

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 4 March 1997

The SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

WILLOW TREES

A petition signed by 1 447 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain the willow trees along the River Murray was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

GLENTHORNE RESEARCH STATION

A petition signed by 17 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to obtain ownership of 'Glenthorne' at O'Halloran Hill from the Federal Government and develop the site for community use was presented by the Hon. W.A. Matthew.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Regulations under the following Acts—

Building Work Contractors—Exemptions

Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—Transfer to MFP

Public Corporations—MFP Industrial Premises Corporation

By the Minister for Housing and Urban Development (Hon. S.J. Baker)—

Housing and Urban Development (Administrative Arrangements)—MFP Industrial Premises Corporation

By the Minister for Industrial Affairs (Hon. Dean Brown)—

Regulations under the following Acts—

Motor Vehicles—Bike Rack

Road Traffic—Bike Rack.

JUVENILE JUSTICE STATISTICS

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I table a ministerial statement made by the Attorney-General on the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee's annual report for the year ended 30 June 1996.

QUESTION TIME

BUILDING INDUSTRY

Ms HURLEY (Napier): Does the Premier believe that measures beyond the Deposit 5000 scheme are now required to stimulate the building industry in the light of today's ABS figures that show that building approvals have again slumped to a near 30 year low?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member has leave to ask her question.

Ms HURLEY: ABS data released today shows that in seasonally adjusted terms there were just 441 dwellings approved in December and only 451 in January.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want any more interjections on my right.

Ms HURLEY: Dwelling approvals fell 22 per cent between October 1996 and January, and are now 57 per cent lower than in May 1994. The Premier told the House on 26 February, and I quote:

Today I can report some encouraging signs in the housing sector and construction area.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Here they go again—good news out. Some indicators from the real estate, housing and construction industries in South Australia, all looking positively to the future, and what do they do? They cannot bear good news for South Australia. They cannot bear that there is an economic recovery, tentative—the right signs, going in the right direction. They have to come into the Parliament to try to draw it back, drag it down. As I said, what they are interested in doing is putting South Australia in a nappy and rocking it to sleep. That is the sort of approach they want. So there is no investment, no jobs—or, at least, that perception created. The honourable member should telephone Mr Gaffney from the Housing Industry Association and ask him what sort of reaction there is. She should go out to the engineers who are doing soil tests in South Australia—the first indicator of a revival in the housing industry. They are out testing soil. As I am advised, it is the largest number of testings for some 18 months or two years, which is an indicator that it is going in the right direction.

The member for Napier can say all she wants in this House but she cannot belie the fact that Housing Industry Association approvals for the month of January 1997 were up 57 per cent. The Deposit 5000 scheme, only introduced in October last year, is now feeding into the system. The exemption for stamp duty on mortgages for first home buyers operates from 1 February this year. The real benefits of the Deposit 5000 scheme and the stamp duty exemption scheme will be seen in the next three to six months in the building construction industry in South Australia. As to the 57 per cent increase in building approvals in January, does the honourable member not know that it takes a month or two after you get the approval to get a contract, to do the soil testing and get the job done and create the opportunities? Let the member just be a little patient and in some three to six months I am sure she will get up and apologise for misleading the House in this way and, as a proud South Australian, will be prepared to laud the fact that the building industry has some impetus which will create jobs for South Australians.

MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Mrs ROSENBERG (Kaurana): Will the Premier advise what action is to be taken by the Government to secure the future of the automotive industry in South Australia? Yesterday the Productivity Commission began hearings in Adelaide and took evidence from a number of companies located in the northern and southern suburbs, which evidence revealed major concerns about the commission's stance on tariffs and which may have severe implications for South Australia if introduced.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Government has been quite pro-active for some considerable time in relation to this question because of the importance to South Australia: 17 000 direct jobs and tens of thousands of indirect jobs in this State. It has had bipartisan support. The union movement is backing the Government—and rightly so, because this is

a fundamentally important policy issue for South Australia now and in the future. This is why we have been prepared to campaign as hard as we have, and we will continue to campaign until the final decision is made by the Federal Government. At the moment, we only have the draft report of the Productivity Commission and in its hearings in Adelaide yesterday and today I am encouraged by not only the motor vehicle manufacturers and assemblers but the automotive component supply companies which have been prepared in unison to stand up and say, 'Do not just because of a philosophical base or ideology pursue a course that will put at risk substantial jobs in this State.'

As the Productivity Commission draft submission states, the benefits after the year 2000 for a further reduction in tariffs is about .6 per cent increase in gross State product, yet the downside is massive if companies withdraw their major investment. It is untenable to think that General Motors would not proceed with the second production line for the Vectra at Elizabeth. The second production line of the Vectra—\$1.4 billion expenditure—will assemble cars in South Australia that will go to world market.

We have already seen Mitsubishi which over the past 10 years has become productive with efficiency gains in quality management and which produces a motor vehicle that goes throughout the world—five continents throughout the world—from Adelaide, South Australia. That clearly indicates that the motor vehicle industry of the 1950s and 1960s is the past. We have a motor vehicle and automotive component supply industry that can mix and match it with the best in the world on quality, price and reliability of supply, and we will not stand back and see an ideology based report go to the Productivity Commission final report and be presented to the Federal Cabinet.

I was certainly pleased to see the Prime Minister's comments only last weekend wherein he acknowledged that it was important to retain an automotive industry for Australia. In doing so, he acknowledged that any detrimental effect as a result of tariff collapse from 15 per cent to 5 per cent does mean job losses in industry sectors. I am also delighted that the Prime Minister has been prepared to give us a commitment that, prior to Cabinet's making its final determination on this matter, South Australia will have the capacity for input directly to the Prime Minister and Federal Cabinet to argue our case.

We are also taking this argument interstate. I have been in Sydney. Alan Jones on 2UE has picked up the cause for tariffs, arguing the case for South Australia. It is important that the more populated States which have a greater number of representatives in the Federal Parliament, in the Party room and in Cabinet in making decisions, understand through media reports the importance of this industry to not only Australia but certainly to regional economies like South Australia and Victoria.

On Friday, a Leaders' meeting will be held in Melbourne. A range of matters will be on the agenda. Clearly, the tariff issue will be raised. I have had discussions with the Premier of Victoria, Jeff Kennett, who is supportive and who will work cooperatively with the South Australian Government in taking up this issue at Federal level, to ensure that at the Federal level they understand that it is not just South Australia and the importance of jobs in this State which are at stake but also Victoria.

An automotive industry is important to underpin the manufacturing industry in Australia. If you take out the automotive industry, you put a black hole in manufacturing

industry generally. A country like Australia cannot afford not to have a manufacturing base within its economy, and that is why we are taking up the issue locally. Our case was presented solidly before the Productivity Commission yesterday and today. The minority report from Ian Webber was reinforced before the Productivity Commission, and the CEO of the Economic Development Authority argued our case.

We also have commissioned Mr Murphy to undertake a further analysis of the modelling of the draft report. Out of that we will be identifying a number of other key areas—eight in all—which we will be putting in a written submission to the Productivity Commission by 14 March when all final submissions will be in. That will reinforce the case we have put publicly, and we will argue another eight points that we think need to be taken into account in preparation of the final report. After that we will also accept the offer to argue the case with the Federal Government and the Prime Minister.

In addition, we will take up this issue at Federal level. I am seeking an opportunity to speak to a number of Federal parliamentary members in a sitting week in the next fortnight to argue the case for South Australia. I have also arranged meetings with individual Federal Cabinet Ministers to argue the case for South Australia. All in all, no stone is being left unturned to make sure that South Australia's case is well and truly understood. The important thing to remember is that it is not only South Australia's case but Australia's in terms of the future of the automotive and manufacturing industry in this country.

SCHOOL COMPUTERS

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Minister for Information and Contract Services. Why did the Government purchase school computers—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY:—from companies on a preferred supplier list that specifically excluded the supply of computers to schools? In 1995, the Government called tenders for two lists of preferred suppliers for computers. The first contract (No. 264/95) specifically stated:

It should be noted that PCs required by the Education and Children's Services Department for curriculum use are not mandated to be supplied under this panel contract.

However, only companies on this list were then invited to bid for the school computer contract, excluding a large number of companies that specialise in the supply of computers to schools.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As I indicated to the House last week, this particular contract for the supply of computers to schools was decided by the Department of Education and Children's Services. I will take up the matter with the Minister for Education and get an answer. Technically, this question should not be directed to me but to the Minister representing the Minister for Education in another place.

Mr Foley: You answered the question last week.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I answered the question last week because it dealt specifically with the panel contract, whereas this question relates to why the Education Department has approached those three companies. I will obtain an answer from the Minister.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mrs HALL (Coles): Will the Premier provide a progress report on the Olympic Dam expansion in the State's Far North and its spin-offs for employment opportunities for South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We will see what the Opposition does to try to knock this particular project. We all remember the activities of the Leader of the Opposition in a former life regarding the Roxby Downs project: he tried to scuttle it altogether. But the important thing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —is Western Mining Corporation's decision to proceed with and advance the development of the Roxby Downs Olympic Dam site. This is the largest capital expenditure by Western Mining in its 63 year history, and it is also South Australia's largest long-term development project. The expansion at Roxby Downs Olympic Dam will boost production at the site to 200 000 tonnes and will create 650 extra jobs in the area. Those 650 construction jobs will be on site by the end of next month, and a further 120 jobs will be created at Port Augusta in your electorate, Mr Speaker, from May this year. One of the areas badly hit by unemployment and the economic mismanagement by the previous Government was Port Augusta. Western Mining has indicated that it will prefabricate much of its mining and construction material in Port Augusta, thus creating jobs in the region for the next two years—good news, I would think, for the people of that area.

However, the good news does not stop there. Contracts worth almost \$100 million have been let for the expansion, with South Australian companies enjoying a high level of success in the award of contracts for that project. There is a target of 70 per cent expenditure in South Australia. Interestingly, initially the expenditure was to be \$1.25 billion, but that has now been increased to just short of \$1.5 billion. The whole development project has been brought forward 18 months, and the expenditure has begun. That is good news for this State.

Major construction contracts now under way and let by Western Mining include: the establishment of an accommodation village for a construction work force which will peak at 1 300 workers; preliminary earthworks; further land development in the Roxby Downs township; stage 1 of additional housing at Roxby Downs; and the installation of an underground crusher at Robinson shaft (Olympic Dam). In all, 25 design and construction service contracts have now been let by Western Mining related to this expansion.

Regional South Australia has not been forgotten and is reaping the benefits of this expansion with contractors at Port Augusta, Whyalla and Roxby Downs, as well as throughout the major metropolitan areas, benefiting from this expenditure. As one example, in the northern Adelaide suburbs 80 new jobs have been established to prefabricate units for the construction work force village. Those jobs are there in the northern suburbs of Adelaide now. In addition, as a further step to ensure that the expansion generates regional economic benefits, Western Mining plans to open a prefabrication yard in Port Augusta. I am sure that you, Mr Speaker, will appreciate that good news.

Clearly, we have at the moment major new capital works programs coming on stream in South Australia which have the capacity to create jobs in this State not only for South Australians involved in construction sites and in preparing a

whole range of units and prefabrication to go on site but importantly for those involved in a whole range of small to medium businesses in South Australia that will benefit from the 70 per cent spin off of \$1.5 billion worth of expenditure. That has to be good news for small business operators and job opportunities in this State.

SCHOOL COMPUTERS

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Why did the Minister for Information and Contract Services claim that small computer companies offering school computers cheaper than the Government contract should have tendered when they were deliberately denied the opportunity to do so? On 27 February in this place the Minister told the House:

... why did they not tender for it when it went out to tender?

The tender document (264/95) for the supply of desktop computers excluded the supply of classroom computers, and small companies were advised by the Supply Board to tender for a second supply list. Suppliers on that second list were then not invited to tender for school computers.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will need to take up with the Minister why the Department of Education and Children's Services apparently decided not to go out to a second list when it called the tenders for schools. I do not know that: it was administered by the department. I will get the information for the honourable member.

UNITED WATER

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Infrastructure please inform the House of details of a new water contract awarded to United Water to undertake the training of staff employed in various Indonesian Government waste water treatment and pollution control operations? During recent meetings with a real estate agent who reported to me that February was the best month that he had had for two years with real estate sales, I was asked me how successful the United Water venture was to South Australia.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I thank the member for Mawson for his lucid question. Today United Water has been awarded a contract for Austraining International to provide training to technical staff and research workers for various Indonesian Government organisations involved in waste water treatment and pollution control. The water pollution course will provide participants with training about the concepts, various techniques and field activities involved in pollution control in Australia. To support this training and education program, United Water has formed strategic alliances with Adelaide universities and also is using training methods and curriculum from international partners and United Water.

The aims of the course are to provide technical leadership, training on policies and technical guidelines relating to water pollution, field sampling practices, water pollution management and interpretation of results. The training will be provided by United Water International, the Australian Water Quality Centre at Bolivar, the Environment Protection Authority, SA Water, the SA Health Commission, the SA Department of Primary Industries, the MFP, Flinders University and the University of South Australia. The training involves a very broad ranging 12 week course which will include the water environment, river catchment management, stormwater management, environmental management systems and the economics of waste water.

United Water's key partner in the project is Flinders University, which will ensure that the course is smoothly run and be involved in the certificates at successful completion. This is another very important project, another expansion of the internationalisation of our water industry in South Australia, and another example of the positives that have come out of the United Water-SA Water contract.

Another example is the involvement of North West Water in winning the \$3.2 billion contract in Manilla. Advertising for 13 middle and senior management positions has now ended and recruitment is in progress. Recruitment will involve training and again will highlight another group of managers in South Australia and the other States of Australia who are benefiting from the internationalisation of our water industry in South Australia.

SCHOOL COMPUTERS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Why did the Government reject the recommendation of the evaluation panel that Southmark Computer Systems be selected as the Department of Education's preferred supplier of desk top computers for South Australian schools? The Opposition has a leaked copy of a briefing—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You would know all about leaks, wouldn't you. You can even have a look at the signature on this one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson, in particular.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Opposition has a leaked copy of a briefing to the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Education and Children's Services, dated July 1996, which details how five companies had been invited to submit proposals to become the preferred supplier of computers to schools. The submission details how the companies were ranked for performance, quality and pricing, and recommended Southmark Computer Systems as the preferred supplier. The companies that have since been announced as preferred suppliers were individually ranked as third, fourth and fifth out of the five, after the best and final offers.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As the Opposition is asking the Minister for Education and Children's Services exactly the same questions word for word in the other place, I just refer the Leader to *Hansard*.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Peake.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest to all members that they cease interjecting.

KOALAS

Mr BECKER (Peake): Will the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources advise the House of the benefits that will flow to South Australia from the launch of the Kangaroo Island koala management program and the opportunities that the program will provide in the way of jobs and traineeships in environmental management?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am sure all members of the House would be aware of the interest that has been shown

from within this State, interstate and internationally in this matter. I am pleased to report the successful start to the program on Kangaroo Island, which we believe to be a world first. We are told that never before has such a wild life fertility control and translocation—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition should be such an expert on this subject, for three Ministers—

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I am very interested in the answer and I am having difficulty hearing it. Will the Minister repeat the last couple of sentences, please?

