

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 May 2000

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following bills:

Health Professionals (Special Events Exemption),  
Mining (Royalty) Amendment,  
Offshore Minerals

South Australian Health Commission (Direction of Hospitals and Health Centres) Amendment,  
Statutes Amendment (BHP Indentures).

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PORTS (DISPOSAL OF MARITIME ASSETS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. Dean Brown)—

Enfield General Cemetery Trust—Report, 1998-99  
Passenger Transport Board—Service Contracts Report, April 2000

Regulations under the following Acts—  
Chiropodists—Fees Variation  
Development—Significant Trees  
Local Government—Procedures and Meetings  
Occupational Therapists—Fees Variation  
Psychological Practices—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Government Enterprises (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation—  
Regulations—  
Remission of Levy  
Variation of Schedule 3

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

Teachers Registration Board—Report, 1999

By the Minister for Environment and Heritage (Hon. I.F. Evans)—

Regulations under the following Acts—  
Associations Incorporation—Corporation Law  
Modification  
Bail—Regulations 2000  
Liquor Licensing—Dry Areas—Hallett Cove  
Trade Standards—Commonwealth

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. D.C. Kotz)—

Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1998-99

By the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. D.C. Kotz)—  
Aboriginal Lands Trust—Report, 1998-99.

### BROOKMAN, Hon. D.N., DEATH

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier)**: I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. David Norman Brookman, a former member of the House and minister of the crown, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service; and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

It is with a great sense of sadness that I rise in the chamber today to move a condolence motion for David Brookman, who passed away yesterday at the age of 82. I am sure that many government and opposition members alike will rise to take the opportunity to pay tribute to and to formally place on record their appreciation of the life and achievements of David Brookman. Born in Melbourne in 1917, David was educated at St Peter's College and Roseworthy Agricultural College.

After completing his education, David worked on the family property at Meadows, and during World War II served with the AIF in the Middle East and Borneo with the 2nd/7th Field Regiment. Elected to this House in 1948, David was widely regarded for his commitment to serving his local community and his personal interest in the problems faced by his constituents. In 1958 he became a minister of the Crown under the Playford administration. During his 24 years as a member of the House of Assembly, David held a number of ministerial appointments including agriculture, forests, lands, repatriation, irrigation, and immigration and tourism.

On behalf of the government, I formally place on the record our appreciation for David's contribution to his local community, the South Australian parliament and the South Australian community in general, and his support for the Liberal Party throughout his parliamentary career. Also on behalf of the government, I express my sincere condolences to David's wife Alison and his children Henry and Katherine.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition)**: On behalf of the opposition, I second the Premier's condolence motion for David Brookman. I did not know David Brookman personally, but obviously, having worked for politicians and governments here in South Australia in the late 1970s, I heard a great deal about him. I heard not only that he was widely regarded on both sides of the House as being an excellent minister for agriculture during the several terms in which he held that portfolio but also that he had been a pioneer in the area of tourism. He took his portfolio responsibilities very seriously both in tourism and also in the area of immigration at a time when state governments had some responsibilities for repatriation and immigration. In fact, he went to Britain to look at how Australia's immigration policy compared with that of other nations and made the point that he felt the post war migration had greatly benefited both our own state and Australia.

As the Premier mentioned, David distinguished himself serving for five years with the Australian Field Regiment of the AIF in World War II, seeing active service in the Middle East theatre and Borneo.

One other fact that has been put to me is that David Brookman, who was known on both sides of the House as 'Brooky', was a keen environmentalist. I understand that this probably came from his experience as a farmer landholder in the Narrung/Coorong area. He held a great belief that the Coorong should be preserved at all costs, given its unique status.

On behalf of the Opposition, I pay tribute to a very distinguished member of parliament who played a pivotal role

in the various stages of the development of this parliament and also express our sincere condolences to his family.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** I, too, support the motion of condolence on the loss of David Brookman. David Brookman was the member for the seat of Alexandra which is now called the electorate of Finnis and which covers the Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island. I knew David as a young South Australian—although not very well, but I met him on one or two occasions. He devoted a great deal of attention to his own electorate. In fact, he had a saying that I would like to quote today, because I know David wanted to be remembered by his saying, 'I did what I said I would do.' In other words, if he was asked to do something and he promised to do it, he went out and did it; he was a man of his word. That epitomises David in many ways: if he committed himself to doing something, he worked very hard to achieve it.

The people of Kangaroo Island remember David for a number of reasons. The first is that he went into cabinet as a minister and argued the case that the *m.v. Troubridge*, which was the vessel travelling to Kangaroo Island, should have the same space rate subsidy as on the railway system of South Australia, and he achieved that. That lasted for a number of years until the late 1970s or mid 1980s. It was a very effective way of making sure that Kangaroo Island became part of South Australia and was connected effectively to the mainland; in fact, that was one of the things he argued very strongly for: that Kangaroo Island should be seen in exactly the same way as the rest of the state. Also on Kangaroo Island he was very much a part of the war service land settlement scheme at Parndana. That was the biggest land settlement scheme in Australia for returned veterans. As minister for agriculture, David Brookman played a significant part in the development of that land settlement scheme and was a very strong supporter of it.

David was also one of the first members of the flora and fauna board of Flinders Chase which was then set up as a conservation park. Again, the point that the Leader of the Opposition made came through strongly indeed—he was a very strong environmentalist and made a major commitment to preserving the environment. Of course, as minister of agriculture in the Playford government, David was also heavily committed to the development of agriculture in South Australia. He had gone to Roseworthy college and was educated in the whole field of agriculture. Therefore, he was a very natural minister of agriculture from 1958 to 1965.

During that period, he worked very hard in three key areas. The first was to increase the amount of research within the Department of Agriculture; the second was to increase the extension services—in other words, information—out to the farmers and the community; and the third was to increase bushfire control research and activity within the Department of Agriculture, which was in those days the department responsible for bushfire control.

Incidentally, David Brookman came into the parliament as a very young parliamentarian at the age of about 31 years. He came in under somewhat tragic circumstances. His father, who also a member of parliament, had been killed in a road accident just outside McLaren Vale, and David came in very shortly after that. His father was a member of the Legislative Council. As I said, David stood for parliament just a few months after the death of his father. He had a 24½ year period in the parliament.

With regard to what he strove to achieve within his electorate, David was oriented towards improving water supply. In fact, he pushed very strongly for the Middle River reservoir on Kangaroo Island. He was heavily involved in the development of the Myponga reservoir and proudly boasted the fact that he was able to provide water to his electorate out of the Myponga reservoir. He was also very heavily committed to extending the electricity supply, first, to the Fleurieu Peninsula and then to Kangaroo Island. The third area was the improvement of the roads. Just prior to the 1965 state election, he boasted that his electorate of Alexandra had 220 miles of sealed road—I might add that it has come a long way since then.

This is probably a fitting occasion to remind the House that only last week we completed the sealing and opening of the South Coast Road on Kangaroo Island which now provides a road from Kingscote through to Cape du Couedic. If David were able to look back on that accomplishment, he would see that that road alone would increase the sealed road within his electorate by almost 50 per cent, and he would have been very proud of the occasion. The member who succeeded him in this parliament for the seat of Alexandra (Ted Chapman) has telephoned me and asked that I also pass on his condolences and memories of David Brookman and the role he played, particularly on Kangaroo Island, in the development of Kangaroo Island at the very early stages of the development of agriculture there.

I also have the chance to be close to the family because his daughter Kate was my electorate assistant for several years. She was a very committed person who understood the issues of an electorate very well indeed. To his wife, Dr Brookman, and to Henry and Kate, I pass on my condolences and those of Rosslyn and the rest of my family.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I support the motion. I think I am the only member present who served in the chamber with the late David Brookman. We both came into the parliament as very young people and, as a representative of the rural area, he gave me a great deal of advice and assistance. He is a person whose judgment I appreciated, and I believe that he made a great contribution to rural South Australia. David Brookman was a staunch supporter of the principles of the Liberal Party.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I certainly am. In my experience, David Brookman never once wavered from his commitment to the conservative side of politics. I well recall many occasions when I visited his home in Dutton Terrace, Medindie; he was indeed a wonderful host. I wish to place on the record my appreciation of his service to the state and the guidance he gave me. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the Premier.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** It is with sadness that I also support the motion. David Brookman's education, his war record and his parliamentary service have been well documented today. I rise to mark the passing of a great gentleman of absolute integrity. I was lucky to go camping on one occasion with David Brookman and his family in country near Birdsville on a property which he owned and loved and which was part of the channel country. He made regular trips with many of his friends to this area. I found it most interesting to observe the clear leadership role that he assumed in this group of people in the back blocks of this gorgeous part of Australia. He

assumed that leadership role because clearly he knew much about the country and obviously loved it.

As a young member of parliament, I received from David Brookman a great deal of advice and he was very free in offering suggestions. He did this in the most kindly way and was not particularly fazed if the advice was not taken. I remember the first thing he told me, which was that Sir Thomas Playford, when Premier, had advised him that the most important thing he could do as a young member of parliament was to read the Auditor-General's Report and to know it backwards. I jested with him on several occasions because that was in the days when the Auditor-General's Report was only 1½ inches or so thick.

Latterly, David Brookman was not well, but in no way did he allow that to get in his way. He spent a lot of time—I think he would acknowledge somewhat unsuccessfully—trying to maximise the length of his drive on his beloved golf course. He was frequently seen with his family and grandchildren enjoying quiet afternoons and pleasant times. He was a delightfully friendly gentleman who freely gave advice, and he will be sorely missed. I offer my formal condolences to his wife, Alison, his children, Henry and Kate, and his grandchildren, who will sorely miss him.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I support this condolence motion concerning a man who was a friend to many South Australians, particularly country South Australians, especially in his ministries of agriculture, forests, lands and others. I speak to this motion on behalf of not only myself (a country person) and my family but of all country people. In this place, David was a friend of my father, Howard, and, as the member for Stuart just said, he and David were friends and colleagues. He was well respected by my father, who entered parliament when David was a senior member of this place.

In those times, he was particularly appreciated for his efforts in setting up the bulk handling of grain act, which was difficult legislation which gave the country privileges that it would not receive today. Many people said that it was a political coup of the time. That legislation has stood the test of time, and we as farmers across the state appreciate David Brookman's efforts in this regard. It is only now that this act is being substantially changed.

Brooky was also a tireless supporter of young people in our state, particularly young country people. It was he who saw the successful introduction and the fostering of the South Australian rural youth movement. He was a tough supporter of issues affecting country people, particularly battling the federals with the superphosphate bounty—and many of us will recall those days. They are things of the past now, but they were very important then because we were trying to encourage farmers to put superphosphate on their land to lift its fertility.

Of course, Brooky was unique in that he was a country greenie. In those days it was very difficult to be a country greenie. Today we are all much greener than we were then, but, in those days, he certainly led the way. I was a young Liberal when I met David and I was inspired by the man because he was so quiet, yet so forceful, in what he wanted and what he achieved.

In those days, most farmers were not involved in agricultural research, but David was a modern thinker, and certainly the department thrived under his stewardship. As I said, he was a good bloke and he did make a big difference by being a member of this parliament. Certainly, he was a man of his time.

Again, on behalf of country people and all South Australians, I express our condolences to Mrs Brookman, Henry and Kate. We certainly were very saddened to hear of his passing, and I certainly support this condolence motion.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I wish to speak briefly on this condolence motion in support of David Brookman. I knew David quite well, but I wish to speak particularly in regard to the contribution that David made to conservation issues in South Australia. In fact, I think David Brookman could be recognised as the first conservation minister we had in South Australia, particularly in regard to his work in the agricultural and forests portfolios.

David was a very practical conservationist on his property, as is his brother, Anthony, at Meadows. He was able to assist me considerably when I became Minister for the Environment in 1979. He was always available. He was very helpful. He had very practical solutions to many of the issues that we then faced and came forward with a great deal of assistance in the preparation of policies, which, I am pleased to say, this party continues to stand by.

In particular, David contributed significantly to the national park system in this state. He recommended a number of areas of the state that should be set aside for national parks and conservation parks, and for that he will always be remembered. He was a great South Australian, a great politician, and someone who helped conservation and the environment in this electorate considerably. I, too, wish that my condolences be passed on to the members of his family.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services):** I will also be brief, but I would like to support this condolence motion. A number of people around home, and indeed in parts of my electorate, have often talked to me about David Brookman being one of the members who served so well around the Fleurieu Peninsula and about the great work that he did during his time as both the local member and as a minister. It is interesting that today his brother, Anthony Brookman, is still a very active member of one of my branches. Every time I go to a branch meeting Anthony is always there and we often have a chat not only about David and his contributions but also about the whole Brookman family's contributions to this state.

When I wake up in the morning, as indeed would be the same case with many people around home and throughout my electorate, and see the majestic panorama of the Fleurieu Peninsula, I am reminded that the Brookman family, and particularly David with his vision, played an integral part in that.

As Minister for Emergency Services, I am fully aware of the issues of which he was aware long before most people, for example, his looking at prevention and education when it came to fire prevention. Over on the Kuitpo Road at Hope Forest, when you pass the Brookman farm, you will see all sorts of agriforestry projects. Many of us who were green, not from a conservation point of view but from not understanding the ecology and biodiversity as farmers to the extent David Brookman did, would look and think, 'What are they doing over on that farm? Why are they not just running as many cows as they could per acre and going from there?' But as history has now proved, he was decades ahead of the rest of us, and we are all now looking at tree planting, landcare, fire prevention and certainly protecting that natural resource. The

family was also very committed to its animals and very good when it came to animal husbandry.

Although this former member of parliament to whom this condolence motion is directed has been out of the parliament for a long period of time, almost without exception, month by month when I go about my electorate, someone raises the name of David Brookman and the good work that he has done. That is a challenge for the rest of us in the parliament today: to leave a mark on this parliament and this state as superb as that of David Brookman. To the whole of the family, including Anthony, I pass on my most sincere sympathies.

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** I rise to associate myself with the condolences expressed by other members. Without repeating anything they have said, but endorsing much of what at least in the public sense I had some first-hand knowledge, I want to make it plain that without doubt, had it not been for David Brookman, I would not be here today. That arises in the context of two events—and there are those I am sure who would have thought that aspect of his judgment where otherwise impeccable might have been reconsidered! I am not one of those.

After successfully completing my matriculation at Urrbrae, I managed to become enrolled at Roseworthy with the help of a number of scholarships. In those days, though unlawful, initiation was still practised. During the time I was there, prior to the commencement of the academic year, because it had been considered I might do well to enter at second year, I was compelled, among other things, to eat a large kitbag full of green grapes which I had to go and pick in the pitch black dead of night late in January. The unfortunate consequence for me was that, without knowing it, I developed peritonitis, leaving me extremely ill and weakened for six or seven weeks. The academic results I achieved at the end of that time were not adequate to enable me to proceed as I had originally enrolled.

Because of the way the college was directly established by law and the fact that the principal answered to the minister, I had to approach the minister, who was David Brookman, unknown to me up to that time. I did so without anybody else's assistance and put my case to him without reflecting upon the incident that caused the illness and the failure on my part. He was compassionate enough to allow me to continue, and that enabled me to finish my diploma and later make his better acquaintance when, as a friend of Ross Story and the late Allan and Bonnie West, who were my in-laws, I met him socially and came to experience the graciousness of his conduct and the usefulness of his counsel. It was in that second context that he encouraged me to get involved in politics.

Of course, the honourable member for Schubert has drawn attention to the fact that it was David Brookman's vision which established Rural Youth and through that provided opportunities for the development of leadership skills for young people throughout rural Australia; otherwise, this state would have been left without the kind of leadership in rural communities that it has enjoyed since. I know that other members here have enjoyed that benefit, none the least being the Premier. David Brookman on a couple of occasions encouraged me to think of being involved in politics, not only as a member of the Liberal Party but also to contemplate that I might be able to one day seek election to the parliament. In consequence, that happened, and he indeed gave me encouragement at the time, both when I nominated for Coles and

again when I was contemplating nominating for preselection for the seat of Mallee in 1978. Dr Alison Brookman, and David's son Henry and daughter Kate I know will miss him. I offer them my condolences and want them to know that in my life he will be missed.

**The SPEAKER:** I thank honourable members for their contribution, and I will ensure that a copy of the *Hansard* record is conveyed to the family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.30 to 2.40 p.m.]

### BEACHPORT BOAT RAMP

A petition signed by 643 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Development Assessment Commission to conduct an independent environmental impact study of all sites, and consider the impact of the closure of the swimming beach and upon local resident amenity before determining the location of the proposed boat ramp at Beachport, was presented by Mr Williams.

Petition received.

### EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

A petition signed by 37 032 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the government to reduce the emergency services levy applied to mobile property from \$32 to \$20 per vehicle, was presented by Mr Condous.

Petition received.

### PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 105 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House strengthen the law in relation to prostitution and ban prostitution related advertising, were presented by Messrs Condous and De Laine and the Hon. J.W. Olsen.

Petitions received.

### LIBRARY FUNDING

Petitions signed by 3 165 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ensure government funding of public libraries is maintained, were presented by Ms Ciccarello, Mr Condous, the Hon. G.A. Ingerson, Mr Meier and the Hon. J.W. Olsen.

Petitions received.

### QUESTIONS

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and prohibited in *Hansard*: Nos 21, 45, 83-92, 93, 104 and 107; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

### PUBLIC HOSPITAL BEDS

In reply to **Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay).**

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Available bed numbers, total admissions and same day admissions by year for public acute hospitals are contained in the table below.

Year	Available Beds	Total Admissions	Same Day Admissions	Day Admissions as a percentage of Total
1994-95	4 946	294 298	103 861	35.3
1995-96	4 874	303 070	112 932	37.3
1996-97	4 726	308 131	122 016	39.6
1997-98	4 673	326 536	137 424	42.1
1998-99	4 605	331 427	146 028	44.1

There has been a reduction in available beds, over the period 1994-95 to 1998-99 of 341 beds.

However, this considered in the context that over the same period:

- the number of admissions in total has increased by 37 129 or 12.6 per cent
- the number of overnight admissions has decreased by 5 038 or 2.6 per cent.
- the number of same day admissions has increased by 42 167 or 40.6 per cent.
- as a percentage of total admissions, the same day admissions have increased from 35.3 per cent in 1994-95 to 44.1 per cent in 1998-99.

The increase in same day admissions is due to improved clinical practice and advances in technology.

**RACING INDUSTRY**

In reply to **Mr WRIGHT (Lee)** 13 April.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** On 13 April 2000, the member for Lee asked the following question:

Why did the Minister tell the House last week that all the state's racing clubs have agreed to rules about the government's proposed corporatisation of the racing industry, when this is not the case?

On 29 July 1999 I received a letter from the general manger of the Gawler and Barossa Jockey Club advising that his club did not support the South Australian Racing Club's Council (SARCC) in its agreement with the South Australian Jockey Club (SAJC) over the future structure of the thoroughbred industry in this State.

Subsequently on 20 August 1999 I received a letter signed jointly by the chairman of both the SAJC and SARCC that the committees of the two bodies had unanimously reached agreement on the structure of a new thoroughbred racing authority in South Australia. Following this agreement the draft constitution was provided, by SARCC, to all thoroughbred racing clubs in South Australia.

As the delegate representing the Gawler and Barossa Jockey Club on the SARCC committee had voted for the proposal I took that to mean the Gawler and Barossa Jockey Club had supported the proposal.

**DAIS PREQUALIFICATION SYSTEM**

In reply to **Ms HURLEY (Napier)** 21 October 1999.

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** The DAIS Prequalification System for building and construction contractors has been in operation for about two years and incorporates a re-registration process to ensure contractor capability information is kept up to date. This process is ongoing with contractors seeking re-registration as they reach the end of their initial 12 month period of registration. From its initial implementation the system has included the facility to effect continuous improvement, through review and amendment of the criteria and benchmarks over time. The original and proposed year two and year three benchmarks were established in conjunction with the industry.

The first process for re-registration commenced in early 1999. Contractors were notified and asked to re-register with follow up action undertaken for those slow to respond. As expected, and consistent with the initial registration process, the urgency with which contractors responded varied. A small number of contractors applied for registration in a timely manner, however, the majority were slow to respond.

