

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 6 February 1997

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: UPPER SOUTH-EAST DRYLAND SALINITY AND FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLAN

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the forty-third report of the committee on the Upper South-East dryland salinity and flood management plan—Stage 1 be noted.

The Upper South-East dryland salinity and flood management plan involves the construction of some 450 kilometres of drains throughout the South-East of South Australia. The drainage works are to be constructed in three stages, with the estimated cost of design, construction, monitoring and overall project management being somewhere in the vicinity of \$24 million. Large areas of land in the South-East of South Australia have been degraded by salinisation and waterlogging as a result of the combined effects of high ground water levels and flooding. The accelerated rate of dryland salinisation is principally caused by rising watertables resulting from the removal of nearly all the native vegetation cover in the region.

The management plan combines the four key elements to achieve the best possible solution to dryland salinity and flooding problems, while taking into account environmental, economic and social concerns. First, surface water and wetland management will be implemented. These wetlands will use high quality surface water in the watercourses for wetland conservation. In conjunction with surface drainage works, it is proposed to create a wetland chain and associated habitat corridors from Bool Lagoon to the Coorong along the various watercourses. This will provide a link between two wetlands of international importance through several extended ribbons of swamps, lakes, marshes and native vegetation.

The second aspect of the management plan is the introduction of coordinated drainage schemes. These schemes will control ground water levels and associated soil salinisation via the construction of a regional network of drains with outlets to both the sea and the Coorong. Drainage within the area will be integrated with the wetlands concept so that sufficient water is retained to maintain or improve wetlands and associated native vegetation habitats.

The third aspect of the management plan involves agricultural production and on-farm measures. Once adequate drainage is in place, landholders will be encouraged to undertake pasture redevelopment programs using salt tolerant and perennial species. The establishment of salt tolerant pastures on saline lands will increase stocking rates and the agricultural productivity of the region.

Finally, revegetation programs will be developed to increase native vegetation and water use in recharge areas while assisting landholders to incorporate revegetation into their forward farm planning. The revegetation programs will promote the concept of longer term planning so as to take advantage of opportunities which may arise during normal farming practice over a period of several years. Revegetation

will include farm forestry, alley farming and shelter belts, in addition to revegetating the native species for amenity and conservation value.

The delegation of the Public Works Committee conducted an inspection of segments of affected lands in the South-East of South Australia. This visit displayed quite clearly the extent of the flooding and the salinity problem. Areas where land that was once arable and productive are now under water due to the rising watertable and native vegetation and crops are dying as a result of the high salt levels. This is particularly evident down there in the numbers of gum trees which are now dead and which stand as silhouettes on the skyline. If members wish to visit this area, an entry point is in the vicinity of Keith. Any member who wants to have a look can drive to Keith and the local office of the department will give directions for access points out of Keith.

If the situation is left untreated productivity loss is expected to be more than \$9 million a year. This equates to 40 per cent of all landholders losing some 40 per cent of their income. Aside from the benefits of increased agricultural productivity, the committee advises that the plan will provide significant environmental benefits through revegetation and the improved management of the wetlands.

In summary, the Public Works Committee endorses the proposal to construct a network of drains throughout South-Eastern South Australia to combat the severe flooding and salinity problems that exist. However, the committee stresses that this report approves Stage 1 of the works only and subsequent stages will be required to come before the committee prior to commencement.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): Naturally, as a member of this committee I support the report which has just been made on the proposition to adopt it with respect to public expenditure that is to be made to mitigate the effects of rising watertables and salinity in the South-East and the Upper South-East of South Australia. This arises not only in consequence of the clearance of native vegetation—because that occurred in many places more than 50 years, and in some instances 100 years, ago where rising watertables and salinity are now occurring—but also because we lost our stands of lucerne across the South-East when the Hunter River strain was easily wiped out by the alfalfa aphids that were mischievously and deliberately introduced at that time into South Australia, and indeed Australia, purely to pick up sales of lucerne seed. It wiped out those stands of lucerne which had been established right across the area on which there had been native vegetation. Cattle and sheep, and any other livestock for that matter, cannot graze native vegetation or, if they can, its very limited nutritional value means that its carrying capacity is much lower than is the case—

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Indeed, it is good roughage in a drought; it is better than sand, and that is about all you can say for it. Dryland lucerne has a much, much greater carrying capacity, and in rainfall isohyets as we have them in the South-East and the Upper South-East lucerne was an excellent pasture plant. It would withstand the effects of cultivation for cropping from time to time in the rotation and come back to provide high levels of nutritious grazing matter during the summer months—when no other species could do anything like that during that period—without reducing the capacity of those pastures to support the same stocking rates during the winter. Indeed, after extended periods of summer rainfall, the forage produced would be so prolific that hay could be cut and

stacked. I well remember the vast area of the South-East that was covered by lucerne pasture before the introduction of the alfalfa aphid. It was the pump which removed the water from the soil to great depth—equivalent at least to the rate at which the native vegetation removed it. In many of the heathlands, strawberry clover and lucerne on sandy soils adjacent to it lowered those water-tables to even lower levels than they had been under native vegetation. That was not a concern for me, or anyone else.

However, once that was wiped out, and following a very important aberration in the cyclical recurrence of weather patterns, we had eight weeks straight in 1981 in which it rained every day across the South-East—with varying amounts of precipitation. The rainfall across the South-East of South Australia and the western districts of Victoria was much greater than it had ever been in living memory, and probably any time since European settlement. Floodwaters came across the border from Victoria through the various shallow water courses that extend for miles in each direction, in many instances, and spread themselves, on that low rate of fall, across much of that land and seeped in. They ended in dead-end places that had been ephemeral lakes—such as occurs on Duck Island—and soaked away slowly, moving north-westward behind the former coastal dune systems, of which there are five, which are similar and parallel to the Younghusband Peninsula dune system—there is one behind that—and so on, through which drains in the lower South-East had earlier been cut to remove that surplus water.

They were cut under the direction of an engineer called Anderson, who was cursed or praised to the skies, according to whether you thought what he did was good or bad. However, in general, I am satisfied that what he did was for the great benefit of South Australia: the enormous wealth that has been produced in that area would never have been possible had it not been for that drainage network. I remarked about 15 years ago, not long after my election to this place, that the finetuning of the effects of that drainage system was necessary, and I strongly supported the introduction of weirs and checks along some of those drains to hold water during the summer months.

However, taking that practice into the wider domain of the South-East to create artificial wetlands has not helped the problem to which this report addresses itself. In many instances, the consequence has been further devastation from the free watertable so created by those banks in some of the areas west of Desert Camp near Keith, such as in the upstream area from Gip Gip, through the pastoral leases of Wongawilli and Paraweena, which I know of particularly and personally.

Great damage has been done by the simplistic belief that you can create wetlands where none existed previously without detrimental consequence to any of the lands round about. Well, I have news for the people who think they can do that without detrimental consequence. It does create a watertable at that level from which, by capillarity, water rises through the soil and will kill off stands of perennial grasses and clovers because that water contains very high levels of salinity. So, we have hundreds of squares miles in the old measurement—several more hundreds of square kilometres—that have been devastated by such wetlands development.

The last remarks I wish to make in support of the factual information provided in the remarks of the Presiding Member in proposing this motion concern the use of underground water. The practice of laser levelling and flooding, such as developed around Keith, and the practice of simply applying

water because, it seems to the grower, that it is about that much is needed is foolish and not sustainable even in the short term. The days of flood irrigation are over. Anyone who contemplates a long-term future for an irrigation enterprise which entails using flood bays and check banks to hold the water within those bays across the areas in which the lucerne or other forage crops are being grown is foolish in the extreme.

We need to use more scientific approaches with lateral irrigation technology now available—that is, instead of having a centre pivot and swinging a circle, you have a line of pipes moving laterally, line ahead, with drop lines to the spray heads very close to the ground to minimise evaporation and to minimise the effects of distortion by the wind in the pattern of application. The water is then placed close to the surface in precisely the amounts required by the crops. The formula for that has been established by experiments using lysimeters and class A pan evaporimeters to determine how much and at what interval. Moreover, a class A pan has a surface to depth to volume ratio which gives rise to an evaporation rate which closely approximates the evapotranspiration rate of most soft leaf tissue plants in permanent turgidity. The sooner we adopt that kind of practice, the better. The sooner the underground water is given true market value, according to its best economic use year by year to determine who should use it and how it can be used, by using market forces rather than a bureaucratic determination, the better off we will all be.

We are talking about a slab of South Australia bigger than the area embraced between Port Wakefield, Morgan, Cape Jervis, Wellington and Tailem Bend. It is a huge area of South Australia, many times larger than the metropolitan area of Adelaide. It is vital that we do not destroy it and that we address it in terms of the proposed drainage system which, with everybody making a contribution, will cost between \$45 million and \$50 million.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BOLIVAR WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That the forty-fifth report of the committee on the filtration plant at the Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant be noted.

SA Water proposed to construct a waste water filtration disinfectant plant at the Bolivar Wastewater Treatment complex at an estimated cost of some \$30.7 million. This proposal is part of an environmental program to achieve legislative compliance with the requirements of the Environmental Protection Act 1993.

The Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant was constructed in the 1960s and is the largest of four major waste water treatment plants in the Adelaide metropolitan area. This plant currently serves a population of approximately 600 000 people or 60 per cent of the Adelaide metropolitan area. The existing treatment process at the Bolivar plant includes screening, grit removal, primary sedimentation, biological filtration, secondary sedimentation and retention in lagoons. Secondary treated waste water is then discharged into Gulf St Vincent via an open channel approximately 13 kilometres north of the plant. Currently, private irrigators can access the secondary treated waste water for irrigation purposes by

specially constructed sumps. Approximately 10 per cent of Bolivar output is currently used for irrigation.

This project proposes the construction of a dissolved air flotation filtration (DAFF) plant and associated infrastructure. Once this project is complete, the treatment process at Bolivar will include the full secondary treatment process currently in place; retention of recycled water in the existing lagoons in Bolivar for a maximum of 16 days for microbiological control; and filtration, disinfection and sludge handling facilities as part of the proposed project for the supply of recycled water to the Virginia pipeline project. This project was investigated by the Public Works Committee, and details are contained in the committee's report.

The proposed DAFF plant, combined with the retention in existing lagoons, is considered to be the most cost effective method of producing recycled water that is suitable for irrigation without public health restrictions. The plant will incorporate chemical coagulation, dissolved air flotation, granular media filtration and disinfection. Retention in the lagoons for at least 16 days, together with chemical coagulation, is the required safeguard for removal of toxic substances and pathogenic protozoa (for example, giardia and cryptosporidium), which have to be removed prior to irrigation use. Sludge and backwash water from the filtration plant will be disposed to new sludge lagoons, which will be constructed adjacent to the existing sludge lagoons at Bolivar.

With regard to recycled water, winter storage may be required to meet peak summer demands and to maximise the amount of recycled water available for re-use, which would in turn minimise the amount of water discharged to Gulf St Vincent. This storage could be provided separately or through a combination of surface storage and lagoons and below ground storage through aquifer storage and recovery, which is commonly known as ASR. It will be necessary to store between 2 000 and 10 000 megalitres annually to minimise discharge into the gulf. Storage is most easily provided by utilising spare capacity that is not required for treatment in six existing lagoons, which could provide available wet weather storage capacity of some 2 000 megalitres.

This project will enable economic development in the northern Adelaide plains, which development is currently constrained by the shortage of water available for irrigation. In addition, an analysis of the benefits associated with the proposed environmental improvement program for the Bolivar plant has been prepared by the SA Centre for Economic Studies. This study has identified approximately \$56.5 million worth of economic development that will result from this project. This benefit will accrue to growers in the region, commercial and recreational fishing and also coastal protection.

The Public Works Committee considered the Virginia pipeline project in August 1996 and as such it is acutely aware of the environmental damage that has been caused by discharging sewage effluent into Gulf St Vincent. However, as a result of the Virginia pipeline project, there will be a substantial reduction in the volume of effluent pumped into these waters. The committee acknowledges the importance of the Bolivar filtration plant proposal and the role it will play in supplying the Virginia pipeline with recycled water that is suitable for irrigation purposes. Furthermore, committee members noted the need to achieve improved environmental performance at the Bolivar waste water treatment plant that is acceptable to the EPA. In addition, the committee understands the importance of providing an alternative source of irrigation water and considers that this project will result in

a reduction in the use of ground water in the northern Adelaide plains and therefore will contribute to the achievement of a sustainable level of ground water usage.

Given what I have said, the Public Works Committee supports the proposal to construct a waste water filtration plant at Bolivar and reports to Parliament that it recommends the proposed public works. It should be noted that, at the time of the Public Works Committee inquiry, Cabinet had approved this proposal in principle only. As such, the Public Works Committee's approval of the proposal is still subject to final Cabinet approval.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I, too, support the proposal to construct a waste water filtration plant at the Bolivar waste water treatment plant. This work is necessary and it is long overdue. As the previous speaker said, it is important that the extensive environmental damage that has been caused to the gulf be remedied, particularly to satisfy Environmental Protection Agency criteria in respect of the quality of sewage effluent discharged into the gulf. The upgrade is also important for a number of other reasons. This upgrade will permit the flow of quality water through the Virginia pipeline project—if that project eventuates, as we desperately hope—and alleviate ground water usage, which is very important.

There is another aspect of this upgrade that is significant. I speak as a local resident of the area when I say that, at times, the odour emanating from the Bolivar waste water treatment plant is very bad. This work will go some way towards alleviating that problem. It is important to note also that, if the Bolivar to Virginia pipeline does not go ahead, further extensive work will be required at the filtration plant in order to meet the EPA guidelines for outflow into the gulf.

This project is supported by the Labor Opposition. I hope that it will alleviate the significant odour problem, and I plead with the Government to give serious consideration to conducting negotiations with the growers who will use the water from the pipeline, because if that does not occur the pipeline will not go ahead and, in the long run, there will be much expense caused to the State by the level of infrastructure upgrade that will need to take place at Bolivar. I support the upgrade of the Bolivar waste water treatment plant, which is long overdue.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): As a member of the committee, as a horticulturalist, and also as someone who had an extensive interest in horticultural production in the Virginia area 30 years ago, I, too, support this long overdue proposal. Not only will it make available water from what is otherwise regarded as waste water following its use in the sewage system of our metropolitan area but also it will ensure that the earlier abuse of the very small (by most standards) aquifer will cease and its life extended. The life of that district as a major horticultural producing district on the doorstep of Adelaide will be extended, and our reputation for producing high quality vegetables of all kinds, which has been established for well over 100 years, will be maintained. We will be able to share that with people from not only interstate but overseas. The export enterprises which can now be established at Virginia to produce high quality perishable food-stuffs, from salad vegetables right through to semi-perishable vegetables, such as potatoes and carrots, can now go ahead with confidence and in perpetuity.

I urge growers in the area not to quibble over the cost. They are better off than growers who have made a sound living out of similar enterprises in the western suburbs where

their gardens have now been taken over by housing. The cost of water they are using through this scheme is only a fraction of the price that was paid by those growers in the western suburbs and only a fraction of the proportion that would otherwise have been expended on water to grow those crops in years gone by. The cost of lifting the water, even from shallow wells on the Adelaide Plains in the Torrens aquifer, for instance, was a greater proportion of the cost of growing the vegetables than will be the proportion paid for water used to grow vegetables from this source in the future. It is a quibble that is unwarranted, and it will not stand up to scientific scrutiny or close microeconomic analysis.

I commend people, then, at Virginia for the way in which, right from the earliest years in school through to early work life, they have embraced the concept and supported it. The member for Goyder, who has been working with those people, deserves commendation, too, as does the current member for Light, who has also been involved.

The DAFF system makes the water very suitable. In addition, I am now helping the Virginia Horticultural Centre, which was recently established to develop export markets in East Asia, particularly Korea. I personally thank that board in the persons of Dominic Cavallaro, its President, and Angelo Russo and others who are prominent producers and leading the way, for instance, in the case of the Russo family, in hydroponic vegetable production that will further strip nutrients from the water which is there as a consequence of its having come through the sewage system.

My last point is this: what we have done by taking the water high in the catchments, holding it in reservoirs and reticulating it through our homes, factories, and so on, as we need it, does nothing than delay its arrival in the gulf. We have also previously changed the form in which it arrived in the gulf because we removed the wetlands through which it used to run and, in due course, disrupted the rhythm of marine and aquatic biology that was otherwise present in the wetlands between the Patawalonga and the Port River. We now return that water—such of it that goes to the gulf—in similar form to what it was when Europeans first arrived and began to interfere. To that extent then I am pleased and commend the committee's report to members.

Mr BROKENSHIRE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I move:

That a committee of privileges be established to investigate whether the Premier and the former Premier misled the House about their knowledge of taxpayer funded opinion polling on the water contract.

The Premier, when he was Minister for Infrastructure, told the House on Wednesday 18 October 1995:

I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the South Australian Water Corporation has not as a corporation commissioned polling.

On Tuesday 28 November 1995, the then Premier told the House:

As I understand it, the Government did not commission any market research on the water contract.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: Later in Question Time on Tuesday 28 November 1995, the then Premier, now the Minister for Industrial Affairs, told the House:

The Minister has indicated to this House that no polling was commissioned by the Water Corporation, and I have repeated that today based on the information the Minister has given.

One can see the hint there from the former Premier that perhaps the information is not true and that he is sourcing it to his then Minister for Infrastructure, now the Premier. On the next day, Wednesday 29 November 1995, the then Minister for Infrastructure, now the Premier, said:

The Premier answered the question yesterday and was consistent with my answer to this House.

Members interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: There are interjections from the members for Hanson and Colton saying, 'Read the *Advertiser* editorial this morning.' I did that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: I always read the paper because I used to work for the *Advertiser* for three years as a reporter and subeditor. The *Advertiser* editorial, for the benefit of those members who have not read this morning's edition of that august journal, argues that it does not really matter whether the Premier or the former Premier told the truth to Parliament. In fact, unless they have committed a criminal offence or an act of child molestation then, according to the *Advertiser*'s leader writer, it does not matter whether the Premier or the former Premier misled the House because, according to the leader writer, far more important issues are facing South Australia now.

Members interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: That is right. As the member for Hanson says, there may be important issues facing South Australians at the moment—jobs and the economy. Yes, they are important issues, but the members for Hanson and Colton are arguing by way of interjection that it does not matter whether the Premier or the former Premier misled the House. They argue it does not matter; we should not be discussing it; the *Advertiser* editorial is right. And it is right that the more senior members of the Government are now hushing the members for Colton and Hanson and asking them to be quiet because the line of interjection they are taking highlights the moral issue that is at stake.

Members interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: It is important whether the Premier and the Deputy Premier have misled this House because it is important that all of us at least maintain the appearance of trying to tell the truth to the House, even if we are Ministers or we are the Leader of the Government in the House. It is especially important that there be an effort to tell the truth in answers to questions without notice and on all other occasions—but especially during Question Time.

If it is discovered that the Premier, the former Premier or any Minister has misled the House, then at the earliest opportunity they should return to the House and set the record straight and explain why on that occasion they may have unintentionally perhaps misled the House.

We know that these statements by the Premier and the former Premier to the House may not be true because subsequently the Labor Party received a leak from the Government, the most significant of which is the following document, which is a memo from the then Minister for Infrastructure to the Premier, and it reads as follows:

To the Hon. Premier.