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the Minister will accommodate the wishes of the member for Peake, and I ask all members to cease interjecting.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, the point I was making was that for many years the Opposition put this in the 'too hard' basket. Minister after Minister after Minister walked away from this issue saying that it was too hard, too controversial and that they could not do anything about it. That does not worry us, because we are going to fix this issue, which is more than the Opposition ever thought would be possible.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is interesting that the Opposition Leader would make that point. I suppose he would be the first one to go out and shoot koalas, if he had his way.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: This program again demonstrates the Government's commitment to get on with a very difficult job, unlike the Opposition which, when in Government, ignored this issue and filed it in the 'too hard' and 'controversial' basket, as I say. The Kangaroo Island program launched only yesterday has attracted major international and national attention and I suggest to the House that it will turn a negative situation into a very positive one for South Australia. As I speak, the first desexed koalas are due to arrive at Naracoorte for translocation to a new home at the Glenroy Conservation Park, further demonstrating that action is well under way in this important program. Apart from saving the island's koalas and helping to restore areas of the island's habitat, efforts now being undertaken to bring the island's koala population under control are already paying dividends. For example:

- World leading research and veterinary procedures in fertility control have been developed by the Adelaide Zoo.
- Our universities are now proceeding in earnest in developing Australian first hormonal implant technology.
- Research is now being conducted into an area for which little had previously been known.
- As a side bonus, up to 20 people have now been employed, or have received traineeships, in areas of wildlife and environmental management as part of the program, and post-graduate opportunities are also being offered.
- In addition, major greening, revegetation and habitat restoration programs have begun.
- And, as part of community and industry support, I am told that more than \$150 000 in equipment donations have been made available from pharmaceutical, medical, veterinary and tertiary institutions to equip the mobile veterinary clinic on the island.

That is something that needs to be recognised: the support we have had from the community, from the tertiary sector and from all these other areas within the community has been quite outstanding. This program combines very carefully elements of scientific, social and economic considerations in helping solve a very difficult problem. I am pleased that the member for Peake has raised this question, because there is a lot of interest in this matter. I would like to commend those involved in the project for the way they are showing the world how to turn a negative situation into one that will position this State at the forefront of wildlife management. It will bring about a much needed solution to an environmental problem without harming an island's or, indeed, this nation's reputation.

SCHOOL COMPUTERS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Information and Contract Services. Given the Minister's and former Premier's oversight of information technology and contracts, what is the pricing agreement between the DECStech Foundation and preferred suppliers, and does the cost of computers to schools include overheads or the supply of equipment to non-school sites? The deal offered to schools includes a Pentium 133 computer for \$1 961. Last Saturday's media carried advertisements from three local computer suppliers offering the equivalent or superior Pentium 150 computers at cheaper prices—after removing 22 per cent sales tax—than those obtained under the Government contract. One advertisement specified a five-year site warranty and another offered a price \$271 cheaper than the Government price, including sales tax.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Regarding the prices factor, the Leader of the Opposition obviously does not understand what is being obtained under this contract.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That is, in material already sent out by the Minister for Education he points out that it is not only a warranty, about which the Leader of the Opposition was talking, but an actual service agreement, a three-year service agreement, which is quite different from a warranty. In fact, it is not just an ordinary service agreement but a 24-hour service agreement, involving the same price, I understand, for the country as for the city. So, the Leader of the Opposition, in giving an example on price, has not compared apples with apples. If he compares apples with apples, I suggest that he include in that a three-year service agreement on a 24-hour basis anywhere in the State. The other information relates specifically to details of the tender: as I pointed out a moment ago, that is a matter for the Minister for Education, and I will obtain that information.

SYDNEY OLYMPICS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the House of any State Government initiatives which seek to maximise potential benefits for South Australia from opportunities associated with the Sydney 2000 Olympics?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: This is an extremely important question for South Australia. The Sydney 2000 Olympic Games has enormous potential to provide great economic benefits to South Australia, and this Government has been

working extremely hard to harness all of those opportunities. Our excellent sporting facilities have already caught the eye of sporting associations and competitors wishing to prepare themselves for the Olympics. This evening this Government will open another window of opportunity. I am very pleased to announce that 14 South Australian education and training providers will tonight sign a memorandum of understanding to assist in the training of thousands of volunteers and security personnel for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. South Australia is the first State to sign an agreement with New South Wales to help train the 41 000 volunteers and 6 000 security personnel who will provide vital support to the Sydney Olympics. The training will cover areas such as first aid, crowd management, hospitality, catering, corporate entertaining, supporting emergency services, security and ticket reception as well as inspection.

In terms of size, the Olympics is equal to about 34 grands prix, so there is a massive requirement for supporting personnel. This training will be of enormous benefit to South Australia. A number of major sporting events will be held here in South Australia in the lead-up to the Olympics, and having trained support staff will be a major bonus for these events, as well as the future sporting events held in South Australia beyond the year 2000. The implementation of the training will be through the Olympic Industry Strategy Committee, which has been formed in conjunction with the State Government's Sydney office. This Government will continue to ensure that South Australia is at the forefront of providing services and facilities for the Olympic Games and is able to maximise the very positive spin-offs for this State.

TAB EMPLOYMENT CONTRACTS

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Racing say why the South Australian TAB General Manager has unilaterally offered individual employment contracts to certain TAB head office staff, notwithstanding the Government's having coordinated collective enterprise bargaining agreements for all other Government departments and agencies through the Department for Industrial Affairs, and contrary to the provisions of the Industrial and Employee Relations Act; and was the Minister's prior approval sought?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: First, he did not do it unilaterally: he obtained the board's permission to do this. The Board is a statutory authority, and it is quite within its general guidelines to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As usual, you get most things wrong. You ought to know that this is not a State award: it is a Federal award.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: What has happened—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: That does not help very much. The General Manager, with the support of the board, has made an offer to all the central administration staff of the TAB and has asked them to consider a letter of application for some change to their conditions. They have been given one week to sit down and discuss it and, so far, I have been advised that about 50 per cent have supported the changes in question.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader does not have the Chair's approval to continually interject.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The board has a statutory requirement under the Act to manage the TAB. If you look at the history of the TAB, you will see that there was a successive downturn under the previous Government. It was only under the previous Minister that it started to turn around, and it is now really flying. This year it will be something like 4.5 to 5 per cent up on turnover, which is about \$30 million.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: No, it is not due to me: it is due to the fact that we put in place professional boards to run huge statutory authorities. That is what it is all about—making sure that we have good outcomes.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is warned.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Every management group under this Government has the right to deal with industrial relations with their staff. As the Deputy Leader knows, it is to be done within the law, whether it is State or Federal. It is absolutely fascinating to me that the Labor Party wants to take us back to the good old days of industrial relations—confrontation and argument; you are not allowed to sit down and—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON:—talk to your staff and sort out the problem.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader is warned for the second time.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The letter of intent has gone out to all TAB administration personnel. Let us wait until the end of the week to see whether they accept it.

HEALTH, SOUTHERN SUBURBS

Ms GREIG (Reynell): Will the Minister for Health advise the House of initiatives the Government is undertaking to improve the range of health services available to residents of the southern suburbs?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The increasing range of health services under this Government is a very vital matter for people living in the southern suburbs. A major milestone in South Australian health care was heralded yesterday with the ground-breaking ceremony for the construction of the new Flinders Medical Centre \$60 million private hospital development. I am delighted to assure the House that construction will be completed in September 1998, and I am informed it will be open for public and private patients in December 1998. For the amount of investment in South Australia that is a tight time-frame, but it is one with which I know that the member for Reynell's constituents will be delighted.

What does this private development mean for the South Australian public health system? It means more public health facilities, more public patient operations, more choice in private facilities and, very importantly, more jobs for South Australians. A \$12.5 million investment in public hospital infrastructure is being made by the private sector at no cost to the taxpayer. It is a stark illustration of the benefit of private and public sector collaboration.

I know that is a message which this Opposition does not like to hear, and I know it is a message that it will be tired of hearing but, because of the public and private sector collabor-

ation at Flinders Medical Centre, there is a \$12.5 million bonus for the South Australian taxpayer. I know that the member for Mawson is delighted with this proposal, as are the members for Davenport and Brighton.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson will not be delighted if he keeps interjecting.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: They also know that there will be another 1 400—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the Deputy Leader be very careful.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The local members know that there will be not only \$12.5 million of infrastructure for the taxpayer at no cost but also 1 400 extra public inpatient services of care at no cost to the State and more choice in private health facilities. A total of 450 jobs will be created during the construction phase and approximately 150 new jobs when the new hospital comes on stream. As well as that, there will be 150 beds—a 100 bed private hospital and up to 50 step down care beds—day surgery facilities for public and private patients, step down care accommodation for public and private patients, cardiac catheterisation, ophthalmology units and so on.

Whilst the Opposition believes it is heresy to have public patients receiving health services in private facilities, it is good for the patients. The Government will ask the Opposition to tell the people of South Australia at the next election whether it would stop patients receiving day surgery services in private facilities. Would it stop patients receiving step down care in privately provided facilities? Would it deny public patients access to the eye facilities? Of course it would not: it would say that we have done a great deal—as I know every taxpayer would acknowledge.

TEACHERS, FEDERAL AWARD

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier advise the House how much the Government's opposition to the making of a Federal award for teachers has cost the State's taxpayers, including costs of the Government's recent unsuccessful appeal to a Full Bench of the Full Commission? The Opposition has been advised that earlier today a Full Bench of the Federal Commission brought down a decision dismissing the Government's appeal and that the total Government costs with respect to this matter will exceed \$1 million.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The facts are that the teacher dispute in South Australia was settled back in December and, as part of that settlement, it was agreed between the parties that the court case, particularly the appeal against the earlier decision, would settle as has occurred today. That was part of the agreement put down in December last year. The real question today is right back on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition because he needs to be willing to stand up before the public of South Australia and say whether he supports a State industrial system or the State awards going to the Federal system and coming under the Howard Federal laws. I would like an answer from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: are you saying that we should be under the Federal laws?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Are you saying we should scrap—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We all know that the Deputy Leader really wants to keep a State industrial system. He has always supported a State industrial system. Therefore, he would have been the first out there backing any case whatsoever to ensure that we maintained the State industrial system. Therefore, what is the real purpose behind the Deputy Leader's question? It shows that he simply wants to make a cheap political point. However, the fact is that the dispute with the teachers was settled in December. Part of the settlement was that we would wait for the appeal judgment to be handed down. It has been handed down and, therefore, it goes to a Federal award.

FAMILY CARE

Mr WADE (Elder): Will the Minister for Industrial Affairs notify the House of recent steps taken under the State Government's industrial relations system which will make it easier for workers, especially parents, to obtain time off work to care for sick children and family members?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Before this Government came to office, we said that we would put flexibility into the industrial relations system. We said that we would make it easier for parents to take sick leave to look after sick children—a very important principle. About six or eight weeks before the election, I remember putting down that very important principle to which this Government has adhered. I ask the Deputy Leader to listen to this because I am coming to him on this matter as well. Through enterprise agreements introduced by this Government, 65 per cent of all enterprise agreements now signed under the State industrial system allow parents to take day care to look after sick children.

Under enterprise agreements, something like 70 000 South Australians have the right to take up to five days off work to look after sick children. In addition, we went into the Industrial Commission recently and supported a submission that under all State industrial awards up to five working days from sick leave could be taken for family care purposes. It shows that the promise we put down before the election has been now fully met. In fact, the Industrial Commission congratulated the parties, particularly the State Government on the stance it had taken.

This Liberal Government has gone into the industrial relations system, both through the commission and legislation in this Parliament (which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition opposed), to ensure that parents could take sick leave to look after sick children. I highlight not only what this flexibility has meant but also the sharp contrast between the Labor Party and the Liberal Government on this ground. It was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, a staunch trade union official, who went into the Industrial Commission and opposed part-time work under the Clerks Award.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This shows how bigoted Labor Party members are, particularly the shadow Minister for Industrial Relations who, as a union official, opposed part-time work for people under his award. He was brought up in an industrial straitjacket under the union movement and has stayed there ever since. He opposed our legislation, which was deliberately designed to bring in flexibility. He opposed our legislation which has now meant that 70 000 people in

South Australia can take sick leave to look after sick children. That is a significant advance for South Australia.

POLICE, SOUTHERN SUBURBS

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): For the purposes of allocating police, does the Minister for Police define the south as being the Christies Beach metropolitan division, in particular the Christies Beach, McLaren Vale, Aldinga and Willunga police stations and, if so, has the Government increased overall police numbers at those police stations by 89 since taking office?

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson is warned.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The south is defined under the southern command, but I will obtain information about the exact boundaries because I do not know them.

LAND CARE MONTH

Mr BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Primary Industries advise the House of any plans the Government has in place to celebrate Land Care Month which I understand the Minister launched yesterday?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Light for his question and for his active participation in the Landcare movement in his area. There are 300 Landcare groups in South Australia, which is an impressive effort. The people involved are doing a terrific job in offering leadership to the community in a range of Landcare activities which are of great interest to my colleague the Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources. Yesterday, we launched the South Australian Program for Landcare Month at the newly created Urrbrae Wetlands, which now have water in them. Landcare Month this year will focus on revegetation, weed control and the protection of native vegetation. Its focus will be on encouraging people to 'Veg out with Landcare', with an emphasis on the need to protect native vegetation and plant new blocks of trees. There is enormous focus nowadays on getting as many school children as possible involved, and there were many there yesterday.

PISA, on behalf of the State Landcare Committee, has put together a calendar of events which will be held this month. Activities will include the commencement of the Green Corps employment program by the Australian Trust for Conservation Volunteers. There will be a special dinner to thank the retiring Landcare Chairperson, Dr Barbara Hardy, AO, for her commitment to the program and the leadership that she has given to Landcare in South Australia. There will be the ABC car park caper, one of the ABC *Gardening Show's* premier events, and also a seminar organised by the Threatened Species Network on the management and protection of native grasslands. Next week, I will launch an Environmental Awareness Day on the Broughton River between Spalding and Yacka in my electorate of Frome.

It is certainly an important year for land care in South Australia. From 17 to 20 September this year we will host the National Landcare conference, which is anticipated to attract between 800 and 1 000 people with an interest in land care from all States and Territories as well as from New Zealand, South Africa, the USA and Europe. Not only will those people attend the conference in Adelaide but importantly for the regions there will be 20 field tours to show these people

the remainder of South Australia. The National Landcare Conference includes a national photo competition, which was launched yesterday and which will be sponsored this year by Hanimex. We have 100 box cameras to distribute to land care groups around Australia to record their activities. Hopefully, about 1 000 photos will be displayed.

This Government is spending \$7.5 million on land care and revegetation. Our farmers, who do a terrific job and who show a lot of dedication to land care, and the environment will certainly reap the benefits. Those benefits will not be just environmental but also economic, and in the long term there will no doubt be social benefits as a result of the efforts of those people who are leading land care at the moment.

PARKS REDEVELOPMENT

Mr De LAINE (Price): How does the Minister for Housing and Urban Development propose to achieve a maximum of 25 per cent of public housing tenants in The Parks urban renewal project area if more than 25 per cent wish to remain in the area? At present, in The Parks project area 57 per cent of housing tenants live in Housing Trust homes and the other 43 per cent are private tenants. The joint developers (Pioneer Homes and the South Australian Housing Trust) have informed me that those 57 per cent of public housing tenants will be reduced to 25 per cent maximum under the renewal project policy.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: As the honourable member knows—he has been kept informed of progress on the project—there is an agreed optimal situation of reducing the concentration of Housing Trust tenants. I believe that policy was supported by the previous Government, and it is certainly supported by this Government. This Government believes, as did the former Government, that there should be a more even spread of public housing in this State. In terms of the development of The Parks, a number of proposals have been put forward, but the team is still working on a proposal that I have not yet seen, even in draft form, at this stage, to define the parameters under which the redevelopment of The Parks area will proceed. Once I have seen what is planned, I will be in a better position to answer the honourable member's question.

