

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 26 August 1998

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

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

A petition signed by 252 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to oppose the sale or lease of ETSA and Optima Energy assets was presented by Mr Foley.

Petition received.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MOTOR ACCIDENTS) BILL

The **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training)**: I move:

That the sitting of the House be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Bill.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The **Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart)**: I bring up the twenty-fifth report of the committee, being the annual report for the period July 1997 to June 1998, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The **Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier)**: I move:

That the report be printed.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I bring up the report of the committee on regulations made under the Water Resources Act 1997 and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS: I bring up the report of the committee on the regulations made under the Education Act 1972 and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS: I bring up the twenty-first report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS: In accordance with the preceding report, I advise the House that I no longer wish to proceed with Notices of Motion: Private Members Bills/Committees/Regulations Nos 1, 2 and 4 standing in my name.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The **Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher)**: I bring up the eleventh report of the committee on gambling and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

MOTOROLA

The **Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition)**: My question is directed to the Premier. Did the letter written by the now Premier as Minister for Industry to Motorola in early 1994 commit the Government to awarding to Motorola the contract to become the radio equipment suppliers for the whole of Government radio network? Did the letter commit the Government?

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: What is important is that the letter that went to Motorola in April had a clause in it that said 'subject to commercial negotiations'—that is, processes of Government. As I outlined to the House yesterday, on 23 June 1994 the Government signed a contractual binding commitment between Motorola and the South Australian Government that was complete in its entirety, and there were no side deals. Subsequent to that, in September I answered a question from the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader is obviously out of questions today. I would simply ask him to go and read the *Hansard* of yesterday.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Premier outline to this House the key positives of Public Service employment programs in this State?

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: I am happy to respond to this question, because it is in stark contrast to an announcement yesterday by Senator Faulkner about some of the jobs programs, particularly for the public sector, that the Federal Labor Party proposes to put in place. It is also in stark contrast to the sort of programs that we are delivering in South Australia, and I think it is timely for us to compare the two. What Senator Faulkner has said is that Federal Labor's policy is to create 500 jobs for young people in the public sector over the next three years.

An honourable member: Five hundred?

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: Five hundred jobs over three years throughout Australia. Well, big deal! Let us just look at that on a *pro rata* basis. If 500 jobs are to be created by a Federal Labor Government for young people in the public sector, on a *pro rata* basis that would mean that approximately 8 per cent of the 500 jobs will come to South Australia. That is about 40 jobs over three years, and that equates to 13 jobs a year for three years. That the policy of the Federal Labor Opposition for the renewal and regeneration of the public sector in this country. Do you know why it can produce only a measly, feeble sort of policy? Because it is not prepared to undertake fundamental reform of the taxation system in this country, and it is constrained in its policy options because it is not prepared to undertake that fundamental reform. Let us compare that with the programs that we have in place. Remember: 13 jobs—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: I am glad the Leader of the Opposition has interjected—on cue. Let us go back a couple of years when the Leader of the Opposition was Minister for Employment. I am sure I do not have to remind the House that when the Leader was Minister unemployment in South Australia grew by 35 000 or 74 per cent and the unemployment rate rose from 7.4 per cent to 11.8 per cent. This is the track record of the Leader of the Opposition. The number of

South Australians in full-time employment fell by 35 900 jobs—that is the track record of the Leader of the Opposition—and the youth unemployment rate went from 17.6 per cent to 40.6 per cent. I would have thought that, with a track record like that as Minister for Employment, the Leader of the Opposition would sit there in silence on this issue. His track record is absolutely appalling, and Federal Labor clearly has not learnt. Not only did it not deliver in its 13 years in Government but it has not learnt in Opposition and it certainly has not been taking any notice of the failed record of the past in South Australia.

Let me compare Federal Labor Senator Faulkner's policy of 13 jobs a year for three years (big deal) with what we have put in place in South Australia through the budgetary process. We have a target of 9.5 per cent of young people in the public sector, and we are working towards that target for the regeneration to create the public sector managers of the next generation. Over a two year period we are employing 2 400 young trainees in the public sector at a cost of \$43.2 million—a policy in place being actioned.

In addition to that, we have already employed more than 4 600 trainees in a policy that was put in place over the past three or four years—and it was a good policy. We are employing 600 young graduates over the next three years at a total cost of \$47.6 million. Why? Because we want to redress the age profile in the public sector in South Australia to produce an age profile that will meet the needs of the public sector and the managers of the public sector in the future and to give jobs to our young graduates in the public sector in South Australia. We have already employed approximately 250 of those young graduates.

We have expanded the Small Business Employer Incentive Scheme by committing an additional \$6 million over two years to fund an extra 1 500 trainees. I do not have to remind the House that we announced this program during the election campaign last year, opened it on 1 January, and, so popular was that policy with small business in South Australia, that all positions were taken up within six weeks. We have allocated over \$1 million during the next two years to fund pilot projects and \$300 000 over the next three years to expand the Community at Work projects, which will fund an additional eight to 12 Community at Work projects in regional parts of South Australia. We have allocated \$360 000 to fund 90 mature age self-starter grants over the next three years, and we have allocated \$500 000 over the next two years to fund special equity employment initiatives to assist special disadvantaged groups in the community.

So, it is a comprehensive package of \$100 million within a target of three years. It looks at redressing the age profile of the public sector and tackling the levels of unemployment in South Australia that we inherited from the Leader of the Opposition; levels of unemployment which are simply too high and which we need to tackle. But there is one thing for sure: the policy prescription of Federal Labor will do absolutely nothing to help create jobs for young South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): My question is directed to the Premier. Was the 1994 letter to Motorola, which the Premier yesterday admitted to writing, the same letter which was the subject of a case study in the 1995 Auditor-General's Report

which referred to a 'pre-emptive communication' made without the compliance of the State Supply Act and having the effect of 'creating a legal relationship that gives rise to obligations/liabilities/rights by either party'? Was it the same letter?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As the honourable member knows full well, the Auditor-General in his report did not nominate the company for a variety of reasons. That is a matter for the Auditor-General. Members opposite have been on a fishing expedition. What they cannot come to grips with is a letter written in April and a legally binding contract signed on 23 June that locks in the commitment of the Government and settles the matter once and for all. They cannot take it. They have been stumped in their approach, and they cannot take it.

The simple fact is that we must come back to this Government radio network contract. Labor ignored the warnings that we needed a new Government radio network contract for our emergency services. Following Ash Wednesday, clear warnings were given to government, but no Government other than this Government has acted upon them. This Government has been prepared to tackle that which previous governments walked away from. Why? It is because we will not put life at risk through a radio network and an emergency service that do not work effectively and efficiently, as warned by no less a person than the Coroner in approximately 1984.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, there was no Auditor-General's warning in 1995, 1996 or 1997.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We are greeted with silence from the Deputy Leader because there has been no follow-up. Members opposite have thrown in this red herring. What the Opposition does when it has no questions of substance—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You can interject all you like. I can't help it if you don't like the answer.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Members opposite can interject all they like. They can try to turn the forum of the Parliament into a circus, which they do repeatedly, but there is one thing that the Opposition will not be able to achieve and that is alteration of the facts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

KANGAROOS

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. What programs are in place to help the kangaroo meat industry to create a greater awareness of the salubrious—that is, health giving—nature of the properties of kangaroo meat as well as perhaps the high quality of leather produced from kangaroo hide, and did he this morning launch a book which outlines the trading language proposed for the kangaroo industry?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I thank the member for Hammond for the question, and for the description of 'salubrious' in relation to kangaroo meat. With respect to whether or not I helped launch a book, the answer is 'Yes.' This morning at the Hilton Hotel I had the honour of launching a book which takes the kangaroo industry in the State to the next step with respect to its marketing and promotion. This industry has been the target of some quite

unfair criticism over time, particularly in Britain, where we have seen ill-informed and misleading protests about kangaroo meat. They basically hold kangaroos up as almost a protected species, and that is very unfair and it has hurt the industry in relation to exports and gives very much the wrong perception.

There are very good reasons for having a kangaroo meat industry: first, in relation to exports—and quite a few jobs have been created throughout the pastoral areas of the State. There are also some very good environmental and economic reasons why this industry should continue. The number of kangaroos in pastoral areas is very high, and this impacts on the economic circumstances of the pastoralists in those areas. Also, the amount of environmental damage is quite unacceptable. If we are to cull these kangaroos, why leave the meat to rot? In South Australia alone, we cull between 300 000 and 400 000 kangaroos a year: that is a lot of tonnes of meat, and there is no reason why we should not receive the benefit of the jobs and the exports that flow from that.