Re: Market research conducted by Kortlang for SA Water.

At your request I have obtained from Kortlang the executive summary of market research conducted by Kortlang on behalf of SA Water during May this year. This was proposed as part of Kortlang's brief to prepare a marketing strategy for the outsourcing project.

Kortlang advises the results must be read in the context of little or no marketing of the concept having been undertaken by SA Water at this stage, and that there has been considerable effort and a shift in public reception since then.

Under the supervision and direction of the Chief Executive Officer of the new SA Water Board, it is understood further research will be undertaken to monitor public perceptions of which I have been asked to be kept informed.

Please let me know of any particular concerns or questions you may have about this research which is now four months old. (signed) John Olsen.

So that is a memo which was going between the now Premier and the former Premier at the same time they were both denying in Parliament that SA Water conducted any such polling. I would have thought that that created a *prima facie* case. In fact, if you do not think that creates a *prima facie* case of misleading the House, you do not think that there is a *prima facie* case against O.J. Simpson!

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I know that we are establishing whether this House considers it worthy to have a committee of privileges; however, in making the assertion that there is a *prima facie* case I contend that the member for Spence is directly flouting your authority, because you ruled yesterday that there was no *prima facie* case.

The SPEAKER: Yesterday I invited the House, if it wished, to take the view that a motion could be moved if the due process took place. Therefore, in accordance with that ruling, I cannot uphold the point of order. But I do point out to the member for Spence that he cannot reflect upon a decision of the House or reflect upon the Chair.

Mr ATKINSON: After these and other documents were leaked showing a clear consciousness of guilt within the Ministry and the Public Service about the Premier and the former Premier's answer to Parliament, the Premier was interviewed by a reporter who asked him, 'At what point did you become aware of the polling?', to which the Premier replied, 'I guess at the time they went into the Cabinet documents.' In an interview the same day (29 January) with Leigh McClusky on 5AA the Premier said:

Well, because this was commissioned by SA Water in terms of there was a constant barrage from the Opposition of misinformation. The question was, 'How do you manage that?' SA Water in fact commissioned the poll—not me—SA Water did.

So the Premier told 5AA's vast audience that SA Water had commissioned this polling when, in fact, he told Parliament the complete opposite. I call for a committee of privileges to consider this matter because there is a clear inconsistency. The silence of Government members shows that they know there is a clear inconsistency. What does the Government have to hide in agreeing to a committee of privileges on which there will be a clear majority of Government members to investigate the apparent inconsistency?

Mrs Rosenberg: What about unemployment? What about the workers?

Mr ATKINSON: Again the member for Kaurua interjects. This shows that the Government does not value veracity in Parliament. I will admit that the Labor Party is not lilywhite about the question of truth telling in Parliament. There has been a consistent decline in parliamentary standards over a very long time. We reached the point last year when Paul Keating was willing to let Carmen Lawrence

remain a Minister despite answers she gave to Parliament which, in my view, were clearly untruthful—and yet it goes on. The Liberal Party condemned Paul Keating for allowing her to stay, yet today these Government members will vote to the last man and the last woman against even having a committee of privileges consider whether the Premier and the former Premier told the truth to Parliament about polling by SA Water. They are going to close up and cover up.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Mawson interjects that Carmen Lawrence was guilty, but he will not even allow a dispassionate, balanced and thorough inquiry into whether the Premier and former Premier told the truth to Parliament about the SA Water contract.

The Opposition has to go through three gates to bring the Premier and the former Premier to justice on this issue. First we had to go through the gate of getting precedence to discuss the motion. The Speaker denied us that. Then today we have to convince the House to set up a committee of privileges to inquire into this matter. That will be voted down today on Party lines. Even if we got through that gate, we then have to go through the third and final gate of having a committee of privileges with a Government majority bring down a finding adverse to the Premier or former Premier. We are all politically realistic enough to know that that will not happen, either. But at every gate the Government attempts to use its record majority to stop the Parliament delving into the truth.

The Liberal Party has 36 out of 47 members in the House of Assembly—a record majority—and it is clearly abusing this record majority to stop the proper functioning of Parliament. I hope that at least one or two members opposite feel a few pangs of guilt about the atrocities you are about to commit.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Obviously in seven years I have never heard parliamentary debate reach such a low point as it just has.

Mr Clarke: You're about to debase yourself.

Mr BRINDAL: The Deputy Leader says that I am about to debase myself. Far so. There is nothing I like better than sticking up for this institution and the dignity of this place, but what the Labor Opposition seeks to do by this motion brings it no credit at all. The member for Spence cannot even do it with a bit of grace. He impugns improper motive to every member of this House by assuming that the vote is already cast in iron. He is not giving any Labor member the integrity for perhaps considering the issue and voting as they wish to vote, nor any Government member either. He really says there is no point in debating this, so why then are we debating it at all?

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: He says it is right to debate it. That honourable member has just told this House that the Labor Party is not lilywhite when it comes to telling the truth in Parliament. They were in office for a number of years and how many committees of privileges did we see—not one ever! How many committees of privilege has this Parliament ever established? The answer is: 'Not one'. Never has this Parliament established a committee of privilege. Why? Because this House has so in mind its own dignity and so submitted to the authority of the Chair that a committee of privilege is without precedent in this place.

So, members opposite come in here today and say that they want a committee of privilege. What about—some

affront to the ancient privileges of Parliament, some real attack on this institution or the integrity of its members?

Mr Atkinson: Lying.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Spence says, 'Lying', but lying is not an offence in this House. He has said that the Labor Party is not lilywhite when it comes to lying in this Parliament. He said it as a throw-away line as if it is excusable. It is as if: 'My Party did it all the time when in Parliament, but that is all right; we have found a new morality; we have converted on the way to Damascus and now it is important.' Not only was the member for Spence grasping at straws but he was factually incorrect when he said that you, Sir, denied precedence to a matter of privilege. When he rose to his feet and the matter was first discussed, the matter was automatically accorded precedence.

I remind all members to look at their Standing Orders. When a matter of privilege is raised, any honourable member can speak. In this House two days ago one honourable member chose to speak before the matter was referred to the Speaker. The matter was referred to the Speaker because the House believed that the Speaker was the person who would make a determination on this matter. Any member opposite could have spoken if he or she chose to do so, yet we now have the member for Spence bleating that the matter was not given precedence.

Frankly, it was given precedence. Members opposite had their chance to speak and they chose not to. Then you, Mr Speaker, came in with a ruling that you could find no *prima facie* evidence for the establishment of a committee of privilege. According to my dictionary, *prima facie* means at first sight or that there was no technical breach. I understand from my friend the member for Florey that most matters before a court—and that is what members opposite are asking Parliament virtually to sit as, the High Court of Parliament—first go to a magistrate, who examines whether there is a *prima facie* case. If the magistrate determines that there is no *prima facie* case, the matter is thrown out; it is no longer dealt with.

This House put this matter before the Speaker of this House, who went away, weighed it up and considered it. He came back and said that he could find no *prima facie* case. Now the Labor Party screams 'Foul!' and does not want to take the umpire's decision. It wants to say 'Yes, but Parliament is sovereign'—as it is—and Parliament can make its own determination.' I put to every member of this House that if we today vote for a committee of privilege, an unprecedented step for this House to take, we affront the dignity of this House and we certainly call into question Mr Speaker's ruling of yesterday.

As a Parliament yesterday we resolved the matter of our confidence in the Speaker. Yesterday we clearly showed that we had confidence in the Speaker, and part of the motion of no confidence was that the Speaker found no *prima facie* evidence in this case. It is extraordinary that members opposite should come in here as an Opposition one day later—

Mr Bass interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Florey is too kind. I must put on record that the member for Florey said that there was one fact in their whole argument yesterday. I think he is rather kind; I could not find any facts. But he is given to being kind.

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order, Sir, I draw your attention to the Standing Order that requires members to

address the Chair and not to debate with their colleagues on their side of the House.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is correct. I ask the member for Unley to address the Chair.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you, Sir. The member for Spence then makes a giant leap of fact. Every member of this House heard him say, 'There will be a committee of privilege and the committee of privilege will have a majority of Government members.' This House has never established a committee of privilege, so how does he presume to know what the composition will be, who will be on it, how it will meet, what the rules will be or anything else? It is unprecedented in this Parliament, yet the member for Spence in his normal godlike way can presume to tell us not only how it will operate but who will be on it.

I am sure that following me will be the Leader of the Opposition, and I just say this: when the House considers this motion, we have to consider our dignity and our function as a Chamber of the Parliament. We are asked to consider a case that is based on a whole lot of questionable evidence. What is this evidence that the Leader of the Opposition purports to have? It is what we euphemistically call 'leaked documents'. My knowledge of any court—and I would hope that would include Parliament if Parliament chooses to constitute itself as a court—is that there would be a simple rule such as that one does not use evidence that is improperly or illegally obtained.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The member for Unley is imputing improper motives to the Opposition and I ask him to withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Unley did impute improper motives, I would suggest to him that he withdraw.

Mr BRINDAL: I would if I did, Sir, but, as I did not, I will not.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a further point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member said that, if he did impute improper motives, he would withdraw. I think we have taken it far enough.

Mr FOLEY: He accused the Opposition of illegally obtaining documents. We would be happy to tell you where they came from.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart has gone far enough: he is now taking frivolous points of order. The honourable member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: The point is simply this: it has not been denied that the documents in question were the property of a staff member. In argument, they then become the property of the current Premier, who has recently released them. However, at the time the Leader of the Opposition had them there was no suggestion that they were given freely or willingly. If that is not obtaining information by improper means, I do not know what is. I will not lower the dignity of this House by using the word 'stolen' but there are others who would.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The member for Unley is continually referring to members of the Opposition as receiving documents illegally, and that is imputing improper motives. If you want to know where we got them from, we will tell you.

Mrs Rosenberg: Go ahead.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Foley: We'll tell you from where we got all our documents for three years.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the second time for the member for Hart for. I do not know whether his course of action is designed to obtain some extra publicity. The House has been behaving, as it should, in a dignified manner this morning. If the member for Hart continues to shout out at the Chair and other members and interrupt the proceedings, the Chair will interrupt proceedings for a while to deal with the matter. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): The member for Unley said that we had received these documents illegally. If the House is prepared to form a privileges committee to look at this matter, I will go into that privileges committee and I will name two senior Liberals who provided us with the so-called 'illegally obtained' documents.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: When Government members sit down with bated breath to hear me, I will first name the principal source in the Government (who telephoned me at night) of all the information we received about Catch Tim and Moriki, all the information we received about the sale of the State forests and all the information we received about EDS. I will name the Liberal who told us and leaked information to try to destroy the former Premier—and did so. It will not take a great leap of your imaginations to guess whom I will name, but I will name both of them on the same day so that members opposite can take their pick. You form the privileges committee today, and I will come in and do in both of them in the interests of truth and to clear the name of the Opposition, which we hear has somehow received illegal, stolen documents. That is what this issue is about today: this Government and its veracity, integrity and honesty. Judging it is not a test for you, Mr Speaker—I acknowledge the point you made yesterday—it is not even a test for the electorate: it is a test for a polygraph, a lie detector.

Quite frankly, this Parliament, the public and the media have been told a pack of lies about this outsourcing contract. Of course, that does not come as any surprise to anyone. We have the head of the Minister for Tourism's department, Mr Gleeson, outside Parliament House, on television, accusing the Minister for Tourism of deliberately misleading the House. If there ever was a case for a libel or defamation action, the Minister for Tourism would have issued a writ and, if the Minister for Tourism was right, on my guess he would have made about \$200 000. But he will not because he knows that Gleeson told the truth and he did not.

Mr BASS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I ask you to rule on the relevance of these comments to the matter being debated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the House comes to order the Chair will give a ruling. This is a wide ranging debate and therefore I suggest that members have some latitude. I suggest to the Leader that he link up his remarks.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir. Then we go on to what the member for Unley says was my questionable evidence in relation to whether the present Premier misled the House. That is a reflection on the present Premier because the questionable evidence to which he refers is a document with the signature of the present Premier on it and which shows that three months beforehand the Parliament was told the direct opposite. As the member for Spence said, we have the

Premier telling the truth on radio on 5AA—a brief lapse of his judgment, he actually told the truth—and said that SA Water did commission the polling material. He told Parliament a year and a half ago that it did not. We have a memo by Kortlang in March 1995 saying that we want to commission polling, tracking polls, market research on behalf of the Government, on behalf of SA Water. We have a reply from SA Water saying, 'Yes.' We have a minute from SA Water to the Minister, the Hon. John Olsen, saying 'Tick off on this', and he did.

The fact is that we also have minutes from the acting head of the Premier's department advising Richard Yeeles, the famous Richard Yeeles, whose file, according to members opposite, apparently is the source of this material. Let me tell members opposite this. That document addressed to Richard Yeeles spells out one thing. It says, 'Be careful, Richard. Basically you can use this document how you want, but remember that both the Minister and the Premier said it did not exist. "Use it with care".' Then we have a Ted Phipps letter also pointing out that this material had been commissioned.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It has been released. Does the honourable member not even know about what he is talking? It was released publicly; given to the Speaker. Even the Premier was forced to release documents that were damaging to his own credibility. He was forced to release it—

Mr Bass interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Be careful, I know the honourable member has been the subject of a court case recently in terms of being mentioned. We will talk about Mr Sam Bass another day and some of his actions.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I read about it in the *Sunday Mail*. I believe what I read in the *Sunday Mail* and the *Advertiser*: I have read about Sam Bass. We have a minute signed by the Premier (John Olsen) to the former Premier (Dean Brown) saying, 'At your request, I provide you with a summary of the polling.' Yet, three months later, the former Premier comes into Parliament and says that there was no polling undertaken. I read today in the *Advertiser's* editorial that these matters are not relevant. This is about honesty. It is about the honesty and integrity of the present Premier and the former Premier, let alone the hapless Deputy Premier who was prepared to knife the former Premier in the back just so he could get a new title—that is what it was all about—before he goes off to London or wherever they want to dump him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Let us go into the suggestion that the documents were illegally obtained. Here is the scene: I am sitting in my office and a very famous South Australian Liberal—but not the same famous South Australian Liberal who used to give us information to do dirt on Dean Brown—rings up and says, 'I have got proof that basically the public of this State have been lied to about the water contract. If you are prepared to make this phone call and go to an inner city house tomorrow night, you will be given certain documents.' Those documents show what we believe: that basically this Government is a pack of liars on the water deal. I know it and you know it, and the Speaker has seen the documents. The House will not pass this motion to establish a Privileges Committee, but here is an open invitation: you call the Privileges Committee and I will name the Labor Party's two

biggest sources over the last three years, and it will tear your Government apart.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Gordon): This debate is really about judgment and trust. Members must bear in mind that it comes from a Party whose own judgment and financial competence has already been condemned by the electorate at large. It comes from a Party whose former Cabinet members—one of whom is among the dearly departed—are still here. That Cabinet not only feigned ignorance of the pending State Bank disaster in 1989, 1990 and 1991 but also with a special kind of blindness it saw Marcus Clark as the financial expert who would save the State—I ask you! They saw him as a gifted financial leader, and the Leader extolled his virtues in this very place, not once but several times.

This motion is moved by those of clouded judgment against our visionaries. It is just an attack upon the Liberal Party's visionaries. Our visionaries warned them repeatedly that the State Bank house of cards was about to collapse. What happened? Our visionaries were ignored and the Labor Government, the remnants of which are still lurking and sulking in Opposition, outdid Nero with their navel gazing. They navel-gazed while the State teetered on the brink of bankruptcy. Their reward is to be part of the smallest Opposition in recorded history in South Australia. The electorate passed its judgment. This motion is a tactical one and it is bad tactics.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have made copious notes, mate. If you do not make notes, you speak for an hour. If you make notes, you speak for 10 minutes. Playford's advice to a young member. This motion has everything to do with point scoring and the honourable member knows that.

The Labor Party's pre-election promises are being thrown out on the waters of the electorate, almost in panic, because it thinks there will be an election next week. What is happening to those policies? They are sinking without a trace, and the Opposition's emperor is desperately in need of a suit of new clothes. So, what do they do? They idiotically attack a successful policy—John Olsen's success is under attack.

The ALP spent years in Government only to bankrupt the State. The Labor Party in Opposition is continuing to hammer the State downwards. Bankruptcy, keep hammering the State down, that is the best we can do. Opposition members are never satisfied. They have made whingeing the state of the art. They are whinge-aholics. They cannot get enough of it. They are a doomsayer's delight. This motion is really about the United Water contract. If, when in Government, Labor members had spent only a fraction of the time they have spent trying to undermine the United Water contract trying to look after the State Bank, they would still be on this side. They never learn.

You are trying to destroy the United Water contract. You have become a negative, blinkered, one issue Party. You are saying, 'Forget the State Bank; let us have a look at United Water.' Okay, let us have a look at United Water. There is an essential difference between the two issues. The State Bank was a disaster for the State, a millstone around the necks of our children for decades to come. United Water, despite the Opposition's continuing unremitting attempts to bring down the contract, is a success story for the State's taxpayers.

Mr Foley: How do you know?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It has yielded profits to the State Government—I know because the profits are there, in the first year. The member for Hart was one of the mealy-

mouthered people on the Opposition side who stood up and said, 'We support the Bill, but I hope it fails.' You supported it; it went through; you were behind the legislation—and that fact is recorded in *Hansard*. It is yielding profits, and it is already tens of millions of dollars in—

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Gordon continues to refer to the member for Hart as 'you'. I would ask him to refer to him by his electorate.

Mr Foley: Keep reading your speech, Harold.

The SPEAKER: I say to the member for Hart that I was about to rule on the point of order taken by his colleague. He is obviously not a bit interested in the point of order, or he would not continue to interject. I suggest to him that if he wishes to see the afternoon out he conducts himself in a rational manner and not continue to disrupt proceedings. The member for Spence is technically correct, even though the member for Gordon was making the comment in passing.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: You have been going around my electorate and all around the State saying, 'The State's water supply has been sold. It's a real shonky on the part of the Government.' But what has really happened? We still own the dams, the rivers, the assets and the pipelines. The State Government still sets the prices, still collects the revenue and still, under SA Water, looks after South Australia's rural water supplies. It has not been sold. There is simply a manager for the metropolitan Adelaide water supply. There is nothing more sinister than that, and the public is beginning to realise that. The Opposition has campaigned on fear, misinformation and half-truths, and that is evident in my electorate. The Opposition has hung its hat on being able to destroy the Government by attacking—and this is the eccentric thing—a successful, and progressively successful, contract on the most specious grounds. Today's motion is part of that continuing campaign of fear, smear and misinformation—and it is a failed campaign.

I will deal with the sequence of investigation, as best I can set it out. Literally hundreds of questions have been asked in the House of the Premier, and the former Premier (Dean Brown); there was debate on the Bill to which the Opposition acquiesced—it passed it; there was a strange Dick Tracyesque and, I suspect, largely concocted story of a clandestine meeting with a disaffected leading Liberal; there was painstaking scrutiny, I am sure, of hundreds of pages of leaky documents, and it has promised the media that now a second flood is imminent and that the Government and the Premier will drown when it is released; the Premier has released the full set of documents—much to the Leader's dismay, of course; and, finally, the Premier tabled the Kortlang affidavit, which exonerated the Premier's past and present involvement in the polling. Let us face it: does it really matter? Is it going to destroy the State? What a petty, small-minded issue it is at base. However, that does not surprise me. This is not the issue or the flavour of the day.