I make the point that if we want areas such as The Parks redeveloped—the honourable member would be aware that I have taken the time to visit the area, and I believe it has a great deal of potential—that potential will be met only if we start to deal with the principles of how the development should take place and good sound commercial practice. I believe that everyone wants to see a greater housing mix and a wider range of people being housed within the area.

If we contrast The Parks with developments that have taken place beyond its boundaries, we can see those sorts of developments being translated across those boundaries so that we can create a vibrant suburb in the process. That does not mean that every tenant's wish will be met—and I think the honourable member would understand that. I know there has been some agitation from various groups in the area. They say that they do not like the consultation process and that they will set up their own. When the proposal has been given a tick by me, at least in conceptual form, we will go through the financial details and make sure they all match up, and then I am sure we can have a much wider debate on the issue.

All I can say to the honourable member is that the Government is intent on getting a very good outcome for the area. We believe that it can go ahead in leaps and bounds if

we come up with the right solutions. If the honourable member has any ideas to feed into the process, I would be happy to hear from him, and I am open to any suggestions that come through the door from anyone who wishes to contribute to this process, because some of the answers are not as easy as people suggest, and 100 per cent of the people will not necessarily be satisfied. However, the Government is committed to a great outcome in The Parks redevelopment.

OPAL MINING

Mr BASS (Florey): Will the Minister for Mines advise what action is being taken to stop the practice of night shifting on opal claims? I understand that opal mining permit holders view very seriously the practice of night shifting which, for the benefit of members, is the practice of illegally working other claims during the night with the intention of stealing opals.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: In terms of night shifting, someone said to me, 'Have you heard about the night carting?' I reflected that they have one thing in common in that they both take something that belongs to other people. Quite often you hear about it only after the event, but the practice of night shifting in this State and across Australia has reduced dramatically since the turn of the century. However, recent incidents have received press publicity. In the latter part of last year, there was a prosecution for night shifting: in other words, someone who worked another person's claim while they were absent. More recently, four armed persons were apprehended on another site, and they will appear before the court on 18 March.

The last thing these people would want is to be caught by the miners themselves, because justice in the mining industry is often swifter than justice in the legal system. It is a serious offence, and it is covered by sections 51A(1) and 74(2) of the Mining Act. Section 74(2) provides that a person 'shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding \$2 000 or imprisonment for two years.' Under section 152A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act a person 'shall be guilty of a felony and liable to be imprisoned for a term not exceeding five years.' So, there are some serious penalties for this serious offence, and the Government is committed to ensuring that people who have a right to mine do not have that right taken away by people who seek to work their claim without authority. Not only do those penalties apply but a miner's permit to operate a mine can be forfeited.

I congratulate both the Police Force and the Department of Mines for the efforts they have made recently to apprehend those people who are offending by night shifting. People should be aware that there are severe penalties, and the Government will continue to pursue anyone who is believed to be involved in these actions.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I put on the public record concerns that I and people to whom I have spoken in my electorate have with regard to the Charitable and Social

Welfare Organisations Fund. It is causing a lot of consternation amongst groups that are doing a very good job of dealing with many of the casualties resulting from the introduction of poker machines. As the Minister knows, I spoke with him and the Chairman of the committee distributing those funds a month or so ago, together with representatives of a funding organisation from the northern area. We spoke of a number of concerns then. I was interested and very concerned to be informed by people in my electorate that, after the start of the second funding round for the release of money from this fund, people had been informed that the criteria had been changed.

The first issue is that when you start a system and begin a call for people to make representations for funds you stick by your criteria and do not change them mid-stream, as has happened. I have with me a copy of a form from Community Benefits SA entitled 'Additional guidelines for funding criteria'. This is what I am referring to. Point 7 notes that individuals, including applications placed by organisations on behalf of individuals, will no longer be funded. I make the point that on the initial funding guidelines from Community Benefits SA the criteria state quite clearly that the program was to meet the social welfare needs of families and individuals. This has been changed. Point 1 states that there will be no funding for emergency relief, that is, food vouchers, food, payment of bills, clothing and money. It explains this by saying that this is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Certainly the Commonwealth Government funds emergency relief, but the increase in need that has come directly as a result of the introduction of poker machines has nothing to do with the Commonwealth Government. These organisations should be funded and considered for relief from this fund because they have had to withstand an enormous increase in demand for their services directly as a result of the introduction of poker machines. One agency in my area—the Elizabeth-Munno Para Community Fund—has carefully kept records from the beginning of the introduction of poker machines until now that quite conclusively illustrate that the demand for assistance from them has increased by a massive 80 per cent since the introduction of poker machines. It has now received notification that it is out of contention and will not receive funding.

Christmas hampers will not be funded, yet the very organisations that provide Christmas hampers have had their fundraising base eroded since the introduction of poker machines and will not be able to provide hampers. All members would have received letters from large charitable organisations saying that they have concerns about the fund. It is time for a relook. It is quite clear that the spirit of the legislation is not being followed and that the money is not being used as we intended. The fund itself has now been hijacked by another agenda, and worthwhile organisations which have been affected by poker machines and which should be funded are now out of contention.

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

Ms GREIG (Reynell): I open my grievance with a quote from Samuel Taylor Coleridge. From what I recall, it goes like this:

What a melancholy world this would be without children and what an inhuman world without the aged.

As a member of Parliament, I have a real passion to work in the better interests of children yet, at the same time, I enjoy sharing the wisdom and knowledge that many older people in my community enjoy giving. The words 'You are never too old to learn' come to mind.

Today I pay tribute to a particular school community in my electorate—Lonsdale Heights Primary School. Lonsdale Heights Primary School has had many significant achievements, and last year it celebrated its twentieth anniversary. Once again the school has started off this year with another major achievement: an introduction to the world of information technology. On Tuesday 11 February I had the honour of officially opening the school information technology centre—the SIT centre, as it is commonly known. It is a fantastic example of a school community pulling together and achieving a vision, a dream, that has culminated from four years of hard work. As a Government we have made many advances in the area of children's learning. We have recognised that our children are part of a changing world and that our children are having to learn many new skills unheard of in our primary school days.

Things are not easy in the education sector. We all acknowledge that, and I have said it before. It has never been easy in the education area. One of my high schools used to have a message on its board in the form of a cartoon showing Government inequities. The message implied that there will be equity in the system when the Department of Defence has to raise its own funds from cake stalls to buy weapons and ammunition and Defence Department money is directed into education. The cartoon is about seven or eight years old, but I am sure that at times that is how our schools still feel. They feel that way but, nevertheless, no matter how difficult things have been for our schools, the parents, teachers and students have pulled together to ensure that we get the best deal we can for our children.

Several years ago Lonsdale Heights Primary School had a limited information technology program, which meant that other schools were at an advantage. However, even though other schools may have seen this as a weakness, Lonsdale Heights Primary School has turned this around and made what was seen as a weakness into one of the school's strengths. Along with Government initiatives in the information technology area, Lonsdale Heights Primary School is now leading the way in implementing an information technology vision that compliments our own initiative of DECSTech 2000.

Lonsdale Heights Primary School has a vision, and that vision has been driven by many movers and shakers. The Past Principal (Colin Davidson) turned a vision into reality. Trevor Ellis, the current Principal, has enthusiasm and a 'never-say-die' attitude which puts the school at a real advantage. He operates under that maxim, identifying strengths and weaknesses, improving on the weaknesses and capitalising on the strengths. I also acknowledge in the House the work of Tim Johnson, the school council chairperson and computer person extraordinaire. He worked almost single-handedly to ensure that the school's IT dream and decisions quickly became a reality.

Tim worked days, evenings, weekends and throughout the school holidays to make benches, upgrade the school's computers, provide security and install the software. This was all done because of Tim's commitment to the students of Lonsdale Heights Primary School. Tim Johnson has a good parent support base. They genuinely support all students and staff within their school. We can say similar things of all our

schools. However, for me there are special individual qualities that schools have, and each school in my electorate is special in its own way. Lonsdale Heights Primary School has a quality best described as welcoming. Everyone is part of the school and everyone is accepted.

The school is dynamic and the children are extra special—bubbly, bright, full of energy and hungry to learn. They are ready to accept change and are ready to prepare themselves for the new century and the challenges this presents. The entire school community, including the teaching and support staff, are a wonderful group to work with. Whilst I am their elected representative, I will continue my commitment to the school to ensure they are fairly represented and that they do get their fair share of educational funding.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will respond to the answer by the Minister for Racing to my question in Question Time today concerning the South Australian TAB. On 26 February this year, the General Manager of the TAB authorised a letter to be sent to his head office employees inviting them to enter into an individual contract of employment and requesting that they give an answer to him, yea or nay, as of today.

First, the employees were invited to the Manager's office to discuss this matter on a one on one basis, and they were presented with their contracts. They were not presented with contracts or a draft contract to negotiate separately with the TAB on this matter: they were led in one by one, given a letter and told, 'This is your letter of contract. You have a few days to think about it. Let us know what you want to do.' Part of the contract of employment that relates to remuneration and allowances states quite clearly (2.3):

The remuneration and allowance payable in accordance with 2.1 and 2.2 above will be reviewed at the discretion of the TAB but not less frequently than annually. Adjustment may be made to the stated remuneration as a result of such reviews. In conducting the reviews, the TAB will have regard to relevant movements in remuneration in relevant parts of the public sector in SA, the private sector in Australia, your work performance and the TAB's ability to pay.

That means nothing to individual workers. Quite frankly, it stacks all the cards in favour of the employer, because it is entirely at the discretion of the TAB management whether it passes on any pay increase whatsoever to its employees and on any basis that suits it. In fact, the adjustments could be up or down. It does not refer to increases in wages: it refers just to adjustments.

Contrary to the Minister's answer—and again, I do not say that the Minister deliberately misled the House; it is just that this Minister knows so little about his own department and industrial relations in particular that he is simply ignorant of the facts—the employees of the TAB of South Australia are covered by State legislation—by a State award, not by a Federal award, as stated by the Minister. The State Industrial and Employer Relations Act does not allow for individual employment contracts. The General Manager of the TAB must have been confused and had a rush of blood to his head over the Howard Government's workplace agreements which provide for individual contracts for those under Federal awards. It does not so provide under State legislation. TAB employees in this State have never been under a Federal award.

The other point is the unilateral nature of the situation. Here we have a Liberal Government saying it wants enterprise agreements and negotiations with its employees directly, and then we have a Government agency where, out of the

blue, the General Manager sends to a number of its employees a letter saying, 'We want you to enter into this individual contract of employment.' It is not about giving them forewarning, saying 'Let's talk about the concepts, the principles; what would make you feel comfortable about it?'—just, 'Here are the conditions; here is the letter; let us know in a few days what you think about it. We will call you in one by one.' When the unions initially asked for a copy of the agreement, they were refused access to a copy of the draft agreement until yesterday afternoon.

They also refer to management common conditions, such as annual leave, long service leave and sick leave. Of course, they have to be common conditions: the TAB is not offering anything new. They are the legislated minimums under our State Industrial Relations Act with respect to each of those matters. From the Minister's answer today, I think he has absolutely no idea what his General Manager of the TAB is doing in this area. It would appear that the TAB board and the General Manager have been let loose to do what they choose to do with respect to this whole issue.

This is the only State Government agency where there has not been a collective bargaining agreement entered into between the Government, as the employer, and the employees, on a collective basis, rather than trying to get it through on an individual contract basis and without it going through the coordinating committee of the Department of Industrial Affairs. I might say to the Minister that it is about time he was in charge of his department.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I place on the public record my appreciation of a committed group of constituents in my electorate who again joined me for the annual Clean Up Australia day last Sunday, 2 March. I was delighted to see how responsible the community is within my electorate, given that four years ago, when we started this annual clean-up, there was an enormous amount of rubbish. In particular, I noticed a lot of what is known in the litter stream as hardware—things such as old car tyres, rims, axles, heaters, all those things which people have decided they do not want to take to the dump but would rather dump in their next door neighbour's reserve.

Much work was done by the community in the first year or two to make sure that that was removed. What delighted both me and the committed group of constituents who helped me on Sunday cleaning up our area was that the community in the south has realised there is no future in dumping hardware. In fact, they have put in a concerted effort to make sure that rubbish goes to the appropriate place. Whilst there has been a lot of hype in the media about flavoured milk containers in particular being among the villains in the litter stream, the number that I saw was far reduced from previously, and congratulations should go to BRF, which has been committed to self regulation and getting on with the job of trying to clean up the litter stream. Whilst there is still a lot of work to do there, I congratulate BRF for its initiatives.

Some members may know that, on behalf of Minister Wotton and the State Government, I chair the second stage of 'Litter: It's your choice. Strategies for South Australia'. Already the South Australian Government can take some accolade and pride in the fact that many of the initiatives that were put forward have now been implemented, including the increase in fines that is currently being debated by the Parliament. I am delighted to see the cross section, the

commitment, and the general input and knowledge on the Minister's working party in assessing things such as bench marking for industry with respect to reduction targets and time lines. Industry is working with recyclers and environmental groups to make sure the best outcomes are achieved for South Australia.

At times some people say that we want to wrap people up in cotton wool, that we are a nanny state and whatever. The negative people talk about the nanny state. The fact is that South Australia should be proud of the way it leads in so many areas. Recently we tried to source information from overseas just to make sure that South Australia was up to speed on reduction of the litter stream. People from KESAB tried places such as America, England and Europe, and they were surprised to see just how advanced South Australia was. In fact, the comment at the working party meeting this morning was that South Australia possibly leads the world when it comes to initiatives and other issues with respect to reduction of the litter stream.

However, there is still a long way to go and we must not be complacent. One thing that disappoints me a lot when I walk through Adelaide is to see chewing gum on the ground. The Adelaide City Council recently indicated that it was spending \$100 000 of ratepayers' money each year trying to clean up chewing gum. That is an appalling waste of resources when that \$100 000 could be going into an area of economic benefit for retailers and landlords in the city. It will be very difficult to address the problem of chewing gum, because chewing gum and cigarette butts are the two major components of the litter stream, and it will always be difficult to catch people spitting out chewing gum or throwing away their cigarette butt. But surely those South Australians who choose to chew or smoke have a responsibility to all citizens to ensure that their litter is disposed of correctly. Therefore, I call on everyone to be far more vigilant and responsible when it comes to litter disposal. I must say that I am still disappointed when I go on these clean-up days to see the amount of fast food rubbish still in the stream, and I hope that that will improve in the near future.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Today, I wish to reflect on what is clearly mounting evidence of this Government's inability to manage and put in place contracts that are good for the State. We have heard much from the former Premier—

Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:

Mr FOLEY:—and members opposite, and I hear an interjection from the member for Kaurana—

Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Like EDSAS.

Mrs Rosenberg interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Let me go through this. I am glad the honourable member interjects—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Mawson can just keep quiet. We know what you did to the Minister for Information and Contract Services. Do not worry about what I did about information technology when we were in government.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: You voted against him.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: His conscience is getting at him.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: So, you voted for Dean Brown?

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Is that what it was? The member for Mawson's conscience is starting to get to him as he starts to realise how he ratted on the guy he spent three years sycophantically crawling to.