The response of the industry to what has been going on has been extremely proactive: it has got off its butt and done something. In the past three or four years the kangaroo industry has done an enormous amount with quality assurance and accreditation: it has gone out and assured consumers, both domestic and overseas, that food safety is not an issue because it has completely lifted its game as to how it handles kangaroos. This has brought about substantial investment by the players involved—however, they still face some large marketing challenges.

Kangaroo meat varies a lot, depending on the cut, and that has often caused a problem for people when they order (whether it be at the supermarket or at a restaurant) and they are not too sure which cut they will get. The book that I helped launch this morning is titled *Trading Language and Specifications for Kangaroo*. The book sets down some national specifications whereby consumers know what they will get, and it customises the names of the cuts (which is helpful to not only the consumer but also the processor), and it is certainly a very important aspect when ordering from a supermarket or a restaurant.

The book has been funded by the rural industry and the Research Development Corporation. It is certainly vital for market development, both domestic and overseas, and it will also be a very useful book to inform markets of the management arrangements and to help correct those incorrect perceptions which have been created by those who are against the kangaroo cull.

MOTOROLA

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Was a Crown Law opinion sought and provided on the legal status of the 1994 letter written by the Premier to Motorola and about the legal obligations of that letter in terms of awarding to Motorola the contract to become the sole supplier of radio equipment for the whole of Government communications network and, if so, what was that advice? Did Crown Law find that your letter already locked in the Government?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is commenting.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: What we have is a repetition of the questions that were asked yesterday. Let me quote—

Me Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Just let me quote. If the member for Elder will show some slight tolerance, patience and a bit

of decorum in the Chamber, I will answer. Yesterday, I pointed out to the House that an agreement was signed with Motorola as it relates to its software development centre. That agreement was signed on 23 June 1994. It was an agreement signed after the letter—and even the Leader of the Opposition would acknowledge that. That agreement signed between the Government of South Australia and Motorola is a binding contractual agreement. It provides, in clause 17—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has asked his question.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You only hope—and you are wrong, mate.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Mr Speaker, does the member for Elder want an answer or does he want to interject for the purposes of theatre in the Chamber?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, I'm not: I have rock solid support behind me, mate, and it happens to be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I had one of them in 1985.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Listen, mate, I would be the last person throwing stones.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will come to order. There are too many interjections across the Chamber. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Let me recap, because I am sure that during the interjections it has escaped their attention once again. Today we have a repeat of the thrust of the questions yesterday. What the Opposition does not want to acknowledge is a simple fact: it is called a contractual commitment between Motorola and the Government of South Australia. Clause 17 of that contractual commitment provides:

This agreement constitutes the entire agreement of the parties in respect of the matters dealt with in this agreement. . .

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the Leader of the Opposition for continual interjection.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let me go back again—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You can interrupt all you like, but I am going to go back and give you the full answer—an uninterrupted answer.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Mr Speaker, let me start again; let me trace this again. In April I wrote a letter to Motorola and I have acknowledged that.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has asked his question and I think he has had a fair go.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I wrote a letter in approximately March-April 1994 to Motorola to secure a software develop-

ment centre in South Australia. In that letter, I gave a number of options to Motorola and included in that letter, as I indicated yesterday, was a clause which stated 'subject to normal negotiating processes or due process of Government'. That was in the letter and that was in April.

Subsequent to that letter, on behalf of the Government I signed a contract with Motorola. In that contract is detailed every incentive that was put in place for Motorola and the agreement put in place provision for a purpose-built facility and contributions towards the fit-out costs. The agreement also talked about a training and recruitment subsidy for a specified number of employees and provided relief for a specified period from stamp duty, land tax and payroll tax. The incentives in the agreement do not include anything in respect of guarantees to Motorola of supply for future Government contracts, and the agreement itself specifically states that no side deals of this sort were entered into. Clause 17 provides:

This agreement constitutes the entire agreement of the parties in respect of the matters dealt with—

and I have told the House what was in there—

and supersedes all prior agreements, understandings and negotiations in respect of the matters dealt with in the agreement.

That was signed by Motorola and by the Government. So, on 23 June we signed an agreement with Motorola that clearly set out the incentives that were put in place.

I want to make one other point, having now debunked the thrust of what the Opposition is on about. It does not like new private sector capital investment in this State. For four years the Labor Party has tried to destroy every new project that we have put in place. Members opposite have knocked, criticised and opposed every new private sector capital investment in this State. Have a look at EDS, at the water contract and at those private new sector investments that have been put in place. We have even had the Leader of the Opposition complain about overseas capital in this State when in his own electorate there is General-Motors Holden's—American money. Is that not good enough for job creation? What about Mitsubishi? Is Japanese money not good enough for job creation in South Australia? For five years and for base political purposes, we have had an Opposition that has wanted to destroy any company coming to this State.

I happen to be proud of the fact that at Motorola, one of four worldwide software development centres, we have employed 230 graduates from many countries around the world. I am proud of the fact that within the Motorola organisation Adelaide is now the preferred site worldwide as a software development centre. It is on the basis of that that we will try to do more business with Motorola and any other company that wants to come to this State, because we are about new private sector capital investment. We are about rebuilding the economy that the Labor Party destroyed and about building permanent and certain jobs in this State which the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister for Employment destroyed. Well, you can continue to knock and to have no plans. We will simply get on with the job, and in getting on with the job we will rebuild this economy that the Labor Party destroyed.

RURAL TRAINING GRANTS

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Deputy Premier provide details on the uptake by primary producers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the member for Flinders.

Mrs PENFOLD:—of the training grants under the Rural Assistance Scheme? Last year, the then Minister announced plans to improve access to training for primary producers in South Australia.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: In early 1996 my office did quite a bit of work on what was available in the way of training for rural communities. As expected, we identified quite a few needs for training within rural industries. We verified the low level of formal training amongst many farmers and, in particular, the lack of training opportunities with which farmers would be comfortable. Certainly, the food and fibre industries in South Australia offer us enormous potential for growth. However, to reach that potential we need to address the training needs and the weaknesses. So, we set up the RAS training scheme.

Acceptance of the course has outstripped everyone's expectations and it really shows the ability of the rural community to be very proactive. Certainly, a big part of its success is the fact that we used group training, because we realised that many farmers did not feel comfortable with the classroom-type environment. The success of the training courses is well and truly mirrored by the fact that in the first full year, 1997-98, \$1.7 million was provided, and that has been supplemented with considerable investment by participants in the courses. For example, some of those courses include: 24 business management groups, with 646 farmers participating; 88 crop and pasture management groups, with more than 1 000 participants; 44 groups in quality assurance, which is becoming very important to some of the industries, with 691 participants; and 231 group training groups, with nearly 5 000 participants. Big players in making it successful were the Advisory Board of Agriculture and the Agriculture Bureau Network, which have been extremely cooperative in running a lot of these courses. The South Australian Farmers Federation also cooperated and was integral in many of the courses.

In addition, for those who want to undertake courses available at TAFE or other established providers, grants were offered: 322 farmers gained individual training grants, taking such courses as the Certificate in Rural Office Practice, farm computing technology and on-farm training. It demonstrates that the farming community does realise that some real opportunities are available. A lot of training does assist them to embark upon enterprises in which they were not previously involved, and this is very important if we are to reach our goals under the Food for the Future program. Their acceptance augers well for the future, and the farming community ought to be congratulated on that.

FIREARMS

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier agree with his Education Minister that we should have firearms safety training in our schools, including high school students firing weapons on ranges? On national radio last night it was reported:

... already one Education Minister, South Australia's Malcolm Buckby, has today given in principle support for firearms safety training in our schools; however, he wants to see more details on this particular package before giving final approval. He is also insisting that no guns be taken into any school.

The report went on to indicate that part of the plan proposed by shooters is for high school students to carry out this training on firing ranges.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: It is interesting to see how facts get distorted by Opposition members when they come into this place.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: That's not unusual.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: There is nothing unusual at all: in fact, we are getting used to it. You really have to double check things when you listen to the Opposition. Yesterday afternoon I received a facsimile from the Sporting Shooters Association which put to me a proposal in very brief terms about the possibility of teaching firearms awareness and safety in our secondary schools. They noted and explicitly pointed out that it would involve no firearms—I repeat: no firearms—nor would students be involved in the firing of rifles or any firearms; no firearms practice on ranges or anything else along those lines would be undertaken. My reply to them was, 'Supply to me the outline of the material that you want to present to our schools. I will have a look at it and come back to you with a consideration on whether or not we would take that up.'