To ensure adequate tender fields are maintained DAIS notified contractors that the obligation to re-register would be extended until a review of the reasons behind the slow participation by industry in the re-registration process could be addressed. Original registrations carried over and new registrants are being assessed consistent with the benchmarks which applied with the original prequalification

criteria until further notice. Contractors were individually notified in August 1999 of the revised administrative arrangements to apply in the interim while re-registration issues were resolved.

DAIS is currently working with the Construction Industry Forum, the industry representative associations, and key industry participants to improve there-registration practicalities.

In this process a range of issues including those raised by contractors will be considered to assess their relevance to prequalification re-registration. This includes both the prequalification application and assessment process and the year two benchmarks. It is anticipated that any required changes to the prequalification system will be developed in conjunction with the industry in early 2000 with implementation commencing in May 2000.

This will ensure that DAIS prequalification continues to meet Government's and industry's needs and assists in maintaining the national competitiveness of the South Australian Construction Industry.

**MANUFACTURING SECTOR**

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Earlier today we saw workers from various sections of the state's manufacturing sector attend a rally here at Parliament House. We saw employees attend from a range of companies—Mitsubishi, Perry Engineering, the Submarine Corporation and the Port Stanvac Oil Refinery. The government acknowledges that there is major change going on nationally and internationally in some of our very important industry sectors, and we acknowledge that South Australia stands to be hit harder than some other states because of our reliance on the manufacturing sector. However, we are doing more than simply acknowledging it as an issue. The government is looking to the future to ensure that we have a plan for these workers, so that they can feel confident that, in five and 10 years' time, they will have a job in a growing, albeit changed, sector of our community, and they will have the capacity to look after their family and their children.

I acknowledge that the changes taking place globally mean that in five years' time the industry sectors I have talked about will look different from the way they are today. We have no choice but to move ahead and deal with those changes—not sit back and let it happen and then turn our minds to a plan. Those workers who came here today want to be able to feel confident that they will have a future.

This government is committed to pursuing initiatives to help achieve that job security. I would today like to outline some of those initiatives. The government is funding, as previously announced, on a dollar-for-dollar basis with Mitsubishi, assistance and career counselling for workers displaced as a result of the rationalisation required for Mitsubishi to continue local vehicle production.

We are looking to attract automotive component supply firms to this state through the automotive task force. As I previously indicated, we are also establishing Supplier Park to underpin the automotive manufacturing at General Motors. I have lobbied the federal government strongly and on many occasions on behalf of the Australian Submarine Corporation to ensure that the ASC has longevity; that our specialised skill base is not lost to the state; and that the commonwealth exercised its pre-emptive rights in respect of the 49 per cent shareholding of the ASC. We are also working with Mobil to help improve the competitiveness of the Port Stanvac refinery by removing charges on Mobil's crude exports and reducing council rates paid by Mobil.

And we will be announcing a further new funding initiative in Thursday's budget to assist industry to adapt to the global changes I have talked about. These initiatives are a start. The key is for government and industry to work together so that our economy is structured properly to see us through this period of change. We should embrace that change together and make it work to our advantage—not against us.

The priority is ensuring jobs and job security for the many thousands of workers who hold up our manufacturing sector. I believe that the initiatives I have outlined today go towards that goal, as will the budget initiatives.

### PERFORMING ARTS

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** I lay on the table a ministerial statement relating to a major performing arts inquiry made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning.

### DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

**The SPEAKER:** Order! My attention has been called to the presence of a distinguished visitor in the gallery this afternoon, His Excellency Sim Dae-Pyung, Governor of ChungChongNam-Do Province in the Republic of Korea. For the information of members, in the Korean jurisdiction His Excellency holds the equivalent position to that of a state Premier in Australia. On behalf of the House, Sir, I bid you a warm welcome and invite you to take a seat on the floor of the house. I ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition if they would be good enough to conduct His Excellency to the Chair and accommodate him with a seat on my right.

His Excellency Sim Dae-Pyung was escorted by the Hon. J.W. Olsen and the Hon. M.D. Rann to a seat on the floor of the house.

### QUESTION TIME

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** I direct my question to the Premier. With the government's announcement today of the emergency services tax mark 3, has the Premier now satisfied members of his caucus such as the members for Colton, Fisher and Hammond and the Hon. Julian Stefani, who have been publicly reported as stating that they would accept nothing short of the total abolition of the tax; and does the Premier guarantee that the rebate paid for from general revenue will not be removed or reduced in the future?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** Well this is a member—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Here is the member for Elder leading with his chin in the first question of Question Time today. It was interesting to note the member for Elder saying on Ashley Walsh last week that the revenue ought to be between \$60 million and \$80 million or thereabouts—he had it within broad parameters. The Democrats have said that it ought to be set at \$82. What have we delivered? We have delivered a cost across the board of \$76 million. This is an opposition that has no ideas and no policy and is retreating. The other day on Ashley Walsh's program, when the member

for Elder was asked, 'What is your position?' he ducked and weaved and did not want to answer the question. Why did the member for Elder not want to answer the question? Because members opposite have a policy direction that simply ups the ante all the time. Their track record in government clearly demonstrates that. Let me just trace a little bit of history—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bragg will come to order.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** It was the Labor Party that ignored the 1983 Coroner's Ash Wednesday report. The Labor Party was not prepared to take the initiative to appropriately fund our emergency services. It was the Labor Party that was prepared for our volunteers to go out and use equipment that was not safe. It was the Labor party that ignored the call from our volunteers to put in place appropriate equipment so that they could do the job that we want them to do in the community.

**An honourable member:** They walked away from it.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** They walked away from it. We lost 28 lives in the Ash Wednesday bushfires, and since then in Victoria, without an appropriate communication system, we have seen lives lost. After all this time and five reports urging government to do something about it, we have done something about it. The 30 per cent of South Australians who did not pay in the past are making some contribution.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The leader will remain silent.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** As to the Leader of the Opposition's interjection, I refer him to the Deloittes report this week. The Deloittes report has said that, in looking at insurance levies around the world, in other states and South Australia, it demonstrates that South Australian consumers are now better off as a result of the combination of their levy and the fire insurance premium, and the extra benefit for South Australians is that this levy does not involve GST. Every consumer in other states—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I know you don't want to hear this. Consumers in other states are paying for their emergency services through a fire levy on their insurance bill, and from 1 July they will pay an additional 10 per cent. That will not apply to any South Australian consumer. We have given a commitment to funding \$141.5 million worth of expenditure. The second reduction in revenues will not affect the outlays, that is, the emergency services will continue to have \$141.5 million expended on them. I point out that this is a dedicated fund: not one cent of the emergency services collection will go towards the hip pocket of the government. Every cent will provide emergency services to South Australia.

I hasten to add that, despite the best efforts of members of the Labor Party to block our sales and lease program to retire debt—despite their 500 days of opposition, their carping, opposing and whingeing, which they do all the time—we are able to succeed when two of their colleagues decided to back us for South Australia's sake. That has meant that we have retired half our debt. Retiring half that debt has freed up some of the interest, and that means that some dividends are now going back to South Australians. Last November, when we had the first indicative results from the bidding process, we immediately took off \$20.5 million. What we have done on this occasion—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The leader will remain silent.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** —will require another \$24 million reduction. In effect, in real terms that is less than what would have been collected under the old fire insurance levy. What have we put in place? In relation to mobile property, we have reduced—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the member for Hart to order.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** We have reduced the levy on mobile property from \$32 to \$24. We have abolished the levy on passive vehicles, that is, trailers, boats and caravans. We have reduced the levy on commercial properties by 20 per cent (on average); on residential properties by 30 per cent (on average); and on primary producing properties by 30 per cent (on average); and we have created a special category for charities and like organisations in order to look after their needs. We now have a fairer and more equitable way of funding our emergency services, and we are committed to maintaining an appropriate level of funding.

Last August, before any bills were sent out, I indicated that with any new system there would be unintended consequences and—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the Leader to order.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Hart.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I indicated at that time that we would undertake a review of the process and deliver. In accordance with that commitment, we have today delivered. This is the second return to South Australian consumers as a result of our leasing and retirement of debt. Instead of the money going to foreign institutions in interest bills, it is now going back to and being retained by South Australians.

In addition, on 1 July this year we will see a \$25 million reduction in WorkCover premiums for small and medium businesses: that is, a 7.5 per cent reduction in the cost of operating businesses in South Australia. Compared with New South Wales, Victoria and the other states of Australia, we are creating a competitive advantage. What we are about is making the right principal decision for South Australia.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The member for Hart can laugh all he likes. He is an avid reader of the *Financial Review*. I wonder whether he read last week's *Financial Review* which contained a glowing report about the economy of South Australia.

**Mr Foley:** Written by your office!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Did you read that? That is one *Financial Review* that the honourable member did not want to read because it told the accurate story about the economy of South Australia, its strength and its direction. As promised, we have delivered.

## BUSINESS COMMUNITY

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** Will the Premier share with the House the response he has had from high profile business leaders to the Leader of the Opposition's recent letter to them in which he begs for forgiveness and asks for their trust?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** You know when you are in trouble: you write a letter to the business community saying, 'I am a bipartisan Leader of the Opposition and I have supported 98 per cent of the government's legislation. We have learnt from the past, and we can manage the state's finances in the future, and I am here to help you.' I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that the business community is having a very good laugh at the moment because it knows that, when the Leader of the Opposition was a minister in the Bannon and Arnold governments, he took this state to bankruptcy. That is what he did. And, Mr Speaker—

**The Hon. M.D. Rann:** You ought to hear what they say about you.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I am sorry to interrupt the Premier, but there are far too many orchestrated and disorderly interjections from my left. I ask for them to cease or the chair will do something about it.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** This policy vacuum that we have on the other side keeps going on and on. I will take a snapshot of the past 10 days. What have we heard from key spokespersons on the other side? On Sunday, the Leader of the Opposition said that we should spend more money on health, but the member for Hart is saying that this government spends too much money. The two of you ought to work out what your story is. Then we had the member for Elder—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The chair will not be totally ignored. I warn the leader and the member for Hart.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** And the member for Elder goes one further: not being content with either spending more or constraining expenditure, he wants us to spend more and take it in the other direction—he wants to have it both ways. So that, between the three of them, they have not sorted out what policy direction they take.

**Mr Foley:** Very confusing, John.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No, the member for Elder wants to spend more.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No, he has both of your stories. The member for Elder is trying to cover both of the lines. The leader wants to spend more; you want us to curtail the expenditure because you have been critical of the government spending too much. Yes, the member for Hart nods. He says that we are spending too much; the leader says we are not spending enough; and the member for Elder wants it both ways. If you are to have any credibility at all, you have to have some consistency in the line between you.

Recently, the Minister for Minerals and Energy drew the attention of the House to the Mobil Port Stanvac circumstance. Let me recount that to the House. A few weeks ago the leader was given a confidential briefing from Mobil management about industrial negotiations occurring at the plant. It was a confidential briefing to the leader. Mobil urged the leader not to talk to the media about it, asked for his concurrence not to talk to the media. He could not wait; we had the farce of backgrounding of journalists out of the leader's office regarding what that confidential briefing was. He had the gall to say to this House that he had only heard of the potential shutdown on that morning's media reports, though he knew and we knew that he had been confidentially briefed on the circumstances some time before.

Two weeks before he had had a confidential briefing, yet what he wanted to do was portray a different set of circumstances to the House. Thankfully, the situation at Port Stanvac

has resolved itself without any help from the Leader of the Opposition—quite the contrary. All he was on about was trying to make a political point. Given the fact that spokespersons from the Labor Party are all over the place and have a different view, is it any wonder the electorate is saying ‘No plans, no ideas, no strategy’—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes, they are—and that is why we have the carping, opposing and whingeing opposition. The only reason you go on radio and write letters saying, ‘I support the government 98 per cent of the time. John Olsen and I go around overseas working together as a team’ is that non-one believes you and you are wanting to create a different perception from the carping, opposing, whining, whingeing opposition with no ideas and no policies. Well, business will see through you: business understands your position and business understands what the bottom line is. This is the most buoyant economy that we have had in this state for a decade or more, and we have a more buoyant economy in this state than we have had at any time in recent history because of the policy settings that this government has worked hard to put in place. What we have done is lay a financial foundation on which this state can grow and expand in the future.

#### EDUCATION BUDGET

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children’s Services. Was the Director of Corporate Affairs in the minister for education’s department telling the truth under oath when he told the Industrial Relations Commission on 19 April this year that a document called ‘The Department of Education, Training and Employment budget strategy’, which details cuts to education spending of \$62.1 million next year, represented ‘the revised situation as most up-to-date as I could present it to the commission’.

On 19 April, the Director of Corporate Services in the education department was required by the Industrial Relations Commission to table an update of the government’s three year strategy to cut education spending. This new document sets out savings plans totalling \$62.1 million in 2000-2001, including \$3 million by cutting the school year; \$1 million by cutting adult re-entry education; \$1.5 million by closing schools; \$4.4 million by cutting 90 jobs; \$1.7 million by cutting school buses; \$19.5 million from absorbing inflation and continuing the freeze on school grants; and \$11.9 million from cutting operations, including TAFE. That is what he said under oath in the Industrial Relations Commission.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Was he telling the truth about your budget strategy?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is absolutely no need for a questioner to repeat the question at the end of the explanation.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children’s Services):** The true facts are that education spending by this government has increased over the past few years, and will increase again in this coming budget. We only have to look back to the time when the member was a minister of the former Labor government and see the amount of maintenance money that was spent in schools. When the Liberal government took over in 1993, I would have to say that our schools were in a deplorable state. My local school, Gawler High School did not receive a coat of paint for about

10 years because of the amount of money that was not spent by the Labor government in those days.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** It was not only that school in my electorate; schools in all other electorates suffered the same fate. The member comes in here and criticises the government for the amount of cuts that it has had to make to the budget because of the inept financial management of the previous government, landing this government in a \$300 million recurrent deficit. He has the hypocrisy to come in here and say that this government should not be undertaking a sound financial strategy. I will look at the comments made in the industrial commission and report back to the member.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** Will the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services please outline to the House the recent changes to the emergency services levy?

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services):** As members are well aware, when a new and significant opportunity is introduced certain accompanying issues need to be addressed. Over the last few months, it has been on the public record that we have been looking at some issues surrounding emergency services and seeing where there may be some beneficial changes. Importantly, whilst the government has been able to make these announcements today providing significant benefits for every family across the whole of South Australia, at the same time we have been able to ensure that the 30 000 volunteers will continue to receive the sort of funding that they received under us this year which they never received under Labor in 13 years. We have a quarantined dedicated fund, with the money going not into government revenue but into supporting all South Australians by virtue of equipping, training and looking after the risk management and all the other issues involved in providing essential emergency services.

Whilst there has been a benefit for all South Australians, the volunteers and paid emergency services workers are also benefiting, something they never experienced under the former Labor government; instead, they were left underfunded, under-trained, under-resourced and the CFS alone was left with a \$13 million debt. That is what the Labor Party did for the South Australian emergency services workers.

In this measure, there will be benefits for those people who have mobile property. There is a reduction from \$32 to \$24 on a car or truck. There has been a removal of the emergency services levy on all the other mobile property, such as the horse floats, etc. When one looks at the issues around charities, because we have been able to look at the unintended consequences, and because this government stands proud on a record of being able to manage—unlike Labor—we also have been able to start to get some of the dividends back to South Australians. As a result, the charities have seen significant reductions announced today—the churches, St Vincent de Paul, the Salvation Army and a range of other not for profit organisations, including the hospitals. In addition, issues around rural South Australia have been looked at, and there have been significant benefits there. These are benefits that are locked in by our government and not only will they be there next year but also they will be ongoing.



I hear the Leader of the Opposition speaking about the truth. Of course, we all hear the Leader of the Opposition saying, 'What about the truth? Tell the truth.' Well, we have come up and we have delivered. This government has delivered and delivered and delivered, and the proof of the pudding is right here today. But let us have some truth from the opposition, and especially let us have some truth from the Leader of the Opposition.

The other night I attended a surf life saving annual dinner. Surf Life Saving SA is talking to this government on a range of issues, because it needs more support. The rescues that it is carrying out and the protection of the community on the beaches are paramount. We are funding the association, and we are funding it properly. The Opposition did not do so when it was in office, and it has never done so. However, this government is doing so. What this particular person (and he happens to have very close contact with a senior Labor Party card carrier) told me—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** Well may members of the Opposition laugh—because there were quite a few photos in the paper recently with this senior card carrier talking about the fighting and talking about screwing people and pushing them out of the parliament. And there are two of them right there who are gone, because they did not get the support of any Opposition members. This person said to me that the only truthful thing that the Labor Party is disappointed about is that it was going to have one policy for the next election. But we gazumped them. That policy was to be that the Labor Party would introduce the levy that we now have in place. That is what was to happen. That is the truth, and members opposite can tell us if it is not, because we know that it is.

To touch on another matter with respect to the shadow spokesperson, it is about time that he did a little work if he honestly believes that he has any credibility in going up the ladder in the opposition. I know that the shadow spokesperson is pretty busy at the moment, because apparently from time to time in the Labor Party bed partners can hop—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** Well, Kevin, you do not do it very well at all, because the message coming across loud and clear is that you have hopped bed partners because you know that you will never be a chance as Leader of the Opposition, and you have been hopping out of bed with the member for Elder—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** —and jumping into bed with the member for Kaurua.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the minister to return to the question.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** That is what he has been doing. Therefore—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order. I ask the minister to return to his reply.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Bragg and the member for Schubert.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** As the Premier has already pointed out, the shadow spokesperson did not even know, even though it has been in the budget papers year in, year out, whether \$60 million or \$80 million was being spent on emergency services. He could not get closer than \$20 million. But we have come to expect that, because the

opposition has never been able to balance the books in the past; it cannot do it now; and it will never be able to balance them in the future.

We have delivered today for all South Australians, for the volunteers and for the emergency services. I have seen some absolute non-factual material bandied about in the electorate by the Labor Party, yet it supports every principle—

*Mr Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** Yes, the member for Elder agrees that what was put out in the electorates is untrue. I thank the honourable member for being truthful. The honourable member has agreed. The point is that the Labor Party agrees with the principles, and I therefore say that it is now time for the Leader of the Opposition and for the shadow spokesperson to announce what they would do if, heaven forbid, they had an opportunity in government. I say to them: put up now or shut up, and support this levy and support the South Australian volunteers.

## EDUCATION BUDGET

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** I am just so grateful that the visitors from Korea did not have to be amazed that this man is actually a minister.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** My question is again directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services, given the minister's sensitivity to my previous question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Although we saw the—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Was the Director of Corporate Services in the minister's department also telling the truth when he told the Industrial Relations Commission under oath that, in addition to the government's strategy of cutting \$62.1 million from education next year, there is a \$30 million black hole as a result of the costs of Partnerships 21, the new computer system—

*The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Premier interjects. This is evidence given on oath before a judge.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come back to order. I ask the Leader to put his question to the House and get on with it.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Perhaps the Speaker might advise the Premier not to interject. On 19 April—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —the Director of Corporate Services gave evidence to the Industrial Relations Commission that the education department had new costs to be funded by the budget over and above the budget strategy to cut \$62.1 million. These included \$20 million for grants to schools joining Partnerships 21, \$3.5 million to Partnerships 21's School Card holders, \$3.2 million for promotion and training for Partnerships 21 and \$4 million towards the new computer system. That is what the minister's director said under oath.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I withdraw leave. The Minister for Education and Children's Services.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** I will seek the information the honourable member is requesting.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Minister for—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for continuing to disrupt the House.

**Mrs PENFOLD:**—Recreation, Sport and Racing inform the House of changes to the emergency services levy as they affect recreational boat owners?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** As part of the \$24 million reduction in the emergency services levy announced today, I am pleased to be able to advise the House that, as part of that package, the government has removed the \$12 levy on recreational boats, which will benefit the 45 000 recreational boat owners in South Australia. The cost of the measure is approximately \$540 000. The removal of this part of the levy on recreational boats is in conjunction, of course, with the removal of the levy on trailers, caravans and the like, as well as the reduction of the levy on cars from \$32 to \$24.