After all the fine-toothed forensic examination of United Water, what happened? What did the Opposition do? Did it move against the Premier? No. It moved against our innocuous, kind-hearted Speaker. What did the Speaker do in response? In effect, he said, 'Look, it is a complex issue. I do not think there is a case to answer. However, if you want a stoush, have it out on the floor.' And here, at last, belatedly, after 18 months, that is virtually what we are doing. So, after months of a failed campaign by the Opposition, it now proposes to ask the House to save it from its failure by

instituting a privileges committee to do the work that it has either not done or has done inadequately or inefficiently.

I think it is a specious, lazy, mean-spirited motion from what I consider to be a scatophagous Opposition. One might well ask why the Leader, who has regarded this as his key issue, has asked one of his lackeys to move the motion with the Leader speaking in support. That indicates that it is a futile, ill-conceived, badly motivated, mean sort of motion. The Opposition is really acting like political scarabs in reverse. The motion really asks the House to waste its time on something the Opposition, with all its intellectual wisdom, should have spent far more time on doing itself. The House is not prepared to acquiesce. I ask members to oppose the motion.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I should know, after being in this Chamber for three years, that I should not get quite so agitated by the member for Gordon. Even though he sticks some barbs into the Opposition, he really does speak only in jest. To hear the member for Gordon praise you, Sir, and give such positive comments about you, as he spends most of his time wanting to see himself in that chair, it was clearly just a speech of humour.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member is reflecting on the whole House and, in particular, the member for Gordon.

The SPEAKER: The member for Gordon is in the House and, if he wishes to take objection, it is in his hands. The Chair is of the view that by doing so would give some dignity to what is an undignified comment.

Mr FOLEY: I chose not to make an issue when the member for Gordon referred to me as mealy-mouthed, but I am quite happy to withdraw any imputation that the member for Gordon may have felt. As usual, it was an entertaining, well prepared and well scripted contribution by the member for Gordon. For the Government to bring into this debate issues to do with the State Bank, as it does with much regularity, is very interesting. The Government accuses the former Labor Government of a lot of things it should have done in terms of the State Bank. Here we have an issue which, in its magnitude, is very much of the order of the sort of dollars involved with the State Bank. It is a \$1.5 billion contract. It is the signing off of our State's water assets for 20 years.

We are trying to say that, as an Opposition and as a Parliament, we want scrutiny. We want appropriate, responsible scrutiny of that contract. We want a committee of inquiry, but most of all we want the Premier, who was responsible for this area in his former capacity, to be honest to this Parliament. It defies description to have the member for Gordon, the member for Unley and others castigate the former Labor Government for its errors, for which we have paid a price and which we have acknowledged, and then in the same breath ignore those failures and lessons and simply allow history to be repeated. With the water contract and with the North Terrace development for EDS, it is history repeating itself. It is not the Labor Party but the Liberal Party that has failed to learn the lessons of the past. You have no accountability, no openness and no honesty with these contracts. You are not prepared—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before the honourable member speaks, having been brought to order by the member for Hart, I would ask him not to keep using the word 'you'.

Mr BRINDAL: That was my point of order, Sir.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir, and a very good point of order it is, for which I apologise. The reality is that, for my three years in this Parliament, both I and my colleagues have copped a barrage about what should have happened with the State Bank, SGIC and Scrimber. In many parts, it was justifiable criticism. We have had to cop it.

But what do we see with the water contract? Absolute secrecy, no accountability, no scrutiny. What do we see with the EDS contract? No accountability, no scrutiny, no due process, no appropriate due diligence, no benchmarking—none of the principles in relation to which you accuse us and condemn us regarding the State Bank. There are questions to be answered about whatever we look at in the water contract, but nothing is more fundamental than that, when a Minister or Premier rises in this House, they give us honesty and openness. That is what this Parliament is about. The former Minister for Infrastructure, now the Premier, told this House in October 1995 that SA Water as a corporation did not conduct taxpayer funded polling. The former Premier, now Minister for Industrial Affairs, told this Parliament some weeks later that no market research was undertaken by this Government.

Through documents deliberately leaked to the Opposition we now find that, many months before that, not just the former Minister for Infrastructure but also the former Premier were more than just aware of polling: they were using that polling for their Party political ends. To compound the issue further, we find that the former Premier conducted his own market research through Harrison Market Research Company, commissioned out of the office of the Premier, to check up on his Cabinet colleague the Minister for Infrastructure: he conducted his own polling. So, we had the Minister for Infrastructure, now the Premier, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on Kortlang research and the former Premier conducting quite a large quantity of research through Harrison Market Research Company, checking up on each other, at the same time as both men told this House that no research existed. That was dishonest and untrue, and those statements failed the people of South Australia.

You can laugh it off; you can have a smirk on your face; you can be smug. As the member for Spence said yesterday, 36 beats 11 every day. You can use your numbers, strength and arrogance to dismiss the issue, but think back a bit when you were sitting in Opposition and you were asking questions about the State Bank. Is there not a semblance of similarity? Have you learnt nothing? As you hide these details, as you are dishonest and as you fail to be open and accountable, you are re-creating the mistakes of the past. What do you have to hide from a privileges committee? If you are so strong and so sure of your convictions about this issue, why not have a privileges committee? Let us get all the evidence on the table.

This information was leaked to the Opposition not because the person involved had nothing better to do that day. It was done for a reason: that person believed that there had been a gross misleading of this House. That person did it out of a duty to ensure that the truth came out. If you want to refer continually to these as 'stolen documents' and accuse the Opposition of obtaining them illegally, so be it; you do that. The Opposition has received many leaks over the years; we have had Cabinet submissions, letters and documents. If you want to call them all illegally obtained documents, fine, but we will bring it all out and come clean on everything. You would not like it. I know why Ingo wants it out—because he is the next one in line.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Sir, Standing Orders provide that in debates in this House members must be referred to by either their title or their seat, and the member for Hart has just transgressed that Standing Order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take the member for Unley's word for it, but the cacophony in the House was such that the Chair was unable to hear who was saying what and to whom.

Mr FOLEY: That is right, Mr Deputy Speaker. I do not seem to receive the protection of the Chair that sometimes I need. That is a bit of a side issue. We will not go down that path, because I know the Government does not want to. At the end of the day, the establishment of a privileges committee will give us the opportunity to analyse this issue carefully, as it should be analysed. Remember this: if you fail to learn from the failures of the past, if you allow your arrogance, your brute strength, your numbers—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The Government. If the Government fails to learn from the mistakes of the past, its members will be judged by the electorate. Over time, as the water contract causes this State great problems, and as the EDS contract causes this State significant financial cost, as we see other major outsourcing projects that this Government has undertaken in total secrecy, with no public scrutiny, with no accountability, no proper process and no adequate due diligence, when this State pays the financial penalty for those errors, the Government will stand condemned as was the last Government.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): When initiating this debate in the House today, the member for Spence said that it had been discovered that misleading evidence had been put to this House. Let us get the facts right: it has not been discovered that any misleading evidence was put to this House. Clearly, when you look at the evidence in its entirety (in *Hansard* and throughout all the documentation) you can see that nothing has been misled. It is a pity that the Opposition pulls out documents, misinterprets them and misleads the people instead of putting together all the facts, as the Premier did when he highlighted a document and all the information two days ago. This is an absolute beat-up by the Opposition. The public of South Australia know that it is a beat-up, and even the media does not believe that it is an issue. If members opposite do not believe that, I suggest that they read the editorial opinion in today's *Advertiser* and go out into the community and talk to their constituents.

It is clear from what we have seen today in this House that all Caucus meetings will have to be carried out in the Playhouse in the Festival Theatre, because Dick Tracy and the actors and actresses on the other side are purely theatrical. They do not have any substance when it comes to running a Government. That has been proven time and again. They do not even have any substance when it comes to being a credible Opposition. Yesterday, during the second or third attempt to try to get some mileage out of this issue—which is not an issue—even the most committed members of the South Australian Labor Party on the Opposition benches could not support their Leader and the member for Spence. They even had difficulty in making a significant noise when the debate was called to a vote. That is clearly evident—look at *Hansard* and you will see it.

The community and members of Parliament are sick and tired of the games that the Opposition plays, its lack of

responsibility and the shabby and reckless way in which it conducts business in this Parliament. We have not heard members opposite apologise or say to one member of the South Australian community that they are sorry for the devastation and destruction of South Australia. They wasted an hour of private members' time when we could have been getting on with business. Instead of saying that they are sorry, they have had another go at playing in the theatre. We all know that they misled the Parliament during their 10 or 11 years in Government. They interfered with the process of the State Bank's business and they covered up the debt and, when the then member for Coles, Hon. Jennifer Cashmore, started to make this evident in the House, they booted her out, because they knew they were in trouble and they wanted to cover up.

We are all paying the price in South Australia for the Opposition's actions. This Government's accountability is known throughout the community. If the Opposition wants to talk about polling, let it do some polling on the accountability of the Liberal Government in South Australia, because we are very strong in that area. The water deal is a good deal for South Australia. The Opposition is sour faced about it and should let us get on with the business of running this State.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I hear the member for Unley. I would like to read briefly from a document with which I believe all members of this House would agree. The relevant section leads with the words, 'Conformity with the Westminster principles of accountability and collective and financial responsibility', and reads:

Ministerial responsibility requires the collective responsibility of Cabinet to Parliament for the whole conduct of Government administration and the individual responsibility of Ministers to Parliament for the administration of their departments and agencies. All Ministers will recognise that full and true disclosure and accountability to the Parliament are the cornerstones of the Westminster system which is the basis for government in South Australia today. The Westminster system requires the Executive Government of the State to be answerable to Parliament and through Parliament to the people. Being answerable to Parliament requires Ministers to ensure that they do not wilfully mislead the Parliament in respect of their ministerial responsibilities. The ultimate sanction for a Minister who so misleads is to resign or be dismissed.

That document from which I read is titled *Code of Conduct—Government to Serve the People*, and was issued in November 1993 by the Liberal Party, South Australian Division. How far this Government has slipped from its own election pledge! Its code of conduct, with respect to identifying the principles under which a parliamentary democracy is best served through the Westminster principles, has not strayed but has been totally abandoned by this Government.

The principles underlying the motion moved by the member for Spence are fundamental to the good governance of this State, because if we cannot believe what the Ministers of the Crown tell us in this House then we are in for a dictatorship.

Basically, if a Government that has a majority on the floor of the Lower House uses it brutally to evade the responsibilities of its Ministers and, in particular, the Premier of the day being held accountable to this Parliament to tell the truth, then, between elections, we might as well close up this place and all go home and allow Cabinet Government to rule the roost. There is little point in our being in this House if we cannot demand of our Ministers, and the Premier in particular, to tell the truth.

The member for Spence has clearly outlined a sequence of events and circumstances which prove beyond doubt that there is a *prima facie* case for the Government to answer in so far as the Premier and the then Premier's lying to this Parliament, and that issue should be dealt with through this privileges committee.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I object to the honourable member's use of the words, 'lying to this Parliament'. It is unparliamentary and I ask the honourable member to withdraw those words.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member knows that, under the very Standing Order that he called to my attention a few nights ago, Standing Order 127, his own language was improper. I ask him to withdraw his remarks.

Mr CLARKE: I withdraw those words, Sir, and substitute the word 'misleading'. When I read the editorial in this morning's *Advertiser* I was somewhat bemused. Whoever wrote that editorial—and I presume it was sanctioned by the Editor—basically said that it did not matter what Governments did in this House—whether or not they lied to the Parliament—because that was not the big issue: the big issue is jobs. As long as the Premier or the Minister of the day was not a child molester, or something of that nature, then it was perfectly okay for Government Ministers to lie to members of Parliament and, through the Parliament, to the people of South Australia.

I find that an astounding conclusion from the *Advertiser* Editor. Certainly, it was not good enough for the *Washington Post* in 1974 and it certainly was not good enough for the United States Congress. Richard Nixon was the only President of the United States to be forced to resign his office because he was on the verge of being impeached and removed from office because he had lied and obstructed justice.

The *Washington Post* thundered away at great cost and risk to those journalists and its editor to establish that no elected official of the United States could get away with lying—that they could not be above the rule of law in their own country. Unfortunately, the *Advertiser* is no *Washington Post*, and the *Advertiser* Editor is certainly no Ben Bradley when it comes to recognising principles.

I am extremely disappointed in the *Advertiser* because, having seen how the Australian media portrayed Carmen Lawrence and hounded her over the days, weeks and months with the accusations that she had lied to the Western Australian Parliament and how the *Advertiser* had thundered in its editorials and its front page stories calling for her dismissal by the then Prime Minister, Paul Keating, to now read in today's *Advertiser* editorial that it is okay if you are a Liberal Premier or Liberal Cabinet Minister in the State of South Australia to openly mislead the Parliament; it is okay as long as you are not a child molester. That speaks volumes about the standard of journalism in the *Advertiser* and the ethics of that Editor.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know that this is a wide ranging debate, but I ask you to rule on relevance: what the *Advertiser* may or may not say is not relevant to the matter before the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The *Advertiser* was deemed germane to the argument when it was quoted by previous members on both sides. So, I can only accept the Deputy Leader's use of the *Advertiser*. Continue, Deputy Leader.

Mr CLARKE: I will conclude shortly. Frankly, members on the Government side in all their debate have not addressed the central issue about the need for the establishment of a

privileges committee because clearly what has been called into question is not just this Government's standards but the standards and ethics of all future Governments. If we in this House turn around and say, 'It is only politics. We all know that politicians lie and, therefore, we will allow Ministers and heads of Government to basically disregard any principles founded in the Westminster system of parliamentary democracy,' we may as well give this game away. We may as well lock up the shop, save taxpayers a lot of money and just worry about the election once every four years and surrender ourselves totally to Executive Government because the Government is telling us by the way it votes on this issue, 'You are irrelevant.' All members of Parliament, other than the Executive arm of Government, are irrelevant for these purposes. Let us just have an election every four years for the Cabinet and leave it at that and save the taxpayers a lot of money.

Mr ROSSI: I rise on a point of order. I take exception to the Deputy Leader's referring to me as irrelevant in this House and I seek an apology.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is here not to assess the veracity of statements made in the House but simply to assess whether or not they are parliamentary. That was not unparliamentary language, and I cannot accept the point of order.

Mr ROSSI: He was reflecting on a member of Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot accept the point of order.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I wish to continue my comments from yesterday about how this is an absolute sham and a deliberate set-up by the Labor Party. Just to prove what a sham this whole exercise is, I will quote from last night's 5AA program when the member for Spence was on air last night with Mr Francis. He made the following comments early in the presentation:

Atkinson: Well, the argument. . . is about standards in Parliament. I mean, should members of the Parliament, when they're in Parliament itself, tell the truth, and if they tell lies, when they're caught, what is the consequences? Now, I'm not saying that any Party is pure on this. As you say, politicians fudge the truth.

Francis: Yeah.

Atkinson: All the time, especially during election campaigns.

A senior member of the front bench of the Labor Party, a person who, as I said yesterday, in a previous life was seen as an honourable gentleman in the industrial field, is saying that politicians fudge the truth all the time, especially during election campaigns. That raises the question: what is this water debate about? What have members of the Labor Party said in the public arena about this water contract? They have said that the Government has sold all the assets and all control of the water to the French, to the English and to a small Australian establishment. That is a blatant lie, and the Labor Party knows it. A very senior member of the Labor Party, the member for Spence—the so-called 'shadow Attorney-General'—is telling the public that the Labor Party, especially during election campaigns, fudges the issue. But that is only half the story. The honourable member also acknowledged that the Labor Party fudged the Keating-Lawrence matter, but we have already heard that story. There was another interesting comment, as follows:

Francis: But aren't you fighting. . . fighting. . . really the Liberal Party just to get Dean Brown and John Olsen to have more fights amongst each other? That's all you're really doing, isn't it?

You. . . you're stirring the pot to get them to scream and yell at each. . . each other.

Atkinson: Look, we'd have a lot more credibility, Bob, if. . . if Labor got back into Government.

Francis: Answer me yes or no.

Atkinson: . . . we love them fighting one another, we think it's beaut, and anything we can do to help them out. . . I mean, look, Bob, a lot of what's been in the. . . in the news on the water contract for the last 10 days is not the Labor Party fighting the Liberal Party, it's John Olsen fighting Dean Brown through the medium of the Labor Party. . .

As I said yesterday, this is not about truth in Parliament: it is about a political stunt that the Labor Party is running deliberately. This stunt is supported by a very senior, potential (in the long, long term) Attorney-General of our State. The member for Spence is telling the public of South Australia that this is an absolute sham and that it is a deliberate political ploy. At last, a senior member of the Labor Party has put it on the public record outside this House so that we can all see what this is about. It is not about whether this Parliament has been misled: it is a political stunt. At last, the public of South Australia will see what it is about.

I am disappointed with the Leader of the Opposition's approach to this. As we know, the Leader of the Opposition played this game in the election campaign some time ago when he fabricated a story about the establishment of Roxby Downs. Today he referred to Mr Gleeson. The simple message for Mr Gleeson is that if he did his job why is he not still CEO and Chief Executive of the Tourism Commission? It is not a question of whether I should pursue him for libel. The question is: why is he not now employed? Because he was not doing his job—it is as simple as that.

A lot of dirt is being thrown about here, but at last today we have on the record what it is all about, what we have been saying to the public of South Australia for a long time. This water contract is in the best interests of South Australia. It is about reducing the cost of management and getting export jobs into South Australia for our kids. I am absolutely staggered that the Labor Party is not at all interested in our kids but is only interested in a political ploy. The member for Spence clearly put that on record on 5AA last night. The one thing we can all say about the member for Spence is that he is probably the most honest person in the Labor Party. The member for Spence goes out there and tells it as it is. Here we have a very honourable member, who wants to be a future Attorney-General, being prepared to say what he said.

In the past few weeks we have had some absolute shams from the Labor Party. First, we had the member for Torrens saying that she had no policy and had no idea about the debt management issue. We have had the member for Spence out there in the past few days. The Leader, known everywhere in Parliament as a fabricator, is doing exactly the same thing again. The Speaker yesterday ruled that there was no misleading of the House and that is where it ought to begin and end because the Speaker has the integrity of this House in his hands and he will act if any one of us should attempt to mislead the House.

This whole exercise is an absolute sham and the member for Spence ought to remember it and when he goes to his Party room next week he ought to say to his colleagues, 'I hope we will not mislead the public of South Australia during the election campaign.' But he is really saying that the Labor Party as of now will mislead the public of South Australia, as directed by the member for Spence and his peers.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): How three years in office has coarsened the idealism with which so many Liberal members of Parliament entered the House! Members such as the members for Lee, Hartley, Mawson, Hanson and Colton would not have believed three years ago that they could behave in the House as they have behaved today on this matter because all of them claimed to be concerned about parliamentary standards, about lifting standards, but today they chorused in interjections saying, 'Lying doesn't matter.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lee has a point of order.

Mr ROSSI: I take objection to the honourable member's saying that I do not care what happens in this House and that I am supporting lying in this Chamber. I ask that the honourable member apologise.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr ATKINSON: It is telling that an honourable member such as the member for Ridley did not speak in support of the Government on this issue. His omission from the Government ranks in this debate is a telling one because he is one member who understands the principle at stake in this debate.