ANIMAL WELFARE

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage outline the program she has in place to work with the RSPCA and the community to further animal welfare issues in this State?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I appreciate this very important question from the honourable member. The Government has an ongoing commitment to the welfare of animals in South Australia and, to this end, Government officers, industry representatives and the RSPCA work in a very cooperative manner to devise mutually agreed improvements in animal welfare standards. The Circus Code of Practice is a pertinent example. The code, which was formulated by the Liberal Government, has been developed by the National Consultative Committee for Animal Welfare and now endorsed by the Federal Minister for Primary Industries (John Anderson). The final code, which is regulated under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, demands one of the highest standards of animal welfare in the world and is fully endorsed by the industry, the RSPCA and the Government.

The code is currently being published and will be signed jointly by the President of the RSPCA South Australia, the Executive Officer of the Australian Circus Federation and myself on behalf of the South Australian Government. Through such tripartite initiatives and this most cooperative approach, we can ensure that the owners of animals are informed of their responsibilities, that animals are protected by law and that the industry has ownership of the standards by which it abides. Prior to the election last year the Government made a commitment to increase funding to the RSPCA and to ensure that the society had the financial ability to meet its charter. Despite the fiscal restrictions placed on Government agencies, we have met our commitment to increase RSPCA funding, and this will contribute greatly to the enforcement of legislation.

I am pleased to announce that early next week I will be presenting to Mr John Strachan, President of the RSPCA South Australia, a cheque for \$500 000 as the Government's contribution, which is specifically earmarked for enforcement costs for the 1998-99 financial year. This is an increase of \$14 000. The Government recognises that the South

Australian community demands high standards of animal care and that they depend upon the RSPCA to ensure that those standards are met. Consequently, the level of funding provided is significantly greater than that in any other State or Territory. The inexcusable shooting of the Port River dolphins is currently being investigated by officers of my department, the police and the RSPCA. Only through working across agencies and relying on all the experience available to us can we make some real improvements in environmental and animal welfare issues.

I would like to thank publicly the police and the RSPCA for their professional assistance in dealing with what is an extremely disturbing issue. The Government believes that all sections of the community must accept responsibility for animal welfare issues. Through this House, I request that any individuals who can provide information to the police with regard to the recent Port River dolphin shooting to please do so. Indeed, I would encourage all individuals to report all forms of animal cruelty to the RSPCA or to the police. The unfortunate incidents and events that have transpired have sent a strong message into the community: animal cruelty will not be tolerated. It is a strong message, and it is a simple message, and the community of South Australia can rest assured that it is a message that the Government will back up with strong and decisive action.

SCHOOL FEES

Ms WHITE (Taylor): My question is directed to the Premier. Given that the Government has introduced legislation to make school fees compulsory and that in some schools a 10 per cent GST would add up to \$70 per student, is the Premier now prepared to publicly ask the Prime Minister to make school fees exempt from the GST? Yesterday, the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training told the House that the Federal Treasury had confirmed that fees for materials and services charged by our public schools can attract a GST. The Opposition has a copy of the fee schedule for one Adelaide high school which explains that in 1999 the materials and services charge for years 11 and 12 will be \$360, plus the book deposit of \$100, plus the resource centre fee of \$100, plus charges for stationery, schoolcard, school dairy, ID card, sports carnival, special subject charges and the school magazine. For new students there is also a non-refundable enrolment application fee of \$50.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Of course, what the member for Taylor conveniently overlooks is the balancing factors in a household budget, with the very significant reductions in personal income tax schedules that are being proposed. We have the Labor Opposition, as is its wont, taking one component in isolation without looking at a package of events—not looking at the trade-offs that there might be in terms of fundamental taxation reform. I know that we have to wait until tomorrow before Federal Labor puts its slightly modified tax package on the table. Importantly, we know one thing that it does not do: it does not address wholesale sales tax—the hidden tax that is being paid by people, daily and weekly, out of the household budget for a whole raft of goods and services.

We know that wholesale sales tax is the tax that was expanded and upgraded by no less a person than Paul Keating. Why? Because he got rolled by Bob Hawke in that late night motel meeting in relation to option C. What did Paul do as Treasurer? He did not have option C any further, so by stealth he proposed a whole raft of wholesale sales

taxes. As you go through the supermarket checkout, it is ringing up Labor's hidden tax—Labor's expanded tax. In the supermarket, as the cash registers are ringing, that is coming out of the pay packet and the wages, the purses and wallets, of ordinary people, denying them the opportunity of further discretionary spending on a whole raft of things they would want to purchase for their family. Let the member for Taylor be a little more honest in her approach. Let us look at the whole picture, not just part of it.

APPRENTICES

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training provide details of the Government's commitment to ensuring a skilled work force for South Australia, given recent trends and opportunities in apprenticeships for young people in this State?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Once again, this is an area where the Government is delivering, and we fully recognise the need for training in South Australia and the need to equip our young people with adequate training to get real jobs in this State. We have instituted a vigorous and robust training sector in the VET schemes that we have implemented, along with the TAFE sector, the private providers and also in our secondary school system. Let us look at the results, though. In 1997, 7 363 South Australians commenced apprenticeships and traineeships. That was built on an impressive figure of 7 098 in 1996. Let us go back a bit. Let us compare this with 1993, the last year of the Labor Government, when the figure was 3 772. We are doing more than double what the previous Labor Government was doing. This is no comparison.

Our commitment to training far exceeds that of the previous Government, and we are delivering. More than ever before our young people are seeking training in areas such as health and education, hospitality, primary industries (as the Deputy Premier announced earlier today), information technology, food processing and community services. Currently, 16 400 South Australians are in training, either under a trade or a traineeship arrangement. These skilled people will ensure the economic success of our future. A strong commitment of this Government is to ensure for our young people an absolute in training opportunities, be they through vocational education training in our schools, TAFE systems or through our private trainers.

SPEED DETECTION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is directed to the Minister for Police, who is not here. Can the Minister assure South Australian motorists of the complete legality of expiation notices when the speeding infringement is detected by speed camera? I understand that, when a driver is sent a notice and subsequently requests a photograph of the incident, in almost every case the numberplate is not clear in the full vehicle picture. Only when viewing a close up of the numberplate are the letters and numbers legible, which I am told can lead to legal difficulties when trying to prove that the numberplate, in close up, belongs to the particular vehicle identified by the expiation section.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have no evidence before me that it is illegal, but I will get some advice on the matter. To my knowledge, it is all legal, but I will check that for the honourable member.

YOUTH WEEK

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Minister for Youth inform the House of progress in the planning of events for Youth Week 1998? The Minister has previously encouraged all members in this place to actively involve themselves in proposals being developed by local councils to participate in Youth Week 1998. I understand that applications for funding closed recently and would like to know the results of this process.

The Hon. J. HALL: I thank the member for Colton for his question and for ongoing, long-standing commitment to young South Australians. Many members would know, because they have all received a substantial amount of information over the past few months, about the Youth Week activities which will take place between 17 and 24 October. Recently I have signed off grants to local councils of more than \$60 000, spread across the 43 councils in South Australia, to enable them in partnership with the State Government to celebrate young people's activities, skills and achievements.

The House might be very interested to know some of the very interesting and diverse mix of activities in which young South Australians will engage in the various council areas. For example, we have rock climbing in the Adelaide Hills council area; a combination of debates, music and food in the Barossa Council Youth Fest; a video production and photographic display in the Goyder regional council; a joint event with Seniors' Week in Naracoorte; and a multicultural arts event in the City of West Torrens. One of the things that is very evident through the grants that have been approved is the enormous emphasis on recreation and sport among young people. In no fewer than about six council areas there have been approvals of joint projects, with Skate the Cove at Marion; a skating and live music event by a group called 'Phoby' in Mitcham; Saturday Night in the Cage at Murray Bridge; Skate Out 98 in Yankalilla; and Skate Out 98 in Victor Harbor.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J. HALL: I suppose it depends, doesn't it? In the Berri Barmera council area we have the Youth Resource Card and the 'Moving on—starting out' resource kit; and in my own electorate of Campbelltown council we have a Youth Fest, which includes a computer game competition. There is a whole range of activities in the local councils, but this year a very important first ever event called the Youth Focus event is being coordinated by the City of Adelaide. This is very specifically where young people from across the State will be able to take advantage of expressing their views in designing visual art pieces. Initially this will be opened and displayed at the Adelaide Town Hall, and when it is completed there it will be put on tour and displayed throughout South Australia in the very many regional council areas that have participated.

As you know, Mr Speaker, this Government is absolutely committed to encouraging and supporting this State's nearly 250 000 young people between the age of 12 and 24. We have enthusiastically invited them to participate in these activities. I sincerely hope that all members will take advantage of the activities in their own electorates and support their local councils in this very important initiative as a partnership among young South Australians, local government and State Government.