The levy on boats was removed in recognition of the fact that, to some degree, boat owners already contribute through the value of the levy on their motor cars. The decision was taken to abolish the levy on recreational boats. As members would be aware, the government has always been a strong supporter of the recreational boat community. Through the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning in another place, we have the Recreational Boat Facilities Fund which, since its establishment, has contributed approximately \$1.6 million or \$1.7 million to improving recreational boating facilities throughout the state, many of which are located in the electorate of the member for Flinders as well as many other rural electorates. The announcement today made by the Premier and the Minister for Emergency Services is indeed good news for recreational boat owners.

#### TAFE BUDGET CUTS

**Ms WHITE (Taylor):** My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Given warnings from South Australian TAFE directors that institutes are under-funded and that TAFE is no longer at the leading edge for industry, will the government still be proceeding with budget cuts to TAFE set out in the documents tabled under oath in the Industrial Relations Commission by the Education Director of Corporate Services on 19 April 2000? The opposition has a copy of a minute written by TAFE directors to the Chief Executive of the minister's department which states that the South Australian government now contributes less to the costs of vocational education and training than any other state or territory in the whole of the nation and has the highest level of student fees in the whole of the nation, for example, over twice the level of New South Wales.

On 10 May 2000 the Director of the Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE told a Senate committee that TAFE was unable to maintain equipment, was not at the leading edge for industry and that the skills future of South Australia was at risk. The government's revised education budget strategy states that the operations group, including TAFE, will be cut by \$11.9 million in the year 2000-01.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** South Australia's TAFE institutes are performing extremely well in terms of their outcomes (and that is what we are talking about), with 87 per cent of TAFE students who complete their degree or diploma getting jobs, and, after all, that is one of the most important focuses of TAFE in South Australia. In case the facts washed over the head of the member for Taylor, two years ago the federal government introduced 'user choice' in the tertiary sector. TAFE did have the monopoly on tertiary education not only in South Australia but across Australia.

Students are now able to choose under which facility they will study from a number of private providers and TAFE. Prior to that, TAFE in South Australia was one of the highest cost deliverers per student hour of education in Australia. To TAFE's credit—

*Ms White interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Taylor will come to order.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**—the directors of TAFE have now reduced that cost to just above the national average. TAFE is producing quality courses; there is no doubt about that. TAFE is now going out and seeking what business wants—in other words, demand driven rather than supply driven. That is a very important factor because that is what efficiency is all about: responding to your market—not what you think you should deliver but what the market wants. We are performing in South Australia. In fact, I returned from Vietnam only this morning. For the first time representatives from the Douglas Mawson Institute of TAFE signed agreements with the Hanoi Industrial College, as well as Industrial College number 4, in Ho Chi Minh City for the delivery of a diploma in Information Technology and a degree in Information Technology. That is a first in Vietnam for any country in the world in terms of delivering those sorts of courses. It indicates excellence in respect of TAFE's performance—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Spence.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**—and demonstrates that its courses are of international standard and accepted in that area. TAFE has undertaken no greater proportion of cuts than any other area in the education budget. I know that TAFE will continue to provide very high standard and efficient courses.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** Will the Deputy Premier explain the benefits to farmers and families in rural communities of recent modifications to the emergency services levy? The benefits that have been announced go a long way towards assisting people in rural areas. Will the Deputy Premier also indicate when modifications will be made to the Country Fire Services Act so as to give emergency services volunteers real control over fires?

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier has the call.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier):** I thank the member for most of the question; as always, he has a few surprises. I will refer the last question to the responsible minister. I know that, having had the opportunity to see the modifications planned, the honourable member certainly supports the changes made. No doubt they are of great assistance not only to his electorate but also to rural and

regional people throughout the state. It also acknowledges the role that those people play in providing in those areas the emergency services that are important not only for their welfare but also in protecting their property. It is important that those people are well equipped, and the ESL certainly provides that.

The government, as quite passionately pointed out earlier by the minister for emergency services, has been doing a lot of work on the equity of the level. I certainly acknowledge the minister's work on this matter and congratulate him on the package he has put forward. I point out a couple of the measures that impact on rural areas. First, there has been a change to the boundaries. Properties in the councils of Barossa, Yankalilla, Victor Harbor, Mount Barker and Alexandrina have been transferred out of the greater Adelaide area, and they will therefore attract lower rates. Secondly, there have been large reductions in the variable part of the levy, and I will give a couple of examples of that. The levy on a \$600 000 farm in the Barossa Valley will be reduced from \$207 to \$59, which is a huge saving. In region 2, the levy on a \$1 million farm will reduce from \$241 down to \$65. That is an enormous saving, and it acknowledges the fact that the income from a \$1 million farm is not as high as many people think, and it does not normally reflect the level of equity that the farmer has in that property.

Also, a number of farmers in the greater Adelaide area will benefit from the reduction in the levy on their farm vehicles, from \$32 to \$12. This mirrors the rate applying to the outer areas. Also—and the member for Stuart has certainly been involved in this—the fixed \$50 fees on properties in unincorporated pastoral areas have been removed. I know he will support that. People with blocks valued at \$100 in towns such as Craddock were levied at the \$50 fixed rate. There are also examples involving major country towns. Once again, the decreased variable levy on an \$80 000 house goes from \$72 to \$57 and, on a \$150 000 house, from \$92 to \$63. I know that one of the other issues that have been raised not only with the member for Stuart but also with other country members is the fact that, while the fixed fee of \$50 for rural land applied only once in any one council area, those who straddle council boundaries or have multiple holdings have had to pay the levy more than once. That will be removed and there will be equity, in that all will pay the fixed fee only once.

Following on from the remarks of the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, rural people will also benefit from the removal of the levy on trailers, boats and caravans, and that will be appreciated. No doubt the changes will be well and truly welcomed, not only by the member for Stuart but also by country people in general. However, we should not lose sight of the most important aspect of the emergency services levy: we will see well funded emergency services in our rural areas.

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Given the changes announced today to the government's emergency services tax such that the tax will raise less money than the \$141.5 million originally proposed, will it still cost \$10 million a year to collect what is now a \$76 million tax? What has been the cost of advertising and promoting the new tax so far, and what is the expected cost of advertising the emergency services tax, mark 3?

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services):** It is a pleasant change to get from the deputy leader a question on

emergency services, because we all know how seldom members opposite have asked a genuine question on this matter when they have an opportunity to do so, as against peddling misinformation around the community. As the honourable member knows full well, this is a levy, because it is dedicated and quarantined, and all the money goes into rescue and emergency services. That is just one lesson for the deputy leader. If you are going to go out and peddle a few papers around your electorate, I am happy to give you all the facts, line by line. What do you want to know? Do you want to know when you will get a new fire truck for your electorate? Would you like to know how much more training we will do for your volunteers? Are you interested in a new fire station that may well be built? If the honourable member is interested in the facts, I am very happy to provide them for her electorate. The honourable member well knows that there will always be costs in collection. She also well knows that the set-up costs over the first few years are higher than those as the system progresses.

*Mr Hanna interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mitchell will come to order.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** Given that the Labor Party supports the principles of this in all respects, let members opposite not try to run innuendo on collection costs; it is very old news. Rather, let them tell the South Australian community that this is exactly where things should be. Let members opposite show some fortitude and tell the public that they support the South Australian Liberal government in looking after lives and property.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I direct my question to the Minister for Human Services. Will the minister advise the House what the benefits will be to South Australians in receipt of concessions with the changes to the emergency services levy announced today?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** I know the member for Hartley has an older community within his electorate. Therefore, two groups within that electorate would be particularly interested in this matter. The first comprises those who are already eligible for the \$40 concession, and the second is those who are in places such as private hospitals, retirement villages, aged care accommodation, etc. The announcement made today gives two very important concessions. First, it establishes the special community use for community facilities such as cemeteries; hospitals; retired, aged and nursing home accommodation; social welfare institutions; halls—scouts, guides, churches, youth clubs, clinics and various other facilities such as that. Through special community use those various facilities will now be able to pay a lower rate in the dollar and also receive a reduction in the base rate from \$50 per title down to \$20 per title.

The other very important group is those people who are eligible for the \$40 rebate. Currently it is applicable to pensioners and a range of other groups. Those groups are now being extended to include people who are on Austudy or Abstudy, people who receive special benefits from the federal government and people with a veterans affairs gold repatriation health card. It will also now be available to those seniors who have a partner who is under 60 years of age but who is also retired and working less than 20 hours a week. In the past they have not been eligible for the \$40 rebate, but they will be under the new arrangements. A remission will also be granted to persons in the occupation of land as beneficiaries

of the estate of a person who qualified for a concession—in other words, if the estate is in the name of a person who has died and who would have been eligible for a concession if they had been living. A remission is also to be provided to those people who live in all public housing. There was some issue over the extent of the public housing in the past. It did not cover SACHA, but it will now be covered. Therefore, those people in community (publicly financed) housing will now be eligible to get a complete concession in the same way as Housing Trust tenants have in the past.

### SUBMARINE CORPORATION

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Given reports of a further 500 redundancies from the Australian Submarine Corporation in September or October this year unless additional work eventuates, which is what we all would like to see, what commitments have been received by the Premier from his federal colleagues—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —in particular from Senator Nick Minchin—about when the federal government believes it will resolve the current impasse over the future ownership of the Australian Submarine Corporation and also a commitment from the federal government as to awarding of the refit and 30 year maintenance contract for the life of all the six Collins class submarines? Today, the rally on the steps of Parliament House of hundreds of manufacturing workers called upon the Premier to lead a delegation that would include shop floor workers, representatives of unions and the state opposition to meet with federal government ministers regarding the future of the submarine corporation to demonstrate the depth of support across the board in South Australia for a future for the Australian Submarine Corporation, its skill base and for its workers.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** There are several aspects to the leader's question. As it relates to through life support, I have indicated publicly that I have received an assurance from the defence minister that, following the McIntosh review and a recommendation accepted and agreed to by the federal government, through life support for the major refits of the submarines will be undertaken in South Australia. The media were advised that that was somewhat not the case in some backgrounding, because contracts had not been let.

Logically and obviously, contracts would not be let in a state of uncertainty related to the ownership, so you have to sort that out before you take the next step. However, the defence minister affirmed publicly and to the media in South Australia that my interpretation of his assurance to me was an accurate one. It can then be cemented in the contractual base only when the ownership is concluded.

As it relates to the ownership, the federal government did put a time line on it. If my memory serves me correctly, about 128 days was a period for sorting out the ownership. They have been assessing the level of interest in relation to a range of consortia to take over the ownership of the Australian Submarine Corporation. I have consistently and persistently put to the commonwealth government that this matter needs to be resolved at the earliest opportunity, and to that extent cabinet ministers from South Australia have supported our case in the debate that has taken place at a federal cabinet level.

In addition to that, over the course of the past month, I have had meetings with a number of international consortia—people and companies associated with the defence industry worldwide—who have visited South Australia in relation to the prospects of the submarine corporation and its future. In each instance, the Department of Industry and Trade and I have reassured them that under this government, and indeed in South Australia, the submarine corporation has wide support. It is a very important contributor to gross state product in South Australia. We are intent on ensuring longevity of the submarine corporation, and it is the best new site for ship building in Australia. It is the most modern in Australia.

**An honourable member:** Purpose-built!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Yes. In fact, Australia has a number of ship building facilities that are old. It is logical that consolidation take place on the South Australian site and not in some of those other sites that are now quite old and, therefore, past their useful life. The discussions we have had have been on the basis of what the government needs to do to assist to facilitate decisions for investment, first, in Australia and, secondly, in South Australia. Having secured the through life support, that at least is now on the table for prospective purchasers to take into account in their deliberations. A group from the submarine corporation have asked to meet me, and I have indicated that, if they so wish, I would be happy to meet a group of workers from the submarine corporation to talk through the issues with them. We pressed the case with Canberra and we will continue to do so.

### EMPLOYMENT, STATISTICS

**Mr CONDOUS (Colton):** My question is directed to the Minister for Employment and Training.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I remind members of the gallery that they are not permitted to join into the debate in the Chamber. They run a grave risk of being removed if they do so.

**Mr CONDOUS:** Will the minister comment on the most recent employment statistics, as well as the negative statements by the Leader of the Opposition on the figures?

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Employment and Training):** I thank the member for his question, and I must say that it is important that the doom watch brigade does not talk down the economy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will continue.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for the third time.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** I quote as follows:

It is important that the doom watch brigade does not talk down the economy or paint a worse picture of employment.

They are not my words but those of the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister for Employment. However, it was not surprising recently to see media Mike do a complete about face, because he is now the leader of the doom watch brigade. He cannot wait for those months when there is a glitch in the employment figures to get out there. On the months that it improves, the hapless member opposite is paraded out. However, in the months when there is something that media Mike thinks he can grab on, he is there with all his bells ringing and jangling, talking about his bipartisan approach. I was not therefore surprised when,

shortly after the pronouncements of the leader, the Labor Party's court jester, in the form of Terry Plane, wrote an article about animal dung.

The public of South Australia has every right to question the authority of a columnist whose sole claim to fame appears to be as an expert on sewerage. However, I predict that if ever Labor achieves office he will reap his reward—he will work for the opposition. When he was minister for employment, it never seemed to bother him that unemployment topped 12 per cent and youth unemployment was running at 40 per cent. It did not seem to bother the leader when a couple of weeks ago Morgan and Banks indicated that it had surveyed firms and found that about 38 to 40 per cent of employers were planning to hire people in South Australia. All the Leader of the Opposition wants to do is run down this state. All he wants to do is focus on possible job losses at Mitsubishi and the submarine corporation. I refer the leader to the Premier's statement to this House today. I also refer the leader to his own inane comments when he said this:

All the international research shows that the health of an economy depends on the health of existing industries.

Where are the existing industries that the Leader of the Opposition—then the minister for employment—sought so hard to protect? Most of them have gone. Most of them have been swept away. What the Leader of the Opposition does not acknowledge and what he should acknowledge is that, as the Premier has said, when existing industries can find no place in the new world, this government has worked very hard to create new jobs in new industries. We are supporting those industries that will survive in this state. More importantly, for those industries that cannot survive, we can guarantee them a smooth passage by reskilling members of our labour force so that they can transfer from their old job into a new place of employment that guarantees security for their children and their children's children.

The leader has learnt little since he was the minister for employment. He fails to realise that through creating 125 jobs every week since we have been in government we now have 22 consecutive months of rising employment. We have the highest number of South Australians working who have ever worked in the history of this state. Does the leader want to go back to the myth of so-called full employment when I entered the work force? Because that was a myth. Women were virtually contracted out of the work force. We ignored 50 per cent of the talent of this state. Women have a rightful place in the work force and they are participating in increasing numbers.

We are now seeing record employment levels. Sure, we have a way to go because there are more people wanting a job. There is some way to go, but only because we have a bigger, more active, more intelligent and more skilled work force. This is something on which we have been working for six years. I note that the Leader is nodding. Instead of nodding and agreeing in here, as he does for 98 per cent of the time, instead of running down the Premier on the steps of this place or putting this government down on the ABC, let the leader go out and tell the people of South Australia that his government got it wrong and that this government is getting it right. I do not mind the drivel of the Leader of the Opposition in this place, but I object to the fact that he goes out there and, for my children and grandchildren, tries to undermine the confidence of South Australian employers.

**Mr FOLEY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The minister is clearly in breach of standing order 98. He is debating the matter.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the minister to come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** A few moments ago, the leader questioned the Premier for waiting 145 days for something. He interjected across the chamber, 'That is too long.' The leader will have some credibility in this chamber and in every lounge room and family room in Adelaide when he apologises to all those who were unemployed, not for 145 days but for years, while he was the minister for employment. Let him explain to all those people who were on the scrap heap and about whom he did not then care why they were unemployed and why they did not matter.

We have a job to do and we are getting on with it. We are not doing it on our own. The Premier, every minister and the backbenchers have said repeatedly that we are working in concert with the community, employers, the trade union movement and anyone who will work with us—I note that the Leader of the Opposition has never offered—on this problem in South Australia. We are doing our best to show leadership and to fix the problem. Perhaps on Thursday when the budget comes out the leader might care to support what we are doing instead of knocking it as he normally does.

---

## SUPPLY BILL

**Ms KEY (Hanson):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Ms KEY:** I wish to correct a point, which I made during my contribution to the Supply Bill on 12 April this year, regarding the workers compensation system in South Australia. Whilst I remain critical of the government's rebate of \$25 million to employers in this state, whatever their occupational health and safety record, I think it is important to emphasise that that rebate was not made available or extended to exempt employers in South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That is a very marginal personal explanation, but the honourable member has made it.

**Ms RANKINE (Wright):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Ms RANKINE:** I also refer to my contribution to the Supply Bill on 2 May in which I referred to a number of statistics relating to crime in my electorate. I inadvertently read from the wrong line when I quoted the increase in larceny or illegal use of a motor vehicle. For 1998-99, I quoted an increase of 30 per cent. In fact, I was reading from the line 'illegal interference of a motor vehicle' which was, in fact, 30.4 per cent for that year. Illegal use of a motor vehicle was 6.3 per cent for that year. However, it has risen to 34 per cent since the introduction of Focus 21.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** In the last sitting week I presented a petition signed by some 2 000 library users in the city of Salisbury expressing their concern at changes to

library funding initiated by the government. Many members of this place have tabled the same petition. At present, petitions signed by 25 644 residents of South Australia have been received in this place with more to come from residents who regularly use and value the services of community libraries.

The government has attempted to argue that the new financial arrangements proposed do not constitute a cut in funding for public libraries. On 30 March in the other place the minister made the following statement in answer to a question from the opposition:

I absolutely categorically deny, as I have on earlier occasions, that there is any cut in public library funds from the state government. . .

This was said, I am told, in the face of overwhelming evidence of a state government grant cut to the libraries board in excess of \$1.2 million which the board has been forced to make up by dipping into its reserve funds.

While public libraries are generally owned, operated and staffed by local councils, a number of key services have for some time now been operated centrally—services such as book selection, purchasing, inter-library loans, cataloguing and the Public Libraries Automated Information Network (PLAIN). These services have been provided by the state government and are currently under the aegis of the State Library through its agency PLAIN Central Services under the direction of the libraries board.

The minister has proposed to slash this year's state government grant to PLAIN from \$13 million in 1999-2000 to \$11.8 million in 2000-2001. The \$1.2 million saved is said to be for the redevelopment of the State Library building on North Terrace. At first glance, some would say there is no apparent loss to the library system, but I am informed that an understanding of the institutional structures, particularly the use of funding reserves by libraries to fund ongoing capital upgrades and purchasing, reveals that public libraries will lose not only \$1.2 million in direct funding but, as a result, \$336 000 due to inflation (which has not been taken into account in this budget as it has in previous years), \$94 000 per annum as a consequence of the break in the five year funding agreements, \$226 000 per annum in lost interest from investments made from funding reserves, and a reduction in funding reserves of approximately \$2.3 million in order to maintain current services (from \$2.7 million to \$400 000).

The issue is put in the clearest context by quoting from PLAIN Central Services budget documents for 2000-2001. Under state government grant, the 1999-2000 figure is \$13 018 000. For 2000-20001, it is \$11 819 000. The net result (taking into account funding reserves to be used to make up for the shortfall) is to leave PLAIN with a closing balance of \$426 375 for 2000-20001, some \$2 342 000 less than in 1999-2000.

In a statement in the other place on 4 April, the minister claimed that 'the Libraries Board of South Australia had approved total spending of \$14.273 million for the next financial year, 2000-2001', which she stated was an 'increase of \$230 000'. The minister is of course correct to state that this is the expenditure approved by the libraries board for this financial year. However, what is not pointed out is that the government grant to the libraries board has been cut and that the libraries board is making up the shortfall from reserve funds which were supposed to be used for other purposes. The minister went on to say in her ministerial statement of 11 April:

. . . the LGA wants more funding to be provided from government and, at the same time, wants to be able to leave untouched and sitting idle a very large and growing sum of state government or taxpayers' funds in the accounts of the libraries board. This is not an acceptable way to use public funds.

The minister well knows and understands that these funds are not idle. Her own department holds a so-called idle operating account of some \$50 million in reserve. They are reserves which are used to fund ongoing capital upgrades not directly funded by government, the most recent being the funding of PLAIN network upgrades. The maintenance of these reserves is essential to the future ability of the public library system to continue to provide and improve its services to the community. This money is an investment in the future of libraries in South Australia; it should not be used on recurrent expenditure as the government is forcing the Libraries Board to do this year.