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am being distracted. I want to talk about the mounting evidence that the Government's contract for the supply of computers to schools is somewhat less than satisfactory, based on the initial perusal that Opposition members have undertaken. It would appear that a sloppy and incomplete piece of work will mean that what should have been a good Government policy—that is, to put large resources into computing—will be less than satisfactory. It will mean that, because of some overall Government panel contracts, schools may be paying well in excess for computers than that which they should be paying if they had the flexibility to simply use the grant money and source their own computers. As my colleague the Leader of the Opposition in another place further investigates this matter, it will become very clear that Government bungling, incompetence and less than satisfactory performance will yet again cost more but, most importantly, will cost mums and dads more than they would otherwise have had to pay.

This matter comes red hot on the heels of other Government contract debacles. I have often talked in this place—and no doubt I will continue in the future—about the bungling of the State's \$1.5 billion water contract. It is well documented and there is more documentation to occur, but to this day it is clear to any casual observer of the water contract that it was bungled. We also have the EDS contract for the supply and provision of IT services to the Government. Whilst it is difficult to tell exactly how well that contract is performing, it would appear on the anecdotal evidence available to the Opposition to be causing some difficulty.

We know from the former Premier and now Minister for Information and Contract Services' enthusiasm to see a crane on North Terrace that we might have bungled that contract as well and so we will see South Australian taxpayers at real risk of having to pay tens of millions of dollars for rental space for an office building that is simply not required. There are question marks over the Modbury Hospital contract, and my colleague the member for Elizabeth has well documented that case before the House. As we know, it would appear on the evidence available to us that that is yet another contract that is not performing as was required. It is a contract that may cost this State dearly.

These are just the big ones, the big fish that are there for all of us to see. But if this situation is indicative of this Government's ability to negotiate and put in place contracts, the mess that will be left behind when the Olsen Government is defeated will require much work by my colleagues and me to right. This comes from a Government which prides itself on economic management and business acumen but which has failed dismally. Since it got rid of its Leader toward the end of last year, the Government has been in constant turmoil, with massive leaking of information. This is a Government that has not delivered to the people what it promised to deliver; it is a Government that has not delivered what it should have delivered; and it is a Government that has not learnt from the mistakes of the past. We in the Labor Party have been subjected to an onslaught at the ballot box, in this place and in the media for our mistakes. At least we learned from the past, but this Government has not.

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

Mr ROSSI (Lee): Unlike the member for Hart, who always criticises and fails to present any alternative means of running the State, I would like to put a few suggestions before the House. As a child, I was brought up in the small country town of Keith in the South-East. When I travel through Adelaide now and encounter traffic congestion, I get frustrated and bad-tempered. For example, not long ago I was on Unley Road travelling towards Cross Road, and it took 20 minutes to travel from Fisher Street to Cross Road at 4.30 in the afternoon.

As to trains, before we came into government and even soon after I entered Parliament, South Australian trains were always dirty, covered in graffiti and there was much broken glass in them. However, after I complained to the Minister in another place, I found that train cleanliness greatly improved and graffiti has been cleaned off trains regularly, but there is still a problem with Adelaide's traffic system. I hope that the Department of Transport will look at my preference of making main roads out of Adelaide one-way roads, prohibiting right-hand turns wherever possible and keeping the traffic moving.

A few years ago I visited Brisbane as a member of the parliamentary bowling team and I noticed that alternative streets were one-way streets and, although Brisbane is two or three times bigger than Adelaide, the traffic flow made it a pleasure to drive. If the Adelaide City Council implements some of the ideas in place in Brisbane and Sydney, the congestion and smoke pollution from stationary cars at traffic lights will be reduced considerably.

Another problem of concern to me involves broken bottles, papers, milk cartons and the like left along railway lines and at railway stations by travellers. If the Department of Transport banned all drinking, smoking and the use of open cartons on trains, the trains would be much cleaner. For example, I visited Singapore in April 1996 and was most impressed with the taxi and train services at the interchange where three services connected at a central point. Indeed, one could almost eat off the train floor in Singapore because the trains were so clean. Taxis carried the sign 'COMFORT' which meant 'caring, observance, mindful, friendly, obligating, responsible and tactful' in regard to the care of customers by taxi drivers. The trains carried the sign 'No eating, no drinking, no smoking, fine: \$500'.

Further, I draw the attention of the Department of Transport to something which it does not do but which impressed me in Singapore. At every train door was the sign 'Please give up your seat to someone who needs it more than you do.' The sign pictured elderly men and women, pregnant women and disabled persons and indicated to children that they should be shown some courtesy and be able to sit down if they wished. Something I have noticed in Adelaide since I was a bus conductor in 1972 is that nowadays many young children do not have respect for the elderly or the sick.

Another problem is that some councils in Adelaide often erect 'No through road' signs in streets but that those signs can be seen only when motorists have actually turned into the street. I suggest that the Department of Transport examine that matter.

COMMUNITY BENEFIT FUND

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Minister for the Environment and Natural Resources): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Earlier this afternoon the member for Elizabeth grieved on the matters relating to the Community Benefit Fund. Again, the member for Elizabeth is wrong. I am told that the criteria for assessing the latest funding round are no different from the criteria for assessing the first funding round and that those criteria were minuted at the board's meeting of 3 December last year. The action now being taken by the board is in fact to clarify some issues relating to those criteria. For example, it has found it necessary to indicate to all applicants that the funding is not designed to duplicate existing programs, particularly where funding opportunities already exist under a variety of State and Commonwealth programs.

I find it interesting that the honourable member continues to try to find negatives from a very positive initiative. I thought that she would have welcomed the funding that has gone out under the scheme to numerous organisations around South Australia which have received money they otherwise would not have received. I also found the press release that the member for Elizabeth released recently on the same issue misleading and mischievous, to say the least: it was headed 'Olsen Government gives with one hand and takes back not much later'. The member for Elizabeth is wrong again. The level of funding going to organisations and agencies outside the Department for Family and Community Services has now reached more than \$100 million for the first time—I understand some \$30 million-odd more than was the case under the previous Labor Government. The headline should more appropriately have been 'Olsen Government gives back what Labor took away'.

MEMBERS' LEAVE

Mr MEIER (Goyder): By leave, I move:

That one week's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Mitchell on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

Mr MEIER: By leave, I move:

That one week's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Hartley on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 February. Page 860.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I said the other day that this was the last piece of legislation with which I would be dealing, but it is not quite the last one: I am doing a Melba. However, I have to say that this Bill is the result of a Caesarean birth, and what I mean by that is that it was not ready for the normal canal, and we find ourselves debating something here this afternoon, the key parts of which we cannot debate because they do not exist yet. We might accept that from a private member who finds halfway through an argument that the whole proposition was dumb and stupid but who proceeds with it anyway. I even voted for one of those

propositions, in the hope that when we got it into Committee we could belt it into shape. I will not identify the measure, because it would upset the member for Unley. However, this is no way for a Government to conduct its affairs.

I am sure that the Minister present in the Chamber is not responsible for this mess that we have and that he has diligently gone about his work, but a number of other cooks have decided to stir the pot and chuck another half a dozen principal issues in with the whole thing. Anyway, this afternoon we have the legislation before us, which I suspect will be significantly amended. In fact, I feel confident in saying that it will be significantly amended when it eventually gets into Committee.

In terms of the Bill's basic provisions, I draw attention, first of all, to the anti-bootlegging provisions. The Opposition has no problem with passing any measures that will protect the integrity of our taxation system in South Australia; so, we support those particular provisions. It is rather interesting, in a sense, that every State has been dragged up to the 100 per cent taxation mark and is protecting its own particular taxation legislation by implementing legislation similar to that which applies in South Australia. I understand the same thing applies now as was debated here a few years ago: that is, there is a wholesale price of cigarettes, irrespective of how cheap the tobacco companies wish to sell them, and the anti-bootlegging provisions are now somewhat old.

I remember for many years in the Enfield area there was 'Mr Smokes', who I believe ran for Parliament a couple of times on that particular issue, although I do not see him around here today. In fact, he did not do too badly: I believe that on one occasion he received four times the number of votes required to get his money back. He probably should have thought about running for—dare I say it—the Senate or the Upper House. However, we have no problem with the bootlegging provisions contained in this Bill. We suspect that the modest increase in taxation provided here will probably not make the whole exercise worth while: I do not know—I guess we will find that out in the future.

What used to be a lucrative business—loading up a utility and bringing cigarettes to South Australia from Queensland—I do not think will translate into bringing them across the Victorian border, although I could be wrong about that. It may well be a very large truck that has to come across the border to achieve that, because we are dealing with an increase of only a few per cent.

The Opposition has always taken very seriously the question of under-age smoking. In fact, I cannot think of any more serious debate around the place than one on this sort of issue, and I believe it is important that I put a few remarks on the record today. It was, of course, a previous Government that dealt with this issue and, in particular, with the question of students under the age of 16 years (as I think it was then) going down to the local deli and buying not only packets of cigarettes but cigarettes in one's and two's.

I do not blame the deli owners because the perceived dangers of smoking were perhaps not as obvious as they are today, and I am sure that in the future the community will have an even stronger attitude about smoking. In fact, community attitudes to smoking have changed incredibly in my lifetime. Indeed, in the 1940s and 1950s cigarettes were free issue to soldiers, sailors and airmen. It was perceived as a way of improving morale in many areas, particularly during the Second World War. Movies from that era depict widespread smoking and the role models were always seen smoking. One of the good aspects of this Bill is that smoking

will now be regulated and will be seen differently from what has been the case in the past. This Bill is about regulating and controlling dangerous substances.

The Opposition also supports the provisions in the Bill implementing a much tougher regime for dealing with those people who knowingly sell cigarettes to minors. We think that those provisions ought to be supported by not only all members in this place but also those further down the corridor. It is no longer acceptable that cigarettes are sold to minors. The community accepts the dangers of smoking. In fact, one does not need a medical degree to understand that smoking and good health do not go together. Smoking for some people can be a life threatening activity very early in their life.

Over the years many people have suffered from asthma caused by their proximity to other persons, possibly partners, who smoke. The issue of passive smoking, rarely heard of 10 years ago, is now an issue that must be addressed in a range of places, and the Opposition accepts that. We know that passive smoking can be as dangerous as smoking itself. A person voluntarily lights up a cigarette or cigar but the person downwind, particularly children, may or may not have any opportunity to avoid the fumes emanating from that source.

The Opposition, whilst it supports those provisions in the Bill, draws the line at what it sees as a revenue grab. There is no doubt that if this Government were serious about the tar tax involving an increase from 100 to 102 or 105 depending on the level of tar, it would have addressed the problem a little differently, acknowledging that the indisputable argument about tar is that it is a cancer causing agent and that, because it is the principal ingredient in cigarettes, cigarettes containing less tar should be cheaper. But, no, the Government will not do that: it will make the heavier tar cigarettes dearer.

I do not know all the medical evidence about tar, but I am assured that tar is only one of a number of substances in cigarettes that are injurious to good health. I am told that tar, in fact, may be a significant ingredient. We do not know the complete answer as yet, because the jury is still largely out on this matter. However, we do know that a number of substances in cigarettes and tobacco products generally are the cause of considerable concern to health authorities.

Tar has been singled out here and, in essence, we see a grab for about \$4 million from the consumer. I think that that clearly shows the real purpose of this Bill which is to squeeze a few more dollars out of the smoker. In my electorate, there is a large number of smokers. When I go to hotels and clubs I find that smoking goes hand in hand with drinking, and I will have a few things to say about this when other proposals finally surface in this place. What has been a relatively benign Bill will be one of the major issues debated in this session of Parliament. However, today I want to make quite clear that the Opposition does not support this tax. We thought about moving some amendments but we can count: 36 to 11 does not work well, even though a number of those 36 are telling hotels and clubs within their electorates that they will do the right thing. At the end of the day, I take the view that they will vote for the Bill which will then go up the corridor where some of the principal issues will be further dealt with.

I must say that this Government, including the new Premier, has a cheek when it says regularly, 'No increases in tax, no new taxes—read our lips.' I say 'our lips' because there have been two Premiers since the last election, in circumstances which, again, I cannot understand. In any case,

both Premiers have said it (one as recently as in December last year), yet we now have a Bill that will significantly increase taxation. Promises were made and broken. The smokers in my electorate, and those in the electorates of every other member, will not be impressed by what the Premier says on the one hand about no increase in taxes and no new taxes, only to find a Bill such as this which is obviously a tax grab.

The Bill also contains provisions containing the power to make regulations, which I understand will be relied upon heavily in a day or two when the rest of this legislation is introduced. The Opposition makes it crystal clear that the days are over in terms of our accepting regulatory powers in legislation. That is because of the contemptuous way in which we as a Parliament have been treated when a regulation is disallowed in the other place and is immediately regazetted the following day. We now look at every piece of legislation that is introduced to ensure that all the relevant provisions are in the Bill and can be dealt with accordingly. We may sometimes not be successful in the other place, but I suspect that we will be more successful on some occasions than others.

The Opposition will support those measures which seek to regulate and control a dangerous substance. We will also support those measures which will correctly ensure that tobacco products will no longer be sold to minors. We also believe in the anti-bootlegging provision, although we point out that that has been created with a view to the tax grab. However, we do not and will not support an increase in the level of taxation. It may be argued that, in some instances, it is only 2 per cent—in others, 5 per cent—and that, in any case, in respect of a packet of cigarettes it represents a small increase of only about 30¢ or 35¢. There are two issues involved. First, as recently as three months ago, this Government promised that it would not increase taxes, but at least part of this must have been in the pipeline. It may not have known about restaurants and hotels—because we still have not seen that—but the Government knew when it made its promise that it would bring forward this proposal for tobacco taxation in South Australia.

The other issue about which we are very sceptical—in fact, we are not at all sold on it—involves the question of whether any differential, if it exists, is linked to tar. The Opposition is not convinced about that. To say the least, members on this side believe that the jury is still out regarding that question. We do not know what relationship tar has to cancer and respiratory illnesses that stem from smoking: either by a smoker lighting up or from a person being downwind of a smoker. The Government is rushing through this Bill. It is attempting to control a dangerous substance—that much we support—but it is also picking up an extra bit of spare cash. That could have been done very differently. I will have more to say about this in Committee, and I indicate to the House that some other members on this side will also have a few things to say when the Bill reaches that stage.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I wish to comment on three aspects of the Bill. The first matter relates to the provisions that deal with the question of who is a fit and proper person to be a tobacco merchant. The Opposition and I support those provisions as they will go some way towards decreasing the ability of merchants to sell tobacco to minors. I also support the so-called anti-bootlegging provisions in the Bill. I believe this issue should be supported, so I have no problem with those provisions.

I want to make a brief comment regarding the taxation provisions of the Bill. It introduces a three tiered taxation system: 100 per cent of the value for low tar cigarettes; 105 per cent for cigarettes where the tar content exceeds 10 mg; and 102 per cent for medium tar cigarettes. I oppose this part of the Bill on two grounds. First and foremost, I do so because of the effect this measure will have on my constituents. No matter what evidence is presented to me, I know that an increase in cigarette prices will mean that many of those people will spend less on things such as children's shoes, food and other essentials.

Of course, it represents another broken promise of this Government which, only a few months ago, guaranteed the people of South Australia that it would not increase taxes in this State. It has taken the Government only three months to break that promise. I not only oppose those provisions on that ground but also because they create an additional impost on small businesses in South Australia. Much is said in the second reading explanation about the health implications of tar and cigarette smoking, but we must recognise this Bill for what it truly is: a blatant tax grab.

