yumbera to become a model for environmental and social factors to be taken into account in a mining operation.

I think they are serious when they talk about their three levels of responsibility and what they wish to achieve. At the end of this day Yumbera will be jointly proclaimed. That is my understanding of it, unless the minister is lying, and I quote from Minister Kotz when she was correcting what she said in another place. This is what she has put in writing to me to explain what she said in another place, and I quote from her correspondence:

... that it is a myth that protection is being removed, because it will be jointly proclaimed, affording the same protection under the National Parks and Wildlife Act of 1972 as it currently enjoys.

I think there would be very few people in this Council who would disagree that if Yumbera was to come up for proclamation today it would be jointly proclaimed.

I have outlined to the Council the environmental concerns and what we had to deal with. It should not take me too much longer, but I would like to cover employment considerations. There were wide-ranging representations made to the Hon. Trevor Crothers and to me in relation to the creation of employment opportunities for the Ceduna and Eyre Peninsula area. In no way am I being critical of all the effort that that community has made, as it has worked hard over the past decade to try to secure employment and a future for people who grow up in that area, but the facts speak for themselves. We currently have 9.6 per cent unemployment. In the past three years unemployment has risen from 7 per cent to 9.6 per cent during a period when unemployment in South Australia has been falling.

Quite clearly and quite simply, rural South Australia and, in particular, Eyre Peninsula, has been affected by the downturn in certain commodity prices. I will not go into all the details, but if members want me to I can quote the prices of all of them over the past five years; it is just something that I am interested in. Not only do we have a high level of unemployment in the area and even higher levels of youth unemployment, a worry to us all, but we have endemic unemployment in the Aboriginal communities, and this could be, if an ore body is found, a way of resolving a problem over there, which, if mining does not resolve, we will probably be talking about in 20 or 30 years.

I have already referred to the Aboriginal community, so I will not go back over that again. The Hon. Trevor Crothers speaks for himself, but I know it was a persuasive factor with me and I know that it was a persuasive factor with the Hon. Trevor Crothers that this could be the answer to their unemployment problems. One thing I want to briefly talk about before I wind up—

The Hon. T. Crothers: Do you need to be rewound?

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: No, I don't. I have been a little bit interested in the mining industry since my earlier days, and having spent nine years working as an industrial advocate for the Australian Workers Union—

The Hon. Sandra Kanck interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yes, they are on my pecuniary interests' list, if you care to have a look—MIM which has been a real dud and Normandy Poseidon which has gone even worse. They are there for you to have a look at, Sandra. I want to say a few things about the mining industry. I spent nearly nine years looking after the mining industry in South Australia, and I would hazard a guess that, with the possible exception of the Hon. Trevor Crothers (because you never quite know where he has been in his life), I have

probably visited more mining sites in South Australia and spent more time underground in mines, ranging from Mount Gunson, Leigh Creek, Roxby Downs (from when the first holes were drilled), right up to the Lindhurst talc mine, than any other member in this place—and I can tell members that conducting a site inspection up there is an experience. So, I have some little experience with the mining industry.

It has always amazed me why, as a country, we are not proud of our mining industry. We are one of the leading miners in the world. Mineral exports underpin our standard of living, particularly the standard of living of city residents. Australia mines many minerals: gold, nickel, iron ore, zinc, lead and, of course, South Australia's mine at Roxby Downs. We can look at rare earths, diamonds, it does not matter—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: The Hon. Trevor Crothers interjects and mentions bauxite. Keep going.

The Hon. T. Crothers: Coal and iron ore.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yes. It does not matter what one looks at, Australia is blessed with minerals. Not only are we one of the great mining nations in the world but our mining exports have risen to the top of our exports—

The Hon. T. Crothers: It is one of the great manufacturers of mining equipment, too.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Yes; I am further reminded that we are one of the great manufacturers of mining equipment and, in addition, we export mining technology and infrastructure right around the world. It should come as no secret that mining companies in Australia are now based in countries as far flung as Zambia—

The Hon. T. Crothers: Canada.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:—Canada and Russia—all over the world. I might add that not only are we at the cutting edge in the development of new mining technology but we are at the cutting edge and one of the world's leaders in being able to undertake mining in a sustainable way, yet protect the environment at the same time. Members will not find me, like the Australian Democrats, attacking one of the country's leading industries—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:—and one of the largest employers of people—

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Crothers will come to order. It is nice to hear him in good voice but the honourable member has had his chance.

The Hon. T. Crothers interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: Mr President, I thank you for protecting me from the incessant interjections that are designed to sway me from the task at hand. Whilst this has been a difficult decision, I will not stand up in this place and downplay the concerns that have been stated by the environmental movement or its spokespersons. This has been a difficult decision, but it is a decision one had to take weighing up all of the factors and taking into consideration all of the facts. And, in doing that, I am absolutely convinced that, on balance, my decision to allow exploration to proceed is correct.

It is the correct decision for Ceduna, for the local people who live in Ceduna and for the local Aboriginal communities who live in and around Ceduna. It is the right decision for Eyre Peninsula, it is the right decision for the Upper Spencer Gulf region, and it is the correct decision for the people of

South Australia. This decision, if a commercial ore body and mine is proven up, has the potential to transform the economic future of Eyre Peninsula. I am sure that you, Mr President, do not need any reminding, considering your background, of the pressing need to develop our regional areas.