The minister has made a mistake on the issue. Public libraries are among the most widely utilised public sector services and the community has strong feelings about the maintenance of their libraries. In the Florey electorate, the City of Tea Tree Gully library is an important community resource, providing not only access to the State Library network but also free internet services and the use of its facilities for community meetings and seminars. The City of Salisbury also operates many innovative programs and is a valued part of community life to many in that community.

The fact is that we cannot afford to leave our public library system starved of adequate funding. The minister should not attempt a sleight of hand on this issue.

Time expired.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** The week before last my wife and I had the privilege of camping in the Gammon Ranges—and I should point out that it was totally privately funded, so no members of the opposition need get too excited. The tent cost \$20 to repair, so it was a very modest outlay. The point of my contribution to this debate today is to outline once again the wonderful aspects of the Gammon Ranges, and in particular to highlight that national parks such as the Gammon Ranges are not just for people. We know that they are important for tourism but they are also important for conservation. I commend the Department of Environment, and in particular the National Parks and Wildlife Service, for what has been achieved in getting rid of feral goats, dogs and cats, and you can see the return of native vegetation as a result.

Members should not underestimate the tourist potential of not only that area but also Arkaroola, which is nearby. By chance, I bumped into the Minister for Tourism, who had just opened a refurbished part of that wonderful facility at Arkaroola. The area has a great attraction for interstate tourists and people from overseas, and the more they hear about it, the more tourists we will attract to that area. In general, the roads are quite good. We travelled from Yunta to Arkaroola. Although it is a dirt road, it is maintained in quite good condition considering the recent heavy rains in part of that area. On that point, I am hopeful that in this forthcoming budget the Minister for Transport might be generous in terms of contributing to further sealing of roads in the whole northern Flinders Ranges area because that will assist even further in promoting tourism.

I notice that the airstrip at Hawker is in use and I have always argued that it would be good if that was expanded even further to take 737 size aircraft. I guess that I am

looking into the future, but I believe that many interstate tourists would like to spend a few days in areas such as the Flinders Ranges, and that would be made more possible by an even bigger airstrip. I do not expect that that will happen overnight. I believe that the same thing should also happen on Kangaroo Island.

On the return from camping in the Gammon Ranges, and in particular in Weetotla Gorge, we stayed at Quorn (where we took the luxury of a motel) and again enjoyed the excellent Pichi Richi Railway. Members who have not taken time to enjoy that should do so, particularly now that the railway has been extended from Woolshed Flat to Stirling North. That is an excellent extension: it is a wonderful piece of countryside to observe. I must pay tribute to the people involved in the Pichi Richi Railway because they are volunteers. I note that many of them have come from TAFE, people such as Chris Dunbar, whom I mention as one example. The train driver on the original Ghan on which we travelled was a TAFE person. But people of all ages, young as well as mature age people, were working as volunteers on that excellent railway, a great tourist attraction, and I commend them for the effort that has been put into it. I gather that at some stage they are keen to extend the railway possibly into Port Augusta, but even terminating in Stirling North as it does makes it a delightful trip from Quorn to that destination.

The final point I make is once again to commend the Department of Environment, and particularly the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Patawalonga Water Catchment Management Board, for the excellent work they have undertaken recently in the Belair National Park in restoring Minno Creek and in getting rid of a lot of the ash trees, willows, lantana and hawthorn bushes. It is now looking the best that I can recall in my lifetime—

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** Doing a fantastic job.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** Yes, as the member for Heysen says, 'Doing a fantastic job'. Well done to the National Parks and Wildlife Service with the support of the Patawalonga Water Catchment Management Board. Much more needs to be done, but it is a great step forward which needs to be applauded and is applauded by the whole community. I look forward to seeing that work extended right throughout the hills creek lines to the Sturt River where some work has already been done, and in particular continuing along the Minno and other tributaries of the Sturt River.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake):** I rise today in this grievance debate on a very sad matter; that is, another case of a fatal crash on the Bakewell Bridge leading onto Glover Street. From my knowledge and the research I have done on this matter, I can say that this bridge has claimed more lives than any other bridge in Australia. I often see accidents on my way into the city in the morning because that is the main route I use to go to the city. I would have to say that it is one of the most dangerous bridges I have ever seen. When I was first elected to this House there were no safety barriers or rails along that bridge capable of holding cars on the main road. After much lobbying and threatening the minister, she finally conceded and built the railings. However, the bridge is still not safe.

In this case, I do not condone the fact that the people were speeding on that bridge and I accept that their speed led to the accident but, of course, I have not seen the results of the findings of the investigation into the accident. However, I will say this: I see a number of speed cameras and radar

protection devices on Burbridge Road, Holbrooks Road and Henley Beach Road but, as far as I know, there has not been one single radar detection device on this bridge in an attempt to try to discourage people from speeding. I try to take the government at its word; that is, it is not about revenue raising or making money off the unfortunate motorist, but I have to say that this government has to act and it has to do something about this bridge.

There is a strange kink in the bridge. I believe that it should be a flat, straight bridge over the railway lines rather than having that bizarre turn into the bridge; it is very dangerous. Almost every day school children wait at the bus stop on that bridge. Cyclists use it and pedestrians use it to walk to and from the city, thus avoiding the parklands. This bridge is a death trap. I might also say that it is not a very attractive bridge. I have noticed other bridges in North Adelaide, such as the one opposite the zoo on Frome Road on which there was one fatal accident about three years ago when two young lads lost their lives. I have never seen a government act so quickly. This bridge was fully renovated, restored to its majestic beauty, given a total upgrade, including safety rails, and made safe. It looks beautiful.

The Bakewell Bridge is an eyesore. I wonder why the government is not keen on ensuring that this bridge is as attractive as it could be. It is a major gateway to the western suburbs heading towards Henley Beach and, of course, the wonderful shopping district at Henley Square and the new shopping district on Henley Beach Road, and it is a major gateway from the airport to the city. I would imagine that the government should be doing something about this.

Another point I add is that today I noticed the member for Colton introduce a petition to the House from 37 000 residents who were opposed to the emergency services tax. When I was a candidate for parliament, I recall the member for Colton introducing a petition given to him by the Secretary of the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association signed by 50 000 South Australians in connection with Sunday trading. I remember seeing Mr Condous receive those petitions in good faith, saying he would not let us down; he would stand with us arm in arm and stand by us the whole way. Of course, at the end, he reneged. The member for Colton and his colleagues have said that anything but a complete reversal of the emergency services tax would not be good enough. Now that he has accepted the petition, I wonder whether this is actually good enough for him.

I know that the member for Colton comes out and says a lot of things. He talks about standing side by side with protesters to save West Beach, diving under a bulldozer, chaining himself to fences, saving small business and Sunday trading, but every time he has taken a step back from the brink. I just wonder whether he will do it again. If you were betting on form, I would say it is a sure bet that he will renege again.

Finally, I hope that Minister Laidlaw does her best for the Bakewell Bridge because the people of the western suburbs deserve a better and safer bridge: our motorists deserve better than that. However, I would advise all motorists not to speed on this very dangerous bridge.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** On the weekend of 14 and 15 May, a very significant event occurred in Wallaroo, and I refer to the inaugural Copper Coast prawnfest. It turned out to be an extremely successful event. Certainly, the organisers were very concerned in the lead-up to the prawnfest because, on the Friday, two days before it was due to occur, a major

low pressure system came over South Australia with extremely high winds and rain—

**An honourable member:** Sleet.

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, sleet. Indeed, it looked as though it would be a total wash-out. Saturday was not much better, but come Sunday and Monday the weather fined up and was absolutely excellent for almost all of that period of time.

I am well aware that in neighbouring places on the Sunday, rain was falling, but at Wallaroo, although there was a shower at about 7 a.m., no rain fell throughout the day. Most of the day was sunny, with an occasional bit of cloud cover. It was not until about 5.30 p.m. when there was a short shower. The weather conditions in Wallaroo on Monday were absolutely perfect, the same day that the Adelaide Cup was washed out. I can certainly speak well of the weather on Yorke Peninsula, and particularly the northern Yorke Peninsula, last weekend.

It was the inaugural prawnfest. The organisers were uncertain as to how many people would attend, and they were very pleased when in excess of 5 000 people attended. Comments concerning the event were very positive. I would like to congratulate all those involved, particularly Mr John McCormack, chairman of the prawnfest committee, and members of his committee. They worked tirelessly in the last few weeks leading up to that weekend, and certainly much work had been done earlier on.

I also want to thank the events officer for the Copper Coast, Mr Brian Harris, the gentleman who oversaw the last Kernewek Lowender, or Cornish Festival, which was held last May. He did an excellent job with that, and he also oversaw the Copper Coast prawnfest. So much of the good work is due to his excellent organisation and attention to fine detail. There is no doubt that the first prawnfest will probably go down in history as the smallest prawnfest, and it will simply grow in strength in future years. Almost certainly it will be held on a biannual basis in the future. It shows once again that Yorke Peninsula has so much to offer tourists, and the potential is just bursting at the seams.

It was also the same weekend as the opening of the new Copper Cove marina. I was delighted that the Premier was able to officiate at the opening of both the new marina and the prawnfest. I want to thank the Premier very sincerely for making himself available on Mother's Day to participate in these two great events. I know that the Premier was most surprised that the weather was so good at Wallaroo when he had travelled through some storms on the way there.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Crystalcorp Development for the Copper Cove marina project and particularly Mr John Falting, who has worked tirelessly to get it to stage 1, the opening of the marina. Certainly, a lot of work is continuing and will continue probably for the next year or two. It is a huge development. The Premier indicated that more than \$14 million has been spent already, and the total value of the project is expected to exceed \$30 million. It is probably the biggest project going on in South Australia at present, and I would say to everyone in South Australia: take advantage and come and have a look at it.

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** I want to place on record some issues relating to the disposal of the site of the former Morphett Vale South primary school which, Mr Deputy Speaker, you will recall was closed at the end of last year. For a school closure, this was a model of how it should be done, including great cooperation with neighbouring schools and

support from the minister and the department to undertake the school closure in an orderly and humane manner.

One of the issues identified was what would happen to the site. The school organised a meeting with residents in October last year. It was a clear priority for the residents that the site not become a focus for vandalism. They were very pleased that the buildings from the school were to be removed immediately, and that an orderly process would occur in relation to the use of that site. Unfortunately, not all the buildings have been removed, and the feared vandalism has occurred, much to the distress of the neighbours. The lawns are being mowed, but greater attention needs to be paid to the care of this site to see that it does not become a focus for disorderly activity.

The residents have formed a community group to work out how they would like to see this site best used, and I am pleased that there has been support from the Housing Trust with an amount of money which will enable this group to go through a fairly orderly process of working out how it can make use of the site that is available and to preserve its amenity. Their priority is the protection of the oval and the facilities relating to the oval, and they are balancing some concerns that, if the site is not used soon, it will deteriorate, with the need for a process of consultation about the best use of the area.

The Land Management Corporation is consulting with council and there has been some question about the council's acquiring the land but, as members would know, the City of Onkaparinga has particular pressures on its budget and it does not have money available at the moment to buy the land. Indeed, it would have trouble maintaining it, even in the fortunate position were a gift to be made of the land to the council. So, there would be many pluses in that eventuality, but we hope that the Land Management Corporation will consider how the land can best be maintained.

We hope that the community group, the council and the Land Management Corporation can see a way of preserving the best parts of that site and allowing the community to continue to walk their dogs and the kids to continue to rollerblade, skateboard and ride their BMX bikes. BMX riding is the main activity that occurs on one part of the land. The oval is ideal for junior sports. I just wanted to place on record the matters relating to that site because they are of concern to the community. It is quite a tricky issue to deal speedily with some issues while allowing time for consultation for others.

I now want to turn to another matter which relates to some comments made by the Premier on the last day of sitting, when he referred to a dinner party that I was supposed to have attended with Mr John Rau. At the time the Premier made these comments I was perfectly well aware that I had not attended any dinner party with John Rau, let alone been discussing the types of matters the Premier indicated. However, I was interested to listen further to see if I could identify whether some honest mistake might have occurred in terms of who I was dining with on that day and to see whether the Premier was just slightly misinformed. However, after checking *Hansard*, it was quite clear to me that when the Premier referred to Monday a fortnight ago he was talking about Monday 17 April. On that day, the shadow cabinet met in the south and I attended both that meeting and a reception with a large number of leaders of the community and local business. From that reception I returned directly to my office for a sub-branch meeting—and, in fact, I ate leftovers there. There was no dinner.

Time expired.



**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I would like to refer to a contribution that I made in the House on 29 March, in which I said that I was fortunate in that, during an Italian radio program that was broadcast from the Adelaide Produce Market, the chairman, Des Lilley, offered \$200 worth of fruit and vegetables for the six primary schools in my electorate. I said that I would make arrangements for those schools to receive the produce. On 8 May, I was able to deliver the fruit and vegetables to each of the primary schools. Since the merchants at the Adelaide Produce Market had been kind enough to make the fruit available for the students, as I have a truck licence, I thought that I would deliver it myself. So, I made the deliveries.

*Ms Hurley interjecting:*

**Mr SCALZI:** Is the deputy leader undervaluing the contributions of truck drivers? As I said, I made the deliveries myself. I was fortunate enough to be accompanied by Judy White, the promotions officer at the Adelaide Produce Market, and we set out delivering to the six primary schools: Hectorville Primary School, Newton Primary School, St Josephs Primary School at Hectorville, St Josephs Primary School at Tranmere, Sunrise Christian School at Paradise and East Marden Primary School. I would like to thank the principals of those schools: Ross Joel, Judy Francis, Sister Theresa Swiggs, Diane Colborne, Kym Golding and Maggie Kay. I have received thank you letters and drawings from the students, and I can tell the House that they are very much appreciated. I know those merchants who made the fruit available very much appreciate the thanks from the school children. I would therefore like to thank, on behalf of the schools and the students at the six primary schools, the merchants from the Adelaide Produce Market who made it all possible. The merchants who supplied the produce were: oranges, Tim Collins, Collins Orchards; apples, Tony Ceravalo, R. Ceravalo and Co.; the pears, Gilmaers Orchards, store 54; the tomatoes, Pat Scalzi, Scalzi Produce, store 47 and Bill Stamatopoulos, Stam Fruit Supply, store 44; the grapes, Jim Koukos, D&G Fresh Fruits, store 16; the watermelons, Brian Schirripa, Hockney Brothers, store 20; and the bananas, Tony Schirripa, Carbis Banana Agency, store 31. All these merchants were from the Adelaide Produce Market at Pooraka, and I believe that they made a valuable contribution in supplying those primary schools with the fruit and vegetables that day. As I said, I know from the drawings, the letters and the comments that I have received from the principals that it was very much appreciated.

I am aware from Des Lilley, the chairman of the Adelaide Produce Market, that they are working closely with the Department of Human Services to promote a healthy eating lifestyle. These merchants should be commended for their willingness to contribute to a healthy eating lifestyle, because it is so important that our young people get to know the importance of having a balanced diet.

Time expired.

#### **CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (MANDATORY REPORTING AND RECIPROCAL ARRANGEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

#### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (EXTENSION OF NATIVE TITLE SUNSET CLAUSES) BILL**

Second reading.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage):** I move:

*That this bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

Part 9B of the *Mining Act 1971* was enacted to establish a 'right to negotiate' (RTN) in respect of mining activities on native title land. It commenced operation on 17 June 1996.

Part 7 of the *Opal Mining Act 1995* was enacted to establish an almost identical RTN scheme in respect of opal mining activities on native title land. It commenced operation on 21 April 1997.

Both Part 9B of the *Mining Act* and Part 7 of the *Opal Mining Act* contained a 'sunset clause' (sections 63ZD and 71 respectively) in recognition of the likelihood of amendments to the Commonwealth *Native Title Act 1993* and, in particular, the RTN regime in that Act, so as to avoid the possibility of South Australia being left with a more onerous regime than that contained in an amended Commonwealth Act.

The sunset clause in both Acts was synchronised in 1998 and extended to 17 June 2000 by an amendment contained in the *Statutes Amendment (Native Title) Act 1998*. That period is now about to expire.

The *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) was substantially amended in 1998. Amendments to the State's RTN regime to reflect the changes at the Commonwealth level have been prepared. The content of those amendments is the subject of ongoing negotiations with the Commonwealth. At this stage, it is difficult to predict the precise content of those amendments and when they will be ready for introduction into Parliament. It is important to retain the existing RTN schemes, pending further negotiations with the Commonwealth.

In the meantime, the mining industry in South Australia is continuing to utilise the procedures in Part 9B of the *Mining Act* and, to a lesser extent, Part 7 of the *Opal Mining Act*.

In the circumstances it is both necessary and appropriate to continue the operation of Part 9B of the *Mining Act* and Part 7 of the *Opal Mining Act* for a further 3 years beyond 17 June 2000, up to 17 June 2003. It is appropriate to amend the Acts in such a way that the notion of a 'sunset clause' is preserved in both Acts.

I commend this bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Interpretation*

These clauses are formal.

*Clause 3: Amendment of s. 63ZD—Expiry of this Part*  
The amendment postpones expiry of Part 9B (Native Title) of the *Mining Act 1971* until 17 June 2003.

*Clause 4: Amendment of s. 71—Expiry of this Part*  
The amendment postpones expiry of Part 7 (Native Title) of the *Opal Mining Act 1995* until 17 June 2003.

**Mrs GERAGHTY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **CORPORATIONS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Second reading.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage):** I move:

*That this bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

The *Corporations (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2000* makes a number of amendments to the *Corporations (South Australia) Act 1990* which have become necessary following four major Commonwealth legislative initiatives in the area of Corporations Law reform.

The Corporations Law scheme is administered jointly by the Commonwealth, the States and the Northern Territory under the

Corporations Agreement. This agreement establishes a Council of Commonwealth and State Ministers known as the 'Ministerial Council for Corporations' to oversee the operation of the Corporations legislative scheme in Australia, and to co-ordinate legislative initiatives arising out of that scheme. South Australia is a party to the Corporations Agreement and the Attorney-General for South Australia is a member of the Ministerial Council.

The Corporations Agreement obliges a State to secure the enactment of a Bill required to complement a Commonwealth Bill which amends a Corporations legislative scheme law and which the Ministerial Council agrees should be enacted.

On 22 July 1999 at its 24th Ordinary Meeting, the Ministerial Council approved amendments to the Corporations [Name of State] Acts of the States and the Northern Territory, including the *Corporations (South Australia) Act 1990*, necessary to complement the following Commonwealth legislative initiatives:

- the *Company Law Review Act 1998*;
- the *Managed Investments Act 1998*;
- the financial sector reform ('Wallis') legislation of 1998 and 1999; and
- the *Corporate Law Economic Reform Program Act 1999* ('the CLERP Act').

On 24 March 2000 this year, at its 26th Ordinary Meeting, the Ministerial Council approved amendments to the Corporations [Name of State] Acts of the States and the Northern Territory, including the *Corporations (South Australia) Act 1990*.

The amendments in this Bill are consistent with amendments which either have been or will be enacted by the Parliaments of the Commonwealth, the other States and the Northern Territory pursuant to the Corporations Agreement.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### *Clause 1: Short title*

This clause is formal.

##### *Clause 2: Commencement*

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act which is to be on proclamation. For the sake of consistency across jurisdictions, those amendments which arise out of the financial sector reforms, being the change of name of the national corporate regulator from the Australian Securities Commission, or the ASC, to the Australian Securities and Investments Commission, or ASIC, and in particular to the legislation and regulations governing this body, must commence in all jurisdictions at the same time. Consequently, the date of commencement of these provisions will be coordinated on a nation-wide basis and may differ from the date of commencement of the remaining provisions.

##### *Clause 3: Amendment of s. 1—Short title and purposes*

Clause 3 amends section 1 of the Corporations Act. It strikes out the reference to the 'Australian Securities Commission Act 1989' and replaces it with a reference to the 'Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 1989'. This reflects changes contained in the *Financial Sector Reform (Amendment and Transitional Provisions) Act 1998* of the Commonwealth.