I am disappointed with the fact that the Bill is likely to be substantially amended when we go into Committee. We have not been given any opportunity to see those amendments. I am a bit aggrieved that I will not have the opportunity today to comment on what is proposed. There has been much speculation about the introduction of smoking bans to a greater or lesser degree in restaurants and hotels. I would have liked to comment on any such proposals, but they have not been put forward today. As the member for Playford said, it is a sign of arrogance that this Government has put this legislation before us at the last moment. We are expected to vote without knowing what is in the proposed amendments.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Ms WHITE: Those amendments have not been put before us today, so we do not know what they are. Therefore, I can speak only on the Bill that is before us. So, I will have to reserve my comments on any other aspects of the Bill until the Committee stage. Some aspects of the Bill are fully supported by my colleagues and me, but the tax grab proposal is not supported. I urge all members of the House to think carefully about the effect that this Bill will have on their constituents and small businesses in their electorate and to vote with me against that aspect.

Mr LEWIS (Ridley): It is my belief that motherhood is delightful, desirable and necessary for the survival of the human race. Equally, it is my belief that children are a sexually transmitted disease. It is also equally my belief that this legislation is desirable. We are heading in the right direction, and sooner or later we will get there. The public need to understand that if we smoke the majority of us enhance the prospect of an early death. If anyone wants to die sooner rather than later and to die horribly without dignity, I encourage them to smoke and to smoke more heavily in accordance with the strength of their desire because the probability is that their wish will be granted. It does not automatically follow that just because you smoke you will die of lung or throat cancer, emphysema or some other cardiovascular disorder, but all of those diseases are enhanced in the general population by smoking.

There has been a proportional increase in these diseases in the general population in the extent to which smoking tobacco is practised. There are variations according to the type of smoking that is undertaken. We all know of those

stories. It is ridiculous for the tobacco industry to claim that smoking its products does not cause premature death.

We also know that, regardless of whether the smoke has been inhaled by the person possessing the cigarette, the pipe or the cigar, it is immaterial: if you inhale tobacco smoke by some measure you increase your risk of being afflicted by one or other of the diseases that are induced by tobacco smoking in at least a proportion of the population. To those people who wish to smoke, I say, 'Carry on; it will cost you more because at present the revenue raised from tax on tobacco products is not sufficient to meet the health costs incurred by the public purse.' I doubt that we will ever reach a point where we recover as a tax on tobacco sufficient revenue to treat the illnesses from which people suffer when they smoke because, as those taxes increase beyond their current level, there is a stiff disincentive to anyone continuing to smoke as heavily as they may otherwise have chosen to smoke had they only to pay the price for the production of the tobacco itself and the value adding to prepare it in one form or another for consumption. That would mean that the death rate would be very high.

I am worried about the implications for people in other countries in terms of the effect on their health. As their prosperity levels increase, the tobacco companies are enhancing the levels of expenditure in promoting the use of their products. This is particularly the case in Asia where lower levels of income previously acted as a deterrent to those people. They knew that they had to sustain life first: they needed food and fibre in which to clothe themselves as well as shelter for themselves and their families. At lower levels of disposable income it was difficult enough, God knows, to get that, leave alone medicine when they became sick, so they did not in any great numbers at that level of income choose to consume tobacco products or other things that might have cost them any money.

Once the price goes up the demand is marginally reduced and, as you incrementally increase the price—so the law of demand and supply indicates in economics—you more than marginally decrease demand. You incrementally increase the rate at which demand drops off as you marginally increase the price. I am therefore well satisfied that the so-called tax grab—to use the words of members opposite—is not only desirable but necessary. In fact, it is sad that the Government did not feel that it could increase the rate of taxation on tobacco consumption even more.

I am a reformed smoker. I had a serious cancer on my bottom lip. As members know, it affects my speech in some measure on occasions. When the lip gets tight I cannot pronounce words easily. In the matter of a few weeks—during the period between Christmas and New Year—it went from just a bleeding crack in my lip to something bigger than a puffed rice grain that one finds in a breakfast cereal packet. When I went to a surgeon to have it removed he made the point that, had I not acted to have it removed when I did, in all probability it would have gone past the point of no return within three weeks and been dead within three months. I recall thinking that it was just as well that I had given up smoking when I did some time earlier because it was a cancer of the type that also breaks out in the mucous tissues of the throat, oesophagus and trachea but not the same as the one contracted in the lungs.

In my judgment, anything we do as a Parliament to discourage people from consuming tobacco and anything we do to prevent passive smoking is desirable. The measure before us does just that. I am sorry that people have feelings

which they want to balance against that general public good and their own personal best interests by saying that we must be careful not to go too far too soon. I will conclude by simply saying that ultimately legislators who follow us, even perhaps before most of us have departed this earth, will have made tobacco and its consumption a product identical, in the way the law treats it, to marijuana. The health consequences in respect of both products are very serious and are largely underrated by the proponents of their use, be they commercial interests that are legitimate, as is the case in tobacco consumption, or commercial interests that are illegitimate and illegal, as is the case with marijuana.

All such substances that make an individual feel more confident, that are mood modifying in some form or another, that are not essential or desirable as part of what we need to sustain life, are substances that we ought not to treat lightly and encourage. By that I mean that it is both irresponsible and stupid for student union organisations to do what they have been doing in this State and elsewhere in the country in recent times, particularly during 'O' Week in South Australia, where they have made it seem fashionable and fun to get involved in the consumption of narcotics of one type or another. That is grossly irresponsible on the part of the people who advocate it and, if only they knew the agony and pain they will cause in consequence of that advocacy, they would not have done it. For some reason or another they have not been taught by the Life Education Committee's campaign throughout our schools.

As I have said before, I have been a long time supporter of Life Education and the caravans that move around the State. It is a pity that it does not get more support from the revenue we raise from tobacco products and expiation notices collected by Government. It is not a Government initiative. Those of us who support LEC do so by voluntary effort. We raise the money and manage the program with the Government's agreement but without its financial support. That is sad. I urge all members, as part and parcel of the way they look at this and related issues, to continue to give support and encouragement to Life Education, as it is the only means by which we can get children to understand the stupidity of getting involved in drug consumption of any kind.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): As my colleague the member for Playford stated, attitudes and knowledge about tobacco smoking and the effects of tobacco smoking on health have changed incredibly over recent years as we have come to understand and realise how dangerous is that substance and to realise the great health cost we pay in relation to it. To deal with that, Governments have employed a range of measures to control its distribution and merchandising in an attempt to minimise the harm that tobacco smoking causes. They have tried to alert the population to the dangers of tobacco consumption and to prevent especially young smokers from taking up smoking in the first place. The two previous Acts—the Tobacco Products Control Act 1986 and the Tobacco Products Licensing Act 1986—were brought down by the previous Government. That legislation covered many of the issues that have been strengthened somewhat in the present legislation. As the member for Playford stated, the Opposition supports a number of these issues in relation to merchandising, regulation, control of advertising, and so on. However, the issue that we believe is negative is that in relation to the increase in tax, leading to increased prices, for cigarettes according to their tar content. It is interesting to

note that the Government has argued for this tax increase based on the health question, and it has justified it as a health measure.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Perhaps the member for Mawson might stop interjecting and listen for a change. I will spend some time putting on the record some facts in relation to that point. The issue in relation to health and tar is not, as the Government suggests, clearly defined. The Minister in his second reading explanation said:

The link between the quantum of tar in tobacco products and the likely adverse impact on health flowing from tobacco smoking is well documented.

I take issue with that statement and back it up with some information that I sought and received that presents a different picture.

I contacted the Anti-Cancer Foundation, which sent me information from the South Australian Smoking and Health Project, which is jointly auspiced by the Anti-Cancer Foundation, the Heart Foundation and Living Health. It sent a number of documents and made a number of points in relation to tar content and the health consequences. The letter, which refers to an attachment of two chapters on health and smoking by the Royal College of Physicians, states:

The conclusions in chapter 9 are worth reading and support our concern that although there is evidence to support low tar cigarettes reducing death from chronic obstructive lung disease, there is no evidence that deaths from coronary heart disease are affected. It reconfirms that there is no safe level of smoking, and that reducing the tar content may give smokers the false impression that they are smoking a safer cigarette.

Three or four of the papers indicated that, as has been documented in research, smokers actually change their smoking pattern to increase the tar that they receive from low tar cigarettes. I quote again:

One of the concerns that we have is that smokers will increase the depth of inhalation of the smoke or that they will increase the number of cigarettes that they smoke in order to maintain the level of tar that they are used to smoking.

The Hon. S.J. Baker: Not true.

Ms STEVENS: The Treasurer says, 'Not true.' That is the Treasurer's view, but it is certainly not the view of this organisation and backed up by a number of research papers on that matter. There is reference to a press clipping from the *Advertiser* of 1 February 1997 which, regarding an unpublished report on the tar and nicotine content of cigarettes, essentially states that cigarette smokers are getting twice the tar and nicotine they expect when smoking ultra light and light cigarettes. The letter is summarised as follows:

Some concerns about this move raised by others who work in this area are:

- it officially endorses the view that low tar cigarettes are less dangerous, that is, using a harm minimisation approach, it endorses the notion that smokers should be encouraged to switch to low yield brands;
- with youth being very price conscious, it provides a Government sanctioned lower priced cigarettes situation that could be predicted to act as an additional incentive to youth smoking;
- might it place the Government in a position where it might be sued later by smokers who were encouraged to switch;
- when the US Government started requiring that the tar-nicotine content be placed on the cigarette packages the industry re-engineered their cigarettes so that regardless of how much tar or nicotine they contained, they registered lower on the machines, which tested the cigarettes. It is difficult to have a machine mimic the actions of a person smoking a cigarette.

That is the information I received from this organisation in relation to this matter. It clearly demonstrates that you cannot

ever say that smoking is safe and, on the basis of tar content only, you cannot argue that the price differential is anything to do with health. Quite clearly, this measure introduced by the Government is about taxation; it is about increasing the take that the Government gets from smokers. That is very important. Let no-one be fooled that this is a health measure, because it is not.

I also quote from a letter that I received from the Anti-Cancer Foundation. Interestingly enough, despite the health information from their own project, the foundation's representatives said they supported the moves on the basis that any increase in the price of cigarettes should discourage consumption. However, they make these further points:

However, we should point out that these steps alone cannot be expected to cause a significant decline in smoking prevalence, as price increases are just one component of a comprehensive tobacco control plan. We recommend that the Parliament should not rely solely on the tiered tar licence fee structure to deliver the best possible health outcome. We encourage you to support an amendment which would significantly increase the amount of money spent on tobacco education and publicity campaigns to a minimum of \$5 million per year.

I am looking forward to seeing the amendments, which are yet unseen. Perhaps we will see the Government making a further commitment so that it puts its money where its mouth is in terms of taking steps actually to do something about people, especially young people, taking up cigarette smoking.

I want to make one comment in relation to the Anti-Cancer Foundation. One of the points raised with me was that the Anti-Cancer Foundation is funded at only \$500 000 a year. I have read a consultant's report in relation to the programs it runs, and that consultant has made quite clear that, in terms of being effective in fighting smoking and the taking up of smoking, that organisation is severely under funded. Here we have an opportunity for the Government to put its money where its mouth is and actually do something other than just rake off more money from cigarette smokers to show that it is really serious about health measures.

Regarding the amendments in relation to bans on smoking in restaurants, I am staggered at the ineptness of this Government in not being able to get its act together to properly consult, work with the stakeholders and get it all together in the one Bill before the House to allow proper debate and scrutiny of legislation. Again, members opposite show that they are not able to do it; they show that they will use the muscle of their numbers and just ram something through without proper consultation and debate.

I am concerned about this, because when the news broke about this measure I expected to receive discussion papers and I expected that there would be public debate, but of course there was none. I was surprised to hear on the radio last week, when the Minister for Health proudly spoke about this great step forward concerning smoking bans, that the Australian Hotels Association and the Restaurants Association say that they had not been consulted. So, we were not the only ones not consulted.

Mr OSWALD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is nothing in this Bill before the House that allows us to canvass this subject. All members are in the position of restraint: we cannot canvass that subject until the Committee stage of the Bill, and I ask you to keep the debate constrained as is expected of all members.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order is quite correct. The member for Elizabeth is speaking in anticipation of an amendment that has not yet materialised. The only references to smoking in public places are in clauses 45, 46

and 47 concerning buses, lifts and places of public entertainment. The debate is somewhat constrained.

Ms STEVENS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Obviously, I accept your ruling. I will not continue with those remarks but I will be commenting later.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is not trying to gag any member. Each member will have the right to speak three times for 15 minutes each on all the clauses in the Bill during Committee. There will be ample opportunity.

Ms STEVENS: Thank you for your clarification, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I will certainly take my time then. It seems to me that the Government has chosen a very inept way to handle this matter. Surely it has been in office long enough to conduct a proper process, wherein it consults, allows adequate time for discussion and plans things so that it can get its act together at the right time.

Members interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: The member for Peake interjects that our mob did it that way. If our mob did it that way, it is not okay either. This important matter deserves better treatment by the Government. It deserves proper scrutiny with a proper second reading explanation followed by a Committee debate, as all other Bills are subjected to. It does not deserve this half-hearted, ham-fisted and inept attempt that we are seeing today.

Mr BUCKBY (Light): I support the Bill. Smoking regulations have changed over the years. We have seen a number of changes which have had an impact on people's smoking habits. We have looked at changing those habits away from smoking because of the perceived and known health dangers that accompany smoking. A couple of those changes have related to advertising on television and in newspapers. We would see sporting events subsidised or promoted by cigarette companies, but that has now been stopped. We have also seen health warnings on cigarette packets to advise of the dangers of smoking. We have seen tar content levels printed on cigarette packets as well. In addition, we have seen the development of Foundation SA—now Living Health—its prime aim being to educate people about the dangers of smoking, particularly about the long-term damage that smoking can do.

One has to look only in hospitals to see the number of people taking up places in wards because of emphysema. The prime cause of emphysema results from long-term, consistent and heavy smoking. Certainly, the cost borne by our health system from that disease is significant. Anything that a Government can do to dissuade people from taking up smoking is an important factor in what we are here for. Another important aspect is that, when people go to hospital for an operation, they are asked, 'Do you smoke?' That question is asked because, if people do smoke, it restricts the range of drugs that can be used post-operative because of the effect of nicotine and tar with those drugs. That is another aspect of health cost to the community.

The Bill divides cigarettes into three levels: A, cigarettes containing less than 5 milligrams of tar; B, cigarettes containing between 5 to 10 milligrams of tar; and C, cigarettes containing more than 10 milligrams of tar. A tax rate is applied to each of those levels and the higher the tar level, as other members have pointed out, the greater the tax. The idea is to encourage people to smoke cigarettes with less tar, which will be more beneficial to them compared with smoking cigarettes with a higher tar content.