WORKCOVER

Ms KEY (Hanson): Is it the case that the Minister for Government Enterprises and the Government are deliberately delaying the proclamation of section 107(b) of the Workers' Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 due to a current investigation by the media, particularly Channel 9's *Sunday* program, on long-term WorkCover cases in South Australia? If not, when will it be proclaimed? In April 1998 (this year) an amendment to insert new section 107(b) was assented to. Essentially, the amendment seeks to ensure that all WorkCover claimants have access to documentation about their WorkCover case regardless of the status of their employer, for example, whether they are a self managed employer or an exempt employer.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I honestly cannot recall being aware of any investigation by any television, radio or print journalist of this matter at all. Accordingly, the answer to this question is 'No.'

WORLD WIDE WEB

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Will the Minister Assisting the Premier for Information Economy detail to the House the use of the world wide web in delivering Government services and information to the community of South Australia?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Government is indeed very mindful of the huge benefits which can accrue by using the Internet or one of its faculties, the World Wide Web, as a very good medium for delivering particularly information but also services to the South Australian community. I think it is important to identify to the House that the web or the Internet is a particularly good way to deliver services and information in a timely fashion, in other words, the time in which constituents want to get that information or those services. One of the many—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Elder interjects that he understands what 'timely' means. The point I am making is that, through the use of technology, it is timely from the point of view of the people who want the information, in other words, not Government office opening hours. Whilst I am confident that, with a law degree and a number of other accolades to his name, the member for Elder would have known what it meant, it is important to emphasise that this is external from Government office opening hours, which is why it is timely.

One of the many examples that I would like to highlight is the WorkCover web site. This web site's primary focus has been on making information available and more accessible to WorkCover's customers. Since April 1998 the on-line presence of the corporation has been expanded considerably, with the addition of a number of the publications put out by the corporation, and that is mainly occupational health and safety material.

Since the inclusion of this material in April 1998, only a few months ago, there have been several thousand downloads of WorkCover publications. The most successful publication has been the recently produced Workplace Health and Safety Training Resource Kit, which has been designed to deliver basic OH&S training to non English speaking background workers and workers with low English literacy. Whilst a limited number of physical copies were printed, in the six weeks that this has been available on the web site the publication has been downloaded completely more than 2 000

times. That is not people who have just flitted into the web site and gone somewhere else but people who have specifically visited, seen a document which interested them and then bothered to download it. That occurred 2 000 times, which is a particularly good strike rate.

Other popular uses of the corporation's web site include the use of e-mail to communicate with the corporation, access to the annual statistical review in the corporate plan and the Smart Move site, delivering basic OH&S knowledge to senior secondary school students who may be undertaking work experience or starting their working careers. With the WorkCover web site being visited by up to 14 000 people per week, there is clearly a demand from the public of South Australia to have access to the relevant information in a timely fashion, which again I stress for the member for Elder's benefit is when they want it, not when it is available in public offices. So, I am delighted to report the success of this site to the House, and I assure the House that I will be further encouraging WorkCover and other agencies in their attempts to provide information and services via the net so that members of the community can receive information as and when they want it.

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT UNIT

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Minister for Police make the two reports undertaken on the Youth Development Unit based at the Holden Hill police station in my electorate available to the House and, if not, why not? The unit was a valuable resource to our local community and greatly supported by youth organisations. I understand the local internal report supported the need for the unit's continuation but that after a report from the Strategic Development Branch the unit closed on 30 June with just a day's formal notice.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I do not have a problem with making those reports available. I will provide the honourable member with a copy.

WATER INDUSTRY, EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises explain to the House the opportunities that will become available due to the internationalisation of the water industry and what this means in respect of jobs for South Australians?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I am delighted to answer this question because the internationalisation of the South Australian water industry is one of the great unsung success stories of this State, particularly for the Government, despite the derision of the Opposition. What was once a small inwardly focused static industry has, because of moves by this Government, been turned into a most vibrant outwardly focused export growth industry for South Australia.

The internationalisation of the water industry is occurring in several ways. First, there is recognition of the commercial value of the expertise and excellence that South Australia, which as members know is the driest State in the driest continent, has developed. Our Asian neighbours in particular recognise the value of the skills that we can offer to help improve their water supplies. This has led to South Australian expertise being utilised in Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia and China, and I am confident that we have only just scratched the surface of that potential.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen: Hear, hear!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As the Premier says, 'Hear, hear!' As this House knows full well, the Premier was instrumental in the changing of the South Australian water industry from small and inwardly focused to an industry that is export based. Secondly, Adelaide as a centre for water excellence has become attractive to international firms who are looking for a base for their Australian and Asian business endeavours.

This, of course, has opened up enormous opportunities. It means the injection of overseas capital into the State's economy, something which I am sure members of the Opposition would applaud if only behind the scenes. It means an increase in the pool of expertise and technology that is available to others in the industry. Most importantly—and this was the intent of the member for Bragg's question—it means jobs for South Australians.

It is surprising that, despite all this, we hear nothing but criticism from the Opposition. I assure members that corporations are expressing their confidence in the water industry through investment—actually making their dollars talk. Only three weeks ago, I announced the establishment of yet another international firm in South Australia which will produce 200 jobs for South Australians and an estimated \$46 million windfall for the economy. During that same week, I was fortunate to be part of a ceremony to mark the graduation of the inaugural class of students from our new water industry traineeship scheme. Clearly, it is a sign of confidence in the future when the water industry says, 'We need young South Australians to be trained to take up jobs in this industry.'

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: And experts.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As the Minister says, it means having experts here whom we can utilise to teach our children to become international experts. Hence, their job opportunities will also increase.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As the Premier says, regarding the episodes in Sydney of late and again this morning which have attracted a lot of media attention, it is interesting to see where the people come when they need the world's best advice on how to stop those problems. They come to South Australia. That is everyone, including David Hill, the Labor Party candidate for somewhere—I think it is some Federal seat in New South Wales.

I am absolutely confident that if David Hill is standing for a seat in New South Wales his electoral brochure will not include the fact that he has served as the Chair of the New South Wales water board and that his CV would have been revised since Giardia and Cryptosporidium have been found everywhere in the water and people in Sydney have regularly opened up their letterbox to find yet another notice saying 'Please boil the water before you drink it.' I am absolutely sure that David has been frantically pressing the delete button on his computer when writing his CV to send out to potential constituents.

Where did David Hill and his board come when they needed help? To South Australia. Why? Because we have developed the world's best practice in our industry. This also means that we get access to the best possible technology. Next week I will be present at the opening of a new filtration plant at Mannum. This is an example of what can be achieved when international and South Australian firms work together in partnership.

As every member of the House knows, this means that we will see another 100 000 South Australians receive excellent water whereas governments for decades, including, specifi-

cally, the most recent Labor Government, ignored them. We are not prepared to do that. We are opening filtration plants throughout the country areas of South Australia. These successes are a tribute to the robustness of the industry and the Government's water industry strategy. I also openly acknowledge that they are a tribute to the commitment of the firms, local and international, that are involved in this growing new industry.

To conclude my response to the member for Bragg's question, what this means for South Australians, particularly young South Australians, is jobs, because, even before the 200 new jobs which the contract that I announced last week come to South Australia, the estimated increase in employment in the water industry since the outsourcing contract was signed is 23 per cent. So, this water industry means 500 new jobs for South Australia. That is of credit to everyone who has been involved. It gives no credit to the Labor Opposition which continues to denigrate the great efforts of this new industry.

POLICE BICYCLE PATROLS

Ms RANKINE (Wright): Why did the Minister for Police tell the House last week that I had not provided him with information that he requested in relation to a question that I asked him about the withdrawal of police resources when I had delivered that information to House of Assembly staff on 23 July? Will he tell the House what happened to that information, and will he now answer the question that I asked on 21 July together with the question that I asked last week?

Last week I asked the Minister whether the police department's bicycle patrols would be expanded during this financial year and, if so, whether the Government would undertake to pay for the officers' bikes. I explained that whilst supporting this proposal both the Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully councils objected to picking up the tab for what they see as a State Government responsibility, with one councillor stating that the Government point blank refused to pay for them.

Despite this information being freely available in the local Messenger press, the *Advertiser* and from the councils involved, in his reply the Minister asked for the information on which I based my question and accused me of not having provided him with the information that he requested on 21 July about the effect of the withdrawal of police vehicles from patrol bases, CIB units, country divisions and other areas of the police department.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It might be of some surprise to the honourable member to hear that just because something is printed in the Messenger press or by some other media source that does not necessarily mean that it is fact. So, just because it is there does not mean that I will regard it as factual. In relation to the two questions that the honourable member has asked on which I am getting details, she should receive a reply within, I think, two days. Those details are being checked.

Regarding the reason why I did not have the information that the honourable member says was given to the Assembly attendants, it has been confirmed to me by a member of the parliamentary staff that that information was given to the attendants. Where it went from there, I am not sure, but when I gave my reply I had not seen that information. The honourable member will receive a reply in about two days.

NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I lay on the table the ministerial statement relating to the NCA bombing inquest made in another place by my colleague the Attorney-General.

DEVELOPMENT ACT

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I lay on the table the ministerial statement relating to the Development Act 1993 made in another place by the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I refer to one of the most serious endemic problems in our society, that is, bullying. I have devoted much time and research to the topic and declared my resolve to speak out about bullying in an effort to eradicate it many years ago, at a time when I was bullied in the workplace. Bullying affects everyone at some time in their lives. It is prevalent in our school yards, the home, the workplace and our political system: I see examples of it every day. It is, therefore, not an understatement when I report to this House that bullying is rife within our community. This continuing wave of undesirable behaviour, often covert, is a most destructive force. In 1995, Professor Ken Rigby described it as behaviour that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The member for Florey has the call.

Ms BEDFORD: —involves repeated oppression, physical or psychological, of a less powerful individual by a more powerful individual or group. It does involve a power imbalance, it does involve intimidation and it is a deliberate and persistent behaviour to which we give licence every time we remain silent in the face of wrongdoing. These wrongdoings can, and do, occur everywhere in both our public and private lives. The South Australian research (principally conducted by Ken Rigby and Phillip Slee) thoroughly documents the occurrence of bullying within our schools. Outside schools, this abuse of power manifests itself in many forums: industry, offices, Governments, the armed forces and the home. Bullying must be discouraged and outed wherever and whenever it occurs.

Our school yards should reflect our society's value of knowledge and the avenues that education provides. The playground should be a haven of safety where children can play unperturbed by the passing world. Our classrooms should be supportive and nurturing. However, the sad reality is that our school yards have become imitations of our boardrooms, with children negotiating friendships in an all too often destructive manner. Students develop values that will stay with them for a lifetime. Some are greatly troubled, seriously depressed and quite often become ill because of bullying. Because bullying is so widespread and persistent, we need the support of all concerned to reduce its harmful effects on the communal life of the school.

The Working Women's Centre produced a report under its workplace bullying project because bullying in the

workplace is a daily reality. It reports that workers are experiencing social isolation, humiliation, regular insults, sarcasm, exclusion, trivialisation of opinions and persistent criticism. Some of my constituents wryly note that they see these behaviours in this place far more than they would like. The report also stated that 70 per cent of respondents took time off from work as a result of bullying—an astounding figure that must surely highlight the reality that bullying not only has a multiplicity of effects on the individual involved but is costly to the organisation. Bullying has negative effects on people's health and wellbeing and, in extreme cases, their ability to work well. Bullying is one factor that seriously undermines the capacity of some individuals to work productively. It prevents full production and impedes full potential.

Bosses who inappropriately use coercive managerial styles are, in fact, using the powerlessness of employees. In times of organisational downsizing, the requirements of performance and accountability, managers are seen to rationalise their behaviours under a rhetoric of restructuring that allows them to do the wrong thing. So-called ethical deviations resulting from an unethical stance made in the name of organisational restructuring cannot be justified. There is no legitimacy, and it cannot be tolerated. The recent Maritime Union of Australia dispute is an example of such a situation.

South Australia has no specific regulations or code of practice to deal with occupational bullying, unless we can find some way to interpret it as harassment on the grounds of sex, age, race or disability. Thus workplace bullying is not necessarily, under our civil or criminal system, unlawful. However, as the research suggests, the costs are great and our industries are picking up the tab through sick leave and lost productivity.

It is in everyone's interests to work towards eliminating these behaviours. I reaffirm my pledge to strongly oppose bullying in all its insidious forms. I urge everyone to heed their social conscience and not allow bullying to be a part of our daily lives. Effective bullying programs must come from the top; be supervised and regularly reviewed; be based on clear awareness of the extent and nature of the problem; change basic attitudes to all unfair or aggressive behaviour; and teach people to promptly report incidents of victimisation in any way possible.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today I wish to make a contribution in relation to citizenship. Members would be aware that I put forward a motion (which was carried) in regard to waiving the citizenship fee application for migrants who have resided in Australia for more than 20 years. I thank the member for Lee for his contribution in regard to promotion of citizenship. I passed on that motion to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Immigration, the Hon. Philip Ruddock, and I received a letter from him in which he states that matters raised in that motion will be examined. He says:

You may be interested to know that the Australian Citizenship Council was established on 7 August 1998 in recognition by the Government of the national importance and significance of Australian citizenship as the 'unifying force' which binds all Australians together.

Members would be aware that 26 January 1999 is the fiftieth anniversary of the Australian Citizenship Act, which came into force in 1948. So, next year is a very important milestone in Australia's history in that regard, and I would have thought that, with the Australian Citizenship Act celebration of 50

years and the centenary of Federation, we should place greater emphasis on promotion of Australian citizenship.

I am still concerned that 750 000 permanent residents in Australia are not Australian citizens—and there are more than 61 000 in South Australia alone. I believe that, with a population of 18 million, the fact that there are 750 000 permanent residents who are not Australian citizens should be of major concern. I am pleased that the Minister has been kind enough to respond and inform me about the Australian Citizenship Council. He said:

Australian citizenship reflects our democratic traditions and diversity while emphasising our shared values, our common purpose and vision. It is also symbolic of the inclusive nature of our society and our unity as a nation. Citizenship is about loyalty to Australia and its people, a shared belief in the democratic process, respect for the rights and liberties of other Australians, and the commitment to uphold and obey Australia's laws.

He further said:

With the fiftieth anniversary of Australian citizenship occurring on 26 January 1999, the council's initial task will be to provide advice in appropriate ways to mark this important celebration. As Australia moves into the new millennium, and we celebrate the first centenary of Federation in 2001, the Australian Citizenship Council will play a crucial role.

I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to establish the council, the members of which are very eminent Australians. It is chaired by Sir Ninian Stephen (the former Governor-General) and the members are: Mrs Sallyanne Atkinson; Mr Mark Ella; the Hon. Robert Ellicott; Miss Mirta Gonzalez; Archbishop Barry Hickey; Professor Donald Horne; the Hon. Gary Johns; Mr Bernard Kilgariff; Miss Tan Le; Ms Caryl McQuestin; Mr Robert Manne; Miss Marilynne Paspaley; and Professor Judith Sloan. As a former Governor-General with extensive experience in a wide range of areas, both in Australia and overseas, Sir Ninian Stephen will bring valuable expertise and insight to the council's deliberations. I look forward, as does the Minister, to seeing the results of the council, and I hope that we go into the new millennium with greater emphasis and greater appreciation of Australian citizenship.

Last night, I was fortunate enough to be at the Campbelltown council citizenship ceremony when more than 30 citizens took up a commitment to Australia. I was pleased to see the expressions on their faces, which showed how important citizenship is to them. I would like to see a proposal put forward to acknowledge the transition from childhood to adulthood when young people turn 18 and when they are given the right to vote and become adults of this great country.

Ms KEY (Hanson): I refer to the Western Suburbs Residents Environmental Association, which was established on Monday night as a result of work done by a number of residents in the Camden Park, Plympton and North Plympton areas. Residents in this area have had longstanding concerns about pollutants resulting from the operation of industry in their area. People at the meeting on Monday night had different concerns about different industries in the area, but their main concern was the Castalloy operation on Mooringe Avenue, North Plympton. The concerns included possible adverse health effects associated with exposure to atmospheric contaminants, noise levels and noxious odours—and any member who has been in that area when Castalloy has been in full operation will understand what I mean by 'noxious odours'.

Most residents around Castalloy, in particular, have to keep their windows closed because the smell is so strong. Whether they like it or not, they must have airconditioning because they are unable to use any natural air flow through their house because of the stench. The local Labor candidate for Hindmarsh, Mr Steve Georganas, and I have been campaigning for a long time to address these concerns. So far, regarding every avenue that we have followed, whether it be the Environment Protection Authority, the Minister for Environment or the Minister for Human Services, we have been told that our letters have been noted and they will get back to us. A number of residents have tried to get some assistance from not only the Minister for Human Services and the Minister for Environment and Heritage but also the West Torrens council. Although the West Torrens council has been supportive, so far there has been absolutely no action whatsoever.

At present, we are seeking to intervene in the process in relation to the Environment Protection Authority. The licence of Castalloy, which is only one of the companies with which local residents have environmental problems, is due for renewal. We have written to the Environment Protection Authority asking it to intervene and to ensure that the environment improvement program, which is developed (as I understand it) in conjunction with the authority, is observed; and also that local residents and local members of Parliament have an opportunity to view the environment improvement program so that we can see what steps Castalloy, in particular, is taking to ensure that environmental pollutants generated by it are being investigated and, hopefully, minimised.