##### *Clause 4: Amendment of s. 3—Definitions*

Following on from the same Commonwealth reforms, clause 4 strikes out all references to ASC in section 3 of the Act, and replaces them with references to ASIC.

##### *Clause 5: Amendment of s. 15—Corporations Law of South Australia*

The most recent of the Commonwealth's Corporations Law reforms are contained in the *CLERP Act 1999* which commenced on 13 March this year. This legislation reformed the Corporations Law provisions on Accounting Standards, Takeovers, Fundraising and corporate governance.

Section 15(2) of the Corporations Act provides that chapter 7 of the Corporations Law, which includes the fundraising provisions, do not bind the Crown in right of the State of South Australia, of the Commonwealth, or any other State or either of the Territories or Norfolk Island. As a result of the reforms contained in the CLERP Act two important amendments to section 15(2) are necessary.

Firstly, the Commonwealth has decided for policy reasons that it is to become subject to the fundraising provisions of the Corporations Law. The States, including South Australia, the Territories and Norfolk Island are to remain exempt from these provisions. Secondly, the fundraising provisions themselves have been relocated to new chapters, 6, 6A, 6B, 6C, and 6D of the Corporations Law.

Consequently, clause 5 of the Bill inserts a new section 15(1a) to clarify that the relevant provisions are now to be found in these new chapters, and the Crown in right of the States, the Territories

and Norfolk Island, but not the Commonwealth, are to be exempt from these new provisions.

##### *Clause 6: Repeal of Part 6*

Clause 6 of the Bill repeals section 21 of the Corporations Act. Section 21 provides that any written accounting standards made by the Accounting Standards board under section 32 of the Commonwealth *Corporations Act 1989* for the purpose of Parts 3.6 and 3.7 of the Corporations Law of the Australian Capital Territory have effect under the Corporations Law of South Australia. The Commonwealth's Company Law Review Act repealed both section 32 of the Commonwealth Act and Parts 3.6 and 3.7 of the Corporations Laws of the ACT and South Australia.

##### *Clause 7: Amendment of s. 60—Interpretation of some expressions in ASC Law, and ASC Regulations, of South Australia*

Section 60 of the Corporations Act defines a number of terms for the purposes of the application of the legislation and regulations governing the Australian Securities and Investment Commission, formerly the Australian Securities Commission. Clause 7 of the Bill amends those definitions which been affected by the Commonwealth's reforms.

Clause 7(a) and 7(b) of the Bill amend the definitions of 'affairs' and 'books', taking account of changes brought about by the Company Law Review Act. Clause 7(c) amends the definition of 'Commission' to reflect the fact that the ASC is now call ASIC. Clause 7(d) inserts a definition of 'panel proceedings', while clause 7(e) amends the definition of 'witness'. Both amendments arise as a result of the reforms implemented under the CLERP Act.

##### *Clause 8: Repeal of s. 94*

The Commonwealth's Managed Investments Act of 1998 introduced a new regime for the regulation of managed investment schemes. This regime replaced the regime which provided for the regulation of 'prescribed interest' schemes under the Corporations Law.

Section 94 of the Corporations Act provides that any prescribed interest scheme which was exempted from the prescribed interest provisions of the Companies Code, is taken to be exempted from Divisions 2 and 5 of the Corporations Law.

The Companies Code was replaced by the current Corporations Law regime on 1 January 1991. Division 5 of Part 7.12 of the Corporations Law was repealed by the Managed Investments Act. Section 94 of the Corporations Act is therefore no longer relevant. Consequently, clause 8 of the Bill repeals section 94.

##### *Clause 9: Amendment of s. 97—Certain land transfers by companies not to constitute reduction of share capital*

Clause 9 of the Bill amends section 97 of the Corporations Act to ensure the section has no ongoing operation. Section 97 relates to the transfer of land by companies in exchange or in satisfaction of rights referred to in section 195(13) of the Corporations Law. Section 195(13) was repealed by the Company Law Review Act.

##### *Clause 10: ASC replaced with ASIC throughout Act*

Clause 10 strikes out all remaining references in the Corporations Act to the 'ASC' and substitutes 'ASIC'.

**Mrs GERAGHTY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## DAIRY INDUSTRY (DEREGULATION OF PRICES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 April. Page 895.)

**Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** The dairy industry in South Australia is spread right across the state. There are farms and processors in the Adelaide Hills, the Murray River swamps and lakes, the South-East, the Mid North and the Riverland. So, it is obviously a very important industry to all those areas and to the state in general.

Milk is, in general, supplied to five major processors—for example, National Foods and Dairy Farmers—and a number of small processors around the state. The processors in South Australia produce market milk products, butter, cream, flavoured milk, UHT milk, cheese, yoghurt, dairy deserts, ice-cream, etc. In fact, when I attended the opening of the National Foods plant at Salisbury, I was informed that South Australians were, by far, the biggest drinkers of flavoured milk in Australia and that the sales of flavoured milk in South

Australia outstripped the sales of Coke in other states, which I found very interesting. So, obviously, South Australians are very keen dairy consumers.

Production in the dairy industry, despite a number of setbacks, has been increasing in recent years and, in fact, the number of cows has been increasing. The increase in production is due to higher yield. The industry is being characterised by a larger number of cows per farm and other innovations required for the dairy industry to remain competitive in the current environment. I want to give a bit of history about how the current environment has evolved, and I am indebted to an excellent article by Nicholas Way in the *Business Review Weekly* of 18 February 2000. Part of his article also outlined the history of the current dairy situation in Australia. State government regulation of the dairy industry goes back a long way and was obviously due to the long distances encountered.

I have previously outlined how widespread the industry in South Australia is; and one can see that the distances between, say, the Adelaide Hills, the Riverland and the South-East are quite great. There were and have been limited storage and transportation facilities. Quality control and food safety concerns were obviously a prominent consideration because dairy products in their natural form have a very short shelf life. It was important to have local industries operating profitably and state governments did, in fact, impose regulations and subsidies to ensure that this did happen, and it naturally occurred in every state in Australia.

I suppose that the first major shock to the dairy industry occurred when the United Kingdom joined the European Common Market in 1974. In the 1970s the number of dairy farmers in Australia virtually halved. It was a difficult time for the industry, which had come to rely on the UK and European export markets. There was quite a dramatic shake-out at that time. Shortly after, in the 1980s, came the closer economic relations agreement with New Zealand, which similarly caused great anxiety in the industry. There was some concern that New Zealand product might swamp the Australian market. Effectively that did not happen, but nevertheless there was the threat, which concerned the industry.

John Kerin, who was then the federal minister with the Hawke government, addressed these issues. John Kerin, who was a very far-sighted minister, devised a plan (known as the Kerin plan) which would give the industry time to adjust to shocks of this kind and which has indeed assisted the industry to cope with subsequent events. There has been a lot of pressure in the current situation as a result of deregulation, particularly from Victoria, which produces approximately 60 per cent of milk for the South Australian market. It is a large and profitable area and there was quite a movement towards deregulation of the industry among some Victorian farmers.

There was also a lot of commercial pressure on the industry from large supermarket chains which found the state borders and the state subsidy arrangements unduly restrictive. Supermarkets, of course, are also chasing cheaper milk and, to that end, have encouraged competition between farmers in not only different states but different regions. This bill gives effect to the agreement between the commonwealth, the states and the dairy industry to deregulate the dairy industry in an orderly manner. Under this agreement the commonwealth will provide \$1.8 billion in compensation to the industry over eight years.

This amount will be funded by a levy on drinking milks of 11¢ per litre. The payments under this restructuring agreement will be quarterly payments to farmers or a tax free exit payment. The current situation is that milk is divided into two broad categories: market milk, which is liquid milk for human consumption; and, secondly, manufacturing milk, which is milk used in the manufacture of dairy products. The current situation is that there is a guaranteed price for market milk, which is approximately two times the price to the producer for manufacturing milk, and this is where the subsidy arises. The price paid to producers to achieve that even price for milk will no longer be there—it will disappear.

This situation will very obviously result in a significant loss of farm income for dairy farmers, and it will naturally then lead to significant industry dislocation with a negative effect on regional businesses and possibly manufacturing and processors in regional centres as well. ABARE estimates that, around Australia, this will mean a decrease of \$28 350 per year per farm. The figure in South Australia specifically is \$31 550—obviously, in anyone's terms, a marked impact. The national average payment under the restructuring arrangements will be \$118 192 per farm, and the payment for South Australia will average \$160 159.

Farmers will be required to undertake a farm business plan prior to receiving any payments and, similarly, if farmers choose to take the exit payments. The levy required to fund this graduated restructuring of the dairy industry will be on whole, modified, UHT and flavoured milk. The collection will be at the processor rather than the retail level in order to ensure ease of collection, although the levy will be determined on the retail price of milk. As a result of the drop in price to the producers of milk, the estimate is that the consumer will see no increase in the actual price of milk compared to the current price—they may even see a small drop despite the 11¢ per litre levy, although it will remain to be seen if the price drop, which is expected to be up to 4¢ a litre, comes into effect.

This bill therefore deletes price control and the price equalisation provisions of the existing Dairy Act 1992. The dairy authority in South Australia will continue to exist—95 per cent of its current functions relate to milk quality issues. The authority has an annual budget of \$500 000 and will continue to perform those quality functions for the industry. I will certainly be asking questions of the minister about the likely impact of deregulation in South Australia and the number of farms and farmers it is likely to affect. The dairy industry has, generally speaking, supported this bill. In fact, a resolution was carried at the December 1998 central council meeting of the South Australian Dairy Farmers Association, which stated:

SADA [South Australian Dairy Farmers Association] supports the maintenance of the current SA regulation including farm gate price and equalisation. As such it urges the review of state legislation, including the public benefit test under the national competition policy be undertaken immediately. SADA supports continued negotiation by ADFF towards a national market restructuring package.

Once it became clear that Victoria intended to deregulate, and because such a high proportion of milk is produced in Victoria, the rest of Australia would have to follow. A further resolution was carried which stated:

SADA central council reaffirms its total support for the 'restructure package' that is being developed and negotiated with governments and presented to the federal minister Mark Vaile.

In other words, the industry not so much supported this bill and the restructuring package as recognised the inevitability of such a measure and supported the gradual restructuring of the industry and the ability for farmers to be cushioned against the impacts of this drop in farm income if they were to continue and be able to use the payments from the restructuring grant to take steps to modernise their farms, buy more farmland, or whatever, to reach the stage where they are once again profitable; or, it gives dairy farmers the opportunity to exit the industry gracefully with that tax free exit payment which would enable them to deal with debts and leave their farms in an orderly manner that would not completely devastate their and their families' lives.

I suppose the opposition's position is very similar to that of the dairy industry. We reluctantly support the bill. I will be asking questions about the oversight of the impacts of deregulation, some aspects of the food safety program and what assistance will be provided for regional areas to enable them to cope with the impact of deregulation. So, recognising that this is something with which the industry will have to cope, the opposition will support this bill in order to ensure that the dairy industry package comes into force and that dairy farmers can as soon as possible access the money that comes from those grants and get on with their lives in an attempt to deal with this radical change in the dairy industry.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I rise today with an element of concern to speak on this bill. As I have said before in this place, I will say up front that I do not always embrace matters relating to the deregulation of an industry, particularly a very successful primary industry. I would not do that with open arms. I was most concerned when I became aware of the proposed deregulation of our dairy industry, driven as I know it is by the Victorian section of the industry, particularly when it is very large and has huge facilities which, particularly with the processors for by-products of milk such as dried milk and UHT milk, are far superior to those in any other state. In fact, they are 60 per cent of the total Australian industry.

The dairy industry in this state has formed part of the backbone of our primary industries, and I was concerned that any change that could harm the income derived from this industry could result in the demise of many producers. The producers have a lot of confidence in their industry and to take this certainty away from the industry and the families involved concerns me.

I know that the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services (the member for Mawson) is a dairy farmer, and I appreciate the discussions he has had with members on this side. I appreciate the courage of the member for Mawson and his wife and family in facing the issue. He is to speak shortly, and I will be interested to hear what he has to say. He is the only genuine, 100 per cent dairy farmer on this side of the House—in fact, in the whole House.

*The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** The minister says that his wife is the dairy farmer now; that is right. I know that the member for Mawson and his family is the only dairy farmer in the parliament, so we will certainly appreciate hearing what he has to say. I know that privately we have shared concerns about why we need legislation such as this. As members would be aware, many men returning from the two world wars took up land under the soldier settler scheme and established thereon dairies that are now being run by third generations, in other words, their children's children. To put

anything in place that would jeopardise the financial wellbeing of these people and their families would be most unwelcome. We all know that nothing stays the same and that, whether or not we like it, change is always with us. The dairy industry is not insulated from this.

The state of Victoria first announced that it would deregulate its industry on 1 July this year. With the change of government over there, we were hoping that there might have been a change in this, but I note that there has not been. Mr Bracks, the new Victorian Premier, has not changed the situation at all.

Following that, the Australian Dairy Industry Council at both the state and national level supported simultaneous deregulation of all states, with support from a restructure package funded by the commonwealth government. The deregulation of the Victorian industry, which represents approximately 60 per cent of the national product, would have placed South Australia in an uncompetitive and unsustainable position if we did not follow suit, so it is more or less a fait accompli. If we do not deregulate we will not have any dairy industry at all. I know it has been an uncomfortable process for the industry to endure and a bitter pill to swallow, but unfortunately that is the state of play.

We know about the success of the industry. I know that milk products are enjoying great success in the community at large. As one can see, I, too, am a fan of Farmers Union iced coffee, and who would have anticipated the success of this drink? But, when I consider the few cents that the dairy farmer gets out of that milk, I am concerned, particularly when they are paid mainly for manufacturing milk for that product. It concerns me that, although the farmers are doing quite well, I do not believe they have enjoyed the full extent of that success, particularly with products such as flavoured milk, especially the coffee flavoured milks that are very popular at the moment. Many have tried to copy Farmers Union iced coffee, and now you can buy the product even in Darwin. Certainly, therefore, there has been great success there.

I am concerned about the huge might of the big Victorian companies Bonlac and Murray-Goulbourn. The huge size of these companies, particularly in the manufacture of their processed milks such as UHT, means that they can and do send their product to every state at below the cost of manufacture, because that is purely a way for them to get rid of their surplus and protect their mainline milks. I do not believe we have very great facilities here in relation to UHT processing.

**The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire:** We have.

**Mr VENNING:** But are we able to match them? The member for Mawson is giving me instructions on the go. I understood that the Victorians certainly get out there to push every other state into a corner, because they think they are strong enough.

*The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** That is right. The minister says that they have been dumping milk here for some years. The answer is that it will be survival of the fittest, and that concerns me. This is where we have come from. We must now get this bill through the parliament and concentrate on the speedy implementation of the restructuring package. I have appreciated consultation with several of my constituents, particularly Mr Murray Klemm, who has been a leader in the South Australian Dairy Association, although I think he retired a couple of years ago. Also, Mr Dave Lillecrapp is a good friend of mine and happens to be a dairy farmer at Eden Valley.

The commonwealth has stated that it will not administer the restructuring package and has passed on the responsibility to the state government to handle. It is incumbent on us to make sure that the package is put in place quickly and not further impact negatively on the producers in the industry.

The bill has the support of the Australian Dairy Industry Council, the Australian Dairy Farmers Federation and the South Australian Dairy Farmers Federation. I support the bill and certainly look forward to hearing what the member for Mawson, the only dairy farmer in this House, has to say.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** The member for Mawson has graciously allowed me to jump the queue; I want to spend only a couple of minutes on this issue. I point out that I have some relatives who are dairy farmers, but I am not here to speak on their behalf. I have taken some interest in this issue. It is a hard way to earn a living. Many members do not appreciate that the dairy farmer at the farm gate usually gets something—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** We have a grain farmer out of control and a dairy farmer almost out of control! At the farm gate a dairy farmer usually gets about 29¢ a litre for white milk and up to 39¢ if they are lucky. However, when one looks in supermarkets and in other retail outlets, one sees that flavoured milk sells for \$4 a litre—a price increase achieved just by adding a bit of caffeine and colour. Someone is doing nicely out of the system, and it is not the cows or the dairy farmer. Restructuring is certainly needed, although my concern is that some of the dairy farmers may suffer under this program. Clearly, the smaller ones will be under a lot of pressure to get big or get out. I do not have a problem with the compensation package per se, although I wish the manufacturers of milk products, the retailers and wholesalers, were making some contribution, because as it stands at present basically the consumer pays small and the dairy farmer will be pushed out. The community needs to understand that milk is a dynamic and healthy product in more ways than one. If one compares what the dairy gets at the farm gate with what the soft drink manufacturer gets at the factory gate, one sees that it is a tough, competitive industry in which to be.

I will conclude by saying that I hope this deregulation works, that ultimately it will bring about genuine competition in the industry, a fair go for the dairy farmers that remain and that the consumers, as well as everyone else, benefit from what is a fundamental restructuring of the industry. Compared to Victoria, we do not have a lot of dairy farmers in South Australia, but it is important in all these industries to maintain a local presence. That is the lesson that applies to other commodities such as petrol—if you do not have a local source, you are at the mercy of others. It is a dynamic industry. We have seen the development of long-life products, and we will see a lot more of them. The sky is literally the limit, particularly in terms of exports, if this industry can be restructured and in some ways focused on a more competitive environment. I hope that this restructuring delivers the goods for all the players involved.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services):** I rise reluctantly to support this bill. First, I must declare my interest as a dairy farmer. I said that I rise reluctantly for the reason that I am still not convinced that what is happening is in the best interests of not only dairy farmers but the

community per se. Having said that, we all know the history of this matter and we know that the Rt Hon. Paul Keating initiated certain agreements as a result of the Hilmer report, and so on, and that is on the public record. As a result of that, the dairy industry was effectively pushed into having to face deregulation. On behalf of not only myself but some of my dairy farmer colleagues I would like to put on the public record my appreciation for the strong leadership of the Minister for Primary Industries.

From talking to some of my colleagues at farm meetings and so on, I know that at one stage or another the message that came through to my colleagues was that the Deputy Premier was trying to go in a direction that was not what has been accepted. Our South Australian primary industries minister was leading the pack and showing strong leadership, especially given that he knew that, if we were not careful, we would end up not only with deregulation but also with no restructure package.

I would also like to place on the public record my appreciation for the previous primary industries minister. I was not all that sure that he was doing the right thing at the time when he effectively partially deregulated the milk industry in South Australia by virtue of the statewide equalisation scheme. South-East farmers received the benefit at the cost of those of us in the Fleurieu Peninsula and the Adelaide Hills. In hindsight, whilst it has kept down the prices at the farmgate for the South Australian dairy farmers as against those of the eastern states, it has pushed us to become more efficient and cost effective, to look more closely at our breeding, production, pasture and the overall management of our farms so that South Australian dairy farmers can generally be as strongly positioned as any dairy farmers in Australia when trying to work through this difficult impost on the dairy industry.

I would also like to place on the public record my appreciation and support for the work of Pat Rowley. I know that I, as well as many dairy farmers, were doubtful of Pat Rowley, who represented us on a national front. Pat Rowley was relentless, and he was ridiculed by a number of people for the way in which he went about trying to achieve the fairest outcome, knowing full well that we would face deregulation. I understand that that even affected his health. I want to put on the public record my sincere and genuine protection for Pat Rowley. Leadership like that gives some of us a chance to grow our farms and it gives others a chance to get out gracefully. As has already been said, this is a complex and exciting industry, and it requires a lot of energy. You are there seven days a week—all day and half the night, quite frankly. The industry still has a great future for South Australia. If we can go forward now as an industry and capitalise on the fact that we have been given a restructure package, we will be able to continue to grow the dairy industry in South Australia.

As I have said, the wine industry is a superb industry. It now exports just over \$1 billion worth of wine product. The Australian dairy industry is exporting just over \$2 billion worth of dairy product. The dairy industry is not doing one thing that the wine industry is doing: we are not fully value adding, and we are not listening to our markets in the same way as the wine industry does. The challenge for the processors—and I will speak about them later—is not just to continue to cut the price to the farmer but to work very hard in the right product mix and to build relationships, whether they be amalgamations, mergers, takeovers, it does not matter. If Australia is to survive in this industry, we will need

to have stronger, more vibrant and more nationally competitive and interrelated companies.