Unlike some, I hope the anomaly is valuable and that it does lead to a world-class mine such as Roxby Downs. When I mention Roxby Downs, I do not want people to seize upon that and say I am arguing that I hope they find uranium up there. I am not arguing that, but I hope they find a world-class mine such as Roxby Downs because, if they do, that could ensure that another \$2 billion or \$3 billion is injected into our local community. It could also ensure the employment of hundreds of people. I know Roxby Downs; I spent 15 years going backwards and forwards up there. It provides hundreds of jobs for people on Eyre and Yorke Peninsulas. I often used to ask the management of Roxby Downs, 'Why are you trying to make my job so difficult as a union organiser when you employ only farmers' sons up here? They don't like us very much.' I think they knew that. I never took it personally and, when I asked those farmers sons to go out on the grass because the management was being belligerent, I am pleased to say that every single one of them followed us. So, even farmers' sons can be educated that there is merit in belonging to a trade union, provided that they act responsibly.

A new mine here in South Australia will provide an economic fillip for the entire upper Spencer Gulf region and the whole of South Australia. I am not putting this forward as a reason why we should go ahead and explore but at least, if we do go ahead and explore, we can sort out this question. I believe the question ought to be sorted and that the people on the Eyre Peninsula have a right to have it sorted out. At the end of the day, if no commercial ore body is found, the government, the minister or this parliament can consider reclaiming the land.

We have already created another wilderness area. If nothing is found here in this small section that is being proclaimed—an area comprising 0.69 per cent of the entire mallee area—then at least carrying this motion will have allowed exploration to take place and finally, once and for all, we will have satisfied the people of Eyre Peninsula that there is no mine potential here and they will be able refocus their attentions elsewhere. But, if we do not, in 10, 20, 30 or 50 years the people in that region of South Australia will still be saying, 'If in 1999 they had only given us the opportunity to move forward and progress with this issue, we would not have 14 or 15 per cent unemployment in this area'; or, 'We still would not be looking at a situation where the Aboriginal employment opportunities were so bad.'

In conclusion (and I am sure everyone is delighted to hear me say that), I wish the local people, the Aboriginal community and the explorers the best of good luck. It is now time to get on with the job. Let us stop the squabbling and, if the numbers are there to carry the resolution, let us all work together to give all South Australians an economic future. If we do not do that, I am afraid we will not have one.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I think it is important that members recognise that we are voting on a motion and not the proclamation itself. I doubt that most members have seen what the draft of the proclamation says and does.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: What an assumption!

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Have you, minister?

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Of course I have. I—

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Well, I am most surprised, but I congratulate the minister in that case. The important thing that one needs to recognise about the proclamation is that, once a majority of this parliament passes this motion today, basically all control will go to the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development. Parliament will be sidelined from this day on this issue.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: And the Democrats don't like that, do they?

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: No, the Democrats don't like that, because we believe that parliament is part of a representative democracy and we should be continuing—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Davis!

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I certainly find it surprising that some members in this parliament support the sidelining of parliament, but that is something for which they will have to answer to their own conscience. My particular concern with the wording of this proclamation, amongst others, is that it does not simply authorise exploration as the motion before us indicates: it also authorises mining. Clause 5 of that draft proclamation provides:

5. Before granting an application for a production tenement, the primary industries minister must [and there are a couple of things the minister must do]—

It is implicit that the primary industries minister can grant an application for a production tenement.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: So, we are authorising something before you lodge the application.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Well, this parliament is authorising something before applications are lodged, and that is of great concern. Everything in this specific part of this national park will come under the control of the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development. Sure, the minister can seek advice from the environment minister and even consider the advice but, having sought and considered the advice, the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development can disregard it.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: But he's a good bloke.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I am not sure that making a decision based on someone being a 'good bloke' is quite the way to do it, and the personnel do change from time to time. The Democrats are concerned about the precedent that the passage of this motion will have for other national parks in this state. For instance, we know that in the future there are likely to be moves on the Flinders Ranges National Park. Fundamentally, we are concerned that there has not been a proper biological survey and that, despite the protestations of some members in this place, what is planned is not a proper biological survey.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: That's not true.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: It is absolutely true. The wording of this proclamation makes it very clear. Clause 6(a)(ii) provides:

6. A person (the miner) who exercises rights under an exploration authority must comply with the following requirements:

- (a) (i) to conduct during the low impact stage of exploration a baseline biodiversity study in a control area identified by the miner for future environmental reference purposes.

It is not even the minister: it is to be identified by the miner, who has an interest in being able to mine. That is who will do this—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Mr Cameron, I am reading from the draft proclamation; that is where the truth lies. The miner who has an interest in mining this area is the one who gets to identify the control area where the baseline biodiversity study is to be conducted. So, at the same time as the miner is mining he will be doing the biodiversity study. This is really a case of putting the cart before the horse. That biodiversity study should be done before anything else occurs. Clause 4 provides:

Before granting approval under clause 2 and before determining what conditions (if any) the approval should be subject to, the Director of Mines must request and consider the advice of the Director of National Parks and Wildlife on reducing to a minimum the adverse effects on the environment of the proposed activities.