The member for Unley said that the House of Assembly had never formed a committee of privileges, but the House of Representatives has a standing committee of privileges that meets regularly. So, there is absolutely no relevance in saying that we have not previously formed a committee of privileges. Other Parliaments have formed committees of privilege and we say that it is worthwhile in this case.

It is a breach of privilege for Ministers or any honourable member deliberately to mislead the House, because our Standing Orders are predicated on the veracity of the utterances of each and every member of the House. It is important that we can trust one another, and, however much that is tested in the hurly-burly of politics, we ought to remember that it is a good principle, one that we ought to struggle to maintain. The Deputy Premier quoted my conversation with Mr Francis on radio 5AA last night, and I thank him for those quotations—and I stand by each one of them. Is it not telling that the Deputy Premier said that it did not really matter whether the Premier or the former Premier misled the House, that was not the issue? He quoted me as saying that the real issue here is that one side of the Liberal Party is in an unauthorised fashion giving documents to the Labor Party in order to attack the other section of the Liberal Party?

He quoted me as saying that, with approval. He said, 'This is what the issue is really about.' So, in effect, the Deputy Premier was saying that the real issue is Liberal Party factionism—'The real issue is that we are a divided Government.' He quotes me with approval. Thank you for quoting me with approval, because I would say that the second issue after the misleading of the House is the issue of how divided this Government is and how vicious members opposite are to one another. Not once did a Government member attempt to argue in this debate that the Premier and former Premier did not mislead the House. It was a telling omission in the debate.

There was no analysis of the text of the Premier and former Premier's answer to Parliament and a comparison of these with the leaked documents, with a view to reconciling them and proving that the Premier and former Premier told the truth. Government members did not attempt to do that in debate, because they could not do it.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (11)

Atkinson, M. J. (teller)	Blevins, F. T.
Clarke, R. D.	De Laine, M. R.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hurley, A. K.	Quirke, J. A.
Rann, M. D.	Stevens, L.
White, P. L.	

NOES (31)

Allison, H.	Andrew, K. A.
Armitage, M. H.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J.	Bass, R. P.
Becker, H.	Brindal, M. K.
Brokenshire, R. L.	Brown, D. C.
Buckby, M. R.	Caudell, C. J.
Condous, S. G.	Cummins, J. G.
Evans, I. F.	Greig, J. M.
Ingerson, G. A. (teller)	Kotz, D. C.
Leggett, S. R.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J.
Oswald, J. K. G.	Penfold, E. M.
Rosenberg, L. F.	Rossi, J. P.
Scalzi, G.	Such, R. B.
Venning, I. H.	Wade, D. E.
Wotton, D. C.	

Majority of 20 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

AUTOMOTIVE TARIFFS

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I move:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to freeze automotive tariff cuts beyond 15 per cent post the year 2000 and to take urgent action prior to 2000 on microeconomic reform and at the same time to ensure predicability and certainty in industry policy to provide assurance for the long term viability and competitiveness of our industry base, in particular the South Australian motor vehicle industry.

This is probably the most important motion I have moved on behalf of my electorate and I certainly expect the support of all members in this House in ensuring that our motor vehicle industry and the South Australian motor vehicle work force have a guaranteed future in our State. The automotive industry has led the development of the manufacturing sector of South Australia and Australia. Today it accounts for one sixth of South Australia's manufacturing activity and one tenth of the State's total exports.

Our two motor vehicle industry plants demonstrate the important employment base of the manufacturing industry: 5 300 people are employed at Mitsubishi Motors Australia and a further 4 221 at General Motors. These figures are only the start. We then look at the employment base of the major automotive component manufacturers in South Australia. These include: Air International, A.E Baker & Co., Aldersons, Australian Arrow, Arrowcrest/ROH, Aunger Group, Bridgestone Automotive Components, Bridgestone Tyre and Development Division, Britax Rainsfords, Bundy Tubing, Castalloy, Exacto Plastics, GNB Battery Technology, Hendersons Automotive, Lear Corporation, Johnson Controls, Lawrence and Hanson, Monroe Australia, Numetric Manufacturing, Plastic Component Painting, Precise Plastic Tooling, Plastec, Rodney Robertson, Tecalemit, TRW-Carr, Tubalco Manufacturing and Walker Australia Pty Ltd. Overall, 17 000 South Australians owe their employment to the automotive industry and just over 2 100 of these workers are from my electorate.

It is the performance of these companies and their workers which underpins the economic performance of South Australia and our State's manufacturing industry. One of the greatest manufacturing job opportunity strengths is the car industry and everything associated with it. We need to get a policy from the Federal Government on industry, a policy that ensures that there is an industry protection base and a level and a foundation for that. The economic importance of the industry goes well beyond the direct output and employment it generates. It also sustains activity in a range of related industries and drives improvements in skills and technology throughout the manufacturing sector. It is important to acknowledge that it has been documented that the car plan has provided a certain and stable policy environment (for tariff related, if not other policy settings) over a reasonably long time frame—and this is important to industry planning. Industry trends over the past decade indicate that long adjustment periods are required before changes in assistance arrangements are reflected in performance.

It has been acknowledged that the competitive pressure on the motor vehicle industry resulting from lower import protection, particularly following the 1988 changes to the car plan, has brought about a significant improvement in industry performance. However, this should not be interpreted as inferring that further reductions in tariffs beyond 2000 will result in a continuation of the rate of improvement recorded over the past decade. Internal efficiencies, which had been supported by high import protection, have been largely removed with the substantial restructuring that has occurred to date. Reductions in tariffs to their current levels have encouraged the industry to lift its international competitiveness. However, further tariff reductions run the risk of diminishing the gains to date by discouraging investment in the industry.

The key competitiveness issues require a policy response from the Federal Government relating to cost factors external to the industry—domestic market growth and foreign market access. Of great significance to me and to the industry workers are the real impacts on the community—issues that touch each and every one of us, things every individual has to consider when their future is under threat. For instance:

- Housing—areas such as mine and many in the south where home ownership could be jeopardised; the reduction in the purchase of household goods and services; lower household income is likely to result not only in lower spending but in less home maintenance and devaluation of properties.
- Health, welfare and care services—more resources would be needed to cope with the impacts of unemployment. Then we have to consider the impact on our health services such as Noarlunga Health Services and the Flinders Medical Centre, and Family and Community Services and the viability of the existing child care services.
- Education and training—as Government has already targeted for development areas such as toolmaking, vehicle painters, bodymakers, automotive production, components and manufacturing—identified industry sectors where shortages have been pinpointed. Our own priorities would seriously need to be re-assessed.
- Then there is the area of crime, safety and security. We would all acknowledge that areas of high unemployment have more crime and an increase in drug related crimes, petty crimes and crimes against property. There is also the potential for increased abuse and domestic violence.

I could go on about the impact on our retail sector and our small business, our youth, our culture, but what I have highlighted to members is enough to envisage the nightmare of a diminishing quality of life, a quality of life to which we are entitled, and one which I do not want to see jeopardised should those sorts of cuts go ahead.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Becker): Order! there is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I cannot hear the speaker.

Ms GREIG: Our manufacturing sector in the south is dominated by Mitsubishi Motors Australia Limited and associated automotive component suppliers. Mitsubishi Motors Australia directly employs 5 300 workers, 70 per cent of whom reside in the southern suburbs. I also want to acknowledge the success of Mitsubishi Motors Australia becoming the source of the Magna and Australia will produce the Magna sedan and wagon for all world markets other than Japan. The United States is expected to be the primary export market. Mitsubishi Motors Australia has export targets of 25 000 sales per annum, worth around \$A750 million per annum. While I am praising Mitsubishi Motors Australia I am going to also commend its initiatives as a great corporate citizen.

Mitsubishi Motors Australia has provided: an extensive school/industry link program; various education support programs; southern skills employment program; Orana special employment program; best practice training programs; sponsorship/support of approximately 200 South Australian charities and community groups. Mitsubishi Motors Corporation and Mitsubishi Corporation acquired Chrysler Australia Limited in October 1980. It has been a longstanding corporate member of the southern community for some 16 years. At that time there were some 68 600 people directly employed in the vehicle manufacturing and components industry.

In 1984, the Button Car Plan was announced, to be implemented in 1985. At this point the local car industry employed 63 400 who produced 383 760 passenger motor vehicles, spread over eight car assembly plants and 13 models. In 1988, following a mid-term review, the motor vehicle industry saw the immediate abolition of quotas, and tariffs reduced from 57.5 per cent to 45 per cent, with annual reductions of 2.5 per cent until 1992. It was in this time period that major changes to the plan were also announced to maintain pressure on the industry, to achieve the objective of becoming world competitive in terms of price, quality and delivery by 1992.

In 1990 the Industry Commission undertook a review of policy settings for the car industry to apply from January 1993 to December 2000, as scheduled, and in 1991, following the Industry Commission Inquiry, the decline in tariffs of 2.5 per cent per annum to the year 2000 was announced. Mr Acting Speaker, 1996 saw Australia with four manufacturers producing 300 000 passenger vehicles per annum. The work force has declined to 43 000 and imports of passenger motor vehicles are approaching 50 per cent of the market. The four assemblers are producing vehicles of world-class quality and price, as are the major component manufacturers.

I believe it is clearly evident that the tariff level of 15 per cent at the turn of the century as presently being implemented could be managed, and in fact is being planned for. A negative shift in policy will have severe ramifications for the southern region of Adelaide. Any loss of our motor vehicle manufacturing base will have a domino effect on my community, with a major impact on employment. I am sure

that all members in this House are aware of the major significance of the car industry to employment. The companies in my region are large employers of the region's labour force.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There are five separate conversations going on in the Chamber at the present moment while the member for Reynell is trying to speak. I think it is rude. I remind all members of Standing Orders. Please cease the conversations. I want to hear the member for Reynell.

Ms GREIG: The vehicle manufacturing industry is a major contributor to the region's economy through the levels of capital expenditure and the multipliers that this generates. For those who have taken the time to read the draft report on the automotive industry it is not difficult to see how many companies are specifically dependent on passenger motor vehicles and component manufacturing, as their sales output is related almost exclusively to the motor vehicle industry.

Once again I stress that one sixth of this State's manufacturing outcome is from the motor vehicle industry. It comprises one tenth of the State's total exports and it generates 15 per cent of Gross State Product. Any policy that impacts against this will have a major effect on the South Australian economy. This is why we have to have a freeze on tariff cuts beyond 15 per cent post the year 2000, with urgent action prior to 2000 on microeconomic reform. Our Premier has made it clear that he believes that we can get an outcome in industry policy that is in the interests of the industry and, more importantly, in the interests of jobs and job protection in South Australia. On behalf of the vehicle industry work force in my electorate, I ask this House to support my motion.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to support my colleague in the south, the member for Reynell, in this most important motion, which is, arguably, one of the most important to be debated in this Chamber since I have been a member of Parliament. If we look at the Liberal vision, particularly that of Sir Thomas Playford when he was Premier, we have a great deal to be thankful for in South Australia because he had that vision and encouraged the motor industry to come to this State. I think every member of the South Australian community would agree that, if Sir Thomas Playford did not have that vision, there would be a great many fewer jobs in South Australia and the prosperity of this State would be nowhere near what it is today. Therefore, I cannot understand the logic in the recommendations of the report.

I also fail to understand the logic in some of the comments that I have heard not only from some members of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament but also some of my own colleagues. In fact, I have been disappointed that some of my own Federal colleagues have been so quiet since this report was tabled. I do not always agree with everything that my Federal colleagues say, but in this instance I congratulate Senator Amanda Vanstone and Senator Hill. I congratulate the Federal member for Sturt, Chris Pyne, and the Federal member for Kingston, Susan Jeanes, on what they have said on this issue—particularly the Federal member for Kingston and the magnificent submission that she put to the inquiry.

Whilst I have been a good supporter—and will continue to be—of Senator Grant Chapman, I was disappointed to read his comments in the *Advertiser* today. As someone who is normally very balanced and who shows a lot of commonsense and an absolute commitment to South Australia, I am surprised that Senator Chapman has chosen this track. I trust that he will have time to reflect and that he will discuss the

issues further with his colleagues. I invite him to ring me at any time and arrange to visit the electorates in the south, and I am sure that colleagues on both sides of this Parliament would also encourage him to look north to see what has been happening in recent years. He should realise that he is a senator for South Australia and that this is absolutely crucial to the future of South Australia.

Whilst the previous Federal Labor Senator, John Button, in many ways tried to get the car industry back on track—and in many ways he did a pretty good job—many of the issues with respect to tariff reductions occurred before the current Liberal Government, under the Prime Minister, John Howard, came to office. Whilst it was clear that the Federal Labor Party would continue to go down the track of further tariff reductions and further damage our textile industry and car industry, I was hoping that Prime Minister Howard would continue his previous commitment to support tariffs.

I was also disappointed to see what the Prime Minister had to say in the paper last Friday. I was very pleased that the Premier of South Australia, John Olsen, quickly contacted the Prime Minister and pointed out to him in no uncertain manner that he, as Premier, and number one in this State, would not accept what Mr Howard was saying and that there were great dangers in falling into the bear trap of following the report's majority recommendations.

As a farmer, and one who is being financially hammered at the moment in our dairy industry with exports, I can understand that, from an agricultural point of view, there is some argument about agreeing with a reduction in tariffs. However, balance must be included in this argument. We cannot rely wholly and solely on agriculture: we have to look at the manufacturing base and ensure that in Australia, and particularly in South Australia, because of our vulnerable situation, we have a strong economic manufacturing base.

Mitsubishi is no longer just a manufacturing company which manufactures product for Australia. We are seeing the success stories day after day of both Mitsubishi and GMH and the magnificent run they are having with their Verada in the USA—and let us hope that multiplies and goes on for many years into the future. We are now starting to see South Australia, in particular, and Australia as net exporters of motor vehicles.

The south is so important to the future economy of South Australia and, as my colleague has already pointed out—and I will not go into the statistical data—the bottom line is that much of the economic engine room for the south and the job creators are centred around the motor industry. Whilst most of it is down at Lonsdale, many of the small businesses in my electorate and many thousands of people who live in my electorate work at Mitsubishi, Walker Australia, Britax Rainsfords—and the list goes on. I am not prepared to stand by as their representative without doing everything I can in my power, as limited as it may be in some ways. Hopefully, we can all be strong spokes in this wheel of fighting against the reduction in tariffs, and I encourage all members to support us in this effort so that wisdom prevails in the Federal arena.

At this stage I would congratulate Mr Ian Webber, the Chairman, who has released a minority report on the inquiry. He has enormous experience when it comes to the motor industry. He was an extremely successful businessman when he led Chrysler. He has gone from strength to strength. It is important that politicians of all persuasions listen, read and not only absorb but take note of and get on with the job of listening to the thrust of Mr Webber's report.

I ask: why does Australia have to lead the way with tariff reduction? With 18.5 million people, right down at the bottom of the globe, why do we have to lead the way? Sure enough, if there is a level playing field, that is fine, but in reality there is not, and with 18.5 million people, when we have 1.8 billion people on our doorstep, I do not believe that Australia can justify leading the way with this tariff reduction. Look at what President Clinton and the US Government did to Australia's beef market just before the last Federal election. Admittedly there was a WorkCover problem as well, and that was disappointing for all the hard workers at Metro Meat at Noarlunga. The reason that closed down and we lost 400 or 500 jobs in the south last year was that President Clinton destroyed our traditional beef markets and subsidised strongly the US beef market with its exports because they support their farmers and listen to them.

The Olsen Liberal Government in South Australia is listening to the community. The submission it put in was absolutely superb. I encourage those Senators and members of the House of Representatives who have any queries to look at the South Australian Liberal Government's submission and at the dynamic and fearless attack that Premier Olsen has put to the Prime Minister and then get behind him as the leader of our State.

One has only to look at the current account deficit in Australia. We know who caused that deficit: it was not John Howard as Prime Minister of the Liberal Government but primarily Paul Keating, a Labor Prime Minister, and Bob Hawke before him. The fact remains that Australia has a very serious current account deficit. Further, it has a core debt which is almost beyond belief, going from \$23 billion (including public and private) in 1983 to nearly \$200 billion in 1996, of which about \$80 billion is public debt, whether we like it or not. We are in a very difficult position in Australia and an even more difficult position in South Australia.

There is light at the end of the tunnel, as I have spoken about in this Chamber before, but the bottom line is that Australia, and particularly South Australia, is still very vulnerable. Why should any political Party or any politician do anything whatsoever that will clearly do so much damage to that recovery, and not only damage the recovery but, I would suggest in a State like South Australia, put us into a spiralling decline that we will never get out of? We cannot afford to lose thousands and thousands of jobs in South Australia. We lost 33 600 manufacturing jobs over a 10 year period in the 1980s and the early 1990s. We are coming out of that and creating new jobs, as difficult as it may be. We have more to do but we are getting on with it.

I strongly appeal to my Federal colleagues to make sure they condemn this report, that they support the motion of the member for Reynell and that they get behind the motor and manufacturing industries and the whole of South Australia and Australia. They must forget about just the big numbers in the eastern States and be fair and democratic in their deliberations and realise that South Australia, Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania are all part of the global situation.

Ms WHITE secured the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House condemns the draft majority report of the Australian Productivity Commission in relation to tariffs protecting our car industry, calls on the Federal Government to reject the report and commit itself to a freeze on car tariffs at 15 per cent from the year 2000 and calls on Federal Liberal MHRs and Senators to fight in the Liberal party room against the lowering of tariffs to a level that would destroy our TCF, motor vehicle and other manufacturing industries.

In moving this motion today, we are underpinning that this Parliament is concerned about the importance of the car industry to this State and the threats that confront it. In my own electorate in the Salisbury area there are firms such as Bridgestone and Lear, and many of the people in my electorate work at General Motors Holden's in Elizabeth. The motor vehicle industry directly employs more than 15 000 people in South Australia. Beyond this it provides demand and orders for makers of glass, plastic and upholstery, and retail and many other sectors. On a conservative assessment, as many as 45 000 households in South Australia rely on income from this industry. But the very future of this industry is under attack from ideologues, theoreticians, abstract economists and pointy-headed free traders who are willing to see thousands of jobs lost in the name of a level playing field that does not exist. These are not the people who design or make the cars. These people do not make anything, but they can destroy the industries that do, and the livelihoods of thousands of decent, hard working people who work at Tonsley Park, Elizabeth, Lonsdale, Salisbury and elsewhere. I am referring to the Productivity Commission and its fellow-travellers.

The draft majority report of the Productivity Commission is a death warrant for our car industry. It calls for a 5 per cent automotive tariff by the year 2004. In real terms, that tariff level is negligible—so small that its effect is almost zero—but of course there are people in our community who support zero tariffs. Unfortunately, many of them, such as senior figures in the Liberal Party, are in positions of influence. Today we read in the press about Senator Grant Chapman. No wonder he lost a seat in the south; no wonder as a former MHR Grant Chapman was disposed of as the member of Parliament representing Mitsubishi workers. He said:

In principle I do not accept that the car industry should be immune from further tariff reductions.

Senator Chapman should go to the gates at Tonsley Park and Elizabeth and tell those workers why they should lose their jobs to benefit car workers in Korea, Malaysia and elsewhere. Senator Chapman is not alone in the Liberal Party in supporting free trade at the cost of local jobs. I quote from one of the most prominent supporters of zero tariffs in the past few years. In the Federal Parliament this person said:

Australia and Australians have expected to be shielded from the harsh realities of international competition with tariffs and quotas for far too long.