My father's side of the family was involved in milk vending, and I am involved in the dairy industry, along with my wife's family. If my son comes home and works on the family farm, we will see fourth generation opportunities. I am very keen to see and am very concerned about what is happening. As I have said to my young son lately (and I hope that he does come home, take over the farm and continue to grow it because, like many other dairy farmers, we have the capacity to increase our production and double the number of cows we milk), the challenge is not only for us on our farms but for the processors.

What concerns me now is this: on two months ago, the processors decided to put up the cost of 500 millilitres of Take Care iced coffee by 25¢. They have just again put that up by 10¢. They have put up the cost of 500 millilitres of iced coffee by 35¢ in about two months, yet at the same time the dairy farmers have seen a reduction in the opening prices and in the prices we are getting. That rings alarm bells, and a lot of mixed messages are coming out of the processors. At the end of the day, the processors have to remember that they do not have jobs or opportunities to grow if not enough dairy farmers are able to produce the base commodity. When I drive around my own electorate—and I am sure the Hon. Dean Brown would confirm this—I look at the number of dairies that have closed down. Since I was a child, hundreds of dairies have closed down in and around the area.

In place of that, we have bought out our neighbours, so we produce more milk and are milking more cows. However, the fact is that we are doing it with fewer jobs. We all know the pressures on labour units and how we can become more efficient. I want to see an opportunity where the processors are part of a willing partnership. The restructure package and the opportunities are there. The dairy farmers that will stay in the industry are committed either to get rid of debt and get themselves into a more viable position or, indeed, to grow their farms so that we can produce more milk.

On the positive side of processing, in the past couple of years or so, \$20 million worth of brand new money has gone into the takeover of Dairy Vale by Dairy Farmers and the economic commitment to Salisbury of National Foods. So, some serious money has gone into this industry, and improvements are being made with respect to the sciences: best practice, quality assurance, increased production, feeding, breeding and management. The opportunities are there, but I ask the processors during this transition period to consider very carefully the issues surrounding the financial stability of our dairy farmers.

I think it is outrageous that, recently, the processor whom my family supplies notified us that, unless we can double our bulk milk vat capacity now and store enough milk for two days instead of one, we will be charged an impost of daily collection freight charges. What that says to an average dairy farmer such as my family is, 'During the next 12 months, you have to spend \$25 000 to \$60 000 just to increase the capacity of your milk vats or you will cop a \$10 penalty on a daily basis because you have built your infrastructure around a daily pick-up.' That is one example of what has happened with processors.

I am sure that my colleague the member for MacKillop could cite some of the issues that have arisen in the South-East. I do not have quite as much sympathy for some of the farmers in the South-East because they jumped ship. When we, as Dairy Vale suppliers, held back on opportunities to get

better dividends, to buy them out in Mount Gambier, to strengthen the opportunities and give them statewide equalisation, because those farmers thought they could get a few more bucks across the Victorian border, they jumped ship. It will be interesting to hear what the member for MacKillop says in relation to that.

In conclusion, I raise two further points. Whilst I support this package, I am disappointed that those people who have been producing milk with a solid composition of butter fat and protein will be disadvantaged. I am one of those milk producers—again, I declare a conflict—because I am a jersey breeder. However, many friesian breeders have worked hard to increase the butter fat and protein content of their milk, but I believe that, sadly, this payment is based primarily on litres of milk. So, those who have been actually producing water—well, not water—

*Mr Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** That's all right, I don't mind. In my opinion, those who have been producing lower fat and protein content and a higher volume of overall milk will benefit from this measure. Nevertheless, we will work past that. I simply say that this is an opportunity to grow this industry and to go forward. It is important that all the players work together in close partnership to capitalise on an issue over which none of us will have any further control. I support the bill.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** I am a farmer, but I am certainly not a dairy farmer. However, I was brought up on a farm, and, as a young lad, I had the wonderful experience of milking a house cow for many years. There are probably quite a few members of the House who also enjoyed that experience. Most of us who work in other forms of farming pursuits would take off our hat to dairy farming. It is a unique form of farming, because there is absolutely no release from the dairy on seven days a week for most of the year. It is a tie which inhibits family and social life to a great extent.

When I was a young lad, close to my home was an area in the South-East known as Glencoe, which was a rich dairy farming area with many small dairy farms in the 1960s and early 1970s. Many of those dairy farmers went to the wall because of problems within the industry. Over the past 30 years, there have been bigger changes in the dairy industry than in any other rural industry. As a livestock producer of sheep and beef cattle, I look up to the dairy farmers and what they have done in terms of livestock production and pasture production and the good sciences they have applied for many years. The remainder of our agricultural industries could take a leaf out of their book because of the science they have applied to production from their land.

I have reservations about what will happen to this industry in the future. Regulation first came into being because milk was seen as an essential product for the community. It was difficult to produce milk 'out of season'. It is difficult to produce milk out of dry feed in late summer and autumn, apart from some very small areas where—

*Ms Thompson interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Yes. As the member for Reynell points out, cappuccinos do not froth at certain times of the year because of the quality of the milk. It is hard to produce milk, let alone high quality milk, throughout the season, and there is an added cost of doing that. Regulation grew out of the necessity to have available high quality milk, which is a perishable product. Many years ago before the advances in refrigeration which we enjoy today, milk was a very perish-

able product. Regulation ensured that fresh, high quality milk was available to households on a daily basis by stipulating that the farm gate price for market milk was such that the dairy farmers could afford the extra technology and effort to produce that milk out of season.

Unfortunately—and the member for Mawson referred to this—the deregulation push came about as a result of the Hilmer report, etc., but it also emerged from the Victorian dairy industry. Victorian dairy farmers produced 60 per cent of the nation's milk. Obviously, much of that milk was never destined as market or 'white' milk, but it was always going to attract a cheaper price. Victoria has relied much more heavily than South Australia on the manufacturing of milk. The manufacturers to whom the member for Mawson referred have built a huge export market and, as he said, they are exporting about \$2 billion worth of dairy product per year. That is a large export market.

In the early 1970s, when Great Britain joined the European common market, suddenly our market for dairy product (butter and cheese, but principally butter) disappeared almost overnight. That is where the dairy farmers of those days got into trouble. Since then, the dairy industry has been restructured through a lot of hard work by dairy farmers and manufacturers. They have built a large export market and are now exporting their products throughout the world. The success of that export marketing has been achieved through regulation.

I have some serious reservations about what will happen to the dairy industry in the short term without regulation, because dairy farmers will suddenly find that they will be squeezed—and they will be squeezed quite hard. In the interim period, with the payments to dairy farmers either to leave the industry or to restructure their business, I think they will be fine in the short term, but I have some reservations about how healthy the industry will be in the medium to long term.

The member for Mawson mentioned the South-East dairy farmers. I point out to the House that most of those farmers are not in my electorate but in the adjoining electorate of Gordon. There is a small handful of dairy farmers in my electorate in the South-East and many more in the lower Murray lakes around Meningie and the Narrung Peninsula, in particular. The South-East dairy farmers received equalisation payments, even though a lot of dairy farmers close to Adelaide were not happy about that and believed that this money should be in their pockets. However, it created efficiency, because the dairy farmers in the South-East were not loading their milk onto tankers, bringing it to Adelaide and trying to undercut the local dairy producers.

So, I think that this system settled down the whole industry and put it on a footing where it could go forward. Even though some of the local dairy farmers close to Adelaide might think it was unfair, at the end of the day, the net effect on them was probably positive, because it allowed the industry to proceed on a sound and settled footing. This is where I think deregulation could get us into trouble.

I point out at least one other industry where deregulation has not seemed to help either producers or consumers. Within the last week I recall reading an article about Victorian egg producers—and deregulation happened some years ago in the Victorian egg market—which was bemoaning the fact that egg producers were being squeezed very tightly and deregulation had done neither them nor the consumers any good; and one asks where the profit is going—in the middle.

Another point I make relates to the wool industry. We are all aware of what has happened to the wool industry over the past 10 or 11 years and how producers' returns have hit rock bottom—and that is an industry that has never been regulated. I also read recently an article on the wool industry, and I think it is worth noting that only 2.5 per cent of the retail value of wool products is returned to the producer.

I think this is one thing of which dairy farmers need to be well aware as they go into the next period with deregulation; that is, that they will be a very small player, and the return percentage of the total retail dollar to them will become smaller and smaller. I do feel for the dairy industry in South Australia because it has largely been based on market milk, not manufacturing milk. I return to my opening comments, that is, that the dairy industry operates only on the goodwill of those people who work seven days a week and must milk their cows night and morning. Going back to when I was a lad, dairy farmers were making a living out of milking probably 50 or 60 cows. I think it probably needs at least 200 cows for a dairy farmer to make a decent living now. So, even with modern technology, they are still tied up at the dairy for many hours night and morning. I hope that they will gain enough incentive from deregulation to continue doing that and produce the product and the wealth that they do for South Australia. I commend the bill.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Minister for Primary Industries and Resources):** I thank members for their contributions. I think they have summarised pretty well where we have come from. I would also like to thank the industry, the dairy farmers, under the leadership of Frank Beauchamp and Chris Luz-Raymond and Pat Rowley who at a national level has provided terrific leadership. It has been a test for the industry. Over the past five or 10 years, deregulation has been looked at as something which may come around, and it has been held in great fear by the industry.

I commend the leadership of those people who got the industry through a very difficult decision-making period. The decision was always going to be extremely hard for the states. What really made it inevitable (and, unfortunately, some of the states did not pick up quickly enough on this) was the fact that Victoria had 60 to 62 per cent of the production when it signalled that it was heading down the deregulation track. That involved not just the government but the industry in Victoria. It really meant that, unless the rest of the industry in Australia was realistic and faced up to the fact that deregulation was coming because of Victoria, there was a real fear that they might listen to what they wanted to hear rather than what they needed to hear. If deregulation occurred in Victoria, cheap milk would have flooded across the borders into other states, and regulation in the other states would have become meaningless.

Because of what has happened in South Australia over the years (and I give credit to previous governments and previous industry leadership in this respect), we are much better prepared than some of the other states. Some of those states, with their quota and very small herd size, whether one looks at New South Wales, Queensland or, to a certain extent, Western Australia, will find it extremely hard over the next couple of years. There will still be some pain; there is no doubt about that. If we did not get all the states to go together (and this is where Pat Rowley was an enormous help), there would not have been a package.

I certainly thank the federal government and the last three ministers for primary industries at a federal level. This was

really a state issue. The federal government has been criticised by some people about the way in which it has handled the dairy situation. However, fair dinkum, the federal government could have left it to the states. If that had been the case, there would not have been a package and there would have been an absolute mess in the dairy industry and in many communities around Australia. So, despite the criticism coming from some other areas, I commend the federal government because it has been prepared to play a role and bring the states and the industry together to create what is really a package that is absolutely necessary.

I would feel really bad speaking in this House today knowing that, because of Victoria, deregulation was inevitable, if we did not have a package to help the industry through its restructure. That has come about only because of the leadership of Pat Rowley at a national level, the willingness of the federal government to take on a lead role and the fact that we have been able to get all the states across the line.

Some statements have been made about processors and whatever. I, too, would appeal to processors to be very careful about how the industry is treated over the next couple of years, particularly the first six months or so. There is no doubt that the processors realise that they need the absolute maximum amount of milk and that, without dairy farmers, they will not get that maximum amount of milk. There is also no doubt that dairy has an enormous future.

The way in which the dairy industry looks into the future will be a little different from the way in which it has done so in the past. The future is largely in export and in larger herd sizes. Certainly, our industry in this state has done an enormous job with productivity, feeding, breeding and the whole lot, and that has been a great credit to them, and it puts them into a good position. Obviously, deregulation will be hard, but considering what has happened with National Dairies at Salisbury and several other moves which could happen in the near future with the dairy industry, I think that South Australian dairy farmers, although they have a hard period in the short to perhaps medium to long term, have a terrific future.

I thank members for their contributions and for the fact that everyone in South Australia has been realistic about what impact deregulation in Victoria would have had on the industry and a lot of communities in South Australia without deregulation in South Australia. The debate in South Australia has been a very mature one, and that has largely come about because of the leadership within the industry. I thank all members for their contributions.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

**Ms HURLEY:** I understand that no payments will be made until five months after the bill is agreed to. I understand that the original time was March. When will payments to farmers start coming through in South Australia?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** It is largely up to industry and the federal government, but my belief is that it is about September. It is something which will now be centrally administered. The industry has been to the Commonwealth Bank for the financing of the package. There will be a period during which the farmers will need to put forward all their details for the restructuring package. It is a big job to do that. My belief is that September will be the first time that they will see payments being made.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

**Ms HURLEY:** The member for Mawson referred to the fact that the minister had been a leader, I think he said, in fighting for the compensation package. I understand that the original amount proposed was \$1.25 billion. There was a meeting of ministers at which an extra amount was added to that, which was sorely needed by the industry. Can the minister advise whether he supported that extra package and the arguments he used in support of that?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** The change in the size of the package was not really made at ministerial council. The major arguments at ministerial council were that we always faced a very tight time line with this, and one of the problems was that, with the change of government in Victoria, the minister decided that he should go back and hold a referendum of the industry. That was a while in happening. It was not until several months after the election that the results of that came through, about Christmas time last year, and that showed that, of the approximately 80 per cent that voted, some 80 per cent were in favour of deregulation.

The issue of the size of the package was an issue negotiated directly between the industry and the federal government. They dealt with tax treatment and the length of the package. Negotiations were held between Pat Rowley (representing the industry) and the federal minister and the federal department as to the size of the package and the way it was to be administered. The actual administration of the package is not something in which the states were intimately involved.

There was some talk at the meeting in December about a change in the package, when there were varying arguments from different states with respect to adding amounts to go direct to communities. It was considered at that time that it may put the bill at risk, but there was actually a move in the Senate to add a small amount to the size with respect to communities. The argument at ministerial council has been getting across the line the agreement that all states would deregulate at the same time and not put the actual package itself at risk.

**Ms HURLEY:** In light of that, did the minister support the extra amount of money that was added to the package and did he make representations along those lines, as the member for Mawson seemed to indicate?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** There is some misunderstanding here. Certainly the size of the package was only an issue as to whether or not there should be a separate package for communities affected by the dairy industry. There was a strong feeling around the table that, as the package itself was going to dairy farmers who were within those communities, to differentiate dairy, wool and wheat communities or all the other rural communities, whether for drought, wool prices or whatever, was somewhat discriminatory. That would be left to the federal parliament to work that out. There was a feeling around the table that to try to renegotiate the package when time was running so short would only put the whole thing at risk. At the end of the day, commonsense prevailed, and it was decided to leave that to the federal parliament as to whether they wished to do anything above and beyond.

The real problem at that stage was that we had terrible trouble in getting all states to commit to the fact that they would deregulate. For instance, if Western Australia felt they had a freight buffer that would protect them from Victoria—although the sums did not show that—and decided not to deregulate, this whole package would have fallen over, and that would have put the entire dairy industry, and the communities reliant on that industry, at risk. That was the



area of negotiation. South Australia, with respect to a leadership role, was to try to hold the states together and make sure the package got up and not allow the whole thing to fall over, because there were states that could not be locked in.

**Mr LEWIS:** It is not my wish to delay the House at all. However, we are here to ensure that we understand the meaning of the legislation and, in particular, the effects of it on the people that it is designed to in some way or other address. In this case, it is the authorised price equalisation scheme which dairy farmers used to enjoy or thought they were enjoying. Notwithstanding the belief long held and widely held by dairy farmers in South Australia in general and in my electorate in particular that they were better off, it was always my belief that they were in some considerable measure living in a fool's paradise.

The price equalisation scheme was authorised by law, and, for my dairy farmers, it meant that some \$6 000 to \$7 000 a year on average would be taken straight out of their bank accounts, put into a lump sum and then redistributed to the dairy farmers in the main in the South-East or elsewhere in South Australia, many of whom were small dairy farmers, some located in the Mid-North, some on the Fleurieu Peninsula, and others in other parts of the state. It meant then that we were subsidising the South-East producers, where their milk went largely for processing in the last decade or so.

It meant that, in consequence, the processor in the South-East, Kraft in particular, was able to force down the price that it paid to those dairy farmers for processing milk. In consequence of doing so, having cheap raw material to work with, Kraft, an overseas-owned company, was able to produce cheese and sell it in competition with the dairy farmers in my electorate who were delivering milk some of the year to the Jervois cheese factory and gave Kraft, an overseas-owned company, an edge over the cooperatively-owned United Dairies factory at Jervois.

There has been rationalisation in the capitalisation of the processing part of the industry, and we have seen that through this chamber where it has been necessary to amend legislation to a point where now we go into a deregulated market. My lament is that the people I have represented have been hoodwinked all these years, and that money which they should have been able to accumulate in their bank accounts to enable them to withstand the onslaught they will now most certainly suffer is not in their accounts. It has been spent in propping up inefficient operations elsewhere and, more particularly, subsidising their natural competitor in the past, and that in some measure was unfortunate if not foolish.

I wanted to draw attention to the consequence of the deletion of these two things. I am not opposing the legislation. I am simply pointing out what is happening. We are knocking out authorised price equalisation schemes and farm gate prices from this day forward because we believe—and I believe—that, in Australia's overall interest, that will be a good thing. But for the people I represent, it will not be, not in the short run. For the people who represent dairy farmers with small herds, they now must face reality, when they should have been encouraged to do so years ago.

I remember the debates in this place when I was on the other side. No-one extended me the courtesy of allowing the same rights as were allowed the former member for MacKillop and the member for Mount Gambier, now known as the seat of Gordon, to vote against measures such as the removal of the potato board and in favour of measures which retained socialised marketing in the dairy industry on the

other side of the argument. Now I am saying that everybody who has lived in a fool's paradise with blinkers on for a long time will have to face reality.

The Murray Goulburn dairy farmers have by far the biggest quantity of milk. They will sell it at processing prices because they can afford to do so, and they are in a much stronger position capital wise per dairy cow they own than are the dairy farmers in my electorate or in other parts of the state. Frankly, the dairy farmers in my part of the state will suffer less than the dairy farmers elsewhere, in the main. The member for MacKillop's dairy farmers, at the northern end of his electorate on the Narrung Peninsula, are part of that group who will suffer less. But suffer they will. The suffering will come in consequence of the forced reduction in prices they receive at the farm gate per litre. There will be reductions, and they will continue, because they are not strong sellers; there is a plethora of producers and sellers and a few buyers. The means of getting their milk from the farm to the processing factory is no longer within their control, so they will have to pay whatever it takes to do that. There have been some arrangements in place in the past where the competition commission has warned the processors and the carriers that they could not go on doing what they were doing. They were pretending to take milk from, for instance, somewhere remote in the Narrung Peninsula or in the South-East to a factory somewhere in the Adelaide Hills; but, in fact, they were not. They were taking the milk to a factory near them, billing for the total freight and not carrying it, because an equal quantity of milk from somewhere else was going to the factory to which that milk would otherwise have gone: they were swapping it over. But they did not reduce the amount of money they received for the amount of freight that would have been involved if they had done it in reality instead of virtually.

To my mind, milk is not homogeneous; that is the other point. Now, coloured milk (that is, flavoured milk), skimmed milk and things such as that will be sold at higher prices but the price which dairy farmers receive at the farm gate will be lower and the competition for the market in South Australia will not come from producers in the regions of South Australia but will come from dairy farmers producing from across the border. And, more particularly, what we have done by retaining this so-called structured arrangement protecting dairy farmers through the marketing system that has existed up to date is allow the soy bean producers and their product to come in more strongly and take a bigger slice of the market more rapidly. Whether that is for better or for worse is beside the point: the dairy farmers need to understand that. I am not telling them to suck eggs. I am just telling them that I understand it and I sympathise with them but there is nought that I can do. They did not support what I was trying to get across on their behalf in earlier times.