How will the minister responsible or the Director of National Parks and Wildlife be able to provide that information when the baseline biodiversity study will not be conducted until after the miner who is exercising the rights under the exploration authority does so? The decision will be based on no information.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: Exactly like agriculture.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Exactly like agriculture. My other concern involves the powers that exist for a miner. Clause 6(a)(iii) of the draft proclamation provides that the miner must comply with the requirement:

to monitor the condition of the environment, in particular the effect on the environment of the exercise of rights to which this proclamation relates.

In other words, again, this company which has an interest in mining is self-reporting. This is self-defeating in terms of protection for the environment. The Hon. Terry Cameron says that we need to find out what is there geologically. The Democrats have been asking for a number of years what is there biologically.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Tell us about one project that you support.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: The Hon. Mike Elliott approached Ministers Kerin and Kotz in 1997 suggesting that a survey ought to be carried out and that, when that was done, we could then sit down and talk about whether or not a proclamation ought to be issued and exploration considered. However, as I have said, a decision is now being made in a vacuum. Nothing was done. Two years on, we make a decision without proper scientific information on which to base that decision. The Hon. Terry Cameron introduced the issue of Aboriginal people—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: I didn't introduce it—it's an issue.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: All right, it's an issue.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Do you think I invented it, or something?

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: It certainly is an issue. That is why I now want to reply to what the honourable member said. He implied that all Aboriginal people support the going ahead of this project. That is not the case.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: That is the case. You are wrong. They've withdrawn that. Your letter is three months old.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Some Aboriginal people support it. The Mirning people obviously spoke to Mr Cameron, but they do not represent all the Aboriginal people in that area. Again, the Hon. Mr Cameron is all too willing to be easily convinced. He seems to think that

protections for Aboriginal sites will be there. Section 6(d) of the draft proclamation provides:

the miner, in addition to complying with any directions given under (c)—

(i) must take such steps as are reasonably necessary—

I stress the words 'reasonably necessary'—

to ensure that objects, structures and sites of historic, scientific or cultural interest, features of scientific or scenic interest and any wildlife on the land are not unduly affected—

again, I emphasise the words 'unduly affected'—

by the exercise of those rights.

I do not believe that that will provide the protection for Aboriginal sites which the Hon. Terry Cameron has been led to believe will be given. I conclude by indicating that the Democrats are strong supporters of regional development, but decisions of this kind should not be made—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Like Roxby Downs? Did you—

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Davis! We have heard the same interjection over and over again.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: —on the run without proper biological studies.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): I thank all members who have made a contribution to this debate. I thank them also for agreeing to sit two extra days this session—last Friday and again today—to address this important measure. It is also important to consider that this is the last day of the session for this century and it is interesting that this is the item that has brought us together. The government totally endorses the view expressed by the Hon. Terry Cameron: if we do not try we will not know what is there. It may be that there is nothing and life will go on. It may not go on to create the wealth and provide the pleasures which the Democrats want and call for every day of the week but which we cannot afford.

This is one way we may possibly be able to afford some of the agenda items that members opposite, including Labor members, the Democrats and Nick Xenophon, call for but never tell us how to pay for. How will we be able to lift the profile of the state's dignity and pride other than through jobs and wealth? How will we keep our younger people here to provide the work force? How will we stop the denuding of country areas of younger families and young people because they do not have job prospects? How will we support our Aboriginal people to stay on their land and get work? That is what the elders and others want because they know that, where there is idleness, there is often trouble. This prospect provides all of those opportunities.

I feel quite distressed when I hear the Hon. Sandra Kanck and Labor members opposite say no in this place to everything that provides an opportunity for this state to stand on its feet again. As a student of history myself I recognise that at the turn of this century South Australia was one of the wealthiest states per capita in the world. One of the reasons that we were able to build from a South Australian base is that South Australians paid for the overland telegraph from Adelaide through Alice Springs to Darwin.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: The Democrats would have been against the overland telegraph.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Possibly, because we might have knocked down a bush. But it went ahead and we paid for it. In the early part of this century, we were able to build a railway from Adelaide to Oodnadatta and from Darwin to Pine Creek. It was built by South Australians, with

no help from anybody else, because of our mining wealth. We were rich and we were able to do things in the state and national interest. Today we are handicapped. If we do not try we will not know.

This is definitely not a precedent. Always there are the checks and balances provided by this place and the other place in terms of majority of numbers to change these proclamations. Everything will be judged on its merits, as has been clearly demonstrated by the people who have spoken in favour of this motion. I do not think that any member or minister has taken this matter lightly. I certainly know that the local community has not done so, as is clear from the representations that have been referred to in this place, the thousands of letters, the many phone calls—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Minister, that is what I got.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: *Hansard* cannot describe that, but it is an 8.5 centimetre thick pile of letters. That is a very strong indication of support from a community which is not strong in numbers. I acknowledge on behalf of my colleagues, the Minister for Environment and Heritage and the Minister for Primary Industries, the support that the Hon. Mr Cameron and the Hon. Mr Crothers indicated in their contributions.

I refer now to the Hon. Sandra Kanck's very selective quoting from the proclamation. It was disappointing to see that the Hon. Sandra Kanck—for whom, unlike a lot of members here, I actually have some respect—having lost this issue, then sought to distort the arguments, including the final draft of the proclamation, because as part of the procedure the Development Act contains a provision—and the honourable member should be aware of this—for the EIS, for instance, to be undertaken by the proponent. We do not do this work ourselves: we provide that the proponent does this work and we have followed the same procedure through this final draft proclamation. I think it is incredible in terms of that process.