That was said on 14 March 1991 in a speech in favour of zero tariffs as part of the Fightback package. The author and speaker of those words was the then Senator for South Australia, John Wayne Olsen. Now as Premier he has done an about turn, and that is a good thing: he has been educated. He now claims to be a strong supporter of tariffs. Four or five years ago John Olsen wanted zero tariffs for the car industry and now he has changed sides. That is a good thing, but now he must show that those are not weasel words and that he means what he says and says what he means by convincing the likes of Grant Chapman and others of the folly of their ways. I hope that he sincerely holds those views and that he

really is advocating for the car industry. I make the offer now that the Opposition is willing to join the Premier in any genuine lobbying effort to help convince the Howard Government totally to reject the majority draft report of the commission. Labor is totally opposed to this plan.

My motion calls for a tariff freeze from the year 2000 when tariffs will hit 15 per cent. I believe that any tariff reduction that takes place after that must occur only if and when our trading partners drop their tariffs and other industry protection barriers to comparable levels. Free trade is a great goal, but the productivity commission is advocating one-way free trade: we cut our tariffs while our competitors throw a protection barrier of up to 200 per cent around their car industries.

Australia's car market is not closed off from competition. Almost 50 per cent of our market is held by imports. So, how can Grant Chapman and the former Senator John Olsen say that we are being shielded from competition? Look at some of the regional markets that we must deal with. South Korea has a tariff import tax of between 25 per cent and 100 per cent; Malaysia has a tariff of between 5 per cent and 200 per cent with import licences and local content quotas; Thailand has tariffs of up to 200 per cent—car imports are banned in Thailand, but there are import licences and local content provisions; China has a tariff of 110 per cent to 150 per cent; and Indonesia has a tariff of a flat 100 per cent with import licences and local content provisions. So the list goes on.

For some reason, the economists in Canberra seem to think that Australia can set an example for the world, that, if we lower our tariffs, all those people in other countries will say, 'Good on you, Australia, we will follow you and drop our tariffs as well.' There is no free lunch in world exports, and the only people who will be cheering a drop to a 5 per cent tariff will be car workers in Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Korea and all the others. A few years ago, I met Congressman Dick Gephardt in the United States. He was then the House majority Leader. He ran for President of the United States in the primaries in 1988. One of his points was the idiocy of this one-way free trade. The same politically correct bureaucrats in the United States were saying, 'Let's wipe out our industry. At least we will be able to go home at night and say that we're pure in economic terms.'

He made the point of saying that if he was elected as President of the United States he would honour his commitment to the defence of South Korea, because that was the way America operated in world politics: it respected its obligations. He also pointed out that a Chrysler car cost \$50 000 on the streets of Korea, because of tariffs slapped on American imports, but meanwhile Americans were paying \$12 000 for a comparable car on the streets of Detroit. He said he would defend Korea and that if he became President he would make sure that the price of a Hyundai on the streets of America would be the same price as a Chrysler in Korea, because someone must send a message to these countries that there is no free lunch and that they cannot expect us to lower our tariff barriers while they keep theirs up.

Recently, the Federation of Automotive Parts Manufacturers provided up-to-date information on the application of barriers in the automotive trade. Australia was found to be the market most open to import competition in cars, alongside New Zealand, which has little or no car industry of its own. The New Zealand car industry is a joke. It once produced a car called the Anziel Nova. Only one copy of those cars was produced before the outfit went bust. That car is still on the streets. It must be highly prized. It looks a bit like a clapped

out Cortina. Industry analysts and commentators have linked any further reduction in assistance to the car industry before the 15 per cent year 2000 target to the possible closure of another automotive manufacturer in this country.

In 1992, the then South Australian Government employed the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research to examine prospects for the South Australian economy during the 1990s and it speculated about the closure of one South Australian car manufacturer. The institute said that such a closure in this State would reduce our economic growth to zero for three years and our employment growth to 1 per cent a year for three years. A similar or worse impact could be expected today. South Australia is the State that can least afford car tariff cuts. The car industry is more important to us than to any other State, including Victoria. In no small part, thanks to our former Industry Minister, the now Premier, our economy has been under-performing so spectacularly that the blows to our car industry would be even more devastating. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

FUNDING, PRE-SCHOOLS

A petition signed by 36 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to continue with the proposed block-grant funding of pre-schools was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

PRISON DEVELOPMENT

A petition signed by 8,083 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to stop the proposed development of a prison at Pelican Point, Outer Harbor was presented by Mr Foley.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:
By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee—Report, 1995-96.

PROPERTY TRANSACTION

The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Mines): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: This statement refers to some allegations made by the Hon. Michael Elliott, MLC, in another place. The honourable member asked a series of questions alleging I had a conflict of interest in relation to the purchase by the Department of Primary Industries of a property near Greenways. The relevant facts are as follows. It was normal practice for the department to seek ministerial approval for such purchases. The department has a budget for land acquisition and considers any properties in the South-East with a view to their purchase for forestry purposes.

In this particular matter, the General Manager Forests prepared a memorandum to me, through the Chief Executive, dated 20 July 1994 recommending approval of the purchase. I was not aware that the department had made a decision to recommend purchase until this memorandum was presented

for my signature on 31 August 1994. In the period between the preparation of this memorandum and its presentation to me, the matter was the subject of normal review by the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Primary Industries, Mr Madigan. I had no involvement whatsoever in this review or any knowledge of it. Mr Madigan has confirmed that I gave my approval to the recommended purchase as soon as the recommendation was put before me.

The Hon. Mr Elliott stated yesterday that the Banksia Company made a written offer for a portion of this property on 2 June 1994. That offer was rejected in writing on 5 July 1994—15 days before the department made its decision to seek ministerial approval for the purchase of the whole property. In accordance with the Ministerial Code of Conduct, I had resigned my directorship of the Banksia Company immediately I became a Minister.

The Hon. Mr Elliott also referred yesterday to a delay in completing this transaction. Following departmental evaluation and my approval, it was necessary for documentation to be processed through the Crown Solicitor's office. By a letter of 22 September 1994 the Crown Solicitor's office advised the agent acting for the vendor of the procedures necessary to complete the transaction, indicating it was anticipated that this would occur on 11 October 1994.

I table the documentation showing the departmental recommendations to purchase the property and my approval, and also the letter from the Crown Solicitor's office advising the procedures necessary to finalise the transaction. Clearly, there was no conflict of interest on my part. This transaction was completed after all the required evaluation and documentation by the Government agencies had been undertaken. I did not act in any way to delay or prevent the transaction. Clearly, there is no conflict of interest on my part, and I therefore reject the allegations of the Hon. Mr Elliott in their entirety.

QUESTION TIME

CRICKET, AUSTRALIA DAY TEST

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Was the Minister for Recreation and Sport informed by a member of the Australian Cricket Board, or any other cricketing authority, during the Test series at the Adelaide Oval last month that Adelaide was likely to lose the Australia Day Test Match next year? Did he inform the Premier, and what, if anything, did the Minister do to fight this move?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I was not advised that we would lose the Test. The Chairman of the ACB had indicated to me that there would be some changes concerning the future programming of all Tests throughout Australia.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I do not care what you have been told; this is what happened. One thing about the Leader of the Opposition is that the truth is the last thing he is ever worried about. All the Leader of the Opposition—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. In the light of your ruling, would you ask the Minister to withdraw that grossly offensive comment?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the Minister that, although his comments may not be unparliamentary, other phrases might better describe the situation, because it could

be suggested that his comments impute an improper motive to the honourable member.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Mr Speaker, I accept your point, but here we have a Leader who makes imputations not based on fact, accusing me of not telling the truth, and who is known as the fabricator.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am not accusing the Minister of not telling the truth: I am asking him a question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has developed a habit of standing and making comments which are completely out of order—he knows that. I do not know whether he believes that he has special privileges as Leader, but I can assure him that he does not. I do not want that course of action to continue any longer, or he knows the consequence. I suggest that the Minister be allowed to answer the question without interruption, because the longer it takes the fewer questions members will be able to ask.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I know that interjections are out of order, but the Leader clearly interjected that the answer I was giving was not, as he saw it, the truth—but then he would not recognise it if he did see it. I was at a luncheon with the Chairman of the ACB when he indicated not only to me but to the entire table that there would be some changes in the program for the next series of Tests. He did not indicate what—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Listen to the honourable member over there who wants to be the Leader. He is just as bad. If he waits, I will get to that point. I ask him to be a little patient. I realise that he does not like the answer that he is getting, but he should be patient, because there is more to come. At this lunch that I had with the Chairman of the ACB he indicated that there would be changes to the coming Test program. He said that there were three icons as far as Australian Test cricket is concerned: the Sydney Test, the Melbourne Test and the Adelaide Test. He also said that he could see that at least one of those Tests was going to be affected. That is all he said.

Immediately I came back from that lunch I took up this matter, through my Chief Executive and other sources, with the ACB in an effort to determine whether it was the Adelaide test that was to be affected. I did not know for sure until yesterday that that was the case. Therefore, I just make the point—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want any further interjections on my left.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I make the point that we were continually trying to establish the facts, which is something that the Leader would not understand. What is the point of going off half cocked until we know? Certainly, as Minister I made the ACB well aware that we did not want—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: No, not yesterday but right through, including at the lunch when I made it clear that I hoped that it would not be our Test that was affected. I have been working behind the scenes. If the Leader would like to go out and establish the facts—again, something that he does not like doing—he would find that that is the case. Here we are talking about this test. Let me make it quite clear: this decision has nothing to do with Adelaide—it is the weekend that they want. I point out to the Leader that we did not lose this test as he lost the Grand Prix. We have not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Let me point out some facts of life to members opposite. The fact is that the Australian Cricket Board, in conjunction with the New Zealand Cricket Board and the South African Cricket Board, made this decision before it was made known where it was going to go. Therefore, I make the point that there could not have been more work done behind the scenes. I could not have worked harder. But the point is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Of course I have been discussing this with the Premier.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is out of order.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I make quite clear that we will have a lot of pluses out of this. There will be two series of three Tests.

The SPEAKER: Order! In view of the fact that there is no guarantee of the 10 questions, I suggest to the Minister that he has adequately answered and should round off his answer.

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: I am just trying to make the point that we will gain a lot from this. We will have a Test against South Africa, and I have been told that the Test against England, which is part of the Ashes series, will revert to the normal long weekend. If members opposite can point out one thing that I could have done as Minister, or that the Government could have done, I would be interested to hear it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the House comes to order, we will proceed.

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Premier report to the House what trends, barriers and issues face South Australian manufacturers and what South Australia is doing to assist industry? My electorate contains many factories and manufacturing organisations, which are beginning to feel slightly more optimistic for the year ahead and which are eager to know just what lies in store for them.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It is an important question in terms of positioning South Australia to open up export markets for small and medium businesses in this State. South Australia has a very good track record as an exporting State, a State that has developed an export culture and a capacity and a range of goods and services to access the international marketplace. In part, that has been brought about by the efforts of the Government over the past three years in our trade offices, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region, to give assistance to business people in South Australia who want to establish contacts in those markets and to assist trade missions with major exhibits to demonstrate the range of goods and services South Australia has to offer. Indeed, as a result of a mission to HOFFEX (Hotel and Food Fair Expo) in Singapore, approximately \$57 million worth of trade contracts were written.

South Australia recorded a 17.6 per cent rise in merchandising exports in 1995-96. Data for the first five months of this financial year indicates that the strong growth performance has continued. In the five months to November 1996, South Australia's total merchandise exports amounted to \$1 892 million, which is a 23 per cent rise on the same period in 1995. In the five months to November 1996, South Australia's exports of manufactured goods totalled

\$1 275 million, which is a 19 per cent increase on the figure for the corresponding period in 1995. That is a significant improvement in South Australia's export performance and underlines the critical importance of this State's manufacturing sector.

This State has no alternative but to pursue the development of an export culture and open up export markets. With a population of 1.5 million, we simply do not have the economies of scale in South Australia to produce a whole range of goods and services. We simply have to win business overseas and bring it back to South Australia to make up for that lack of economies of scale.

We are out performing other States of Australia in many manufacturing areas, which is a reflection of the skilled and available work force we have in South Australia. This State has the best industrial relations record—and that has been the case for 40 years—and that sets us ahead of the other States of Australia; and our cost of production is competitive vis-a-vis the other States of Australia. That is why in policy development, in terms of access to export markets, in my view, it is the Federal Government's fundamental responsibility to ensure that an industry policy is developed to enable our exporters to access markets.

Given that the export facilitation scheme is part of the Productivity Commission report (wherein post the year 2000 the draft report suggests the elimination of the EFS scheme), this State and this country, because of its population base, needs an industry policy that facilitates and assists our exporters to gain access to those markets. Without a proper industry policy we will put at risk the manufacturing industry of this State and this nation. Any developed nation needs a good manufacturing base as part of its economic base.

It is for that reason that we will certainly argue in our response to the Productivity Commission draft report that not only should there be a pause on tariff reduction post the year 2000 but also that it should be a fundamental requirement of the Federal Government to develop an industry policy that facilitates exporters entering the marketplace post the year 2000.

MINISTERS' CODE OF CONDUCT

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Liberal Government's ministerial code of conduct, as set out in the Cabinet Handbook 1994, which provides strict rules prohibiting the active involvement by Ministers in the day-to-day conduct of any business in which the Minister was engaged prior to gaining office and the requirement to declare any real or potential conflict of interest, still apply?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes.

POLICE, SOUTHERN SUBURBS

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Police advise the House whether police resources have been increased in the southern suburbs during the past three years?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition has left the House. As the Leader was so prominent in putting out an unsigned and unheaded document last week, I thought that he might want to hear the answer. I am pleased to inform the House that, under this Government, both policing services and police related capital works have been significantly increased in the southern suburbs.

On our coming to government in 1993, police numbers at Darlington and Christies Beach were 324. That covers general patrols, CIB and traffic. As at 5 February 1997, total police numbers at the 24-hour Christies Beach and Sturt Police Stations is 377. In addition, a further 42 officers have been placed at the Sturt Police Station as part of the new Southern Command Response Division. This is a total of 419 officers, with an Assistant Commissioner who has the ability to make operational decisions in the southern suburbs. Let me repeat that: 419 officers compared with 324. That is a pretty significant increase in personnel.

Under this Government's restructuring of the Police Force, there is greater flexibility to use police officers in a more efficient and effective manner for the community, particularly in the southern suburbs. This has resulted in police being relocated from Glenelg and Thebarton police complexes into a more central location at the Sturt Police Station. Operation Fix and Operation Venom, which I will discuss shortly, are clear initiatives to ensure that police resources are strategically placed to combat crime.

In relation to personnel, the Aldinga Police Station provides police office and general patrol working day and afternoon shift, and has been staffed by four officers since its establishment. Aldinga police have recently been responsible for uncovering a racket involving the dismantling of stolen vehicles for spare parts, and 10 offenders have been charged. The rumour which is going around and which has probably been spread by the Labor Party that Aldinga and Willunga will be closed is a furphy.

The Noarlunga Centre patrol unit patrols the shopping and entertainment areas and attends taskings during business hours. The Southern Command Response Division was established in January 1995. It has been a major contributor to a reduction in break and enter offences in the past few years.

In relation to Operation Fix, there has been the involvement of a strong uniform presence of command response officers in the southern area, responding to vandalism and anti-social behaviour. Operation Venom has been a highly successful task force involving Christies CIB and the command response members in operation to combat breaking offences in the Christies area.

In addition, there have recently been special policing initiatives involving the Star Division in the Christies Beach area with particular focus on youths. It is recognised that, in the summer months, the demand for police services increases along the coastal boundaries of Southern Command. This initiative focuses on the Christies Beach patrol district, with support from other Southern Command Divisions. Two additional patrols are rostered during p.m. shifts when they are needed.

The other major issue in the south has been the significant increase in the capital works program. At the Christies Beach complex, since 1993 there has been significant work in improving the general buildings, and the stage 2 program of \$2.75 million is scheduled to start in 1997-98. The Aldinga Police Station was established with a project cost of \$70 000. The Noarlunga Shopping Centre community policing office was established in September 1995 and is staffed by three officers with a focus on the Noarlunga Centre and interaction with transit police, centre security and centre management. Finally, \$9.9 million has been spent on the Sturt Police Centre. It is an absolute furphy to suggest that this Government has not been interested in the general issue of policing in the south, and this information should clearly put beyond

doubt all the unsigned, unregistered notes that get run out by the Leader of the Opposition.

MINISTERS' CODE OF CONDUCT

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Before the current Premier reappointed the Minister for Finance, did the Premier ask the former Premier or did he make other inquiries regarding the reasons why the former Premier sacked the now Minister for Finance at the end of 1995 to ensure that there had been no failure to comply with the ministerial code of conduct which could have precluded the Minister's reappointment? The Liberal Government's Code of Conduct states:

Ministers will cease to be actively involved in the day-to-day conduct of any professional practice or in any business in which the Minister was engaged prior to assuming office, unless on some special, technical or other reasonable grounds the Premier deems it appropriate for a Minister not to do so, and where retaining an interest upon conditions approved by the Premier would not create any conflict with the Minister's responsibilities in his or her portfolio or portfolios.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I can assure the honourable member that before appointing the ministry I sought advice from the senior public servant in this State as to whether there was any reason he could advance to me why any member ought not to be considered for the ministry. The answer was 'No.'

CRICKET, AUSTRALIA DAY TEST

Mr LEGGETT (Hanson): Following the earlier question to the Minister for Recreation and Sport from the Leader of the Opposition, can the Premier now inform the House what action he has taken to ensure that Adelaide retains its traditional Australia Day cricket Test match?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: First, I thank the Minister for Recreation and Sport, who has aggressively pursued this issue over the past 24 hours. The fact that the ACB had made that decision came to my attention early yesterday evening. First thing this morning, following the return of my visit to HMAS Adelaide, I took action, and might I digress for a moment to say that I am delighted, on behalf of the Government of South Australia, to welcome HMAS *Adelaide* to South Australia. I had the opportunity to congratulate the captain and members of the crew on an outstanding effort given the way in which they had focused—not only HMAS *Adelaide* but also the Orion crew—their activities in rescuing the sailors in the southern seas. On behalf of South Australians, I provided a small gift to the crew, as I did to the Orion squadron. I arranged for a pallet of Coopers Ale to be delivered to the ship today—a good South Australian based company—which I am told the commanding officer and the crew would be duly appreciative of in the course of their three or four day stay in Adelaide.

Returning to the cricket, upon my return from welcoming the *Adelaide* into Port Adelaide, I immediately contacted the Australian Cricket Association. I sought from it advice as to whether, with the Government, we could take this matter up with the ACB to get a reconsideration of the Test. The board of SACA held discussions this morning and advised me that the South Australian Cricket Association is supporting the decision of the Australian Cricket Board and, therefore, the matter had been determined. They also put to me that we ought to look at it in its proper context: in the first weekend in December we in South Australia will have our first day-

night cricket match, at long last and thankfully. They assure me that the lights will be up, and that will be a great thing for cricket fans in South Australia. In that first weekend in December we will have Saturday and Sunday back-to-back day-night cricket matches at Adelaide Oval. So, that is a very significant plus, and I welcome that for all cricket fans in South Australia.