In addition to wanting information on the environment improvement program, the local community is interested to understand how the terrible stench, which seems to be a symbol, unfortunately, of the North Plympton-Camden area, can be allowed to continue. No-one seems to think that it is a problem, and the residents are consistently told that it is within environmental law and nothing can be done about it. It has been suggested a number of times that the local residents are imagining that this environmental problem is happening.

Other areas of concern raised at the meeting on Monday night were that different companies have been seen throwing waste down the drains in that area; the problem of waste management generally in the North Plympton-Camden area (and allegations were made about how that waste material is being disposed of); and the noise problem created by excessive traffic, in particular trucks, on Mooringe Avenue and the back streets in Camden Park and North Plympton.

I congratulate a group of people who have largely never been involved in any action before and who have waited patiently for the local agencies and the West Torrens council to help them to no avail. They have decided that the best thing they can do is to form a residents group that will look at environmental issues, in particular, and to try to lobby for change.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to speak briefly on a matter that has come to my attention through representation from constituents of mine, and it relates to difficulties they are having regarding the burial sites of family members in the Dudley Park Cemetery. I have decided to raise this issue today because a number of attempts have been made over recent time to sort out this matter; it has not been sorted out and it needs to be sorted out.

There are a number of issues and I have not the time today to go into all the detail, but some of them relate to change in location of the graves, some for the third time since December 1997; concerns relating to the duration of lease, as one of the graves is a pioneer grave dating back to 1868; and the verbal agreement that the grave would remain in its original site—and, as I say, the location has apparently been changed and is still metres away from what the family considers to be the original site. In fact, family members visited the grave of their mother on Mother's Day and it was found that the site had been changed with headstones removed, newly formed beams in place and the surface levelled. No prior notification had been received by any family member that the work had commenced, thus the family was afforded no opportunity to visit the grave sites prior to commencement of work.

There have been discussions with the curator, but those discussions have not solved the family's concerns. They have come to me and I have taken up the matter with the Minister for Local Government because I felt it was something in which the Minister may have some involvement. Unfortunately, the State legislation regarding the disposal of the remains of deceased persons and the operation of cemeteries is deficient in areas relating to re-licensing of grave sites. The Minister was kind enough to provide me with extracts from the Local Government Act 1934 and the Local Government Cemetery Regulations Act 1995, but under the circumstances they were of little assistance.

The Minister has advised that there is no legislation which might confer on descendants of deceased persons buried in cemeteries any rights to renew leases over burial sites. Unless specified in the original burial licence or lease, the cemetery authority has total authority as to the ongoing use of the relevant land upon expiry of the licence or lease. The Minister has also informed me that cemetery authorities frequently do all they reasonably can to meet the wishes of descendants. He has referred to the present case where he has noted that the general manager of the Dudley Park Cemetery has offered the Probert family trust a lease for 25 years with a right of renewal for a similar term. There is a dispute about the exact delineation of the grave sites and the 25 year lease.

The Minister has indicated his concern about the obvious legislative vacuum and the concern it brings to many descendants of those who have passed away. The Minister has informed me that a former Government investigated these matters in 1990-91 and that some preliminary work was done on preparing the framework of a new Act to regulate the disposal of human remains. Included in policy considerations at that time was provision for initial minimal terms for burial licences and the grant of rights of renewal to the descendants. However, the legislation was not proceeded with. Of course, we realise that work on the new Local Government Act is proceeding, but the Minister hopes that at the end of that exercise this matter may be addressed.

In conclusion, I indicate my total dissatisfaction with the way in which this matter has been handled. I will call again as I have in the past—and in fact as the Minister has—for discussions on this important issue to involve also members of the trust rather than just the curator and the family concerned.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Last Friday, I had the honour to launch a new community based action group called Action for Breast Cancer, a group that had its origins in a meeting that occurred in February this year when 300 people respond-

ed to an advertisement to discuss the need for better advocacy and support for people with breast cancer and their families. Since February, a group of hard working committee members have worked to put together this action group. With the exception of non-melanocytic skin cancer, breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer and the most common cause of death from cancer in women in Australia. Statistics show that one in 12 Australian women will get breast cancer and that each year about 2 500 Australian women die from the disease. The mortality rate has not been reduced substantially for 40 years, although we have some good news on that front here in South Australia.

The International Agency for Research on Cancer has reported breast cancer to be by far the most frequently occurring cancer (apart from, again, non-melanocytic skin cancer) in women world wide and the leading cause of death from cancer in women. World wide, 308 888 women died of breast cancer in 1985, with annual totals expected to be around 340 000 deaths in 1990 and 420 000 deaths by the year 2000. Major risk factors are age and a family history of the disease. These and other risk factors, such as body size or reproductive behaviour known to be associated with an increased risk of breast cancer, are not readily preventable causes. Currently, prevention of death from breast cancer is achievable only by early detection, principally by way of mammography in organised screening programs set up to achieve reductions in mortality.

However, in spite of this, the news is not all bad. The good news is that most people who get breast cancer do not die from it if it is detected early. Last week, I had the opportunity to speak with Dr Steve Birrell, head of the Flinders Medical Centre's Surgical Oncology Clinic, who told me that there has been some very good recent news in South Australia. Two weeks ago, the latest South Australian Cancer Registry data showed that there had been an 11 per cent reduction in the mortality rate in South Australia from breast cancer over the past 10 years. In Dr Birrell's opinion, the factors that have caused this are as follows: first, a lot of work done by the National Breast Cancer Centre set up in 1994 in raising awareness of the disease; the establishment of Breast Screen South Australia in 1989; and the fact that the best practice in add-on treatment of breast cancer occurs in South Australia.

South Australia also leads the country in the breast conservation rate. Today, only 25 per cent of women require a mastectomy—20 years ago that figure was 100 per cent. Our leading public hospitals—Flinders Medical Centre, Royal Adelaide Hospital and Queen Elizabeth Hospital—all have breast cancer units, and 90 per cent of cases are treated either there or by doctors connected with these units.

However, the major gap in the provision of support for women, men and their families is between getting a diagnosis and starting a treatment program. This is where Action for Breast Cancer, with people who are survivors of breast cancer, will work with other members of the community to provide these benefits. I wish them all the very best. Their President, Denise Wehnert, and their committee are working very hard. I expect that they will make great strides forward in helping our community understand breast cancer, in supporting those with breast cancer to fight the disease and in doing an even better job to reduce even further the mortality rate in South Australia.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): There are two matters to which I wish to draw the House's attention today. I refer, first, to what I presume to be the ambit claim of the workers in the

Mitsubishi and General Motors-Holden's plants in South Australia for an increase in pay that in no way at all respects the necessity for that industry to demonstrate that it has improved its productive capacity before it is given that increase. I do not say that the members of the work force in those plants are unworthy of the wages they currently earn, nor do I say that they may not in their historical belief about how wages are fixed be making an unreasonable claim; but their union is certainly being quite unethical and the employers are being quite unprincipled and irresponsible if they agree to grant any increase. The Arbitration Commission, worse still, if it brings down an award increasing wages paid to people employed in the automobile industry any time before tariffs are reduced to zero, is being irresponsible and indeed quite vandalistic on the economy.

The reason is simply this: at present, all vehicles manufactured at that plant and sold in Australia are protected from open competition by a tariff barrier which we in this Parliament sought to maintain less than 12 months ago before we went to the last State election. We resolved to support the Government in its endeavours to get the Federal Government to maintain a level of tariff protection so that investments in the automobile industry would continue. The several hundred million dollars that was to have been invested in South Australia by both Mitsubishi and General Motors was in jeopardy. We said then that it would be a good idea to hold off on tariff reductions, but many of us speaking in the Chamber at the time said that by doing so it was not an excuse for the work force then to demand higher pay and increase the cost of production still further.

At that time it was demonstrated that the costs of producing a motor vehicle in South Australia were so high that protection was required from cheaper imports produced in economies where the cost of production was lower. I do not know whether or not that was a wise move, but in my judgment we should have included in that a caveat on the employers, the automobile industries and the workers in the plants that they not increase the costs and again destroy the viability. If wages rise, the costs of producing each motor vehicle will increase; then they will claim that production of motor vehicles is not viable and they will want a higher tariff.

All the companies will say to the Federal and State Governments, 'We'll lock the door and close up shop unless we get higher tariffs, which will enable us to raise the price further and become viable again.' In the meantime the effect of giving the wage rise to the workers is to make everyone else want to re-establish their relativities with workers in the automobile industry, and the leapfrog approach begins. The cost increases of all goods and services flow on through the economy in consequence of such a decision, and the only people who pay and suffer in the final analysis are the exporters. They are the people who generate real growth in employment. So, by increasing the wages paid—or allowing the automobile companies and the unions representing the workers in those plants to increase labour costs—we are literally destroying the prospects we might have now of getting unemployment down to an acceptable level of about 2 per cent, where it is just frictional and structural (people are just on the move between jobs at about that level), instead of being where it is in double digits at the present time.