I also want to put on the record that it is absolutely untrue that total control goes to Primary Industries or PIRSA. Everything has to be signed off by the Minister for Environment and Heritage, and it was particularly interesting that this major fact was not only overlooked but it was also deliberately distorted by the honourable member. She said that it involved only Primary Industries because it suited her argument, but it is just not the truth. It is interesting that members of the Labor Party have been quiet throughout this debate and certainly are not interjecting—and most hold their head in shame—because what has not been clearly revealed is that under the previous Labor government joint proclamations were made in terms of 24 reserves. Therefore, Labor agreed to open 24 reserves to mineral exploration.

What we are doing is seeking to provide a future for South Australians in South Australia, to keep our young people here, to keep our regional areas prosperous and to provide wealth for the cities that spend so much of the wealth that is created in our regional areas. As the Hon. Mr Cameron said, I sincerely hope that it does strike 'gold' and that, at the end of this century, we are providing a bright mineral future for the state in the next century.

The Council divided on the motion:

AYES (11)

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

NOES (10)

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

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

EAST TIMOR

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.G. Roberts:

That this Council:

I. Calls on the Federal Government to take those steps required to counter the destabilisation of the ungoverned province of East Timor in the lead up to independence.

II. Commends the United Nations for the establishment of an international inquiry into gross human rights violations and atrocities in East Timor.

III. Calls on the United Nations to—

(a) organise an immediate United Nations supervised repatriation of East Timorese refugees from West Timor and other parts of Indonesia; and

(b) demand the immediate withdrawal of all Indonesian military and militia personnel from East Timor.

IV. Calls on the United Nations and the Australian Government to—

(a) urgently increase the emergency release of food and other humanitarian supplies to refugees in remote areas of East Timor to prevent starvation; and

(b) urge all governments, the World Bank and the IMF to ensure that economic assistance to Indonesia supports democratic and economic reform.

V. Commends the Australian Government for providing sanctuary to East Timorese refugees.

VI. Calls on the Australian Government to—

(a) expand that sanctuary to East Timorese refugees who are being targeted by the Indonesian military and militias;

(b) suspend military cooperation with Indonesia;

(c) immediately cease its de jure recognition of Indonesia's occupation of East Timor;

(d) thank the East Timorese people for their great sacrifice and support during World War II and to welcome the decision of the Indonesian Government in recognising the referendum outcome which granted autonomy and independence to East Timor; and

(e) make a commitment to assisting reconstruction in East Timor.

Which the Hon. Ian Gilfillan had moved to amend as follows:

Paragraph III—

After paragraph (b) insert new paragraphs as follow:

'(c) demand that Indonesia ceases all military and militia activity that is being directed against East Timorese independence activists and refugees who are trapped in West Timor and other parts of Indonesia; and

(d) call on the United Nations to organise a boycott of all military cooperation with the TNI unless this harassment and terror are immediately stopped.'

Paragraph IV—

After paragraph (a) insert new paragraph (ab) as follows:

'(ab) urge all governments, the World Bank and the IMF to ensure that urgent economic assistance will be given to East Timor to assist in its redevelopment and reconstruction to promote recovery from the 24 years of slaughter and destruction and to request that the assistance will be in the form of grants; and'.

Paragraph VI—

Delete paragraph (a) and insert new paragraph (a) as follows:

'(a) expand that sanctuary to East Timorese refugees who are being targeted by the Indonesian military and militias and to those refugees who have recently come to Australia whose homes have been destroyed and for whom an early return to their homeland at the beginning of the monsoon season without adequate shelter will cause further undue hardship and suffering;'

After Paragraph VI insert new paragraph VII as follows:

'VII. That this resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs.'

(Continued from 17 November. Page 499.)

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: In addressing this motion, we need to look back to the Second World War, and I recognise that the wording of the motion also acknowledges the contribution of the people of East Timor to Australia during the Second World War. One of the sad things about that contribution is that up to 40 000 East Timorese people died either through famine or reprisals from the Japanese as a consequence of helping Australia. I expect that, when East Timor was invaded by Indonesia, they anticipated that Australia would be in there helping them but, unfortunately, that did not happen. The invasion occurred and not only did we not help but the Australian government formally recognised Indonesia's annexation of East Timor, and that has been a matter of great shame for many Australians for 23½ years. Even the United Nations regarded the invasion of East Timor as being illegal and yet Australia recognised it.

Part of the reason for that was sheer political pragmatism—and that was the oil in the East Timor Gap. Australia negotiated the East Timor Gap Treaty with Indonesia. It did not have to worry about a small nation such as East Timor in the negotiation. It made life a lot easier. I recall in the early 1990s, at the time of the war with Iraq, the peace movement had a slogan, 'No blood for oil,' and it equally applies, I believe, to East Timor. Since that invasion of East Timor in 1975, we have seen continuing colonisation by Indonesia's sending people to that country who had no cultural or other links with the people of East Timor, so that their numbers could gradually begin to dominate. Australia continued to conduct joint military exercises with Indonesia and trained Kopassus troops.

I remember that during the 1980s the peace movement was involved in debate on the significance of the ANZUS treaty, and it was suggested at that time that probably the main enemy, if any, that Australia might face was Indonesia and that, in the event of any attack by Indonesia, the United States would not come in and help Australia. Although, we did not have an attack on Australia per se, we certainly had an attack on a nation of people over a period of 24 years and, quite clearly, the United States stood idly by during that whole time.