Secondly, SACA pointed out to me today that we have not lost the Test to Melbourne. This is about six one day matches having to be put into the month of January—a quite unusual event—and having rest periods for players between these one day matches. What is occurring on the Australia Day weekend in Melbourne is a one day match. They do not have the Test: the Test will be in Adelaide the following weekend. SACA pointed out to me that we are on the major part of the circuit to this extent: only Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide have the South African team. We have the South African team coming to Adelaide. The South African team playing in Adelaide against Australia had the second highest attendance in cricket history in South Australia. So, SACA says that it is securing South Africa—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: And not on the long weekend. As SACA points out, that really underscores the importance of getting the South African team here and that we are considered by the ACB to be a pre-eminent location for cricketing events in Australia.

Further to that, following representations to the Minister for Recreation and Sport, the ACB has given an assurance to the Minister that the Test will return to Adelaide on the holiday weekend the following year and that it will be the English team versus Australia for the Ashes. So, the Minister has secured the position for South Australia in the longer term and obtained a good outcome for South Australia. We will have South Africa playing Australia here in Adelaide, and that is a good thing for cricket fans here in South Australia. I well understand the Opposition members' interest in cricket, because they make up a cricket 11. I know their sensitivity: they want to move on past the Grand Prix. Remember the Grand Prix that we lost? It was lost while the current Leader of the Opposition was responsible for that portfolio.

PROPERTY TRANSACTION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): During 1994, when he was Minister for Primary Industries, did the Minister for Finance meet and/or correspond with officers of his department regarding their interest in purchasing the property 'Gouldana' on sections 35, 36, 37 and 190 in the hundred of Smith; and, if so, was his or his Banksia Company's interest in purchasing part of the property revealed? The Opposition has a copy of a letter on the letterhead of the Forestry Division of the Department of Primary Industries to the Millicent office of Elders Ltd dated 14 July 1994 which states:

Primary Industries SA Forestry is able to offer \$600 000 for the property as it stands subject to the approval of the Minister for Primary Industries.

The Opposition has a further letter from Elders to the Manager of South-East Forests dated 20 July 1994, stating that the vendor found the offer acceptable and asking that the offer be presented to the Minister for Primary Industries to seek his approval.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: That is exactly, word for word, what I said in the ministerial statement, and the supporting documents are there.

SOUTHERN SPORTS COMPLEX

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Recreation and Sport inform the House of the status of the southern sports complex and the establishment of a board of management to oversee its operations?

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: First, I pay a very real compliment to all the members of the south, namely, the members for Kaurna, Reynell and Mawson, who came into this Parliament following the last election. Before that we had the members for Fisher and Bright. For many years the south suffered from a surfeit of Labor members, including Labor Ministers, who did absolutely nothing to look after the south. I do not think they knew where their electorates were, frankly. Before this Government was elected it made a commitment that if it came to power it would provide the south with a first-class sports complex, and that is exactly what it has done. Again, I commend those local members for their initiative and the way they have worked with the Government to make sure that that sporting complex came to fruition. As we all know, it is now running very well.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: My colleague points out that members opposite not only did nothing but also stated that there would be no Taj Mahal in the south, so that shows how much the Opposition cares about the south.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Absolutely. As the Premier has pointed out, we have saved that, as members opposite well know, but they do not like it. I take this opportunity today to announce that an important committee of management will be established to oversee the current management of the complex and to report to me on the future sporting needs of that very vital southern region.

I am pleased to advise the House that the committee will comprise Mr Ray Gilbert, Mayor of Noarlunga; Mr Bob Bache, a local businessman and a prominent identity in the local sporting community; Mr Frank Seeley, Manager of Seeley International; Ms Lucille Outhred, also a prominent member of the local business and sporting community, together with Ms Soula George, a prominent local community member; and Mr Fred Newman, a staff member from the Noarlunga council. I am also delighted to say, for those members who are interested—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.S. ASHENDEN: Obviously the Opposition is pretty embarrassed by this, because for years it controlled the south and now at last we have some active members, and they will be back to continue their good work. Mr Bache has agreed to chair this important committee. As a former member of the original committee formed to work toward the establishment of the complex, Mr Bache has been a dynamic advocate on behalf of the local sporting community, and I am very pleased that he has agreed to chair this important committee on my behalf.

I also take this opportunity to advise the House that the Government is currently reviewing further initiatives—and I am sure that local members will be pleased to hear this—that it can put in place to ensure that this truly multi-functional complex will serve the southern sports community for many years and be something of which the whole community

can be proud and can use. Obviously, when I am in a position to make the announcement I will inform the House, but I know that the local members are very keen for this additional project to come to fruition, and I am looking forward to continuing to work with them for the good of the south.

PROPERTY TRANSACTION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Did the Minister for Finance contact Elders Real Estate in March 1994 and say that he was interested in purchasing the same 500 acres detailed in a letter dated 2 June 1994 on the letterhead of the Minister's Banksia Company, a letter that was tabled in another place yesterday?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: Again, all those matters were covered in the ministerial statement.

PRIVATE SECTOR SERVICES

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Health inform the House whether the Government's use of private sector services is consistent with past practices in South Australia?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Elder's question is a particularly important one, because listening to the Leader of the Opposition one would believe that the crucial issue in South Australian health at the moment was preventing private sector involvement. On radio recently the Leader said:

We're absolutely opposed to the involvement of the private sector in privatising the Daw Park Repatriation Hospital and the QEH. It's absolutely fundamental and we will stop the privatisation of our public hospitals.

One may well ask: to what is the Leader referring? He cannot be talking about privatisation in the sense of selling hospitals. We have not sold a single hospital since we have been in Government, and I have told people time and again that our hospitals are not for sale either now or after the election. Our hospitals are not for sale. Clearly the Leader of the Opposition cannot be talking about selling hospitals: I think he must be referring to the provision of health services in public hospitals within public assets and, if that is what he meant, one would think that, in Government, to be consistent, the Labor Party would not have involved the private sector in this way.

If it is so much anathema now, would not one reasonably think that, to be consistent, it was anathema when the Labor Party was in Government? Labor's record tells a very different story, and I notice the member for Elizabeth saying, 'No no.' I look forward to her reaction at the end of the question. Under Labor there was more and more private sector involvement. Labor has tried to tell us that the involvement of the private sector at Modbury Hospital is a problem, yet when this Government came to office Modbury Hospital already had—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I ask the member for Elizabeth to quieten down and listen to the facts. When the Government came to office Modbury Hospital, under the Labor Party, already had private sector providers of radiology, pharmacy, nuclear medicine and CT scanning. The Labor Government was already moving to establish a private hospital at both Modbury and Flinders Medical Centre. It was proposing the first private hospitals on public sites in South Australia and, indeed, some of them were the largest private health involvements in Australia.

I would like, for the benefit of the House—and perhaps for the benefit of the member of Elizabeth, and certainly that of the Leader of the Opposition so that he may in fact change his tune—to read into the record some of the private sector provided services which this Government inherited from the Labor Party—the same Labor Party that is now saying that the private sector is ghastly. They are as follows: hospice services at Mary Potter and Philip Kennedy hospices; lithotripsy at Calvary, day care and nursing homes at the Southern Cross Homes; biomedical engineering at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Noarlunga Health Service; and pharmacies at Angaston, Clare, the Gawler Health Service, the Noarlunga Health Service, Northern Yorke Peninsula and Port Broughton.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I will react to the interjection, much as I know I should not. The member for Spence said, 'It's sensible.' Of course it is sensible; that is exactly why we are doing it; it is exactly why the Labor Party did it before; and it is exactly why it should button up about complaining now. I continue with the list of private sector providers under the Labor Government: radiology at Angaston, Clare, the Gawler Health Service, Mount Gambier, the Noarlunga Health Service, Northern Yorke Peninsula, Port Augusta Hospital, Port Pirie and Whyalla; and physiotherapy at the Gawler Health Service.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As the member for Ridley says, members opposite obviously do not understand what some of these terms mean. What is perhaps more important is that surely they understand that with that list of private sector providers under their Government—and we did not criticise that; it is sensible to do that—they totally lack credibility now in criticising our involving the private sector as we attempt to provide more and better services for the people in South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition has no credibility. The Opposition has no credibility in this area, and I would put to the House and to the people of South Australia that the only Party in this Chamber with a vision for appropriate health care for the future is the Liberal Party and the Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PROPERTY TRANSACTION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Finance aware that Elders' file notes, of which the Opposition has copies, record contacts between the Minister and Elders in 1994 regarding the Minister's personal interest in the property in question; and, in the light of that information, does the Minister wish to reconsider his answer to those previous questions? The file notes include an entry on 29 March 1994 which reads:

Dale Baker rang. Interested in purchasing 500 acres along parallel strip of Jorgenson Lane (including scrub). Wait until NVA (Native Vegetation Authority) and W&F (Woods and Forests) state their position.

The Minister in his ministerial statement today said:

I was not aware that the department had made a decision to recommend purchase until this memorandum was presented for my signature on 31 August 1994.

Minister, you were actively bidding against your own department for your personal gain.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that the last part of the question involved comment and as such is completely out of order.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: I am very pleased that these matters have come out, because they have been the subject of innuendo. I stand by everything in the statement I made to the House, including the documentation that was released today.

BUS SERVICE, ALDINGA-SELICKS BEACH

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Information and Contract Services, representing the Minister for Transport, advise the outcome of passenger transport numbers accessing the new Transit Regency bus service now serving Aldinga Beach and Sellicks Beach?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: At the beginning of this year additional transport services have operated from Aldinga Beach to the Noarlunga Centre as a result of very strong lobbying by the member for Kaurna over a period of time. Contracts have been let by the Passenger Transport Board. As a result, the number of services per day during weekdays increased from six to nine, with six of those nine services now travelling via the Seaford Health Centre, which is a new facility that this Government provided in the developing suburb of Seaford. At the same time, weekend services were introduced for the first time, again, from Aldinga Beach and Sellicks Beach to Noarlunga Centre. In the first three weeks of this year there was a very substantial increase in the number of journeys on this passenger service. From last year to this year it increased from 1 494 to 2 461—a very substantial increase of 67 per cent.

It shows that the member for Kaurna's residents appreciate what she has achieved for them. They are using the service. I commend and congratulate the honourable member on winning this improved service for the people of the southern suburbs. Again, they are achieving results from this Liberal Government when they were ignored for so many years under Labor.

PROPERTY TRANSACTION

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Did the Minister for Finance have any other contacts with Elders or the vendor regarding the Minister's interest in the property in question and, if so, what were they and with whom? The Opposition has a copy of a fax from an Ian Leopold to Martin Cameron, President of the Liberal Party, which reads:

These are copies of documents previously faxed to Adelaide. They were supported by telephone conversations with the Premier's Department. I do not have access to Roger Watson's diary notes kept from 12-3-94 (at my instigation) however I believe they hold details of other telephone conversations.

The Minister's statement today detailed his actions as Minister but did not cover the private and personal dealings he was involved in during the same time frame.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: It is very pleasing to flesh all this out. I stand by exactly what I said in the ministerial statement and the documents supplied.

TAFE, OVERSEAS STUDENTS

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the House on efforts to attract overseas students and export dollars to TAFE institutes?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I thank the honourable member for his question and also congratulate him on his ongoing interest in this very important area. The growing number of enrolments from overseas students in TAFE institutes is a very good news story for South Australia in terms of export dollars and the invaluable links made between this State and the graduates who will take an important place in overseas business communities. A growing number of overseas students, particularly from Asia, are choosing TAFE institutes as the best way to improve their employment prospects in their own country, which in itself is an outstanding endorsement of the courses that TAFE South Australia provides.

Eight of the 10 institutes currently provide courses for overseas students. Last year, 566 overseas students were enrolled in various institutes in the first semester, increasing to 615 students enrolled in the second semester. The most popular courses were accounting and computing. While each course attracted 74 students, travel and tourism attracted 52 students, and other popular courses include hotel and catering, hospitality, management, information technology, and marketing. While we have students from Africa, Europe, Oceania and the United States, most of our overseas students are from the Asian region, including Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia and, indeed, Taiwan. Of those students recruited from overseas, about 50 per cent made direct contact with the relevant institution because of our very good international reputation. The remainder were recruited by private agents or through aid programs.

In addition to the 600 plus overseas students at TAFE institutes, the International College of Hotel Management, which is a joint private sector-TAFE venture, teaches an extra 300 students, most of them from overseas. Research by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies indicates that these 300 students have an export impact of between \$5.5 million and \$6.5 million. This income has a flow-on effect of generating between 100 and 120 full-time jobs. TAFE's International Business Services Unit is currently stepping up its marketing, strategic and research efforts to ensure that South Australia continues to attract an increasing number of overseas students. As part of this drive TAFE is building stronger relationships with overseas educational organisations and businesses. Individual TAFE institutes are encouraged by the richness and diversity of culture that overseas students can bring to the campus.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: You may call me the member for Newland. As a result of this, many institutes are actively identifying opportunities to recruit overseas students and are constantly reviewing the delivery of educational services to ensure that they meet the needs of people of different nationalities.

PROPERTY TRANSACTION

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Since it was raised in another place yesterday, has the Premier spoken to the Minister for Industrial Affairs and to the Minister for Finance regarding the South-East land deal? If so, is the Premier satisfied that the Minister for Finance has completely complied with the Ministerial Code of Conduct and, if not, what action will the Premier now take?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Minister for Finance has tabled a ministerial statement in the House. He consulted with me prior to tabling the ministerial statement in the House, and it is self explanatory.

PATAWALONGA

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources inform the House of the progress being made upstream from Tapleys Hill Road on the clean-up of the Patawalonga catchment?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I do not think anyone in the House heard the question because of the mutterings from the other side, but the member for Morphett inquired about the clean-up of the Patawalonga in the upper stream of the catchment. I am very pleased—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will come to you in a minute. Recently, I was disgusted to hear the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knocking and ridiculing the brilliant efforts being made to clean up the Patawalonga. In fact, I would suggest that by his comments the Deputy Leader has ridiculed and offended thousands of business people, service clubs and school children in the catchment area who have put in time, effort and money to get this job under way. It is all very well for the Deputy Leader to object. All that members opposite have to show for their efforts is the black muck at the bottom of the Patawalonga, which resulted from their decades of neglect of our State's waterways.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Both the member for Mawson and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are out of order.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Opposition is pretty good at getting into matters of filth. Just three years ago, let me remind the Deputy Leader—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Deputy Leader for the second time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Just three years ago the Patawalonga was named the most polluted waterway in Australia, and it was recognised as being a national disgrace. It was a national disgrace because of the lack of action of the previous Labor Government over 11 years. Do I need to remind the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that each time the lock gates were opened a huge blanket of black sludge was seen to make its way up the beach? Many of us can recall vividly the constant outcry and frustration at the inaction of the previous Government with regard to this matter.

The catchment has come a long way—with no credit to members opposite. You only have to look at the kids with their model boats and those who are enjoying recreational activities again; and I remind the Opposition that we can now fish again in the Patawalonga.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Members opposite can condemn me for setting a goal of wanting to swim in the Patawalonga, but that is a hell of a lot more than the Opposition ever did in setting goals to clean up any of our waterways in this State. Comments by the Deputy Leader are an insult to the many members of the community involved in this cleanup. If it were not for the support of the community, with the action of the Government, the Patawalonga would still be as it was when this Government came to office, as a result of the inaction of the previous Labor Government. In 11 years in office, whenever the Patawalonga issue was raised, Labor failed the public of South Australia, just as it failed the public on the issue of the Torrens; just as it failed the public on the matter of the Murray River; just as it failed the State in respect of revegetation objectives; just as it failed the State

in being able to provide a development on Mount Lofty; and just as it failed the State in respect of the infrastructure needs of our national parks.

Labor failed this State by not being able to act in respect of the protection of whales in the Great Australian Bight and in relation to other environmental matters in South Australia. Let us look at the environmental credibility of the Opposition in government. It will not take long.

Mr FOLEY: On a point of order, Sir, I draw your attention to the ability of Ministers to use the provision of ministerial statements to give such details to the House.

The SPEAKER: It is not really a point of order. I suggest that members cease interjecting, or we may have to eject one or two of them. I ask the Minister to briefly complete his remarks.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Let us briefly have a look at the environmental credibility of the Opposition. It will be brief, because I can assure members that there is not much to report. May I suggest that they join with the thousands of people involved in catchment programs and go out, perhaps on a weekend, get their hands dirty doing something constructive and find out what it is all about and how to make a positive contribution to the environment in this State for a change. The Labor Party may criticise me for not swimming in the Patawalonga, but when this Government finishes cleaning up the black, stinking mess that was the Patawalonga, left by the Labor Government, I and many other South Australians will enjoy a dip in the Patawalonga. As far as I am concerned, that is a goal worthy of achieving—a goal that the Labor Party failed to achieve.

FINANCE MINISTER

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Why did the Minister for Industrial Affairs, as Premier, sack the now Minister for Finance in December 1995?

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is out of order. The Minister for Industrial Affairs no longer has responsibility in relation to the matters referred to by the member for Napier. That is why the question is out of order.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Mr CUMMINS (Norwood): Will the Minister for Information and Contract Services provide the House with details of initiatives that have recently been undertaken by the State Government to assist industry to demonstrate the potential benefits to South Australians of using electronic commerce and electronic service business?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The State Government has taken a number of key initiatives and is moving to put more information services and electronic commercial services on the Internet, so that people are able to interface with the State Government far more effectively. We are leading Australia in this area, and I think we are also one of the leaders in the world. Let me give some examples to the honourable member. First, in relation to the Department of Primary Industries South Australia (PISA), a number of the information services for that department are now being prepared to go on line, so that farmers around the State are able to link in much more effectively to get that information.

Bass, the booking agency for theatre tickets and major events here in South Australia, is proposing to go on line through the initiatives of the South Australian Government, so that you will be able to book your ticket through the

Internet almost instantaneously. We are looking at a project that will put TAFE services on the Internet and, in particular, we are looking at Mount Gambier, where that service will be initiated. We are making available on the Internet the services within a primary school, first for the parents, so that the parents are aware of some of the initiatives being taken within the school on computer training and the subjects being taught but, equally, we are putting the information on the Internet for that particular school so that other primary schools around the State are able to look at that information and keep up to date with it.

They are just some of the examples, but there are others. We want to develop those on-line services through the Internet so that we are able to achieve a much more enlightened, much more effective electronically controlled service for the people of South Australia. The initiatives we are taking are very exciting, and I believe that they will ultimately be of enormous benefit to some of the companies involved. I can also indicate that we are looking to work with the Wine and Brandy Producers Association so that the sale of wine and information about wines from South Australia are available on the Internet. We are giving some financial assistance to the Wine and Brandy Producers Association so that ultimately it will be able to use the information it has available for commercial transactions and the sale of South Australian wine around the entire world.

It is a very important initiative, but it is more than just commercial sales. We are looking at putting on the Internet information about wine regions in South Australia, as well as information about the wine characteristics of South Australia, the various brands that can be purchased here and the price at which they can be purchased. The initiatives we are taking will help develop export markets for South Australian produce. Wine and brandy is one classic example that, before long, I would hope can be extended significantly to other products which are produced in South Australia and which are sold globally.

FINANCE MINISTER

Mr De LAINE (Price): Did the Minister for Finance during his taxpayer funded trip to Hong Kong and Los Angeles last month or during ministerial trips to Hong Kong since December 1993 (when he stayed at the Peninsula Hotel) conduct any business related to any companies or joint ventures in which the Minister has a financial interest?