That is one important matter that the Bill addresses. It also strengthens the regulatory controls on tobacco merchants. That is also a particularly important factor, because it means that licence fees will be paid on nothing other than the gross wholesale price. As we have seen over the past 12 months or two years, there has been some shifting of seats on the deck in achieving compliance within the industry with wholesalers and retailers paying the correct tax to the Government, given the amount of discounting that has been going on. I will not comment further because I would only be repeating what other members have said. The Bill is another step in educating people and dissuading them from taking up smoking. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition strongly opposes what is clearly a revenue increase. There is no doubt about that. Let us remember that this is an attempt to re-badge something as a health measure. The fact is, the Government rakes in more than \$200 million a year from smoking and only a tiny proportion of that money goes into anti-smoking or health campaigns. This move is fraudulent, and we are being forced to debate only half a Bill. There are parts of this legislation which we have not seen and which we are not allowed to debate, yet we know—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We read about it in the paper, we hear about it in the corridors; and we hear there was a monumental blue last week in the Liberal Caucus—in the Liberal Party room—and another monumental blue today. So, basically, we are confronted with a historic piece of legislation, but the Liberal Party cannot decide what is in it. How absurd can you get?

The action man, the Premier, has come in. The Parliament packs up every night before the dinner adjournment as it does not have any legislation. So, we are now confronting legislation that we are not allowed to debate properly; we are not allowed to see the amendments as it has not been decided what the amendments are. You will breach all the protocols established with the Opposition.

This measure is about a revenue take. It is about ripping off the working class people in electorates such as mine in Salisbury. It is purely a take on revenue—just as with speed cameras. We all know what is going on, but at least the Treasurer should have the decency and the gumption to admit that it is about that: it is about extra tax, extra revenue. Again, there has been virtually no consultation with the industry. Given discussions over the past couple of days, there has been zero consultation with the industry. Apparently, the tobacco companies had about three days. This is the Government's approach to consultation.

We should oppose this measure, because it is simply a revenue grab by the Government. And, of course, members opposite have got themselves into a bit of problem: small businesses are giving them a whack. There was a big blue in the Party room because the Minister for Health wanted to tack something on the end of a revenue Bill. This measure is about revenue, not about health, and the Treasurer knows that. As someone who has never smoked a cigarette in my life—I had a couple of cigars one Christmas—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have never smoked marijuana, either. No, I am not like members who boast about these things. I did not need to inhale; I never actually smoked one.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have drunk a few schooners. The point is that Living Health, the successor to Foundation South Australia, is an organisation which irritates me greatly. A few years ago representatives of a football club in my area came to see me and said that they wanted to dissuade from smoking a number of people in the club, particularly some players' girlfriends; other members had dietary problems and wanted advice on diets and proper nutrition; and some elderly people wanted advice on blood pressure issues. They wanted advice from Foundation SA. So I advised them. I had a look at the Act and noted that there were provisions relating to assistance for people particularly in areas of disadvantage. I assisted them with their application for about \$7 000, from memory; I might be wrong on that figure. However, they told me that they were knocked back, because Foundation SA, Living Health, is about the big end of town.

It is not about the small clubs or about assisting people in need: it is about having its board members and others popping along to their cocktail parties and swanning around town. I know it, and I believe that the Government, if it was fair dinkum, would recognise that. Foundation SA, Living Health, does some good things, but it needs to do a darned sight better and it needs to connect with and assist real people out there, addressing some of the issues in a targeted way.

I would like to know how much of that \$220 million (I have been advised by the member for Elizabeth) actually goes into campaigns to persuade young people not to smoke. I believe it is not very much at all, just as very little of Living Health's money goes towards that purpose. So, I am very pleased to oppose, and quite open about opposing, what I believe has nothing to do with health whatsoever: it is purely a tax grab.

Further, we have this bizarre perversion of the parliamentary process whereby the Liberal Party, the Government of the day, with its massive numbers, cannot sort out its own problems. Members opposite are so busy fighting themselves that they have stopped fighting for South Australia. That is one of the problems. We are debating a Bill today, but we will read in the newspapers or hear in the media what the provisions are, because the Government cannot sort itself out in order to allow the Parliament to know what exactly we are debating and what exactly is part of this legislation. That is why I oppose this Bill.

Mr BECKER (Peake): The anti-smoking campaign in this country over almost four decades has cost millions, if not billions, of dollars, yet it has achieved very little. The incidence of smoking has not declined significantly, yet Government coffers have reaped billions of dollars from the pleasures of some of the people through taxes, levies and franchise fees associated with smoking. What really annoys me is that every time we have to consider legislation on cigarette smoking—and I have had to consider it for three decades—we are provided with certain statistics that claim X number of people are affected by or die from cigarette smoking.

I refer members to an article in the *Australian* of Thursday 20 February 1997, written by Frank Devine. It is headed 'The distortion of scientific research threatens to become an epidemic' and states:

One is reminded of the letter (now famous in scientific circles) sent by Simon Chapman, associate professor of public health at Sydney University, to fellow members of the National Health and Medical Research Council's working group on passive smoking.

Simon Chapman has led the anti-smoking campaign almost from day one and has done everything possible to belittle the tobacco companies and anyone who smokes cigarettes. He has been one of the most ardent critics of smoking in this country. We now find that he has got himself an associate professorship of public health at Sydney University. The article further states:

He warned the group—

and the National Health and Medical Research Council is one of the most highly respected bodies in this country in providing scientific advice to Government Ministers, particularly Government Ministers for Health—

against taking fractions of deaths from lung cancer in various categories and adding them up to reach a total of. . . what? [says the author] 'Whole' deaths, I guess. Chapman added, 'Journalists looking at [our] table. . . [that is, the National Health and Medical Research Council's table] will be hard-pressed to write anything other than 'Official: passive smoking cleared—no lung cancer'. In the event, the working group persisted in adding up its insignificant fractions to achieve specious aggregates. Nor was it deterred by Chapman's opinion that the low incidence of deaths from heart disease attributed to passive smoking in its draft report would give an 'over-the-top' appearance to recommendations for banning smoking in various enclosed areas.

We will have more on that. I have a briefing paper from that report, not stolen or leaked, as the Opposition would claim, but a document referring to that section where Simon Chapman made the very clear appeal for people to be very careful in citing the number of deaths related to smoking by categorising part of the cause of someone who has passed away. I find that absolutely unbelievable. It is intolerable to think that any Government or any scientific organisation would dissect a person's death into various little groups and categories and say that part of the death was caused by this, part of the death was caused by that and part of the death was caused by something else. If you are killed in a car crash, you are killed in a car crash. If your heart stops beating, you die of heart failure. The contributing factors may be many and varied. A person's body deteriorates with age.

I received a letter the other day from a friend living in the south of France. He left Australia after some large financial mishaps in this country which affected this State and the State Government. In the village where he lives in the south of France, if you die before you reach the age of 90 years you have been cheated. So much for passive smoking and the smoking of certain cigarettes. This legislation, whilst it consolidates the legislation affecting tobacco products in this State, brings in a landmark provision, and that is the tax on the tar content. I do not have to go back very far to remind members of an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 1 March 1997, headed 'Low-tar cigarettes causing a different cancer', and which states:

Smokers who wish to switch to low-tar cigarettes are increasingly victims of a different type of cancer—one that reaches deeper into the lungs, a Swiss study found.

I will leave members to go to page 3 of that copy of the *Advertiser* to read the article to save having it all included in *Hansard*. If we are dinkum about doing something about cigarette smoking, why do we not ban cigarettes? If it is legal to manufacture the product, if it is legal to sell the product, then it should be up to individuals to choose where they want to smoke cigarettes and how much they pay for them. If Governments tax them, then Governments must be careful about how the taxing process is carried out.

In a letter to the Editor, in the *Advertiser* of 3 March, J.M. Billinger of Flinders Park (which is in my electorate) referred

to the tar tax. Writing about the impact that the various taxes have and an excise fee which is something equivalent to \$84.27 per kilogram, he states:

It seems to me that Governments are more sympathetic to illegal drug abusers, so why not a 'junkie tax'? Part of the 76 per cent tax imposed goes to Living Health (formerly Foundation SA) to sponsor sport which is mostly athletics, football, soccer, cricket, and so on—not racing, the 'sport of kings'.

I am sorry, Mr Billinger, you have that part wrong: Foundation SA replaced tobacco sponsorship to the various associations—athletics, football and racing. The South Australian Jockey Club receives a considerable amount of support; the Adelaide Cup, previously known as Winfield Cup, now receives living health sponsorship.

This legislation enshrines at this stage Living Health (formerly Foundation SA) in the legislation. I understand that warnings have already been given to various organisations that sponsorship may not continue by Living Health, which is funded by a small levy on cigarette tax in this State to the tune of about \$11.5 million. When Foundation SA was formed in South Australia and the legislation went through the Parliament—and I persisted in questioning and seeking information from the Minister and the Government of the day—it was made very clear to me that the tobacco sponsorship that it would replace (worth only a couple of million dollars) would continue and include at least the cost of inflation.

I believe that the South Australian Jockey Club has been robbed absolutely blind because of interference by that legislation and its impact on the horse racing industry. We had some of the greatest horse trainers in Australia—Bart Cummings, in my electorate, Colin Hayes and several others. Some of the greatest winners of the Melbourne Cup were trained on the beach at Glenelg North. Part of the training process was to use the sand and saltwater there, and Morphettville, Cheltenham and Victoria Park racecourses were also used. Because we could not keep up the sponsorship and funding of the Adelaide Cup, we have lost some of the major races. We have lost these people, the horses and a wonderful part of a strong, viable industry. Horse breeding was very successful in the Adelaide Hills, and it still could be very successful if we had a strong, viable racing industry. That has been the impact of this legislation, which we are now consolidating.

Living Health has not been generous or kind to the sporting organisations, let alone the arts and the health education program. Information given to me, when I ask representatives of the tobacco industry how things are going, indicates that everyone appears to be doing all right, and members only have to read the annual reports to see how sales are going, yet over nine years something like \$700 000 has been spent on tobacco education programs and there has been very little, if any, impact on smoking among young people. I do not think that very much has been achieved at all. All they have done is escalate the price of cigarettes and the income to the Government.

It is estimated that in the financial year 1996-97 the State Government could receive \$214.3 million, a significant increase from the amount of money received during the previous financial year. The sum of \$214 million injected into the South Australian economy is a huge percentage, yet when the tobacco companies decided to have a price war, to see who could increase their share of the market, the impact on this State Government was something like \$20 million.

I question and query the wisdom of bringing in a tar tax. It is impossible to define the tar content in some tobacco products. One of the most popular tobacco products among the working class, and mainly in the correctional services area, is roll-your-own cigarettes. Roll-your-own cigarettes were the most popular form of cigarettes among soldiers during the Second World War and among the manual workers. To now define a tar tax is unfortunate and most difficult to do. To break the 100 per cent tax level and also to be the first State in Australia, and the only State, that will now be out of kilter with the rest of the States is unwise. In other words, the tax on cigarettes in South Australia will be 105 per cent.

What will happen, and what has happened in the past, is that an operator from another State will bring in a semi-trailer load of cigarettes to sell on the black market—and there are plenty of retailers who will buy them and dispose of them and take the risk of being caught—and another black market will commence. While 5 per cent does not sound very much, it is quite a significant amount of money when it applies to a bulk undertaking. It is estimated that about five semi-trailer loads a month will come into South Australia from the Northern Territory, Victoria or New South Wales, and this will easily undermine what we are trying to achieve.

If the legislation passes the Parliament, it will immediately be subject, I understand, to a challenge in the High Court, and that is unfortunate. I hate to see taxpayers' money go into High Court fees. I always thought that we were the supreme body that sets the laws, but the way we are structured under the Australian Constitution, if the State Government brings in something contrary to either section 92 or 93 of that Act we could find ourselves involved in long drawn-out litigation. I do not mind the Government wanting to consolidate the legislation. That is an excellent move: let us make the legislation slimmer and operable. This consolidation is endeavouring to cut out the black market.

By cutting out the blackmarketing of cigarettes, to some degree we are contributing to it by adding this 5 per cent tax on tar. On many brands of tobacco products the amount of tar is not identified. Does this mean that all tobacco manufacturers will have to assess every type of product on the South Australian market to identify the amount of tar, state that on each packet of cigarettes, or whatever, and devise some form of documentation to police the whole thing? This is an additional cost that will impact on the South Australian consumer.

I cannot see anything in this Bill that will educate people about cigarette smoking. That is the flaw in the Foundation SA Living Health program. That program has been given \$11.5 million, and the administration fees amount to about 9 per cent of that figure. From my reading of the latest annual report, I believe that the cost is double that figure. There are costs associated with promoting, setting up and establishing the programs, and those costs almost double the administration fees. If that is so and if we are paying out 15 to 17 per cent of that \$11.5 million in administration fees, the system is flawed.

I would rather see the whole of that sum of \$11.5 million divided between the three departments for sport, health and the arts for them to administer its disbursement in a cohesive manner. In other words, the Minister for Recreation and Sport would know exactly where that money is needed and what it can do; the Minister for the Arts would know exactly what is required in the arts area; and the Minister for Health would know exactly what type of health program he would want to

run. Those three should disburse those funds rather than some autonomous body (totally divorced from Government) doing its own thing in its own style and at its own pace with very little Government involvement. It will be argued that the Government has input through representatives and appointees, etc., but I have yet to see that in the eight or nine years that that organisation has existed.

I advise the Government to reconsider this legislation and to be careful. Of course, it will not be popular with the tobacco companies or cigarette smokers—and you cannot blame them. About 260 000 people in South Australia ‘enjoy’ the pleasures of cigarette smoking. People believe that, if they want to, they have the right. Recently, at my local branch of the RSL a 79-year-old member said to me, ‘What the hell are you doing with the price of cigarettes?’ He said, ‘I put my life on the line for this country in Tobruk, Papua New Guinea and various other places. I volunteered to go overseas to defend this country. I’m damned if I’m going to be told when or where I can smoke while the Government takes so much from it.’

I enjoy playing lawn bowls. One of my most interesting competitors some time ago was a 92-year-old gentleman. I was amazed when I was told his age. I had to help him up and down the step to the green, but at every second end he lit a cigarette. After about an hour, as a matter of normal courtesy, I asked him whether he would like a drink. When we got into the bar he said, as he was lighting a cigarette, that he would like a glass of sherry. He knocked back a few sherries and at the end we had a couple of glasses of port. By the end of the day I believe that he had smoked a packet of cigarettes. I took my hat off to him. He was quite a good bowler and pretty agile. His only problem was getting up and down the step to the bowling green. It proves the point that some people are affected by cigarette smoking but some are not. Why should we legislate to take away from some people this pleasure just because others need to learn to control their habit? Unfortunately, I find this legislation flawed.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I am not sure whether I am following an Opposition or a Government member, but I would like to make some points in my contribution to this debate. At the outset, on behalf of all members, I say how pleasing it is to see the Minister for Industrial Affairs and the Deputy Premier embrace each other. This is a moving moment. I am pleased to see that both Graham and Dean are back on speaking terms. Stephen is a bit quiet at the end of the bench, but I think it will probably take the Treasurer a little longer to be on good terms—

Mr Bass interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Oh, but it’s touching, Sam.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member about using a member’s first name, however well-intentioned his comments may be.

Mr FOLEY: I understand the member for Florey’s being a bit touchy about my reference to the former Premier and the Deputy Premier being together once again. I am touched.

Mr Bass interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Absolutely! I am very pleased that both those members of Executive Government are putting to one side their personal differences. They appear to be getting on well at the moment. However, I am here to debate a very important Bill and I will not be distracted any further or indulge the House any longer in my, as the member for Florey would say, somewhat irrelevant comments.