The people of East Timor have been the victims of genocide. Genocide is not a term that I use lightly, but the facts show that in the past 24 years one-third of the population of East Timor has either been killed or starved to death. If you consider that in terms of the Australian population, it would mean over a 24 year period we would have seen 6 million Australians die. That is almost impossible to comprehend, but that is the equivalent in East Timor.

Fortunately, there were people who kept on fighting to ensure that East Timor would have independence. Some of that fighting was done by the guerillas who lived in the hills; and some was done in a more formalised way with people such as Archbishop Belo and Jose Ramos Horta taking their message around the world. The awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to these two people in 1997 was a significant boost to the morale of the people of East Timor.

I do recall, when Jose Ramos Horta came to Australia and to South Australia, that he was denied an official reception by the Prime Minister of Australia, John Howard, and also by the Premier of South Australia, the Hon. John Olsen. Here in South Australia, three members of this chamber took responsibility for holding such a reception for Jose Ramos

Horta—the Hon. Terry Roberts (the mover of this motion), the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner and I.

People in the movements for East Timorese independence believe that part of the reason Bernice Pfitzner was put to an unwinnable position on the Liberal Party's Legislative Council ticket at the last state election was that she had dared to take that action. Certainly, I thought it was quite incredible to think that we had a Nobel Peace Prize winner in our midst, yet our state government would not give a formal reception. The Adelaide City Council, to its shame also, made life extremely difficult, to the point where a reception would have occurred with probably only three or four people invited.

The sad part about this failure to hold a reception by either the Prime Minister of Australia or the Premier of this state was the message that it gave to the Indonesians. It basically said, 'We are not going to do anything to upset you.' It was a covert message that said to Indonesia, 'Go ahead and keep doing what you have been doing.' Sometimes that message was spelt out more strongly than that. I recall in 1998 the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Hon. Alexander Downer) saying that he opposed independence for East Timor because he did not want to see 'the Balkanisation of Indonesia'. Again, we see this as a very pragmatic position, one that was based purely on convenience for the Australian government. It did not want to have to involve itself in having to negotiate with lots of small nations on all sorts of issues.

Jose Ramos Horta had a three phase peace plan, for which he was given the Nobel Peace Prize. Phase one was what he called the humanitarian phase, which would take up to two years. Phase two would have taken somewhere between five to 10 years—what he called the autonomy stage—and, at the end of that, if all parties were in agreement and self-government was seen as feasible, would come phase three, the vote for self-determination. Unfortunately, for some reason or other (and I must say I have never been quite clear about what caused the reversal of the position, particularly when Alexander Downer only one year before was talking about the Balkanisation of Indonesia), they suddenly reversed their position: not only did they want to proceed towards autonomy but they wanted to bypass that phase and opt for independence. One wonders, in retrospect, given the thousands of East Timorese who lost their lives this year, whether it was a wise decision. Nevertheless, the decision was made.

It certainly was surprising to see how anyone else on the ground—the people involved in the movement for East Timorese independence—could see that there would be the need for UN troops right from the beginning, once that process began, yet the Australian government could not see that. Up to this day, I have not understood where the Australian government was coming from. Looking at it from the outside, it was very clear that, once the decision had been made by the Indonesian government to allow a referendum, every day leading up to the vote saw an increase in the number of Indonesian troops being shipped into East Timor. What happened then was very predictable.

The Hon. Terry Roberts' motion refers to human rights violations in East Timor. There is to be an investigation into war crimes—that is, the events that took place from the end of August onwards once the referendum for independence was held and the outcome was quite clearly in favour of independence. However, the United Nations is unwilling to look at anything that happened prior to that referendum taking place, and I think that is unfortunate. It is common knowledge that, although a lot of money was put into East Timor by Indonesia, it was put into schools and hospitals that

were to assist the people that it had repatriated to East Timor. Pregnant East Timorese women who turned up to hospital for treatment for minor illnesses found while they were in hospital that their pregnancies were being terminated.

The Bishop of Baucau in a book titled *Buibere* says about the treatment of women:

I think that one day the history of the violence inflicted upon East Timorese women will be recorded. And then perhaps we will know the details of the brutalities, atrocities and violence which have been inflicted upon them by the Indonesian military. There are women who, in my view, are scarred forever—who will never be free of the ghosts, the horrors, the atrocities which have been inflicted upon them.

When they come to talk to me, things come out in pieces, sometimes in half-words, other times in comparisons, and many times in tears—lots of tears. Some have stood in front of me trying to say something, but they reach a point where their sobs are more than their words because they are incapable of saying what has hurt them so completely.

By what they do say, we have some idea of what has happened to them. But at this moment, I don't think we can know all the details. Time will bring the truth out into the open.

Similarly in this same book which chronicles interviews with various East Timorese women, there was an interview with a 22 year old woman from Dili named Sintadewe Bikiak. She talks about going to a hotel in Dili to speak to a visiting UN representative. About 100 people were demonstrating inside the foyer of that hotel. She says:

Suddenly, many military were inside the hotel foyer and they started beating us with iron bars and guns. When I fell down and was lying there only half conscious, they still beat me. This was how they arrested me. While I was lying down, the soldiers stamped on me and blood was coming out of my mouth. They dragged me outside the hotel.