I call on the union, the automobile companies and the arbitration authority to now do their bit, because we as members of this Parliament and the Federal Government did our bit at the time to rescue the industry, save it from its own

stupidity—it has allowed that to happen in the past—and, in doing so, ensure that we have the jobs for our young people.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That the seventy-seventh report of the committee on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital intensive care redevelopment be noted.

The Department of Human Services proposes to redevelop the intensive care ward of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at an estimated cost of \$4.68 million, which is the subject of the seventy-seventh report of the Public Works Committee on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital intensive care redevelopment. The existing intensive care unit (ICU) occupies 550 square metres of space and accommodates 11 critical care beds in terribly cramped and inadequate conditions. The proposed project will replace these facilities with a new 14 bed unit design to meet the latest Australian standards and intensive care guidelines. This new unit will utilise 1 653 square metres of space. The 14 bed spaces available in the new unit will comprise one bed for patient diagnosis testing, three beds providing fully enclosed isolation of infectious patients, and 10 beds for other intensive care patients.

The spaces for each bed have been designed to accommodate the range of equipment and staff required when a critically ill patient is resuscitated. The design also incorporates a large central work station with inbuilt cardiac and respiratory monitoring. This area is required to accommodate the high number of resident and visiting staff involved in the management of critically ill patients. In addition, extra wide corridors are required to accommodate the movement of beds and large mobile equipment items such as X-ray machines or dialysis units. That is extremely difficult, if not impossible, at present. Storage spaces have been designed to accommodate the large volume of medical equipment and consumable stock that is required in an intensive care unit. The space is necessary to meet modern infection control guidelines, and a large number of single use items are required. As such, substantial stock available for immediate use has to be stored somewhere.

Patient care will be enhanced through the provision of lounges, waiting areas, counselling and toilet areas within the unit. This will enable staff to be immediately and continuously available to patients, relatives and other visitors. This project also provides for significant upgrade of the intensive care unit equipment, with replacement of all beds and additional monitoring equipment for the three additional bed positions; that is, the total number of beds will increase from 11 to 14. Members should note that prior to the redevelopment of the ICU, the allied health services, which occupy the first floor, will have to be relocated. These services include occupational therapy, speech pathology, orthotics, dietetics and social work. An existing vacant area on the ground floor will be used as the space into which they are relocated.

Once that area has been refurbished the purpose designed accommodation will consolidate the allied health services on an ideal floor, in terms of access—the ground floor, and will satisfy the long-term needs of that service. In particular, the facilities will be upgraded so as to provide improved accommodation for the staff and patients along with additional sound proofing to provide added privacy. The improved

floor plan of the allied health area will also enable staff to triage patients more effectively and, as the reception area will become central to the unit, patients with disabling conditions will not have to walk long distances to reach their treatment area.

The North Western Adelaide Health Service completed an extensive financial analysis of this project and eventually got it right. The analysis identified—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Other members of the committee share that almost private joke. This analysis identified a net present value of \$7.582 million at 1997-98 costs using a 7 per cent discount rate. I have a table of a purely statistical nature containing these details, Mr Speaker, and I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

North Western Adelaide Health Service
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Intensive Care Redevelopment
Cost-Benefit Analysis (constant 1997-98 prices and 7 per cent discount rate)

	NPV \$'000	1997-98 \$'000	1998-99 \$'000	1999-2000 \$'000	2000-2001 \$'000	2001-2002 \$'000
Do Nothing Option						
Recurrent Costs						
TQEH Intensive Care Service [1]	11 871	4 655	4 353	3 119	1 536	0
Transport Costs [2]	974	0	144	187	381	568
Backfill of Medical Officers [3]	287	0	50	54	109	163
Additional Costs at Other Sites [4]	7 830	0	1 005	1 536	3 119	4 655
Dislocation of Services [5]						
Total Recurrent Costs	20 962	4 655	5 553	4 896	5 145	5 386
Capital Costs						
TQEH Site [6]	1 557	650	300	300	300	300
Other Sites [7]	7 693	0	1 300	7 472	600	0
Other Sites Equipment [8]	572	0	200	300	200	0
Total Capital Costs	9 822	650	1 800	8 072	1 100	300
Total Costs	30 784	5 305	7 353	12 968	6 245	5 686
Redevelopment						
Recurrent Costs						
TQEH Intensive Care Service	19 086	4 655	4 655	4 655	4 655	4 655
Transport Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Backfill of Medical Officers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Additional Costs at Other Sites	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Recurrent Costs	19 086	4 655	4 655	4 655	4 655	4 655
Capital Costs						
TQEH Site	4 116	650	3 736	300	0	0
Other Sites	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Sites Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Capital Costs	4 116	650	3 736	300	0	0
Total Costs	23 202	5 305	8 391	4 955	4 655	4 655
Net Benefit/(Cost)	7 582	0	(1 038)	8 013	1 590	1 031

Mr LEWIS: On Wednesday 15 July a delegation from the Public Works Committee conducted an inspection of the intensive care unit at Queen Elizabeth Hospital, when members were able to see at first hand the crowded conditions to which I have referred and the difficulties experienced by patients and staff. We found that they were working at the limit in what were almost intolerable conditions. It was evident immediately to the committee that these conditions provide no privacy for patients receiving treatment or for their visiting family members who may be grieving. Further, members were alarmed to see the makeshift arrangements that have been put in place to provide emergency exits for patients and staff. Indeed, in one instance you have to walk through a cupboard, literally, with the back taken out of it, to get from one area to another.

At the time of the committee's visit the intensive care unit had reached capacity, and we were told that the additional patients were being accommodated in the surgical recovery

ward. Doctors at Queen Elizabeth Hospital explained that this regularly occurred and was a most undesirable situation as, although staff take every precaution, the risk of cross infection between patients is increased in these circumstances. The site inspection certainly substantiated the need for the proposed redevelopment of the intensive care unit. The committee recognises that this upgrade will satisfy the urgent need to remedy the inadequate facilities for both the patients and their families; and, in particular, members welcome the inclusion of public and private waiting rooms in the redeveloped area.

The committee noted that these improved facilities will assist in the reduction of present high stress levels among the staff—with, of course, the attendant consequences for their health. The committee also noted that not only will this development eliminate the need for spillover services to adjacent feeder recovery areas, but the consolidation of all intensive care facilities will optimise the ability of staff to remain constantly within the unit. This will ensure that they

are available for emergency response if required, and one does not need me to point out that it could be a matter of life and death. Committee members acknowledge that, if the proposed work is not undertaken at Queen Elizabeth Hospital, there exists the risk that the Australian and New Zealand College of Anaesthetists (ANZCA) would not accredit the unit for post-graduate medical staff training. As such, the high costs of employing all staff specialists in lieu of existing medical staff undertaking their post-graduate training would make the unit uneconomic in comparison with other intensive care units in our health care market in Adelaide.

In addition, the committee acknowledges the benefits that will accrue to the allied health services area of the hospital as a result of this development. In particular, the facilities will be upgraded so as to provide improved access and accommodation for staff and patients, along with additional sound-proofing to provide added privacy. Given the above, the committee reports that it recommends this proposed public work.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I support very wholeheartedly the adoption of this report from the Public Works Committee. In doing so, I will probably touch on some of the issues raised by the Presiding Officer, but so be it. That this work is urgently needed is an understatement. The committee was told that, during an accreditation survey by the Australian/New Zealand College of Anaesthetists in April 1995, significant deficiencies were identified in the intensive care unit of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. So serious were these deficiencies that they threatened the accreditation of the hospital for full compulsory training in the area of critical care. So, things have been very grim since 1995.

The submission stated that any development of the intensive care unit had been put on hold in 1996, because of the major redevelopment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that was being considered at that time by the Government, and members would remember the big private development of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which was to be the best thing since sliced bread and which was to proceed in 1996. As we all know, that has not eventuated. Of course, because of that process falling in a hole, this redevelopment was set back.

In August 1997, the former Minister for Health announced funding of \$3.9 million, and tenders for this upgrade were called, and they closed on 13 February 1998. Additional costs of \$38 000 were incurred due to the necessity of the preferred tenderer having to extend their tender costs until 30 August 1998. We are now looking at a total cost of \$4.6 million for this upgrade and the accompanying relocation of allied health services. I was not able to accompany the committee on the site visit as I was sick. However, I have been to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital on a number of occasions and witnessed the decrepit and appalling conditions, first, for patients and, secondly, for staff. It continues to amaze me that people can be treated successfully in a hospital that is so run down.