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: For a start, all the ministerial travel is well documented with reports and so on. The trip that I took on 1 January was a private trip on which a report will be put on the parliamentary record.

IMMUNISATION PROGRAM

Mr BECKER (Peake): Will the Minister for Health inform the House how successful the immunisation program has been in South Australia and what the Government is currently doing to further ensure that South Australian children are being immunised and that their parents and carers are being educated on the dangers of side effects from measles and other infectious diseases?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: An outbreak of whooping cough has occurred lately. That and a recent Queensland Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Tribunal decision have served to refocus community attention on immunisation or, if we compare ourselves with a number of other countries,

lack of immunisation. It is interesting that a number of other countries—many more developed than ours but some much less developed—have better rates of immunisation and, in many instances, have immunisable disease under control. In South Australia a very disappointingly low number of children under six are completely immunised, in other words, have every dose of the relevant material. It seems for certain specific diseases that the percentage increases, but what seems to happen is that many people start the program and, as the years go on, they tend to lose interest in it. This is perhaps due to the fact that the effects of many diseases—such as polio, whooping cough (although that is less so now), measles, mumps, diphtheria and so on—are no longer seen as devastatingly in members of the community, and people have become blasé.

Our immunisation program follows the guidelines of the National Health and Medical Research Council and we use the NH&MRC schedule. At the moment we are implementing an immunisation program consisting of a number of elements. We are working closely with the Commonwealth and the Health Insurance Commission to implement strategies agreed to under the national immunisation program and to implement the Australian childhood immunisation register. This register was introduced in 1996 and basically revolves around the parents of particular children being regularly reminded to have their children immunised. We are also distributing free vaccines to local government and GPs across South Australia for use in the immunisation program.

Most child and youth health clinics in South Australia now have an opportunistic immunisation program and, interestingly and importantly, we have set up a particular surveillance of what might be termed adverse events after immunisation. There are now proposals for a special immunisation clinic at the Women's and Children's Hospital to allow people who may be particularly concerned about those potential adverse effects to have immunisation under strict supervision.

I indicate that at my last briefing on these matters, which was very recently, I was informed that the chance of an adverse effect is about one in three million. If one looks at the devastating effects of illnesses such as polio or the one which people seem to ignore, measles—which can have some devastating effects on 14 and 15 year old children as it is a slow virus—and others, not to mention whooping cough—which can kill young children—one sees that a one in three million risk is well worth running, and we would strongly suggest that people do so.

We are very keen to increase our immunisation. We are surveying all South Australian public immunisation service providers to assess any potential problems of accessibility, and that survey is nearly complete. A series of educational updates is planned for GPs and local government staff about any changes or potential new changes to the NH&MRC immunisation schedule. We have discussed with the Commonwealth a series of community based events promoting immunisation towards the end of the year. All South Australian parents now receive educational material as part of their child's personal health record—what is known as the blue book, for those of us who have been to Child and Youth Health Services clinics.

The child and youth health parent help line has been set up and that is equipped to handle immunisation inquiries. Obviously, particularly given the latest epidemic, we are continually reviewing and updating our State plan, and I understand that shortly all Ministers from around Australia will be discussing this matter. It is a matter of particular

interest to Dr Michael Wooldridge, the Federal Minister, and it is a matter which he and I, both as former medical practitioners, have discussed.

Lastly, the South Australian immunisation forum, which represents all the stakeholders in immunisation, will review options on records in light of the Queensland judgment, including the possibility of mandatory record keeping. Those records are designed to encourage parents to keep their immunisations up-to-date and to limit the spread of disease due to an outbreak to enable authorities to exclude unprotected children from areas where they may be at risk. It is still a problem. It is simply a matter of people being blasé about potentially deadly diseases. As Minister for Health, on behalf of the Government and I am sure on behalf of all members of Parliament, I implore parents to ensure that their children are immunised and that they not only start the program but continue it through to its finality.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): A number of members of this Parliament have expressed quite strongly their support for the car industry in South Australia, and I join them in that support. I remind all members of this Parliament that the car industry is in South Australia only because of the strong support of the Government of the day that attracted that industry to this State. Imagine what would have occurred if a senior Minister in the Playford Government had referred to the attempts to attract the car industry to this State as the then Premier Playford as 'bloody nonsense'. Imagine how the Playford Government might have fared in its endeavours to attract that industry to this State if one of its Ministers had carried on in that manner.

In that light, it is appropriate that I refer to the information technology industry. The information technology industry (IT industry) has the potential to create more jobs in South Australia than were created during the entire time of the Playford Government in this State. It has the potential because of the significant benefits offered by the very nature of South Australia, for example our cost of living, our standard of education and the cost of housing in this State—things that are particularly important because the major contributors to the IT industry in South Australia tend to be under 35 years. The IT industry is one that is very important to me not only because I worked in it but because I believe that it offers significant opportunities for the development of this State.

To that end, on 23 June 1993 I prepared a submission to the then Opposition Leader, Dean Brown, recommending opportunities for investigation for the establishment of a significant information technology industry in South Australia. I made those recommendations after extensive discussions and meetings with senior IT people from various companies already in Australia and many no longer in Australia.

On 24 August 1993, I prepared a further submission detailing those benefits and recommending the signing of memoranda of understanding with three significant com-

panies: IBM, BHPIT and EDS. One of those memoranda of understanding was signed prior to the 1993 State election following my submission. On 25 October 1993, I provided further information to the then Opposition Leader as to lost opportunities by the then Labor Government in attracting significant IT industry to this State, and I detailed those companies which were prepared to negotiate with the Liberal Opposition as a potential Liberal Government to be implemented on the Liberal Party's coming to power.

I am very pleased that many of those things have followed through although, having said that, it is fair to say that I have not been pleased with the direction of IT development in this State over the past 12 months. I made my dissatisfaction quite clear to the former Premier during my time as a Government representative on the Cabinet information technology subcommittee. The things about which I expressed displeasure were tackled by the former Premier, and I hope that those things will continue to be tackled in the interests of South Australia.

It is fair to say that some Government bureaucrats working within the then Department of Information Industries had embarked upon a process of sabotage of information industry technology development in this State. They sabotaged it either knowingly or unknowingly because of their lack of experience in those positions. It is vital that this Government seize the opportunities available to it, and I sincerely hope that we will not hear any Minister or any member of this Government refer to the employment development opportunities in information technology as bloody nonsense. For that they are not. If I hear any member of this Parliament, whether on this side in Government or in Opposition, refer to those opportunities in that way again, I will be happy to stand in this place, name them and berate them publicly both inside and outside Parliament.

We have a unique opportunity to move forward and develop employment opportunities with the IT industry. They were not impressed by those statements, and the number of complaints I received from the IT industry after those statements were made were significant. I believe that I have done my bit to dissuade them of the belief that this Government does not care about IT.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Yesterday the Minister for Health tabled the second report of his United States' expert, Professor Lane, this time on the Garibaldi epidemic, and surprise, surprise, we were presented with three vague recommendations followed by a statement from the Minister that he believed that the Professor's report showed that the Health Commission had handled the response to the Garibaldi epidemic in accordance with world best practice.

Why did Professor Lane have to look at the Garibaldi epidemic? When those events were in full swing two years ago, after the mismanagement that was evident to all of us, the Opposition called for an independent inquiry into the whole matter. The Minister refused to hold an independent inquiry, stating that the Coroner would conduct an inquiry. How dare we question the independence of the Coroner? The Minister also said that he would resource the Coroner so that he could complete his inquiry as quickly as possible.

As we all know, the Coroner conducted a very detailed investigation and he made 12 specific recommendations which called for improvements in the areas covered in his inquiry. Those recommendations included improvements for

contacting medical practitioners, changes to the Food Act, better organisation and clarification of roles between local government and the State Government, and better notification practices. They were some of the important issues that came to light.

What has happened with those 12 recommendations? What we as members must understand is that very little—in fact, nothing—has happened in relation to the Coroner's 12 very specific recommendations. That is why the Minister dragged Professor Lane back again to look at the Garibaldi epidemic, which Professor Lane told me in August was ancient history. They were his words. When he came to take a quick and dirty look at the legionnaire's outbreak, he told me that the Garibaldi issue was ancient history.

However, the Minister brought him back to produce a whitewash report that says that Garibaldi was not such a big issue after all, that we have only to follow up on three vague suggestions, and that generally speaking we have all done very well. That is not good enough. I should like to quote one section from the Minister's statement yesterday. The Minister said:

Professor Lane suggested that efforts should be undertaken to help the media, the general public and members of Parliament to understand the abilities and limitations of infectious disease control efforts so that the unfortunate legacy of poor morale and legal complications caused by the Garibaldi HUS outbreak do not recur.

In other words, according to the Minister, Professor Lane says that we should educate members, the media and the community so that we understand how hard it is, and then we will not have poor morale problems in the Health Commission or legal complications. By 'legal complications', he must be referring to the attempts of the victims and their families to get compensation, and he must be referring to the prosecution of the directors of Garibaldi. These are the legal complications that we can do without. What an arrogant and callous statement, with no care or concern for the victims, their families and the South Australian community.

Let us remember that this Minister called in Professor Lane last year when he was under intense pressure. He whitewashed the legionnaire's disease outbreak and the efforts of the Health Commission to deal with it. He has now attempted to whitewash the Garibaldi issue. This Minister cares more about his own backside than he cares about improving public health procedures in South Australia.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Last time I spoke in this debate I paid compliments to those persons in my electorate who were named as citizens of the year at the recent Australia Day awards. I wish to acknowledge and recognise those people for their contribution to the local community. I should like to put on the record their names, as follows: from the Warooka District Council, Miss Joanne Murdock; Yorketown District Council, Maurice Johnson; Minlaton District Council, Mrs Coral Mumford; Central Yorke Peninsula District Council, John Simmons; Northern Yorke Peninsula District Council, Frank Camporeale; Wallaroo Corporation, Robert Miller; Bute District Council, Graham Taylor; and Wakefield Plains District Council, Mrs Ruth Catford.

On the last occasion, I sought to highlight some of the special attributes that these people have and what they have done for their community. I will now continue. I briefly mentioned Mr Robert Miller, and I was pleased that I was able to be present when the Corporation of Wallaroo made its presentation to him. He is one of these people who gives of his time tirelessly, particularly to St John Ambulance. I

have read one of the supporting letters from a person who investigated Robert's activities. On the very day that they went around to have a chat with Robert's wife, Robert was out on a call. A call for an ambulance in rural areas is not the same as a call in the city. Wallaroo is the better part of two hours from Adelaide, and one often has to wait around at the hospital and then drive the better part of two hours back. So, literally, most of your day can be gone. Congratulations to Robert, and congratulations also on the work that he did in the Apex Club.

Mr Graham Taylor, who was the recipient from the District Council of Bute, has been involved in many different organisations. He has given his support to a number of local organisations in Kulpara and Bute over many years. I highlight particularly that he has been Secretary of the Kulpara Progress Association; President of the Kulpara School Council; a past Captain of the Kulpara Tennis Club; a Charter President of the Bute Lions Club, as well as having been a secretary and an active member for more than 20 years; inaugural President of the Bute Aged Homes Committee; and a committee member of the Bute Centenary Committee and the Bute Oval Improvements Committee, among many other activities in which he was also engaged. So, it is a real tribute to Graham that he should receive an Australia Day award, and, knowing Graham as I do, I agree that he was a very worthy recipient.

I now refer to the Wakefield Plains District Council recipient, Mrs Ruth Catford. Mrs Catford, who served as a volunteer St John Ambulance officer for a total of 25 years, is estimated to have volunteered at least 18 000 hours of service, and how wonderful a record that is. Certainly, she has received some recognition from St John's in that time, including a service medal in 1987. She has also been actively involved in the Balaklava Auxiliary of the Friends of the Women's and Children's Hospital for the past 13 years, as well as being a volunteer deliverer of Meals on Wheels since the branch was formed in Balaklava in January 1971. So, that is 25 years of her time that she has given unselfishly to help others who need assistance.

Mrs Catford has also been involved in the Balaklava Community Racing Club Services, and she really is one who deserves the award. Finally, I highlight the fact that she has been involved in the Balaklava Courthouse Gallery since the gallery's establishment some five years ago. So, to all those persons from my electorate, I say again, 'Congratulations, well done, well deserved and we wish you all the best for the future and sincerely thank you for all your assistance in the past.'

Mr EVANS (Davenport): I take this opportunity to raise some matters involving the bus service in my electorate in the area of Bellevue Heights and Eden Hills. As the Minister in another place is well aware, I have on a number of occasions raised with her the need for improvements in the bus service to the Flinders Medical Centre. It was quite untenable to me as the local member to have the situation where bus timetables to Flinders Medical Centre did not coincide with hospital visiting times. For instance, if you were travelling from Blackwood and wanted to visit someone in the maternity section of the hospital, bus arrival times did not correspond with the maternity visiting hours, which is unacceptable. There were numerous other examples of where the buses did not link to the Flinders Medical Centre. In one instance, a person travelling to the hospital from Blackwood had a three-hour wait to get back to Blackwood. Given that Blackwood

is only about five minutes by car from Flinders Medical Centre, one would have to question the need to make a two or three-hour round bus trip to the hospital.

So, on behalf of a number of electors I wrote to the Minister over a period of months to try to have that matter corrected. Other people have also raised the problems of an insufficient number of buses for Flinders University students to go to the university and for people to visit Marion Shopping Centre. While the latter instance causes some problems for local traders, I accept that some people wish to take advantage of the wider services now being offered at the Marion Shopping Centre. So, there were a number of problems involving the bus service. On raising this matter with the Minister, I was somewhat surprised to learn, on 12 January, that a new timetable was being implemented. That was the first I had heard about it. No-one from the Passenger Transport Board had contacted me about the changes.

So, now my office has been flooded with inquiries relating to the changes that have been made. I have received complaints that the early morning service that used to get people into Adelaide at 7.30 has been cancelled, so that anyone who starts work at 7.30 cannot now catch a bus from the Bellevue Heights-Eden Hills area, which is unacceptable for people living so close to metropolitan Adelaide. We now only have four direct bus services in the morning. Anyone wishing to catch a direct bus service from the Bellevue Heights-Eden Hills area into metropolitan Adelaide needs to do that before 8.05. Every bus after 8.05 now goes via the Flinders Medical Centre and the Marion Shopping Centre, adding some 20 minutes to the trip into metropolitan Adelaide.

So, while I should in one way congratulate the people running the bus service for trying to improve the service and trying to heed constituents' complaints, I need to also register some criticism that they have been overzealous in their attempts to provide a better service to Flinders University, in some respects, Flinders Medical Centre and Marion by making every bus after 8.05 detour by that route and disadvantaging passengers. People also have similar problems on the return journey. I do not need to elaborate on those problems here, but I am sure that those using the bus service know of similar problems on the return journey. There are now also more bus transfers at the Flinders Medical Centre; people have to transfer buses to make the journey. While that works, there are concerns that buses will not link up, as happened the other night, when one of the buses left 12 minutes early, leaving constituents on the bus stop for a further 20 or 30 minutes waiting for the next bus.

I am also concerned that there was not enough public consultation with the local community about the changes they required. I include here the local nursing homes, for instance, on Eve Road, and interested people even as far away as Belair (although that is a different bus route); they have been trying to get changes at Barryne for some time. I am concerned there has not been enough public consultation. So, this matter has gone back to the Passenger Transport Board for a review, and hopefully in the near future bus route 728 from Bellevue Heights and Eden Hills will provide a more useful service than it provides at the moment.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to spend a few moments furthering the points that I raised in Question Time this afternoon dealing with the activities of the current Minister for Finance. The issue which is central to the Opposition's case is the very clear breach that

the current Minister for Finance made of the Brown Government's code of conduct, which is still in force today under Premier Olsen, we were told this afternoon, and which states:

... Ministers will cease to be actively involved in the day-to-day conduct of any professional practice or in any business in which the Minister was engaged prior to assuming office.

Then it goes on to specify certain special grounds where Ministers can be exempted but only with the permission of the Premier of the day.

What is very clear, from the evidence that we were able to present to the House today and what was presented in another place yesterday, is that the Minister for Finance, when he was Minister for Primary Industries in 1994, was actively engaged in his own personal business pursuits whilst he was a Minister of the Crown. Those two roles are totally incompatible and, therefore, the Minister should not have been reappointed to the ministry by the new Premier, Mr Olsen, in December of last year.

The Minister made a ministerial statement today in which he stated that he was not aware of the department's recommendation to purchase the land in question until 31 August 1994. I point out that the diary notes, of which the Opposition has a copy, with respect to the agent who was acting on behalf of the vendor for the sale of the property in question have a number entries not only that of 29 March 1994, in which the Minister, Mr Baker, indicated that he telephoned the agent concerning the land in question, but also indicating that the Minister, when he was Minister for Primary Industries, inspected the property on 12 March 1994.

On 9 March 1994, Mr Alan Gray, an officer of the Minister's then own department (Woods and Forests) had inspected those premises. It is impossible for anyone in this House to believe that the Minister for Primary Industries could not have known that his own department was also interested in that same land, because he inspected it three days after one of his own officers had already been out to inspect it for the department. That is an outrage. Even if for some reason or another the Minister was not made aware at that time that his own department was actively considering that land, he was in breach of his own code of conduct, because it provides that Ministers shall cease to be actively involved in the day-to-day conduct of any professional practice or in any business.

That does not mean that you simply resign your directorship of the department and that ends your involvement on a day-to-day basis. The code of conduct is specifically designed to preclude members from acting in any way, whether as a director or in any other capacity, in the pursuit of their own private gain whilst a Minister of the Crown. If the Minister had wanted to pursue his private business at the time, by all means he was free to do so, but he should have resigned from the ministry if that was the case.

Again this raises the issue of the conduct of this Government, particularly under the current Premier, Mr Olsen. Frankly, what we have seen over the past few months has been a constant denial of the principles of parliamentary democracy under the Westminster system, whereby every member of this House is entitled to rely upon Ministers' truthfulness in this House. As I pointed out earlier today, we may as well lock up shop in this place, leave and save the taxpayers some money while the public vote only once every four years for Executive Government, because if members of Parliament cannot rely on the honesty and truthfulness of answers given to Parliament by Ministers, and particularly the Premier, we have virtually surrendered our rights to a

democracy and we may as well have a Cabinet dictatorship for four years and then fight over the votes every fourth year.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Lee.

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Since I have been a member of Parliament I have endeavoured to take as many surveys as possible among the constituents of the seat of Lee. I will read out the results of those questionnaires now. One of the questionnaires was taken between June and December 1996 and the questions and answers were as follows:

'Do you believe that surveillance cameras should be hidden from view of potential offenders in public areas?' 'Yes', 58 per cent; 'No', 40 per cent; and 'Don't know', 2 per cent.

'Do you believe that the names of young offenders [aged] 12 to 18 should be made public for serious offences such as graffiti, housebreaking, assault and car theft?' 'Yes', 87 per cent; 'No', 12 per cent; and 'Don't know', 1 per cent.

'Should parents be required to pay for damage caused by their children engaging in criminal activities?' 'Yes', 65 per cent; 'No', 26 per cent; and 'Don't know', 9 per cent.

'Do you believe that current sentences imposed on convicted criminals reflect the nature of the crime committed?' 'Yes', 12 per cent; 'No', 80 per cent; and 'Don't know', 8 per cent.