They started to tear off my shirt in front of all those people. Then they threw me into a jeep. They kept beating us. My shirt was so ripped it didn't cover me properly. The military also tried to rip off my brassiere but a policewoman said not to, so they didn't.

They drove us to Polres, Dili. On the way, in the car, they continued to beat us with batons. At Polres, the military threw us out of the car and put us all in one room. There were about 50 of us, boys and girls mixed together.

They shot teargas into the room so we couldn't see properly. Then they ripped our clothes—pulled them off. First the boys, then the girls.

It is quite a long story and I will not go into all of it, but later she goes onto say:

They didn't give us any food or water. All my forehead and the top of my head was broken and bleeding from the interrogations. They sewed it up—just like that, no cleaning, no anaesthetic.

Then she talks about the interrogations and says how they did it:

They stamped chairs onto my feet. One military would sit on a chair which was on my feet. Others kicked me in the stomach and abdomen and legs while I was sitting on the chair. The men terrorised me, saying they would kill me if I didn't talk.

She goes on to indicate that later she had broken ribs. She says:

My head was still all broken and bloody, and they still kept bashing my head again and again on the table. They also burned me with cigarettes, all over my arms. They pulled all my fingernails out. They also grabbed my neck and squeezed it very hard so it was bruised all over.

That is just the account of one woman. This book is full of such accounts.

An *Age* article of 21 November 1997 refers to an exhibition of 40 photographs taken of East Timorese women by Indonesians. Those photos depict these women as victims of sexual violence by the East Timorese. In one series of pictures, soldiers are shown sexually violating two women

believed to be schoolgirls who were tied naked to a tree. Other photographs show beaten women lying on the ground with messages scrawled on their bodies. One woman had the words, 'Champion cat shit dead like a rat,' written in Indonesian on her back right leg and buttock. It is believed that such photos were used as a way to frighten other East Timorese into not registering any dissent against other treatment that might have been happening.

In an article in the *Weekend Australian* of 31 January, Andrew Reppin recounts conversations he was having with Indonesian soldiers that the 'skin'—that is the word they used—of each East Timorese fighter brought an Indonesian soldier a bonus of 500 000 rupiah, which was at that time equal to \$A67. I am disappointed that the investigation by the United Nations will only deal with war crimes and not these human rights violations that occurred before the referendum was conducted. I suspect that once East Timor does have its independence, it may have to hold its own investigations similar to South Africa's truth and justice commission because this truth must come out.

I also indicate concern at the role the Australian government has played in providing sanctuary to East Timorese refugees. Just a week and a half ago at the ceremony that was held to remember the Indonesian people who were killed in the Santa Cruz massacre one of the people that we expected to be at that ceremony was not there because he had gone over to the eastern states to fight for one of his relatives, who was facing being kicked out of the country because the Australian government was still not willing to provide asylum. In 1998 when there were nearly 1 500 East Timorese seeking asylum in Australia the Department of Immigration imposed a freeze on the processing of their applications. Again, to the shame of Australians, our government was arguing that the responsibility for asylum rested with Portugal. That was an irresponsible action as far as I am concerned and did not meet Australia's humanitarian obligations.

I do want to put on record something that I am particularly pleased about, and that is the pride that I have in the Australian people. Back in 1975 there were five journalists killed in East Timor by Indonesian troops, and I guess you could say that it was fortuitous that, of all people for the Indonesians to kill, it had to be journalists, and I think that has always maintained a lingering interest in East Timor by the Australian press. If you combine that with the debt that many returned soldiers know that we owe the East Timorese from World War II, there has always been an undercurrent in Australia of belief that we should be assisting the people from East Timor.

Certainly, one of the people who needs credit in this is Shirley Shackleton, the wife of one of those journalists who was killed. She has maintained a 24 year fight for justice for those journalists, and she has kept many other people on target on this particular issue. I know, for instance, that if it was not for her efforts—and there is quite a story of serendipity—there would not have been a journalist back in 1991 to film what happened at the Santa Cruz cemetery.

I want to acknowledge the principal groups here in South Australia who have continued this fight: the Campaign for an Independent East Timor and Action in Solidarity with Indonesia and East Timor. I express my profound admiration for Andy Alcock who has never ever given up the fight, and also other people, such as Bob Hanney, Crystel Holliday and Julieanne Ellis, and for the small community, and it is very small, of East Timorese living in Adelaide. All of these

people have kept up the pressure for that 24 years, and I know that on occasion there have been rallies of only 20 people and it has been hard to see that you could keep up the fight under those circumstances, but they have.

I have to indicate what a privilege it has been for me to be involved with these people and to experience the warmth and the humanity of the East Timorese community. As I say, I am proud of the Australian people. When the Australian government was acting quite lamely in the face of rising aggression from Indonesia towards the East Timorese the Australian people kept letting the government know what they thought. The result, of course, was that the bloodshed that occurred the very day after the referendum result was revealed and, again, as a testimony to the strength of feeling of the Australian people, by word of mouth on the Tuesday evening people turned up for a rally on the steps of this parliament, and there were 1 500 people there. I remember when Bob Hawke sent troops into the Gulf War he said:

It is important for Australia that the world understands that big countries cannot invade small neighbours and get away with it.

Unfortunately, for 24 years Australian governments did allow Indonesia to get away with it. But the Australian people understood what Bob Hawke said and they turned up at rallies, swamped newspapers with letters to the editor, telephoned radio stations and they wrote, faxed, telephoned and e-mailed their MPs. I sent two faxes to the President of the United States imploring him to provide a contingent to the UN presence in East Timor.