This Bill is fundamentally flawed. The way in which the Government is handling this Bill is almost of Monty Python magnitude. This is not the Bill we will debate in Committee tomorrow. I understand that there are certain elements of this Bill that I cannot debate now, even though this is the second reading debate. It is somewhat comical that a Government of three years standing cannot get its act together. It is not a difficult concept. Again, I have some sympathy for the Treasurer, as I am sure that this is not of his doing. From time to time, there will be minor adjustments in terms of amendments, but you do not bring before the Parliament a Bill that potentially will be changed substantially within the next 24 to 48 hours. That is a little unfortunate, and it indicates a Government that, effectively, is making policy on the run.

Having said that, we know of the strength of the Government’s backbench. It has successfully removed a Premier and overturned Government attempts to protect our young children in swimming pools. The power of this backbench is of some note. Clearly, in respect of this Bill we are again seeing the backbench rule the will of this Government. This is not government by Executive; it is not government by the ruling Party; it is government by a backbench rump that is feeling the cool winds of political change. I will not enter into debate on those issues, as I am prohibited from doing so, but I will say that it smacks of some pretty sloppy work by this Government.

My colleague the member for Playford (soon to be Senator-elect) and former shadow Treasurer has indicated the Opposition’s stance on this Bill and has been well supported in his views by my colleagues the Leader, the shadow Minister for Health and others. The Opposition supports the anti-bootlegging provisions of this Bill and the crackdown on the age limits, but we strongly oppose what is nothing but a naked tax grab by the Government to the tune of \$4 million to \$6 million.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Exactly! I was going to make that point. You can always pick it when they come into the Parliament with a Bill that is all about protecting the health of our people and they put up the tax on a particular product.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: It is a ploy used by all Governments.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I am simply saying—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are quite capable of prolonging an otherwise brief speech, as members are well aware. They are also quite out of order.

Mr FOLEY: I thought, Sir, that you were going to make reference to my contribution.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Brevity is the soul of wit.

Mr FOLEY: I cannot be very funny. You can always pick a Government tax grab on tobacco legislation when it begins with words relating to the health of its citizens. It is a bit like the speed camera debate whereby Governments of all persuasions try to convince us that it is all about road safety. I had first-hand experience within Government when I found, to my surprise, that that is not necessarily the view of Treasury. Whilst road safety is important, again it is a revenue-raising issue. It is a \$4 million to \$6 million tax grab, which is well in excess of inflation and which breaks an election commitment by this Government. It was not the Labor Party but this Government that said that it would not increase taxation above the level of inflation. Both the former Premier and the current Premier said that, and I am sure that

the future Premier will say that. The bottom line is that we will hold this Government to the commitment it has repeated often in the past three years. I simply say to the Treasurer that, if he makes those sort of commitments and statements, he can expect the Opposition to keep him to them.

The next time the Government brings in such important legislation I trust that it is the final draft and that we do not have the charade of a mid-week Caucus meeting within the governing Party to resolve a position: simply give us the Bill we are debating, as it is the least we deserve. We are a cooperative Opposition, but our cooperation is sorely tested in this instance.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will be brief. The points about the tax grab by this Government have been well described by the Leader and the members for Playford and Elizabeth. I will concentrate on a couple of points relating to the health of young South Australians in particular. Something like \$11 million has been allocated to Living Health, formerly Foundation SA, to promote a healthy lifestyle, which obviously includes the prevention of cigarette smoking. I for one may have smoked a few cigarettes when I was young but certainly do not now—indeed, with my asthmatic condition, I would find it impossible to do so.

As a patron of the Kilburn Football Club I have tried to encourage that club, because it is building new clubrooms, to ban cigarette smoking on the premises. It is a family club and a number of children use it. Unfortunately a number of members and patrons of the clubs are heavy smokers—regrettably a number of young people and, in particular, young women. When I raised the issue informally with the club management committee I was told that the club was worried about losing bar revenue if it banned smoking. I argued that there may be an initial drop off in terms of revenue, but eventually people come back. I also suggested that non-smokers who do not want to come into the clubrooms now because of the amount of smoke in the atmosphere may be induced to return to the club if a ban is implemented, so there may be a net effect of no reduction in revenue at all. But, like any club management committee, particularly with amateur football clubs, it cannot gamble with what it believes its revenue may or may not be in the future, particularly as it is acquiring new clubrooms. Although the new premises are heavily subsidised by the Port Adelaide Enfield council, nonetheless the club must meet a loan commitment as well. It is worried about the amount of revenue it raises over the bar.

I approached Living Health at the time to find out whether it could offer a subsidy for a limited period, guaranteeing certain revenues from the bar which would not amount to tens of thousands of dollars but which would mean some money for the club for a period of three years on a decreasing basis so that, if there was a shortfall in revenue, the club would not lose out, provided that cigarette smoking or any smoking on the club premises was forbidden. I was told at that time that the amount of money that might have been available, if I could get it, was around \$2 000 and that it was unlikely that I would get that sum of money if it was applied for. That put the club between a rock and a hard place. Smoking ought to be banned, but the club will not do it because it fears loss of patronage and loss of revenue and as a result it may not be able to meet its financial commitments.

My concern is that Living Health is not allocating money at the grassroots level of sport, particularly junior sports. Every member in this place would have been approached at

one time or another by individual sporting clubs seeking assistance from Living Health, only to get the well worn answer from Living Health that the money is given to the peak codes and that it does not arbitrate between individual clubs. At one stage I thought that I could understand that rationale, but increasingly that is less so because I cannot see the point, to a certain extent, of the South Australian National Football League getting large lumps of money from Living Health for the hierarchy of the SANFL, the commissioners and nobs in industry to sit in the dining room and enjoy watching the Crows or Port Power play at Football Park when local junior football clubs find it hard to be able to get guernseys and the like or to enforce smoking bans in their clubrooms because they fear loss of revenue. It would be more appropriate for Living Health to concentrate on the development of junior football, soccer or any other sport and as a result encourage a healthy lifestyle.

I cannot for the life of me see the sense, other than for political reasons on the part of this Government, for Living Health to be tapped on the shoulder and told to donate \$100 000 to a fireworks display in March this year. I cannot understand how the payment of \$100 000 by Living Health, simply so that it can display a few signs at Sky Show, will do any good as very few people understand the term anyway. Most people probably think that it is a health insurance company or something of that nature. I am not fond of the name, and I do not think that it conveys much meaning to the general populace. The sum of \$100 000 will literally go up in smoke on a fireworks promotion. Whilst I, like every other Adelaidean, enjoy going to see Sky Show, it was originally started to promote a commercial radio station. I cannot understand why \$100 000 of Living Health money, which could be better used in promoting a healthy lifestyle at the grassroots level of sporting communities, should go up in smoke.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: As the member for Playford says, they will get a bang out of it. The South Australian Amateur Football League recently applied to Living Health for a grant of \$50 000 to help a number of clubs purchase guernseys and the like. I, together with other members of Parliament, particularly on this side of the House—because the football clubs are situated mainly in our electorates—have written in support of its application to Living Health.

The Minister's second reading explanation states that the Bill is all about the health of South Australians, but that is so much hogwash—it is about increasing the tax take. The Treasurer may well say that it is only \$4 million to \$6 million as far as the tax revenue is concerned. However, the former Premier and the current Premier signed in blood that there would be no increase in taxes and no new taxes. We did not ask for that commitment. They give it freely and voluntarily, and we just happen to believe that they should honour that commitment.

The Bill will do nothing to improve the health of South Australians. The Government has not indicated that the revenue raised will go into the Health Department, Living Health, junior sport or any other field of endeavour to improve the health of South Australians. If the Government is really interested in the health of young South Australians in particular, it would do well to talk to Living Health about allocating its money to the grass roots areas of sport and young people rather than maintaining this facade, as I see it, of spending considerable sums of money in the arts area. I freely admit that I am not an arts person or arts devotee, but

nor am I a philistine, although there may be some who find that an arguable statement. At least in my own mind I do not regard myself as a philistine.

I believe it is far more important that Living Health concentrate on the grass roots areas and, in particular, areas where young people congregate. We should be encouraging our young people to pursue a healthy lifestyle, particularly in electorates like mine, where the thought of their going to Wagner's *The Ring* or whatever is nonsensical. I am not saying that people should not enjoy it: I am simply saying that a significant number of young people within my electorate get their pleasure from sporting organisations and clubs. Unfortunately, a number of sporting organisations and clubs in my electorate, notwithstanding my best efforts, persist in maintaining an open policy with respect to smoking in club premises. It is in places like that that the non-smoking message should be promoted. The money should not be spent on banners advertising Living Health. As I said before, nobody knows what it means and, in fact, they think it is a health insurance company.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I will be very brief. I agree with those parts of the Bill with respect to the health aspects and the control of the sale of tobacco products. However, I do not agree with the taxation provisions. I also object to the fact that we cannot debate the Bill in its entirety and that we will have to wait until the Committee stage when we will finally see the amendments, which we will debate in some detail.

I agree that the smoking of tobacco is a health hazard and a very dangerous practice. However, I also believe that people should have a choice, yet the taxation provision takes away that choice—certainly for many working class people in my electorate. The tax impost will not affect the rich. They will just pay the extra tax, go on their merry way, smoke and ruin their health, but certainly in my electorate and the electorates of other members on this side it is a very discriminatory tax, and that is the part of the legislation that I object to.

We all have our own priorities, and some people actually enjoy smoking. Some people cannot afford to do other activities, but they can afford to smoke instead. Many of these people know the dangers of smoking, but some of them, certainly in my electorate, are perhaps in the final stages of some sort of terminal illness, whether smoke related or otherwise, or they are too old or disabled and cannot get out and enjoy other activities. They seek some sort of consolation in smoking, knowing full well that it is no good for their health but, so what, they enjoy doing it and they get enjoyment out of it. It makes them feel better and able to relax, and who can deny them that pleasure?

Upwards of \$1 million a day is spent by this Government in hospitals and clinics to treat patients with tobacco related illness and problems associated with smoking tobacco products. That large sum of money could be put to better use. That amount is more than will be received from the taxation provisions designed to assist in this area. Some of us do other things. We eat and drink certain things that we know are injurious to our health, but we do that nevertheless. It is our choice, and certainly it seems very discriminatory to single out tobacco users and hit them in that regard while letting those who do not smoke off the hook.

Taxation does not work. I have to concede that previous Labor Governments have also imposed heavy taxation penalties on smokers. It has not worked, so we must find other ways to combat this problem, such as education and

other incentives. We certainly will not achieve results by using the sledgehammer method of imposing a very heavy tax penalty.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I thank members for their contribution, but I have never heard so much garbage in all my life. Members talk about a naked tax grab. We all know who was responsible for the 100 per cent taxation on cigarettes and tobacco products in this State—the former Labor Government. Let us get it right. When they talk about a naked tax grab, I suggest that members opposite look at their own record—

Mr Clarke: Why don't you reduce the taxes?

The Hon. S.J. BAKER: The Deputy Leader was heard in silence. I suggest that he might like to listen for a change instead of opening his mouth. The previous Labor Government said, 'We want to whack all the people with a 100 per cent impost.' That was the amount of tax levied by the former Government. The Opposition does not have a leg to stand on, but it seems that it is not very good at reflecting on the lessons of history.

If members opposite want to talk about a naked tax grab, let us get it out of the way right from the start. As Treasurer, an increase of 5 per cent—from 100 per cent to 105 per cent—will raise perhaps \$5 million if nobody gives up their habit. As a revenue raising measure, that is hardly a dividend that I would wish to bring before the House. The Bill has nothing to do with taxation, as members have suggested, but it does have a positive tax benefit.

I turn now to the rubbish I heard about bootlegging. When the former Government put the tax up to 100 per cent, there was a 25 per cent differential between the States, and I think there may have been a 50 per cent differential. That is when you can talk about the issue of bootlegging. We are now talking about a 5 per cent differential. The outstanding work done by my taxation officers has meant that the amount of 'illegals' or interstate transport of tobacco products has been reduced to a minimum. It will never be completely eliminated, but it has certainly been reduced to a minimum, and there is certainly good cooperation between the States to ensure that each knows what the other is doing.

It is more likely that we will see the importation of overseas tobacco products, about which we have already seen some publicity. The importation of illegal overseas tobacco products is more likely to affect all States rather than just South Australia, because the 5 per cent just does not justify the effort. So, when we talk about bootlegging, let us get it right. If bootlegging was the issue, the differential created by former Governments would have been a major issue upon which they should have reflected. That is one strike against the assertion that this is a naked tax grab.

The second strike relates to trade. It was suggested by the member for Peake that section 92 could be subject to a challenge in the High Court. Again, that is absolute garbage. It has nothing to do with interstate trade whatsoever. I should like to make the point that State revenues are continually under pressure from various challenges to the High Court. I hope that wisdom prevails. One challenge on tobacco products will commence before the High Court this month. We have had challenges on petrol and liquor. In the scheme of things, the challenges against the States continue, and we would desire to distance ourselves clearly from the issue of these licence fees being an excise tax. We firmly put the point of view—if the High Court wishes to read *Hansard*—that licence fees are legitimate; they have stood the test of time to

date and I hope they will stand the test of time into the future. We would not like to see our taxation base eroded by some of the nefarious challenges put before the High Court.

Certainly, I heard some amazing statements from the other side of the House. There was some suggestion that tar and nicotine have nothing to do with some injuries to bodies as a result of smoking. That comment was made by the shadow Minister for Health. I ask all members of Parliament: why would health authorities around the world demand that nicotine and tar contents be listed on cigarette packages? Is it there just for decoration? Are those numbers there for people to add up to see whether there is something magic on a packet? What is clear is that health authorities around the world—universally—believe that tar and nicotine have a deleterious effect on health. To even suggest that there is no substance to the issue of tar having a health impact is something I find amazing.

Members opposite could recall some of the advertisements about how much tar is created from a year of smoking. I reflect on some of the advertisements on television. They did not seem to have much impact on smoking habits but they certainly looked good on TV, showing absorbent material being squeezed and the tar coming out and filling a bucket. Some of the advertisements referred to the black lung syndrome, where people who had been smoking for a long period have serious coatings on their lungs. When members opposite suggest that tar is good, almost good or maybe not all that bad, I just wonder what books they have been reading over a long period.

Some Opposition members seemed to suggest that the Government should be taking no action whatsoever. They seemed to be saying, 'Leave the poor old smokers alone and let them die in comfort.' The Government clearly states, as I hope the Opposition will state, that there is no such thing as safe smoking. People make decisions—rightly or wrongly—knowing the risks associated with them. The risk associated with smoking higher tar products is obviously higher and that is reflected in the Bill. We are saying, 'We are bringing this to your attention. We are not charging you a big dollar for the privilege but we are simply bringing to your attention, if you want to smoke up the tar line, that you pay a slightly higher price.'

In terms of what that higher price should be, we recognised that, if the price was too high, people would somehow believe that lower tar cigarettes were acceptable. Health authorities suggest that cigarettes are unacceptable totally so that, therefore, there should not be a large differential to create the mistaken belief that smoking low tar cigarettes will be healthy, because that is not true either. When members are contributing to the debates on these issues, they should stick to the script and not find whatever reason they can dream up to reject the measure. The measure sends a message about smoking habits.

The Government has said that, even though people have a right to make decisions, if they value their health they should not be tied to cigarette smoking. In terms of there being safe cigarettes, there are no safe cigarettes and obviously, if people smoke cigarettes over a long period, they put their health at risk. Despite the member for Peake knowing someone of 90 years who has obviously shown no ill effects—I remember that Deng in China smoked like a train and lived to 90 or 92 years—those people may be the exceptions to the rule. The Bill does not grab a large amount of revenue. In fact, if everyone is down at the lower end of the tar chain, it does not grab any extra revenue at all. Some

people will recognise that and I expect that some will change their habits. The Government's preference is that they give up altogether.