'Do you believe the courts should impose near to the maximum sentence set down by Parliament for criminal convictions?' 'Yes', 86 per cent; 'No', 8 per cent; and 'Don't know', 6 per cent.

'Do you support the reintroduction of the death penalty for those convicted of murder and terrorism?' 'Yes', 75 per cent; 'No', 20 per cent; and 'Don't know', 5 per cent.

'Do you believe that the standard of education in public schools is high enough?' 'Yes', 24 per cent; 'No', 63 per cent; and 'Don't know', 13 per cent.

'Do you think three tiers of government—Federal Government, State Government and local government—is too many?' 'Yes', 66 per cent; 'No', 21 per cent; and 'Don't know', 13 per cent.

How long do you feel that fixed terms for Federal Government should be? Three years, four years or five years? The answers were: 'Three years', 31 per cent; 'Four years', 49 per cent; and 'Five years', 25 per cent.

Should this be for the full duration?' 'Yes', 77 per cent; 'No', 15 per cent; and 'Don't know', 8 per cent.

'Do you feel that elections should be held on a set month?' 'Yes', 62 per cent; 'No', 26 per cent; and 'Don't know', 12 per cent.

'Do you feel that there is too much violence on television?' 'Yes', 70 per cent; 'No', 26 per cent; and 'Don't know', 4 per cent.

If 'Yes', do you feel that this affects the way young children behave?' 'Yes', 65 per cent (that is, they believe that violence on television affects young children); 'No', 26 per cent; and 'Don't know', 9 per cent.

'Do you feel that police powers are restricted by the privacy laws?' 'Yes', 68 per cent; 'No', 14 per cent; and 'Don't know', 18 per cent.

If 'Yes', should the privacy laws be reduced?' 'Yes', 85 per cent; 'No', 13 per cent; and 'Don't know', 2 per cent.

During the parliamentary break, in January, I submitted some other questions (and some on law and order were repetitious) as follows:

'Would you support the reintroduction of the death penalty for those convicted of murder and terrorism?' 'Yes', 77 per cent; 'No', 13 per cent; and 'Don't know', 10 per cent.

'Do you believe that the names of young offenders aged 12 to 18 should be made public for serious offences such as graffiti, housebreaking, assault and car theft?' 'Yes', 94 per cent; 'No', 4 per cent; and 'Don't know', 2 per cent.

The reason for my asking that question was that when I was a teenager my parents told me to make sure I did not have a police record, otherwise my job prospects might be affected. I remember that a firm near Currie Street used to print the names of young offenders—and all offenders, for that matter—for the general public to know. To some extent we should revisit that legislation, because there should be very tough deterrents to encourage youths not to have a police record.

FINANCE MINISTER

The Hon. D.S. BAKER (Minister for Finance): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.S. BAKER: In answer to a question asked in the House earlier today I said that a trip in which I took part in January this year was a private trip and that the details would be on the parliamentary record at a later date. That was a parliamentary trip, taken on my parliamentary travel allowance, and again the details will be dealt with at the appropriate time on the parliamentary record.

PULP AND PAPER MILL (HUNDREDS OF MAYURRA AND HINDMARSH) (COUNCIL RATES) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 11 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 4 February 1997

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CHICKEN MEAT

13. **Ms STEVENS:**

1. How many premises are licensed in South Australia to process and manufacture chicken based products for human consumption?

2. How many complaints about food quality related to chicken based products have been received by the South Australian Health Commission since January 1995?

3. What program does the Commission have in place to carry out its responsibilities under section 28(2) of the Food Act to ensure that local councils are adequately ensuring proper standards for the sale, manufacture, transportation storage and handling of food?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

1. It is not clear what is meant by 'process and manufacture'. It has been interpreted as not including premises such as delis that 'manufacture' sandwiches.

There are no general licensing requirements for the processing or manufacture of foods in South Australia. There are specific requirements for some industries and this includes processors that slaughter or otherwise process raw chickens. Such processors need to be accredited with the Meat Hygiene Unit which is a part of Primary Industries SA. There are no licensing requirements for processors that receive raw chickens from accredited suppliers and cook them for distribution to sandwich shops and the like or for direct retail sale (i.e., chicken shops).

In August this year, the Health Commission distributed a discussion paper titled 'Protecting the Safety of the Food Supply in South Australia' which proposes the registration and accreditation of all food businesses

As of the 4 October, there are 30 poultry processors registered with the Meat Hygiene Unit. Two of these cook chickens for the trade.

Additionally the Health Commission is aware of four other processors who cook raw chicken for the trade.

The Commission does not have information that would establish the number of chicken shops, bakeries or related businesses that might process or manufacture chicken based products.

2. Most complaints about food quality would be directed to local councils. Eight complaints about chicken-based products have been received by the Commission since January 1995. The complaints allege problems such as foreign matter, wrong use-by dates, improper defrosting procedures and incorrect handling and transportation procedures. None allege food poisoning.

In the period 1/1/95 to 22/10/96 there were 270 reports of gastrointestinal disease made to the Commission where chicken was identified by the attending medical officer as a possible source of the disease. This represents 3.7 per cent of all gastro-intestinal notifications to the Commission in that period. Due to the methods of data collection (specimens are frequently not available, and food histories are frequently imprecise) this figure is an overestimate of the number of cases truly caused by chicken.

3. The Commission has relied on annual reports submitted by councils, investigation of food poisoning incidents and on complaints about food premises or council activities to assess whether councils are effectively carrying out their responsibilities under the Food Act

There are 110 separate Councils many of which cover small areas. The Commission's discussion paper proposes that Councils form eleven Controlling Authorities to administer food legislation. Additionally the Commission's paper proposes, consistent with a recently launched proposal from the Australia New Zealand Food Authority, nationally uniform standards for monitoring every food premises. The discussion paper describes a greater role for the Commission in ensuring uniformity of effort by Controlling Authorities.

COMMUNITY TITLES ACT

17. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. When is the Community Titles Act due to be proclaimed?
2. Will unit owners still be able to choose the Strata Titles Act as law governing their group of dwellings and if not, why not?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Community Titles Act came into operation on Monday 4 November 1996.

I understand that since that time at least 3 schemes have been lodged with the Development Assessment Commission for consideration; 2 urban developments, and one rural development.

The new Act has no retrospective application and all existing Strata Title Schemes remain under the auspices of the Strata Titles Act. There is the facility in the Community Titles Act for a strata corporation to resolve that future administration of the scheme will be under the Community Titles Act, but there is no compulsion in this regard and it will be a matter for each scheme to determine whether they wish to make that change.

It was always the view of the Government that it would be desirable to move as completely as possible to the new system of community titles from 4 November 1996, allowing only those who had applied for the division of land by strata plan before that date to complete the development of their scheme under the Strata Titles Act.

Before the proclamation of the Act it was drawn to the attention of the Government that many developers in fact apply for building approval to build a strata scheme and later apply for subdivision approval (not taking advantage of the fact that the Development Act permits concurrent approvals). Thus, there are some developers with building approval for a strata scheme who would have to complete their development as a community scheme.

Taking those circumstances into account, the Government determined to allow a short period of concurrent operation of the Strata Titles Act and the Community Titles Act. This decision necessitates the Strata Titles Act transitional provision being amended, and that will occur early in the next session.

During the period of concurrent operate industry groups have been asked to note operational difficulties and concerns so any necessary legislative changes can be made.

HEALTH FUNDING

26. **Ms STEVENS:**

1. What is the total of cuts to Specific Purpose Grants for health programs for 1996-97?

2. Which programs will be cut and by how much?

3. How many staff will be transferred or cut as a result of these reductions?

4. What action will the Minister take to address reduction of service in areas such as the dental program?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

1. The reduction in funding to the South Australian Health Commission due to cuts to health Specific Purpose Grants is estimated to be in excess of \$12.5m.

2. The South Australian health programs affected by cuts to Specific Purpose Grant funding include:

- \$5.5m in 1996-97 due to the abolition of the Commonwealth Dental Program (\$10.4m in a full year);
- An estimated \$6.45m penalty to South Australia notionally deducted from our Health Funding Grant (HFG) to account for cost-shifting.
- A 10 per cent cut to the following health SPPs; blood transfusion service, palliative care and the artificial limbs scheme, because of a proposal for these programs to be broadbanded. The value of this reduction is difficult to assess because the base grants, in some cases, have been inflated prior to the 10 per cent cut being imposed;
- The application of an across-the-board 3 per cent efficiency dividend on a number of health SPP's. Again the value of these cuts is difficult to quantify because of the availability of carry-over funds in some programs, because some of the cuts have been absorbed by the Commonwealth and some of the funding arrangements are still to be confirmed: and
- The Commonwealth has frozen funding for pathology services and has signalled that it will want to discuss savings associated with efficiency gains in the public hospital sector at the time of renegotiating the next Medicare Agreement.

3. It is expected that the three SPP programs which received the 10 per cent funding cuts (the blood transfusion service, palliative

care and the artificial limbs scheme) will be able to manage within the reduced funding entitled without the need to reduce staffing levels.

There are, however, implications for staff reductions in the SA Dental Service, which it is anticipated will need to lose 92 clinical and administrative staff (54 FTEs) by the end of June 1997.

4. Commonwealth cuts to health program Specific Purpose Grants in 1996-97 have resulted in the following actions:

- In response to the impact of the funding reduction to the Commonwealth Dental Program, the Health Commission is currently reviewing options to ensure that the supply of public dental services is cost-effective to address dental need in eligible adults in South Australia. However, it is expected that the Commonwealth funding cuts will have a significant effect on this program because the SA Health Commission is not in a position to replace this funding.
- In addition, the cost-shifting penalty will be strenuously opposed both at Ministerial level and by the Health Commission because there is a real risk that long standing arrangements relating to the provision of outpatient services in country South Australia will be inappropriately identified as a shift in costs between jurisdictions. Under the new arrangements, the penalty will, in fact, be levied, not because of cost-shifting, but instead because of a fundamental change to our health funding arrangement.
- In regard to broadbanding, I will be awaiting the outcome of discussions in COAG about broadbanding before approaching the Commonwealth Minister on the timing and extent of the cuts.

FINDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

33. **Mr ATKINSON:** What factors changed in the Mid West Cluster Review Group between 7 December 1995 when the Review Chairman and Seaton Park Primary School Principal, Mr Brendan Ryan, recommended a 'two to three year research period that more closely considers up to date demographic information and changes to levels of schooling' and an 'upgrade to facilities at Findon Primary School as an urgent priority' and 16 January 1996, when the District Superintendent of Education, Dr Craig Cameron, issued an interim report that said 'the principals of the cluster group are readily able to agree that the cluster is overschooled and that amalgamation/closure is essential to increase school size'?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Late in 1995 each school cluster review group in the Central West District was required to draft a progress report for negotiation with the District Superintendent of Education, Dr Craig Cameron, and subsequent inclusion in the Central West District Education Review Interim Report to the Minister for Education and Children's Services on 16 January 1996.

The Mid West Cluster Review Group forwarded its progress report to the District Superintendent in late 1995. However, this report failed to address the deliberations of the Review Group to that point and the terms of reference for the review. It is this initial report from which the Member for Spence quotes. Because of the shortcomings of this report in not addressing the terms of reference, the District Superintendent asked the Review Group to reconsider its report. This occurred at subsequent meetings. This amended report was included in the Central West District Interim Report, forwarded to the Minister in January 1996.

The opening statement of the final draft is:

'The cluster review group believes that given the direct correlation between school size and resource allocation, some schools in the cluster are too small.'

Dr Cameron's comment on this statement was, "The principals of this cluster group are readily able to agree that the cluster is overschooled and that amalgamation/closure is essential to increase school size".

In summary, the Member for Spence has quoted a working paper which was significantly amended by the Mid West Cluster Review Group for inclusion in the Central West District Education Review Interim Report.

PRISONERS ACCOMMODATION

38. **Ms STEVENS:**

1. How many prisoners in each South Australian prison shared cell accommodation as at 1 November 1996?
2. What is the effect on the mental and physical health of prisoners of the practice of 'doubling up' by placing more than one prisoner in a cell?
3. At which prisons are there plans to increase the number of

prisoners by doubling up and how much will be allocated for additional health, employment and education programs at each of these facilities.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:

1. Approximately 270 prisoners were placed in twin share accommodation on 1 November 1996.

2. Anecdotal evidence suggests that in many cases, sharing a cell has a very positive effect on prisoners, especially in the Adelaide Remand Centre. Self mutilations and stressful situations have abated since cell sharing increased, in part, because of the ability of prisoners to share their problems with another offender. This is also the case in Yatala Labour Prison's E Division, which is a reception and induction unit and receives many first time offenders, with the majority of these prisoners sharing accommodation.

All prisoners sharing cells are carefully screened and many have indicated that they prefer company in their cells.

3. Mobilong Prison will receive an immediate increase of 40 prisoners through conversion of 40 cells to twin share, with a further 40 in March 1997.

A further 20 cells will be converted at the Adelaide Remand Centre.

Additional health, employment and education programs will be delivered from within existing resources. The Department is constantly exploring new industry markets and options for employment expansion. Similarly, program activities have undergone a significant increase, particularly at the Adelaide Remand Centre, with improved utilisation of the area formerly occupied by a swimming pool.

YATES, Mr B.

41. **Mr ATKINSON:** In light of the Attorney-General's ministerial statement of 15 October on Mr Bruce Yates, did the then Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Family and Community Services, Ms Sue Vardon, mislead the Parliamentary Select Committee on Child Protection Policies, Practices and Procedures when she told the Committee, about the Yates case, 'The mistake we made with the case is that we did not pursue the matter we had. The matter we had was emotional abuse, and the sexual abuse thing became a red herring to the extent that it became cause celebre. It was never an actual issue for the Department'?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No.

PORT ROAD

49. **Mr ATKINSON:** What is the Department of Transport's assessment of the current condition of the surface of Port Road and is it due for upgrading?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Department of Transport last undertook roughness measurements on Port Road in January 1996. The results revealed the road surface to be in a satisfactory condition.

Nevertheless, subject to confirmation of future budgets, future resurfacing works will be programmed for the following sections of Port Road—

- 1997-98—Grand Junction Road to Cheltenham Parade.
- 1998-99—Cheltenham Parade to Park Terrace.

SHACKS

50. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. What progress has been made with the freeholding of shacks?
2. Why must shack owners at Point Turton improve their effluent disposal systems before being able to purchase the freehold whereas other dwellings in Point Turton need not improve their effluent system to the same standard?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1. About 50 shack areas, representing some 800 shack sites, are currently working on land division concept plans for planning approval purposes. Each shackowner group is working at its own pace towards freehold and it is expected this process will continue.

2. Shackowners at Point Turton wishing to freehold are required to upgrade or install waste disposal systems which meet current Health Commission standards for coastal locations.

Other dwellings at Point Turton are either located further back from the waterfront where the requirements are different, or have a waste disposal system considered adequate at the time of installation.

GAMBLERS REHABILITATION FUND

52. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. What are the details of individual grants from the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund amounting to \$378 750 in 1994-95 and \$628.125 in 1995-96 including the names of recipient organisations and amounts?

2. What are the details of expenditure in 1995-96 of \$5 531.03 on airfares, including details of the origin and destination of all flights undertaken and the date and cost of each flight?

3. What are the details of expenditure in 1995-96 of \$1 750.01 on travel expenses for staff, including the nature of those expenses and details of the travel including the date and cost of each trip?

4. What are the details of the expenditure of \$48,812.64 on salaries and wages in 1995-96, including the names of the positions and the amounts absorbed by these charges?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:

1 Grants from the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund were made to a total of ten non-government organisations for provision of a range of services to assist gamblers and their families. Grants were also made to three other organisations for special initiatives/projects during the funding period.

Details of individual grants to organisations for the years 1994-95 and 1995-96 from the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund are provided in attachment 1.

2 From 20 September 1995 until 29 May 1996, \$5 531.03 was expended on airfares for country based Breakeven GRF organisation's staff to attend workshops, training sessions and Breakeven network meetings, and for the GRF Co-ordinator, employed through the Field Services Division of FACS, to visit GRF Breakeven Services in rural areas and one conference interstate. A detailed summary of these airfares is provided in attachment 2.

3 Details of expenditure for staff travel relate to the GRF Co-ordinator's attendance at a conference in Brisbane and rural based Breakeven Service staff's attendance at Breakeven network meetings. Total expenses were \$1751.01 for the financial year ending 30 June 1996. Details of expenditure are provided in attachment 3.

4. Salaries and wages for 1995-96 were allocated to two positions.

The first of these was the GRF Co-ordinator, employed through the Field Services Division of FACS, \$31 550.

The second position was Policy Officer, employed through the Policy and Development Division of FACS, \$13 100.

Salary on-costs made up the difference.

Attachment 1
Family and Community Services Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund
Schedule of Payments for the period ending 30 June 1996

Organisation	1994-95	1995-96
Adelaide Central Mission	75 000	150 000
Anglican Community Services	60 000	60 000
Centacare Whyalla	31 250	88 750
Flinders Medical Centre	30 000	30 000
Lifeline Mount Gambier	31 250	31 250
Port Pirie Central Mission	31 250	31 250
Relationships Australia	60 000	125 000
Salvation Army	30 000	30 000
Wesley Uniting Mission	30 000	30 000
Other Organisations		
Australian Hotels Association		20 000
University of Adelaide		30 000
Caroline Rowe Marketing		1 875
	378 750	628 125

2.

Attachment 2

Airfares			
Date	Organisation	Destination	Cost
20.9.95	Lifeline Mount Gambier	Mount Gambier/Adelaide return	500.00
20.9.95	Centacare Whyalla	Whyalla/Adelaide return	175.80
25.9.95	Lifeline Mount Gambier	Mount Gambier/Adelaide return	254.20
25.9.95	Port Pirie Central Mission	Port Pirie/Adelaide	146.30
25.9.95	Lifeline Mount Gambier	Mount Gambier/Adelaide return	255.00
4.12.95	Lifeline Mount Gambier	Mount Gambier/Adelaide return	483.80
4.12.95	Centacare Whyalla	Whyalla/Adelaide return	686.00
5.1.96	DFACS	Adelaide/Mount Gambier return	246.05
5.2.96	Lifeline Mount Gambier	Mount Gambier/Adelaide return	304.00
26.2.96	DFACS	Adelaide/Mount Gambier return	294.00
4.3.96	Lifeline Mount Gambier	Mount Gambier/Adelaide return	518.00
1.4.96	Lifeline Mount Gambier	Mount Gambier/Adelaide return	224.00
1.4.96	Centacare Whyalla	Whyalla/Adelaide return	320.00
25.4.96	DFACS	Adelaide/Brisbane return	544.88
6.5.96	Centacare Whyalla	Whyalla/Adelaide return	160.00
6.5.96	Lifeline Mount Gambier	Mount Gambier/Adelaide return	259.00
29.5.96	Centacare Whyalla	Whyalla/Adelaide return	160.00
			5 531.03

3.

Attachment 3

Staff Travel Expenses

Date	Organisation	Destination	Cost
25.4.96	DFACS	Brisbane conference	167.40
30.4.96	Lifeline Mount Gambier	Staff member to attend Breakeven meetings	83.00
3.5.96	Port Pirie Central Mission	Adelaide—Breakeven meetings	1 052.61
29.5.96	Centacare Whyalla	Adelaide—Breakeven meetings	448.00
TOTAL			1 751.01