When I visited Vietnam some years ago and asked the Vietnamese people why they were so generous to me as an Australian, given that we had assisted the United States in killing people in their country, they told me that they understood the difference between the Australian people and the Australian government. From time to time the East Timor issue has certainly demonstrated that there is a huge gulf between the Australian people and the Australian government. While I have been very much ashamed of consecutive Australian governments until recently on this issue, for me the Australian people are the subject of great admiration.

A week and a half ago I attended a ceremony to mark the eighth anniversary of the Santa Cruz massacre, and similar ceremonies were held around Australia. At the same time, 10 000 East Timorese attended a ceremony in Dili. It is ironic to think that, for the first time since 1991, the people of East Timor had an opportunity to grieve for the people who were killed in that massacre and for all of the other deaths in the previous 24 years, and it was certainly very moving. Australia had a moral obligation to be there and we have a moral obligation now to assist in the reconstruction. On that basis, I express some concerns regarding the comments of a US citizen named Rupert Murdoch. On 11 November in an article in the *Age*, Mr Murdoch said:

I have observed with some concern the spread of the notion that a nation's foreign policy can be driven purely by humanitarian or moralistic concerns, divorced from attention to national interest.

For 23½ years, governments of Australia addressed the issue of national interest in terms of East Timor and we have seen a third of East Timor's population wiped out. I fail to see how an issue such as this can be addressed in purely national interest terms and not in terms of moral obligation. Rupert Murdoch says that what is often dressed up as morality is really emotionalism. He describes it as 'a variety of religious enthusiasm'. Mr Murdoch further states:

... if Australia seeks to assert a moral basis for intervening in this region [he is talking of East Timor], it will find that its problems will be exacerbated by the fact that it will be a predominantly white nation intervening in the affairs of non-white countries.

I wonder what he said when Australian troops were sent to Malaysia, Vietnam and Iraq. Mr Murdoch also states:

It is one thing to put young Australians at risk under Australian commanders and pursuant to Australian rules of engagement. It is quite another to place them in harm's way under rules set by someone not democratically elected and responsible to their parents. . . .

Again, I wonder what position Rupert Murdoch took on Iraq when we sent troops there to be part of the UN peacekeeping force. Our friend Rupert further states:

Australia must ask itself whether it is prepared to spend its treasure and, inevitably, the blood of some of its young men and women, in pursuit of a purely humanitarian, or moralistic, foreign policy.

Australia sent troops to Iraq and it had nothing to do with humanitarian or moralistic policy: it had to do with oil. Mr Murdoch says:

The answer may be 'yes'. But it should be a considered answer, arrived at after a full and open debate.

Well, I think the debate occurred in September of this year, and the Australian people spoke clearly, although Rupert Murdoch might not like the answer and he might want to continue a debate until he gets the answer he wants. I also want to acknowledge the Australian armed forces in East Timor who are representing the high ideals that Australians have expressed about democracy, independence and freedom in East Timor. It is a dangerous situation, and our soldiers are handling it with great tact, diplomacy and minimum casualties; and, again, we can be very proud of them. I thank the Hon. Terry Roberts for moving this motion and I have great pleasure in supporting it and also the amendments of my colleague the Hon. Ian Gilfillan.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I thank the Hon. Sandra Kanck and the Hon. John Dawkins for their contributions. I thank the government and the Democrats for their support of this motion. I do not think I need to add anything, except to say that the issue is rolling forward. A number of other issues are appearing regularly or on a daily basis to which we need to pay attention. I do not think that the matter needs any more of a support siren from state parliaments; the fate of the East Timorese people is now in the hands of the federal government. It appears that the next stage of financial support from the World Bank and IMF has to be immediate, substantial and sustained. From what I have seen, the East Timorese people themselves are making sure that the investment strategies of the World Bank and IMF are there to assist the people, and the people have to be part of the process when they start to put their economy together.

I have a little more concern for the fate of Indonesia. I suspect that the Balkanisation of Indonesia is starting to take place with the problems in Aceh and Ambon and now other places. Australia must now turn its attention to assisting the incoming Indonesian government in any way we can to hold down any pain and suffering that may emanate from confrontation that is about to proceed. We need to rebuild the shattered economy of East Timor.

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Hon. Ian Gilfillan reminds me that \$60 million has been promised for rehabilitating the East Timorese economy, so that will be helpful. I

thank everybody for their contribution and look forward to the motion being passed.

Paragraphs I and II passed.

Amendment to paragraph III carried; paragraph as amended passed.

Amendment to paragraph IV carried; paragraph as amended passed.

Paragraph V passed.

Amendment to paragraph VI carried; paragraph as amended passed.

New paragraph VII inserted.

Motion as amended carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I move:

That the Council at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 28 March 2000.

Mr President, in moving the traditional adjournment can I, first, thank you for your presidency during this session. We hope that you and your family enjoy a good Christmas and New Year break. I thank Jan and Trevor, all the table staff, the messengers and Hansard. It is a bit unusual finishing parliament at 5 o'clock: I suspect that Hansard will have to start their end of session party very early and go very late. I thank Hansard and all the other staff in Parliament House, without listing them all individually or separately, for their assistance. It is only through their assistance that we manage to achieve much of what we do in terms of the legislative program in this chamber.