One of the consistent themes running through the debate and one that I am sure Foundation SA, now Living Health, will reflect on is the accusation that the organisation is operating at the big end of town. When this Government inherited Foundation SA, some of those criticisms might have been true. As members would recognise from the number of on-the-ground campaigns that are being run by Living Health, much money is being spent on practical and educative programs, and many people would be impressed. It is no good beating up Living Health in the process. It has improved out of sight since the Government took over. I ask members to reflect on the value of the Bill and its importance to the State, clearly recognising the over-ruling health interest contained in it.

Bill read a second time.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

STATE RECORDS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

SUPERANNUATION (EMPLOYEE MOBILITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LIVESTOCK BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

NETHERBY KINDERGARTEN (VARIATION OF WAITE TRUST) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STAMP DUTIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 February. Page 945.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): The Opposition supports this piece of legislation and accepts a reduction of stamp duty. The Bill encompasses a couple of key aspects. First, stamp duty for first home buyers will be reduced on a sliding scale. In South Australia, I understand, the Government collects about \$170 million currently from stamp duty conveyancing in any one financial year. This measure is in for 12 months, and I note that the Bill contains a series of trigger dates that have passed. Obviously, the world is working on the basis that this legislation will be successful and, in a sense, it was one of those things that the Premier opened his mouth about

before the Bills were prepared for introduction to Parliament. Normally, the Opposition is not too keen on retrospective legislation of any description but, in this instance, we will let it go through.

We understand that the extension of these provisions ends in February 1998, and it is a measure by which the Premier would try to stimulate the building industry in South Australia. That is an interesting aspect at this stage. This afternoon the member for Napier asked a question about the number of new housing commencements and the ABS figures, which indicated, I believe, that they were down to about 470 starts in November or December. The Government retorted by saying that the Deposit 5000 scheme and this Bill will stimulate the building industry in South Australia and that in February and March—because, as I understand it, the trigger date had to be 7 or 8 February this year—we will see much better housing commencement figures.

Whether or not that is the case, the Opposition views it with great interest. We believe, in essence, that stamp duty should be reviewed. Personally, I believe that in South Australia there is far too great a reliance on stamp duties, which I view as a deterrent for people going into the real estate market. I am not talking about first home buyers who, in essence, are helped by this measure: I am talking about any home buyer who was faced with bills of many thousands of dollars for stamp duty and who would, legitimately, think that it was an enormous slug on them, particularly if they moved around a bit in South Australia, for whatever reason but usually for employment.

I note that the Bill contains technical details as to how the money is to be determined. The presence of algebraic formulas is interesting in that the Government says that by regulation and other Acts it cannot do this sort of stuff in Bills. Obviously, the Taxation Department has grappled with this situation and has come up with the necessary formulations consistent with the announcements of Premier Olsen in the *Sunday Mail* two months or so ago.

The Opposition has no argument with the principle. We hope that this medicine will help the building industry in South Australia, will pick it up from the doldrums and will create jobs. Certainly, if we get half of what the Premier has been trumpeting from some of the building tops in Adelaide, we will be very pleased.

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I thank the member for Playford for his constructive contribution. As he has recognised, we are dealing with two measures that perhaps could have been contested by the Parliament, one giving value to a struggling industry and the other being designed to protect our revenue base, which is under severe threat. I appreciate that the legislation as it stands involves what could be classed as backdating, relating to the time at which the announcements were made. It is not the normal province of the Government to put before the Parliament a Bill that contains a date which precedes its introduction. Indeed, 99 per cent of the time the introduction of a scheme takes place some time after a Bill has been assented to: that is the normal way of the world. In each case, there was some urgency with the measures. We believe they are appropriate, that they are properly directed and that they will have some positive results, first, in protecting our revenue base and, secondly, in adding further stimulus to the building industry.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. S.J. BAKER (Treasurer): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr CLARKE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I want to pursue a little further the TAB management decision taken at the end of last week to try to enforce individual employment contracts on a number of head office employees. The individual agreement relates to salaries, among other things, and then deals with management common conditions including annual leave, long service leave and paid sick leave. Of course, that is all subject to State legislation in any event so the TAB certainly has not given away anything there. But another point within the individual contract states:

In relation to the performance of your duties you will be required to participate in the performance management process operated within the TAB for employees at your level (to be developed) subject to modifications to the process as may occur from time to time. For this purpose, participation means being involved in the process as an appraisee, an appraiser or both. A performance payment system (yet to be developed) will apply in addition to total remuneration. The performance payment will relate to the level of achievement of work performance targets agreed between you and your manager for each financial year commencing 1997-98 financial year.

I find this whole document extraordinary, because management of this large organisation, which employs full-time human resource people, is going to head office employees saying, 'We want to know your decision within a few days as to whether you agree to this individual employment contract. By signing this individual employment contract, you agree to participate in a performance appraisal although the guidelines have not yet been developed.' The employees are buying a pig in a poke with respect to that matter.

It also talks about a performance payment system yet to be developed. Here we have a classic situation of employees being intimidated by management, simply being brought in before management on a one on one basis and being told to sign this document. The employee's inference is, 'What happens to me if I don't?' Clearly, this has not been well thought out by TAB management. It is contrary to the State Industrial and Employees Relations Act. As I said in my earlier contribution today, the TAB is bound by provisions of the State industrial system—not the Federal industrial system as the Minister for Racing tried to have us believe—and the State system does not provide for individual contracts. Indeed, if it did, and this was the type of shoddy individual work contract that the TAB was trying to force down employees' throats, then not only the TAB management and board stand condemned but also the Minister for allowing slipshod work to go through.

When the Industrial and Employees Relations Act was being debated in 1994, the Government repeatedly said in relation to claims made by the Opposition at the time that this was an attempt by the Liberal Party to drag down the wages and conditions of working men and women of this State, that that was the furthest thing from its mind and, in fact, the legislation was constructed on the basis of collective enterprise agreements and not individual employment contracts. That was a basic tenet of all speeches made by the Government members on that Bill at that time and certainly by the then Minister for Industrial Affairs, now the Deputy Premier and Minister for Racing.

That also leads me to another interesting point. One of the unions involved in this, namely, the Public Service Association of South Australia, had press releases issued to

the media on this matter and, in particular, tried to get a story raised in the *Advertiser*. Surprise, surprise! The *Advertiser* managed not to find the press release or even to report upon it when it was issued over the weekend. Maybe it is a coincidence that the *Advertiser* also receives significant financial support—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Yes, I do not imply a bias: there is an absolute bias in so far as the *Advertiser* is concerned on a whole range of issues and this is but one of them. Surprise, surprise! The *Advertiser* is also in receipt of significant sums of money from the TAB through its racing form guide. Quite frankly, at least with respect to the old Soviet Union, they had two daily newspapers in Moscow whereas in Adelaide there is only one. There is literally no competition with respect to newspapers in this State.

I find it a little too coincidental that when the union representing the employees concerned in this matter seeks to have it covered within the past few days it cannot get an article raised within the *Advertiser*. That is quite an extraordinary story in itself. Regarding the agreement that has been put to these individual workers on a one-to-one basis by their management, the Deputy Premier told the House today that he believed that about 50 per cent of those employees had signed the contract.

The Hon. G. A. Ingerson: It's 85 per cent.

Mr CLARKE: The Deputy Premier interjects that it is 85 per cent. That is a very interesting statistic. I think that a far more appropriate measure would be for individual employees to be given the opportunity to have their rights and obligations explained to them by the Employee Ombudsman or their union before signing this contract. As I understand it, the Employee Ombudsman has not been involved in this matter—at least not up until the last few hours.

The Hon. G. A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: As the Minister says in cavalier fashion: 'This is just a role for management.'

The Hon. G. A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: The Deputy Premier interjects: 'The Opposition ought to understand how we run business.' We know only too well how the Minister for Racing runs business in this State with his mates, the mess that he is in and the troubles that he has with the Tourism Commission regarding certain allegations that have been made concerning his interference with the day-to-day running of the commission and, in particular, the appointment—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows better than to impugn the reputation of a Minister or any member of the House. He is certainly preempting whatever may happen in this place or another. I ask the honourable member to stick to the subject of his grievance.

Mr CLARKE: I pointed out that that was an allegation. However, at this stage that is not germane to my argument that the Opposition knows only too well how this Minister for Racing and this Government run business in terms of the treatment of employees, whether it be their own or the general work force as a whole. Since members opposite have been in Government, we have seen it over the years with respect to their refusal to give justice to a whole range of injured workers under the workers compensation legislation and the Industrial and Employee Relations Act.

I say to the Minister: 'Get a handle on your portfolio, drag the TAB management over the coals and say that this is totally unacceptable behaviour.' I would say that 85 per cent

of these employees signed this document under duress, because they were brought before the boss and given their contract, and told to take it away and to come back within a few days with their answer at a time when job insecurity was being felt throughout both the public and the private sector. What else would they do when they fear the loss of their livelihood and when they are operating in a vacuum? They were not even given sufficient time to talk to their union or the Employee Ombudsman to enable them to make an informed decision. This flies directly in the face of all the assurances that were given to the House by the Minister when the industrial relations legislation was debated in 1994.

Mr ANDREW (Chaffey): I rise today in this grievance debate to add another chapter to the TeleTrak saga that is developing in my electorate. I have raised this matter a couple of times in this place, and I am sure that my electorate is looking forward to this issue being clearly defined in the short term. I am reporting further to the House because I believe that the emotion and hype generated from some quarters regarding this issue is continuing unfairly to dominate what I would call commonsense, sound business practices and the facts or the need to be patient and wait for the facts.

Because of this, last week I felt compelled to write a further letter to the editor of my local press. I have probably written two or three letters on this issue and interwoven them with a few press statements and public comments. So, I wrote a further letter to the editor of the three local newspapers in my electorate, and I thank them for publishing it. I think it was the editor of the *Murray Pioneer* who used the heading 'Community being misled by TeleTrak' whereas my heading was 'TeleTrak hype—unproductive'. For the record, I wish to read into *Hansard* that letter. Since it was published last week in those three newspapers, I have received some particularly positive and complimentary comments from a range of people. I have received telephone calls about the letter.

On Saturday afternoon and evening I attended a public function in Renmark and on Sunday my family and I contributed to the clean-up of Australia down by the river, and at the time, and since then, people have made positive comments about my letter. It states:

TeleTrak hype—unproductive: I am concerned for the community that misleading comments are being promoted by some individuals which I believe are not productive in achieving the best outcome for our district. In my experience for any major project, I have never seen any promoter or its representatives or its supporters engage in the type of personal abuse campaign which has no factual base, interwoven with political innuendo. In both my business, local government and parliamentary experience this is not a professional, ethical or positive way to successfully continue and conclude negotiations.

As part of ongoing liaison with this issue, in November of last year I wrote to the District Council of Waikerie clearly indicating my support for the project providing normal probity requirements and established business practices were met. In December I arranged for council to meet with the State's Racing Minister, which resulted in the establishment of an appropriate inquiry to ascertain many of the currently unanswered questions about the project—an inquiry that was delayed because the proponents (and some local 'supporters') were not prepared to accept it as legitimate. I am very pleased this is now proceeding to assist in providing an objective assessment of the project. I have also liaised with various interstate Ministers and parliamentary members over the last three months on this issue.

While recognising and representing the support in the community for the project, I will continue my direct and close liaison with the elected representative body of the community—the district council. It is not appropriate for some to imply I should be an advocate for

the promoters—my responsibility is to the electors I represent. Waikerie (or any other site or town) may be a means to an end for the financial interests of TeleTrak. If the community can satisfactorily capitalise on this, that's fine—but the objectives and interests of the whole Waikerie community and those of TeleTrak I suggest may not necessarily be the same. When council and bodies like the Riverland Development Corporation [and the Riverland Racing Club] believe they have a credible proposal to put to Government, I will be pleased to provide the strongest possible representation on their behalf.

However, I am appalled and disgusted to find some of my staff and friends have been verbally harassed in public (as I also understand is happening to some other fair-minded people in the town) by some individuals based on their perception of my stance on this issue. If such individuals haven't the backbone to front me personally, their actions sadly only serve to seriously downgrade the public standing of our community. I have and will always continue to make myself available to discuss any issue with any constituent at a mutually convenient time.

It is important that the community can continue to be respected and acknowledged for its fine history of development via unprejudiced community cooperation. The best result for all will only be achieved if these proven principles and established processes are adhered to.

If TeleTrak is to be successful it will be successful for the right reasons. Therefore if and when it 'stacks up'—that is, if an independent assessment indicates it is likely to deliver what it promises, if the RIDA inquiry is positive, if probity requirements are met, if a prospectus is provided via the Australian Securities Commission, and the required investors are forthcoming—then let's go for it. I together with the whole community can then feel confident our commitment to its success will be justified.

Kent Andrew
Member for Chaffey

This week I also took the opportunity to write another formal letter to the District Council of Waikerie, in addition to my continuing discussion and dialogue with the Mayor and councillors. Again I wrote to the council on the basis of trying to clarify its involvement, its stance and its past and present strategy. I asked council a number of questions. I will not go into the detail of those today but will provide a couple of examples. I asked council whether it had a copy of the TeleTrak's KPMG Peat Marwick business plan for the project and, if so, whether I could be provided with a copy of this; and, if not, whether it has sought one and when it did. When I asked TeleTrak for a copy of that report I got a very rude 'No'.

The other matter I raised with council, as an example of the spectrum of queries I raised, was my concern over recent days after I had spoken to individual councillors and found that the letter I wrote to council on 29 November responding to its request for support and assistance was never tabled or supplied to councillors. I have sought the reasons and questioned who was responsible for that.

Notwithstanding that, the other reason why it is important that I continue this formal response to the district council is

that I want to ensure that I am getting and can reflect and represent a consistent and common goal for councils as distinct from what might be pushed by individual councillors or specific council staff. The support of many of my parliamentary colleagues ultimately may be required to progress this project. Many of them are eagerly awaiting the RIDA investigation into this project, but they have also been asking me for details in terms of the local stance by the community and the strategy and intent of the local council so that they also can get a fair understanding of what is happening with respect to this project.

Many constituents have come to me and questioned some of the actions taken in the community over recent months. It has been unfortunate and unhelpful that premature and arguably unrealistic expectations were promoted and allowed to be accepted and believed in the community right from the outset when this concept was promoted publicly in the community back in November last year. Those involved need to bear some real responsibility in terms of these expectations promoted at the time, particularly before the facts had been adequately investigated and assessed.

Time will not permit me to go into further detail, but it is interesting to note that the Minister for Racing in Victoria made an announcement last week, on 26 February, giving his response. It was reported that Tom Reynolds, the Minister for Sport and Rural Development in Victoria, had announced that he had an interdepartmental committee looking into TeleTrak and found that the report lacked details which the proponents had refused or been unable to provide. He also went on to say that he does not dismiss the concept of a purpose-built track for international television production or wagering. If it is feasible, then the potential economic benefits cannot be ignored. I look forward to the report coming from RIDA in South Australia as soon as possible.

Motion carried.

TAB EMPLOYMENT CONTRACTS

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: In Question Time today I stated that the TAB was under a Federal award and not a State award. That was incorrect; I had been incorrectly advised. It is in fact under a State award—the South Australian Totalisator Agency Board Award, and I correct that error.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 5 March at 2 p.m.