So, now we have authorised price equalisation schemes in clause 3 and farm gate prices committed to the history books, and open competition becoming the order of the day, with the consumption of milk overall likely to fall unless dairy farmers are willing to take from their even smaller returns per litre some money to promote their product to the public where it has to compete with products from things such as soy bean.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

**Ms HURLEY:** I realise that this matter may not be strictly related to this clause, but can the Deputy Premier say what will be the impact of deregulation on the state and which

areas and, therefore, which farmers will be particularly badly affected by the new system of deregulation?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** That is one matter on which we have done a reasonable amount of work. Unfortunately, it is all hypothetical, because we are not too sure of the prices that the processors will be paying in the various areas. One thing that we do know with a lot of certainty is that, without the package, the situation would have been a lot worse than it is with the package, because it does give some breathing space. I think that the best guess as to what may well happen is that probably the farther the farmers are from processing and from competition the worse off they will be. A lot of modelling has been undertaken. The figures in the modelling around Australia do not necessarily agree, because it comes back so much to the assumptions that are made along the line, what prices are paid and what happens in the short term versus the long term.

The figure of \$30 000 per dairy farm has been thrown around. I have spoken to some industry people who feel that the impact in areas, for example, close to Adelaide, close to the market milk sector, will not be impacted as badly as others. So, one would have to say that a best guess scenario would be that, in the short term, the package aside, there would not be winners. I think that would be reasonably obvious, and that is one of the reasons for the package. Probably the areas farthest from the market milk sector and farthest from competition between processors would be seen as the most vulnerable. But, at the end of the day, the processors are in a position where they do see a lot of their future in export and they do need milk. So, it is well and truly in their interests to make sure that the dairy farmers survive and prosper and grow their herd sizes, and that needs to be factored back into some of the modelling that has occurred. But the best guess would be that \$28 000 to \$30 000 that was mentioned.

It is hard to argue in this regard, but it will be worse in some areas, and that needs to be worked out. For instance, the South-East in South Australia will probably see fewer returns but there are bigger dairies in that area, in many cases, so that counts, to some extent. I think that, overall, even though it is a short-term to medium-term package, that will allay some of the problems but not all of them. There is no doubt that the ones that will miss out are those farthest away, and one would also assume that smaller dairies would suffer a lot more than large dairies.

**Ms HURLEY:** What guarantees will there be for the food safety programs, and how will they work after deregulation of the industry?

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** There will probably be no difference. One of the issues involved here is that, because of the package and because of what Victoria was doing, we have brought forward all the price aspects of the review of the act and we are dealing with them here, whereas some of the other reviews of the act are yet to be completed. So, there are some other issues to consider.

As far as food safety is concerned, we need to look at what the long-term role of the dairy authority will be. We need to look at the impact that the new food safety laws will have. So, potentially, there will be some changes. At the moment there are no changes but one must keep in mind the role of the dairy authority and the impact of food safety laws (both state and federal) in the future, and whether or not milk is rolled in with meat and seafood. The direction that we take with food safety in the future will have an impact on the way in which food safety affects dairy. However, a lot of decisions

still have to be made, and much of that revolves around the food safety laws, which obviously will attract a lot of attention over the next 18 months to two years throughout Australia.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **ROAD TRAFFIC (RED LIGHT CAMERA OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 May. Page 1108.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** The government tells us that in 1998 eight people were killed and 178 injured in 7 476 vehicle accidents at signalised intersections in South Australia. It also tells us that it plans to buy 12 new red light cameras to be installed at 25 new sites at a cost to consolidated revenue of \$1.5 million.

**Mr Lewis:** We will have that back in no time.

**Mr ATKINSON:** Yes, I am coming to that. I can help the honourable member with that. These cameras will be in addition to the eight cameras now used at 13 sites. In answer to a question asked of her, the Minister for Transport said:

This \$1.5 million could be recovered in expiation fee revenue in just six months.

Although the minister says that she hopes that making speed camera offences punishable by demerit points, and thus ultimately licence suspension would result in fewer motorists offending, she says that these 12 new red light cameras would result in 20 000 more expiation notices annually and almost \$4 million in fees in a full year. According to the minister, the worst intersection in metropolitan Adelaide for crashes resulting in injuries is that of North-East and Reservoir Roads at Modbury. I notice that among 25 new sites proposed by the minister are the intersection of Jeffcott Street and Barton Terrace, North Adelaide; South and Torrens Roads at Renown Park; and, South Road and Manton Street at Hindmarsh.

The minister cites a SAPOL study of speeding entitled 'Demographic and offence profile of speeding in South Australia' to argue that repeat offending decreases when demerit points are attached to speeding offences. It is noteworthy here that the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin) dismisses tougher sentences as having any effect on reducing crime. It seems that speeding and running red lights are exceptions.

The bill before us allows the government to impose demerit points on motorists caught by red light cameras. This brings us in line with the other five states in the federation and fulfils our obligation under the light vehicles agreement 1992, to which all Australian states and territories are signatories. National competition policy may have compelled us to pass this law on pain of losing payments under the policy.

A second aspect of the bill is its way of dealing with companies that are registered owners of vehicles when these companies do not disclose the identity of the driver snapped by the red light camera. As things stand, companies receiving an expiation fee of approximately \$200 for one of its vehicles running a red light will cheerfully pay the expiation fee and not disclose the driver's identity. The bill will not allow companies to expiate because the police traffic infringement

notices section will now be going in search of the driver to impose demerit points on him or her.

The bill doubles to \$2 500 the maximum penalty for a company car running a red light; that is double the penalty for individuals. The incentive to do in a company driver will now be much stronger. Companies will continue to be asked by the police traffic infringement notices section to nominate the driver, but the consequences for the company of failing to do so are now severe because expiation will no longer be an option. If the company fails to nominate the driver and does not convince the police that it had made diligent attempts to find the driver, it will be prosecuted for the offence. Four states have equivalent provisions.

If the driver is identified, he or she will be sent the expiation notice and receive the demerit points upon expiation or conviction. The minister says that she will try to bring these new provisions to the attention of the public and encourage companies to use log books in their vehicles so that drivers of company cars can be identified by the company. Nevertheless, for some small businesses prosecutions under these provisions could be a crippling blow.

It weighs heavily with the opposition that the Royal Automobile Association supports the bill. However, the opposition will support the second reading.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** In principle, I support this bill. I note and congratulate the opposition for its support for it. The minister's aim in introducing this bill has been to deliver safer roads, to save lives and to reduce injury. There can be no doubt that driving through red lights is a principal cause of major accidents, and that is something that we need to come down on quite heavily. For that reason, I agree in principle with the proposition that demerit points should be introduced in this instance for red light camera offences. However, I reserve judgment on the issue of demerit points in respect of speed camera offences.

I hope that this bill is not a precursor to an effort to introduce such demerit points for standard speed camera offences. In my view, the nature of the speeding offence by comparison with a red light camera offence is quite different, warranting separate consideration and treatment by government. I signal to the House my opposition to demerit points for speed camera offences should that arise in the future.

I also signal to the House my concern in regard to the level of fine provided for in the bill, namely, \$2 500 in the case of a corporate entity and \$1 250 in respect of an individual. I will certainly be asking questions of the minister in committee in respect of those fine levels.

I note that, during the minister's second reading explanation, all other states in Australia have a lower fine level than that proposed in the bill before the House today. In most cases other states have selected a fine level well below that provided for in this bill. I will certainly be seeking further elaboration on why we have gone for such a heavy penalty. I speak not only as a small business person but also on behalf of the many small business people in my constituency by indicating to the House that there are very real problems for small business in fine levels of up to \$2 500 in cases where a corporate entity cannot identify the name of a driver.

A good number of corporate entities may include small business people, farmers, people who run a small shop, a hairdressing salon, or a self-employed plumber who employs, perhaps, a couple of apprentices. It may not always be possible to know exactly who is driving the vehicle at any particular time. I can envisage circumstances where, six weeks after the

event, an owner of a small business finds an expiation notice turning up in the mail demanding \$2 500 payment, and the owner of this small corporate entity scratching his head trying to remember who on earth six weeks ago was the particular one of his staff who drove the vehicle. I can envisage their all either forgetting or obstructing any effort to identify who the driver was and all of a sudden the owner of this very small business is up for \$2 500, being unable to identify the driver of the vehicle at the time. The easy answer is to make sure that the small business proprietor finds out who is in the vehicle 24 hours a day, seven days a week, but that is not an easy process. It would be seen as just another impost on small business. Can you imagine a farmer at shearing time with a stack of people on the property working their hearts out, any one of whom may have occasion to jump in the ute and go into town on an authorised task? And, six weeks later the farmer gets a bill for \$2 500 and cannot work out for the life of him who on earth had the ute in town on that occasion.

The reality is that there are some difficulties with this. I appreciate the bill's intent, which is to ensure that companies come clean and nominate the driver who has offended. I completely agree about the gravity of the offence and the need for a fine to be registered. We should look at the level of fine in other states: Victoria imposes \$600 for a failure by a company to nominate the driver; in New South Wales it is \$1 100 for a failure of a company to nominate and \$550 for an individual; in Queensland it is \$130 or \$180, depending on the speed; and in Western Australia there is no specified limit. It goes on. I think that fine levels of \$2 500 and \$1 250 respectively may be perceived out there as being a little bit harsh. During committee I will ask the minister to provide further explanation and clarification as to why we have opted for such an extreme fine level.

In conclusion, I support what we are trying to achieve here in the bill. Red light camera offences have to be contained and punished heavily, but there is a call from our constituents for a reasonable level of penalty. That is where I will be focusing during committee. In principle I support the bill, but let us see how things travel during committee.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I, too, wish to support the bill. I note from the statistics that the member for Spence has outlined to the House how serious it can be when crashes occur at traffic intersections. As a member of the Road Transport Safety Committee who has served for a number of months now and looked at the problems of road traumas and eligibility for licences and so on, I know that road crashes at traffic intersections is a serious issue. It is not the same issue as speed cameras in general. Intersections are a special case, and I commend the minister for bringing this bill to the House. Demerit points are important in this case, because we know of the possible consequences when these crashes occur. However, I do concur in what other members have said on the level of penalties with regard to this offence. I look forward to the discussions in committee to see whether appropriate levels of fines can be agreed upon. No doubt it is a serious offence, and this bill is certainly going in the right direction.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** The key ingredient of this Road Traffic (Red Light Camera Offences) Amendment Bill is to introduce demerit points for licensed drivers, in particular, three demerit points. This is something that has been considered for some time and I believe it has operated interstate for some time, but just because it operates interstate does not mean that South Australia must follow suit. I have

given it a lot of consideration. I am one who has difficulties with demerit points, simply because I am travelling nearer 50 000 kilometres per year compared with the average road user, who is probably travelling between 10 000 and 15 000 kilometres per year. Therefore, I have up to a five times greater chance of being caught for any infringement of the road rules. I would suggest that virtually every driver infringes the road rules, whether it be crossing onto the solid white line at traffic lights (I have seen police cars do that, and I have felt like getting out and saying to the police officer, 'Excuse me; you have just committed an offence'), whether it is crossing a lane with insufficient warning, in the modern day whether it is exiting from the kerb without indicating for five seconds before moving off, or whether it is travelling at 61 km/h in a 60 km/h zone or any other similar offence.

However, I guess that we in the country are being penalised more with demerit points for speeding than are people in the city, because people in the city are generally caught by speed cameras. Offending drivers detected by speed cameras on the roads do not attract demerit points. In most cases in the country people are caught by one or more police officers with a hand held radar gun or one that is mounted in the police car. They will physically stop you and write you a ticket and as a result of that you will lose a minimum of 3 demerit points. Therefore, I have had to give a lot of consideration whether I agree with three demerit points being lost for infringement of a red light by a motor vehicle. I have decided that I am in support of the loss of three demerit points, because I have read about too many examples of drivers going through red lights where they have caused an accident; in many cases they have caused serious injury and from time to time deaths.

As a person who frequents the city more than I would like to, because I am a member of parliament, I have seen people going through red lights and I must admit it has made me a much warier driver. In fact, I am thankful that recently I did not take the opportunity to be first off the red lights simply because a truck was obstructing my view from the right. I do not know what made me hesitate, because the light had certainly gone green. I waited and if I had gone I would have been hit fair and square by a car coming through on the red light on my right. That might have resulted in a by-election for the seat of Goyder, but there will be no by-election; I can assure you of that, Mr Speaker. Thank the lord, I am still here. I have no problem with the three demerit points being introduced in this legislation. I hope that it will be a significant deterrent to those people who cannot help trying to save time by speeding through a red light. There is no excuse for it at all. If one person disobeys a red light it makes a mockery of traffic lights and we may as well not have them; we may as well have a police officer at each intersection. We could never afford to do that; that is why traffic lights have come in. I am very clear on that point.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

**Mr MEIER:** Before the dinner break, I was saying that I support parts of this measure. I was agreeing with the proposition before us that three demerit points be recorded against people who transgress at a red light. As I said, accidents can happen, and people who run red lights are flouting the law in a way that has the potential to create either a serious injury to or the death of a person. Therefore, within reason, anything this Parliament can do to prevent that should be supported.

I will now deal with the second part of the bill, namely, the provision for a fine of \$2 500 if someone from a body corporate runs a red light, and a fine of \$1 250 for an individual who does so. That individual will not only receive three demerit points but will also be fined \$1 250. Many of the people who run red lights could be unemployed. Mr Speaker, you should be able to weigh up the consequences of a fine of \$1 250 on an unemployed person. It will send that person straight to gaol: there would be no other option. They would not have the capacity to pay \$1 250. It will simply make them a potential criminal because, once in gaol, they will associate with the criminal element. If anyone thinks that we can overcome the problem of running a red light by imposing a huge fine, they are wrong. In all conscience, I cannot support a fine of \$1 250 for an individual who runs a red light.

The current fine for running a red light is \$199, and the offence does not attract demerit points. That brings me back to what I was discussing earlier, namely, that in the first instance this bill seeks to introduce the penalty of three demerit points for anyone running a red light. That I can accept. Likewise, I could accept this bill if it concurred with the present fine of \$199. I could even accept this bill if the fine were increased, say, from \$199 to \$250, and maybe, in an extreme case, I could accept a fine of up to \$300. Under the present system of imposing fines, a person who exceeds the speed limit by less than 15 km/h is fined \$119; by between 15 and 30 km/h, \$189 (which is very close to the \$199 referred to earlier); and by 30 km/h or more, \$300. That is why I could be prepared to accept a fine of up to \$300, which is the maximum fine for exceeding the speed limit. Of course, beyond that, the offence becomes one of dangerous driving. Such a charge is heard by the courts, and much higher penalties can be imposed.

I do not believe that the offence of running a red light should be put in the same category as that involving a person who exceeds the speed limit by more than 30 km/h. In the case of a person driving on the highway, where the speed limit is 110 km/h, it would equate to driving at a speed of over 150 km/h—and I think that is probably a little too fast! However, here we imposing a fine of not \$300 but \$1 250 for an individual and a fine of \$2 500 for a body corporate. In other words, the people who are running delivery vans could be liable to a fine of \$2 500. I assume that in many cases taxicab drivers will be liable to such a fine and that people who drive cars for a company—and they could be pool cars—will also be liable to a fine of \$2 500.

In the past 12 months, I have spoken with a lot of businesses about an issue that has caused much angst in the community, namely, the emergency services levy. Many small businesses were very upset about increases of between \$100 and \$500.

**Mr Atkinson:** By your government!

**Mr MEIER:** Yes, and thankfully today announcements were made about changes to that levy. So, many of those small businesses that were to be up for increases of \$100 to \$500 will find that the levy has been reduced by an enormous amount. I know that any small business hit by a fine of \$2 500 will go completely berserk, and I do not blame them for one minute. The running of a red light can occur in more ways than one. I highlighted the fact that recently I was nearly collected by a vehicle going through a red light. I am very thankful that I was patient at that time. Examples have come forward where people have entered the intersection on a red light when it was completely safe—I say again,

completely safe—to turn right or left, although technically they went against a red light. What will happen to them? If they are part of a body corporate, they will be fined \$2 500. If they are an ordinary individual like you and me, they will be fined \$1 250. It is a complete travesty of justice, and it is something I cannot support, no matter how I seek to interpret this law. No matter how much I might be able to argue that we need to impose a very strict regime to stop people running red lights, I will not support a fine of \$2 500 for running a red light. I would hope that other members of this parliament will not support it either.

As I said earlier, I have no problems with the awarding of three demerit points; in fact, I think that will be a significant deterrent. Anyone who has a habit of planting their foot on the accelerator, saying, 'I can make up a few minutes' will find out quick smart that they will lose their licence before they realise it. Members here would appreciate that, if you accumulate 12 demerit points, you lose your licence. So, you only need to commit four offences before you are ineligible to drive.

I return to the current system of fines that applies to speeding. As a parliament, we need to work through this and come up with a reasonable and fair fine for running a red light—one which will not send people to gaol because they cannot afford to pay \$1 250. Unemployed people come to me because they cannot afford to pay a \$50 fine. They say, 'Mr Meier, where can I find \$50? I don't have that money after living for a fortnight on my unemployment benefits.' So, those people will certainly not be able to find \$1 250, and the judge, who may have excused them in the first instance, will be left with only one choice of having to send them to gaol. In the long term, they will become hardened criminals, which is the last thing we want to happen in our society.

I therefore suggest to this parliament that, in the first instance, we should accept the current monetary penalty of \$199. That is my preferred option. I believe it is a significant deterrent. I advance that argument because, at present, the minimum fine for exceeding the speed limit by the minimum amount (up to 15 km/h) is \$119. The next fine for exceeding the speed limit by between 15 and 30 km/h is \$189. So, \$199 is \$10 more than for the second offence. I think that is fair. As I said earlier, the penalty for exceeding the speed limit by more than 30 km/h is \$300. So, whilst my preferred position is \$199, which is \$10 more than for the second offence for speeding, I might be persuaded, if the arguments are strong enough, to accept a fine of up to \$300, although, as I have said three times now, my preferred position is the current penalty of \$199, because not only would it be the current penalty but also there would be three demerit points.

**Mr Atkinson:** For businesses?

**Mr MEIER:** No, that is for anyone. I don't see any need to differentiate between—

**Mr Atkinson:** The current expiation fee is \$199.

**Mr MEIER:** Correct. As the honourable member points out, the current expiation fee for businesses and anyone else is \$199. I think that is a fair deterrent.

**Mr Atkinson:** That's a fair cop.

**Mr MEIER:** I would say it's a very fair cop. The shadow minister for the opposition actually supports the bill as it is, so he supports a fine of \$2 500. I find that, in itself, to be incredible. The opposition will have to answer for itself; I will not enter into that debate. I firmly believe that this parliament must go away and think about this fine. I do not think we can impose a fine of \$2 500 for bodies corporate, and I do not believe we can impose a fine of \$1 250—

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Where does the bill say 'maximum'? Point out to me where it says 'maximum' and I will be happy to acknowledge that. However, the bill does not say that. There is a simple and straightforward fine of \$1 250. Remember, this will involve an expiation notice. It will not be a matter of, 'Dear So and So, Please feel free to pay up to \$1 250. However, we will be happy to accept \$50.' Let us be realistic: that will not occur.

I clearly heard that the opposition supports the three demerit points. I thank members opposite and compliment them on supporting that. I hope that they will also take this opportunity to reflect on this matter a little more. I am sure that they would understand that many battlers who are working in relatively low paid positions would find it an enormous penalty to have to pay \$1 250 for running a red light, particularly if they entered an intersection in a safe manner when there was no traffic around and said, 'The last car went through—I can get through without endangering anyone.' I think that would be a legitimate case. It could be argued in court, but the cost of a lawyer would probably be about \$500, so that would be a waste of time.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** I personally am in favour of the concept of mandatory sentencing, but I will not be drawn on that. I have enormous problems with this particular case. I think this parliament should rest on this matter and that both sides of parliament should consider it further. I suggest that a much more equitable and appropriate penalty is the current \$199, because three demerit points will also be imposed, and that has not been done before.

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** In addressing this bill, I want to raise some issues relating to how the operation of red light cameras fits into the whole approach to safety at intersections in this state. Several members have said that in another place the minister announced 25 proposed sites for red light cameras. One of those sites is the corner of Wheatsheaf Road and South Road which is immediately outside my office.