I thank the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Australian Democrats, the Australian Democrats and the Independent members of the chamber for their general cooperation over the session. We have got through a lot of legislation. There are occasional disagreements in this chamber, as in any chamber, but, as I say every year, the degree of cooperation and collaboration of members is a model not only for our colleagues in another place but for many other parliaments. I thank honourable members for their general goodwill in terms of progressing not only the government program but their own not inconsiderable private members' program on Wednesdays and Thursdays and, now, Tuesdays as well. Finally, I thank the Whips, the Hon. Caroline Schaefer and the Hon. George Weatherill, for their task in—

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer: I'm 'honourable' too.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I said 'honourable'; or was that 'horrible'? It was one or the other. The honourable member thought I said the horrible Caroline Schaefer and the horrible George Weatherill! I thank both of them for their task in terms of ensuring the relatively smooth flowing, to the degree that is possible, of proceedings with the independent views of all members in this chamber. We thank them for the not inconsiderable amount of work that they undertake on our behalf. On behalf of all government members of this chamber I wish all members and all staff a very merry, happy and healthy Christmas and New Year period. I know that it will not be believed by many in the community, but I know that most members will be working very hard for long periods between now and the end of March. I do hope that they can take a brief period of relaxation—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: For the Festival.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Not only for the Festival but for their own good health. I hope they also take some time to catch up with their families, friends and acquaintances.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES (Leader of the Opposition): Mr President, I second the motion and thank you for your tolerance in presiding over us; it is not always easy. I know that sometimes honourable members—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: No, I am not referring to anybody in particular, but if the Hon. Mr Roberts wants to take up the call he may do so. I also thank Jan and Trevor, all the table staff, the messengers and Hansard. I particularly thank Hansard, who are always so patient when we do not speak loudly enough, for making sense of our speeches, which is really nothing short of a miracle when we make them very late at night. I once looked back at the history of Hansard, and I understand that Charles Dickens was once a Hansard writer. I am sure that his literary efforts on behalf of the members when he was a Hansard writer were very creative, as indeed are some of ours.

I thank everyone in this place, including the kitchen staff, who often have to be here late at night and who are always cheerful and helpful. I also thank the Leader of the Government, government members, the Australian Democrats and the Independent members who sometimes vote the right way, although not very often! This place provides a model for the House of Assembly in respect not only of the hours that it sits but also because, generally, there is a level of cooperation that does not exist in the other place.

I put on the record that, at some stage, we should look at the length of time that we sit late at night. I think that sometimes not very sensible legislation is passed because everyone is tired. I know I do, and when I get tired I get a little testy, as I did the other night, but on the next day, having had some sleep, you can often accommodate things better.

I wish all members a happy Christmas and a prosperous and peaceful new year. I will not wish you all a nice long rest, because I know that we will all be working hard during the next few months. I urge all members—and I am sure the Hon. Diana Laidlaw would agree with me—to look closely at their festival program and book now for early in March, because I understand that the tickets are going fast.

I would also like to pass on my personal thoughts to the Hon. Terry Roberts, who will go through a fairly difficult period in the next few weeks. Our thoughts on the opposition benches will be with him and his family during this rather difficult time. If government members knew what I was talking about (and I will share this with them afterwards), I am sure they would agree. I give my thanks to everyone, particularly Jan and Trevor, our Clerk and Deputy Clerk, who work amazingly long hours and come up smiling the next day—I do not know how you do it. I wish you all a very merry Christmas.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I rise to support the motion. I thank you, Mr President, for the calm way in which you handle this chamber. Sometimes we are a little recalcitrant, but you keep us in line well. I also thank the table staff, who are always available on sitting days and non-sitting days to give us valuable advice. Without the catering staff, when we sit late at night, we would probably fade away. Last week, I indulged in a few mugs of hot chocolate to keep me going late at night.

I also want to place on record the cooperation that we all receive from other members. Although we disagree on some matters, we all recognise that we are working towards the advancement of South Australia. We do not always agree on

how that advancement should take place, but we certainly have the same end in mind, and we manage to have cordial relations with each other, despite any disagreement that is expressed in the chamber. We all work hard, and the break over Christmas and the new year will be acceptable to us all.

The parliament will not sit for four months, which is a little of a worry for me, but I believe that one reason for that is that it will give us an opportunity to attend the Adelaide Festival of Arts. So, I guess I can say, 'See you all at the festival.'

The PRESIDENT: Traditionally, on behalf of Jan, Trevor, Noelene, Chris, Margaret, Ron, Graham, Todd and Sean, our marvellous Council staff, who are not able to reply for themselves, I thank members for their kind remarks. On my own behalf, I thank those same people for the work that they have done throughout this part of the session up to Christmas, although there is still a bit more of the session to

go. Thank you very much for the work you have done and the advice and help you have been to me in my position.

I thank Caroline and George, the whips, for their work and cooperation, and John Dawkins for filling in for me regularly on the hour, day in and day out and, a little less frequently than usual, the Hon. Trevor Crothers for helping also. I refer also to Hansard, the Library staff and the staff of the catering division for the work they do in all their various areas. They are of great assistance to all of us—including our heads, stomachs, eyes and the rest of it. I wish you all a happy Christmas and a prosperous year 2000.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.21 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 28 March 2000 at 2.15 p.m.