For some time, I have been aware of the frequency of crashes at that corner. Constituents have drawn to my attention that, in their view, the frequency of crashes has increased following changes to the traffic light sequence two years ago. So, I put some questions on notice to the minister in order to ascertain the situation regarding this corner. The answers to the questions indicate that the corner of South, Flaxmill and Wheatsheaf Roads is indeed dangerous. In the past five years, of all the corners in the vicinity, this corner has had by far the most crashes and, more importantly and more disturbingly, by far the most injuries.

In the past five years or so for which the figures are available, there have been 64 injuries at this corner. At the immediately adjacent corner of South, Beach and Doctors Roads there have been 20 injuries, and at the northern adjacent corner of South, O'Sullivan Beach and Bains Roads there have been 31 injuries. I have been trying to discover just what has been happening at the corner of Flaxmill, Wheatsheaf and South Roads that should cause this difference in the injury rate.

When I read the minister's announcement I hoped there might be an indication of where a red light camera would be placed to best prevent some of these horrific injuries. However, I was disturbed to discover after two weeks of inquiries that the department, the minister or someone else

had not yet decided where the camera would be placed, or, indeed, whether a camera would be placed at that intersection; that there is a list of 25 proposed sites but that we have not been informed which of those sites are the most effective for positioning a red light camera. I am a little disturbed that this research was not done before the minister's announcement.

I am also interested in how other aspects of intersection engineering can be used to prevent crashes. Whilst talking to people about why this corner is worse than its neighbours, I have received answers such as: the turn right arrow does not go for long enough; there are three lanes that move into two lanes a little farther along the road; and the turn left lane is a problem. However, each of these factors is present at the two neighbouring corners, but the corner of Flaxmill and Wheatshaf Roads has particular problems.

I am currently engaged in consultation with the local emergency services and residents in the nearby area to see whether I can obtain some information about what it is about this corner that is causing this increased number of crashes and, more importantly, injuries. So far, the suggestions have been quite varied. One suggestion is that because of the slight incline at this corner there are problems with speed and sunglare, at both morning and night. The sequence of the lights is most frequently criticised. Local residents seem to believe that it would be safer if the turn right arrow was there all the time and one suggestion was that, instead of just disappearing, there could be some flashing arrow so that people could turn right with caution or that there should be a red arrow, but going from a green turn right arrow to a simple green proceed light does not give a clear enough indication of what the intentions are. Of course, many people raised the issue of idiots on the roads—and we all know that there are idiots on the road—but I do not know why they congregate at that corner rather than at the adjoining corners.

I will continue to consult with my community about what it considers to be the measures appropriate to fixing this corner and making it more safe. Interestingly, only one person has suggested that a red light camera might do any good at all; otherwise, it is very definitely the road engineering suggestions as well as some behaviour modification that arise. What I am interested in is the extent to which the examination of red light cameras and their positioning incorporates an examination of other road safety features at those intersections and whether we rush very quickly to the idea that red light cameras will solve the problems when a lot more thinking is required in terms of appropriate design of intersections, taking into account all the particular variables at various intersections.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I will make a brief contribution.

*Mr Atkinson interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** It must be getting close to 5AA time. I must take some responsibility for this measure—the principle of it, not necessarily the detail—because I have lobbied the minister for many years. In Adelaide red lights are an option for motorists, somewhat similar to the use of indicators which show where people have been rather than where they are usually going. I accept the \$199 (which sounds similar to a Harris Scarfe special), plus three demerit points: I think that sounds reasonable. The penalties where someone chooses not to expiate seems excessive and I will be interested to hear what the minister has to say to justify what seems to be a pretty harsh penalty. It is not uncommon

to be in a situation where literally you are the meat in a sandwich; that is, you are trapped in a car with someone close behind, someone in front and you make that judgment about whether to stop or go. I can see a situation where, unless a police officer is present to contradict the camera, which is pretty unlikely, as my colleague the member for Waite said the camera will be very unforgiving.

It is a serious issue. There are a lot of serious injuries and deaths as a result of people running red lights and I have no sympathy for people who deliberately seek to run a red light, but given that there are circumstances where, as I say, you can be literally the meat in the sandwich, the car in the middle, I think we have to be cautious in terms of setting these very severe penalties where a matter is not expiated. I know what will happen: people will take the expiation. They are more or less forced to be guilty and I do not believe that that is a good way to operate the legal system. It is similar to poor people before the court: they plead guilty because they cannot afford to defend themselves properly.

With those brief remarks, I indicate strong support in principle for dealing with people who run red lights, but I await with interest to hear from the minister the justification for what seems to be pretty draconian penalties at the top end for people who do not expiate this particular offence.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** I thank members for their contribution to this debate. All members have highlighted the point that this is a very significant road safety issue. There is probably no road safety issue in the metropolitan area which is more important than that of those drivers who try to run red lights. We regularly hear of serious accidents (injuries and deaths) in the metropolitan area and it would appear that incorrect driving through the lights plays a significant part.

A number of members have questioned the level of the fine. I think it needs some clarification, so I will do that. The maximum fine for a corporation—and a corporation would be a case which went to court—would be \$2 500. The maximum fine for an individual would be \$1 250. However, there is an expiation fine of \$199. Therefore, if a person had run a red light and been caught by the camera and, having done so, received an appropriate notice and they accepted the fact that they were guilty, then they would pay an expiation fine of \$199 and lose three demerit points and that would be it. However, if the person wished to challenge that, and for whatever reason decided that they would not pay the expiation fine and would allow the matter to proceed to court, then they are likely to face a potential maximum fine of \$1 250.

First, I stress the point, because one speaker picked it up, that it is a maximum fine (it is not necessarily the actual fine) if the matter goes to court. The same applies in relation to the \$2 500: it is a maximum fine for a corporation, not the actual fine. It would be up to the court to decide the level of fine up to that maximum. I guess, if a company car (or vehicle) is caught going through a red light, clearly there is an obligation on the company to try to identify who the driver of that vehicle was at the time. There is now an added incentive to that—and this is what the Minister for Transport would point out to this House if she could do so. There is now a clear incentive for the company to identify who the individual is and require the individual to acknowledge the mistake that they made, pay the \$199 expiation fine and lose the three demerit points. That will be a much cheaper option for the company and for the individual than if the matter goes to

court and the company ends up paying a fine imposed by the court of up to \$2 500.

Members of parliament have to understand why this has been structured in such a way that puts the obligation on the company from its own records to provide the information. Most companies would have a fair idea of who is driving which vehicle at which time of the day and in which general vicinity and, even if they did not know the vicinity in which the vehicle is being driven, they would normally know who is driving that vehicle on that day at that time. That may not always be the case and, in some ways, there is an incentive for companies to put in place appropriate books or logs so that that can be recorded fairly easily. The company can therefore protect itself and put the onus and obligation back onto the individuals if they are running red lights.

The important thing for this parliament to understand is that running a red light is a very serious offence indeed; and, if you run a red light, not only are you breaking the law, which is really the lesser part of it, but more importantly you are putting other lives at risk of either injury or death. It is a very serious offence indeed. When you look at the way some individuals have operated in the past—and I have seen it happen at traffic lights increasingly—you see a tendency for drivers simply to be willing to drive through a red light with little or no regard for the risk at which they might be putting other people. Other issues may arise during the committee stage. I will leave the matter at this stage and see what amendments may be moved.

I want to thank all members for their contributions. However, I want them to understand the basis on which the fine will be imposed, because I think there was some misunderstanding about that. I thank members for their general support of this measure through the House.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

#### **MOTOR VEHICLES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC TRUSTEE AND TRUSTEE COMPANIES—GST) BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### **POLICE (COMPLAINTS AND DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 3 May. Page 1043.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** The opposition has studied the bill most carefully in its slow progress through the parliament. The bill is prompted by Mrs Iris Stevens' 1998 review of the Police Complaints Authority. In the final analysis, the changes proposed are modest and have been the subject of thorough consultation. I shall not attempt to reproduce or summarise the minister's report to the House.

The aim of the Parliamentary Labor Party is to ensure that the Police Complaints Authority procedure is just, both for

the complainants and for the police officers. South Australians avail themselves of this procedure much more than citizens elsewhere in the English speaking world, so they must have some confidence in the procedure. In this area, one must come to terms with the inevitability that many of the complaints are utterly vexatious. Any member of the House who has day-to-day contact with his or her electorate will understand this. About 12 per cent of complaints are ultimately upheld.

Although the opposition has tried to avoid this debate's becoming one in which the government and the opposition compete for the support of pressure groups, I found some of the remarks of the Attorney-General most offensive. For instance, in response to one modest amendment, he said, 'The short answer is that it gives 24 hours within which to concoct a response.' Elsewhere in the public debate, he remarked, 'When a police officer goes wrong, that police officer has greater powers to cover it up than do ordinary citizens.' It does not take much parliamentary opposition for our Attorney-General to go over the top. South Australian police officers have a good record compared with their counterparts in some other Australian states and overseas. Moreover, South Australian police are subject to some of the strictest discipline of any vocation in our society.

We agree with Mrs Stevens that a police officer attending the Police Complaints Authority voluntarily should be informed of the particulars of the allegation against him or her. Although the Police Association made a strong case for police officers to be given 24 hours notice of particulars, the opposition did not at this stage vote to accept the argument.

We did, however, accept the Police Association's argument that what constitutes a complaint ought to be defined. After some debate, we also thought that a complaint ought to be reduced to writing. We were unable to prevail on these matters because we do not have the numbers. We agree with the government that it is appropriate that a police officer called to the Police Complaints Authority or the Internal Investigations Branch should be required to produce relevant property as well as information or documents. Although the bill does not contain all that we would like, the opposition will be supporting it.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage):** I thank the opposition for its support and the shadow Attorney-General for his comments.

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

#### **ADJOURNMENT DEBATE**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** I would like to talk on two topics tonight, the first of which is Labor's recent health hotline held on Saturday 13 May for the purpose of enabling residents of the northern suburbs to have a say about health services as they saw them. We had organised the health hotline to be run out of the office of the Leader of the Opposition because he has the greatest number of telephone lines, so we were operating out of only three telephone lines. We operated from about 10 a.m. until 1.30 to 2 p.m.

We were utterly overwhelmed by the number of calls that came through on that morning. Those of us in attendance,

including my colleagues the members for Wright, Florey, Torrens and the Leader of the Opposition, found that we were constantly on the telephone. As soon as we put the telephone down, another call came through. We took 97 calls or thereabouts over that time. The vast majority of those calls, about two-thirds of them, related to the Modbury Hospital and a range of issues concerning that hospital.

The second largest group of calls involved issues in relation to the Lyell McEwin Health Service, and then there was a range of other issues that covered areas such as dental treatment and services, mental health services, and the lack of general practitioners and their unavailability after hours. There were also, I suppose, extraneous calls, I would have to say, in relation to that particular hotline focus concerning hospitals in the south—for instance, Flinders Medical Centre and the Repatriation General Hospital at Daws Road. We were kept very busy, and some things were said to us that were of much concern. We heard a smattering of good points in relation to those hospitals, but the vast majority of calls indicated considerable concerns in relation to our health services.

I want to mention a couple of incidents in relation to Modbury Hospital, because they were repeated in relation to the Lyell McEwin, and then I will talk about the dental issues. In terms of Modbury Hospital, I have done a breakdown of the calls that we received. They fall into the following categories: first, waiting for surgery or other services; and, secondly, the deterioration of the hospital over recent years (and those comments related to cleanliness, the level of attention that people were now able to receive from staff, and the standards of care—and this was the largest category—in respect of which we had a number of stories that were of considerable concern in the view of the person who was ringing us or their carers). I must say that, after hearing and reading the comments that came through on our sheets, they were of much concern.

Another category was a cut in services, and that ranged from physiotherapy services to diabetes services and to other outpatient services. Yet another category involved staff members who phoned and voiced their uncertainty in relation to the future of their hospital. They felt that there was no future and that morale was very low; they felt, as one person said, that they were drowning and they just could not see any way forward at all.

I want to talk about one particular incident that was relayed to me by a staff member at the hospital, because it related directly to my press release the week before regarding the latest round of cuts at Modbury Hospital, and this is the cutting of 16 beds about two to 2½ weeks ago from the surgical East Ward at Modbury Hospital. Healthscope announced that cut, and its reason was that it had simply run out of money for this year, and that it had exhausted the dollars it had been given for its activity this year and could not afford to run a deficit because it was a private company; that was the way it was. As soon as it had reached its level it had to stop services, and that is what it did, immediately cutting 16 beds. Someone rang me to say that what actually happened was that Healthscope cut 16 beds in the surgical ward. The surgical ward is a 32 bed ward which has an A end and a B end, east and west: Healthscope cut the 16 east at night. It moved all the beds out and then moved the day stay unit from the first floor into the space that was originally taken up by the surgical beds in ward 2 east.

The interesting thing that this person told me was that the day surgery unit had been upgraded only recently. So, all the

chairs and all the accompanying bits and pieces for the day surgery ward were moved down into the surgical ward, and they were to share that area with the patients in the surgical ward. One might ask: what is wrong with that? This person went on to tell me what exactly was wrong with it. She said that as a result 16 beds of a surgical ward were occupied by very sick people who were recovering from surgery, many of them very elderly, who were in their beds with hospital gowns with the openings down the back (as hospital gowns are designed). They were suffering pretty badly, recovering from anaesthetics and not feeling too well at all. At the other end of the ward, the day patients were coming in with their families, and they trooped in past the other patients. This staff member was horrified at the indignity that she believed the surgical patients were experiencing in having that happen.

This same staff member said the other thing that happened with respect to the day patients was that, because they had been moved down into a ward that was not a day surgery ward, there were no change facilities for the day surgery people: they had to change in the toilet. She said that the toilet in the surgical ward is kept clean regularly by cleaners, but that it is not exactly a pleasant place a lot of the time.

So, the situation that has resulted from the closure of those beds at Modbury Hospital has been a really negative one for the remaining surgical patients and certainly the day surgery patients. One has to ask: why bother refurbishing and spending money upgrading a unit if you close it and remove all the patients to another ward?

There were other issues that people spoke about in terms of the Modbury Hospital, and they related to cuts to services and long waiting lists. One woman explained that she had been involved in an accident in New South Wales over Easter and had fractured her shoulder in three places. She decided to return home to have her shoulder fixed. Her doctor wanted it attended to within seven days, as is appropriate. She went to Modbury Hospital on the very day that that ward was closed and she was sent home. She finally had the operation eight days later, more than seven days after the accident and over the time when she should have had her shoulder operated on. So, cuts in funding have meant that the level of care for that person was certainly decreased.

I am sure that my colleagues will also relate examples of the things that they were told. I am running out of time, and I will have to speak further about this issue at another time. Time expired.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** Earlier today I referred to the opening of the Copper Coast Prawnfest and the Copper Cove Marina by the Premier on 14 May. I expressed my sincere thanks to the Premier for the giving of his time on Mother's Day to make himself available to be present at the Copper Coast Prawnfest and the opening of the Copper Cove Marina. It was greatly appreciated. I mentioned that it was interesting that the weather throughout South Australia had been particularly rough the previous two days. In fact, when the Premier was travelling from Adelaide to Wallaroo he found that it was raining at Port Wakefield; it was pouring, I believe, at Kulpara and it was not much better at Paskeville. However, by the time he reached Wallaroo, there were clear skies. Indeed, the town had had clear skies since 7 a.m., and that continued until very late in the afternoon, when there was a short, sharp shower.

On the Monday, the day when the Adelaide Cup at Morphettville was rained out, Wallaroo did not have a shower of rain. Wallaroo enjoyed beautiful sunshine. It was magnifi-



cent weather. I guess that sort of weather is a characteristic of Wallaroo. I believe that northern Yorke Peninsula will take over from Victor Harbor as the preferred seaside location in the coming 10 to 20 years. I believe that for several reasons: first, the weather is significantly warmer than Adelaide and the area has a drier climate; and, secondly, the road from Adelaide to Port Wakefield is a dual highway. One can compare it to the road to Victor Harbor which is, without doubt, a rather dangerous road in many areas.

However, that is not what I really wanted to talk about. I want to finish my compliments to those who were involved in the organisation of the Copper Coast Prawnfest and to those who have been involved with the construction of the Copper Cove Marina. Without doubt the prawnfest was set in train as a result of a Premier's community grant of approximately \$5 000. I thank the Premier and the government of South Australia for having indicated their support for a new festival in South Australia. Without that grant it would not have been possible to undertake the preliminary work last year to organise the multitude of tasks required for a successful festival.

As a result of that grant other sponsors came forward. I know that several major sponsors each donated up to \$2 000 and that they were all delighted with the end result of the prawnfest over the weekend of 14 and 15 May. I want to say a big thank you to the sponsors. I will not mention them by name because undoubtedly I will miss one. Their assistance was very much appreciated and it is absolutely wonderful that most, if not all, indicated that they want to be associated with the prawnfest when it next occurs. Some of the sponsors outlined their proposals and vistas for the next prawnfest, and I think that is wonderful.

As I highlighted earlier, the weather in the lead up to the weekend was nothing short of catastrophic. I thought that we would hardly get anyone coming along. In excess of 5 000 people attended that first prawnfest, and I dare say that nearer 10 000 people would have attended if the weather had been as it was approximately four days earlier. To John McCormack, the president, I say a very sincere thank you. I also acknowledge Grayham Ferber, the inaugural president of the prawnfest. He certainly presided over the earlier meetings and was involved in much of the preparation for the prawnfest. He certainly deserves the accolades.

I thank John McCormack and his committee. Again, I mention Brian Harris, events officer for the Copper Coast Council. I also thank the council for its support of the prawnfest in helping to make it a success. In that respect I particularly acknowledge the then mayor of the Copper Coast, Mayor Ivan Oates. Mayor Oates did not stand for re-election at the last election and so we now have a new mayor for the Copper Coast, Mayor Paul Thomas, who was the deputy mayor. I take this opportunity to wish Mayor Paul Thomas all the very best for the coming three years.

The Sunday program was very much action packed. I was absolutely delighted that when the Premier sought to open

the prawnfest the Bank SA tent was packed. People were three deep, at least, on the sides of the tent to witness the official opening. Certainly the words of the Premier were very much appreciated as were the words from the other guest speakers. The Monday was a day for relaxation. I must admit that, as the local member, I was one who simply sat back with my family and some of the friends we had invited and relaxed.

One thing I had certainly missed out on on the Sunday was a pancake. I got to the pancake stall at about 4 o'clock or 4.30. I was exceptionally disappointed when they said, 'I'm sorry, we're out of pancakes.' I said, 'What? I've been looking forward to this all day.' They said, 'We'll have some more here tomorrow morning.' I will admit that I had a pancake for lunch on the Monday and thoroughly enjoyed it because I had been waiting for it for over 24 hours. I suppose there were some hiccups. For a while prawns were unavailable and some of the service clubs that were operating the stalls (and I pay compliment to the service clubs which were right behind this prawnfest) had to quickly peel more prawns. Some of the fish also sold out.

I pay a compliment to Mr Jim Waller and Mr Jack Waller who made their prawn boat available to people so that they could come on board and have a first-hand look at a prawn boat. They received an explanation of the operation of a prawn boat and saw—I call it the radar monitor—the scanner which detects the prawns. People were also shown how prawns are caught and, most importantly, how prawns are sold to the public. In fact, slightly damaged prawns were available from \$15 per kilo, which is a very good price and many people took advantage of that.

I also pay a very big compliment to Mr Albert McCormack of Albert McCormack Constructions. Albert McCormack is the key construction engineer for the Copper Cove Marina. Albert did an enormous amount of voluntary work in terms of preparing the site for the Copper Coast Prawnfest. I was on site about three or four days prior to the event and I thought, 'It will not come to fruition, it will not happen. There is just too much work to be done.' But to Albert and his crew I say a very big thank you. The event turned out to be absolutely excellent, particularly underfoot because the shell grit-cum-sand was a very firm base on which to walk.

Mr John Falting and Mr Van Stevens, the two key persons of Crystalcorp Developments Pty Ltd, are developing the marina and they have come a long way. It is a huge project. It is a credit to them in terms of the way they stuck at it so that stage one was able to be opened by the Premier. I know that the Premier was most impressed with what he saw. He had seen the marina on several occasions and it was a delight for him to be able to formally open it.

Time expired.

Motion carried.

At 8.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 24 May at 2 p.m.