During evidence, Dr Peisach from the intensive care unit told the committee that the hospital has been extraordinarily busy of late. He said that the activity had increased and he said that not only were more people going through the intensive care unit but more of these patients were elderly, with a number of things wrong with them. He said that they were no longer simple cases but were more complex with patients suffering from more than one affliction. He said that the throughput in the intensive care unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is now 50 per cent above the admissions

that were occurring two years ago. Things have become much busier, and the conditions and the facilities have continued to deteriorate.

As the Presiding Member mentioned, we are looking at a new 14 bed unit being established. I questioned the limit of 14 during the evidence. Given the obvious need for the facility, I wondered whether 14 beds were enough. It was explained that, because of the architecture and design of the building, 14 was the maximum number of beds that could be fitted into that area. I asked, 'Will it be enough?' Essentially, the answer I received was, 'In terms of intensive care beds in this hospital, it probably is not really enough in theory, but we have to be realistic in terms of the costs of these facilities.' It is interesting to note that a similar unit at the Flinders Medical Centre now has 14 to 16 beds, and it will be upgraded to 22 to 24 beds. I understand that the Royal Adelaide Hospital's unit has more beds than the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There is concern about whether, in the end, it will be enough.

Another matter of interest is that 200 of the 710 patients treated last year at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital had been transferred to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital intensive care unit from the Lyell McEwin Hospital in Elizabeth. That is quite a big issue in my area, because people feel that patients who are critically ill—and they are the people who are treated in an intensive care unit—should not, in the middle of or straight after an operation, be put in ambulance and moved across town to another hospital, simply because one place does not have the facilities of the level required. It may well be that, when the Lyell McEwin Hospital is finally upgraded, if it gets an intensive care unit itself of the highest level, 200 patients will not have to be transferred each year to the QEH. Perhaps we will find then that the 14 beds now being established at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be enough.

I was also pleased to see the upgrade of allied health services at the hospital. Obviously this is a secondary benefit, the intensive care unit being the major part of this project. However, in order to make room for the new intensive care unit, the allied health area had to be shifted, and it was a good opportunity to make some positive changes for those very important areas, too, in terms of services for both patients and staff. Finally, I hope that this will go smoothly at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I hope that, once we have given the okay and this report has been presented and accepted in this Parliament, things will proceed smoothly.

We all acknowledge that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, perhaps of all our hospitals in South Australia, has had to contend with incredible uncertainty over many years. This uncertainty continued again yesterday in this House, when the Minister changed the position which had been outlined to the hospital board by his senior executive officer on the debt repayment which the hospital had believed, up until yesterday, would require it to make very large cuts, involving the closure of another ward and beds, and cuts to services.

That was changed as of yesterday. The hospital has been given 10 years to repay the \$8 million. Let us hope that that will be possible for a hospital that is in dire need of a facilities upgrade, as we all know that efficiencies in operations go very much hand in hand with modern facilities. That is how you get your efficiencies today in hospitals. I absolutely support this upgrade. It has been a long time coming. It is necessary and needed. I hope that it occurs quickly so that we can see at least one more section of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital up to scratch for the people of the western suburbs.

Mr BROKENSHIRE secured the adjournment of the debate.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HINDMARSH
SOCCER STADIUM**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That the seventieth report (final) of the committee on the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium—Stage 2—be noted.

(Continued from 5 August. Page 1677.)

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I rise to talk about the seventieth report—the final report—of the Public Works Committee on the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium upgrade. This is the first chance in this Chamber I have had to express to my colleagues some of my frustration and concerns about the politics, backflips and lack of intent over the facts involving the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. First, I believe that the politics surrounding Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium were a deliberate ploy by the Opposition to try to have a go at the then Minister for Sport and Recreation, the Hon. Graham Ingerson. It is amazing how often these days the Labor Party adopts the tactic of playing the man and not the ball. The target at the time was the Hon. Graham Ingerson, and it suited those on the other side to use this project to try to kick someone as hard as they could and where it hurt them most.

What they did not highlight to members of the public and our own members in this Chamber was that, had Minister Ingerson not got in and strongly supported this Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium Stage 2 redevelopment, we would have missed out on an opportunity to host seven Olympic soccer games. I can imagine, particularly from the member for taxis on the other side, who does not have a lot to contribute to this place, the press releases that would have gone out, especially through the western suburbs in the electorate of Peake, which would have stated, 'The Liberal Government fails'—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I ask the honourable member to withdraw the term 'the member for taxis'. The appropriate title for me is 'the member for Peake'.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The honourable member should realise that members must be referred to by their electorates.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: The member for Peake would have been the first person to put out a press release saying that the Liberal Government had failed to deliver and had failed the South Australian community, because we would have been the only State in Australia to miss out on an opportunity with respect to the 2000 Olympic Games. I was also frustrated with the politics of the Opposition side when it came to members stating whether they support opportunities to grow soccer in South Australia, and whether they genuinely support opportunities—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake.

Mr BROKENSHIRE:—for young people to get off the streets and aspire to the elite athletic opportunities of premier international soccer and watching the hosting of seven Olympic soccer games in South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition happens to have four or five scarves in the back of his car: one is a South Adelaide scarf, another is a Port Power scarf and he also has an Adelaide City soccer scarf. About five scarves lie on the parcel shelf of the Leader of the Opposition's car, because he wants to be everything to

everybody in theory and in perception. But, in reality, from the Leader of the Opposition down, all members opposite want is to destroy opportunities for soccer. They stand condemned.

I am proud of the people who get behind soccer in my electorate of Mawson. I am very proud of the young people who are playing up through the ranks and who want to play at a decent stadium one day. They want to be able to come to that stadium and see international Asia Pacific opportunities and, hopefully, one day, Commonwealth Games and so on being played there. None of that was taken into account when it came to this project.

We all know what happens when you are tendering for games, and I would suggest to members of the Opposition that they ought to speak to someone who knows a bit about it, namely, the Hon. John Bannon. He and Steve Condous have told many members of this House how difficult it is and how often the game plan changes when you are bidding for these sorts of events. As I have said before, and I want to get it clearly on the public record now: had this second stage not occurred, we would have missed this opportunity and would have been condemned from the Leader of the Opposition down.

We would also have missed the opportunity of building another piece of icon infrastructure that will allow us the opportunity to bid on Asia Pacific and Commonwealth Games and the like in the future. South Australia does not enjoy the luxury of a good economic base thanks to what happened, as we all know. I will not go through that again; people know about it. Because of that, we do not have a strong economic base. We cannot make a bid for a major game and say that we will put \$250 million, \$400 million or \$500 million of infrastructure in place just like that: we have to do it piece by piece.

This is another piece in the jigsaw that will put us in a very strong position for getting a lot more sporting events into South Australia. Only the other day it was reported in the paper that already three major cultural events are flagged to be held at the new Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. That is the sort of thing which I want to get on the public record and which I want Opposition members on the Public Works Committee in particular to recognise. The fact is that an Entertainment Centre did not just come along and it did not eventuate without support: we had to build the infrastructure and support it financially for some time. But look at what a magnificent venue that is now. I give credit to the Labor Party for that project. It is interesting how it is able to put lots of Government money into projects such as the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, the ASER Convention Centre (which lost a hell of a lot of money), the Velodrome and the REMM Centre, which lost nearly \$1 billion.

The list is longer than my arm and too long for me to highlight in the time I have right now, but I have made the point on the public record. The point is that this money is not borrowed: it is funded out of the Government's recurrent base, particularly that for sport and recreation. This money and support will allow soccer to grow. It will allow many more opportunities for other events, and it will allow teams such as the Rams, which will certainly do so much better in a stadium-type atmosphere than they would ever have done at Adelaide Oval, to have a home. It can be a multiple complex for sport, and it is really about supporting soccer.

What surprises me most in this is that the member for Peake is beside himself, because he is anti-soccer. The Labor Party is anti-soccer, and it ought to be strong enough to get

out there and admit that to everybody. This Government supports a growth sport, supports an opportunity for sport and recreation development and supports the fact that we will be able to gain opportunities through international exposure. The money that we will get out of international exposure just with the seven games of the Olympics is far more than the money that is being put into the second stage in real terms. There is a legacy. As John Hill, one of the very few honourable Liberal Party candidates—sorry: Labor candidates—in the Federal election has said—

Mr HILL: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I ask the honourable member to withdraw the comment that I am a Liberal Party candidate.

Mr BROKENSHERE: I withdraw, Sir. I was talking about another Mr Hill—the gentleman in Sydney, David Hill—who is one of the very few honourable Labor candidates in the Federal election. He came straight out and said that it is time the Labor Party in South Australia grew up, stopped playing Party politics and supported this venture. What the Federal Labor candidate, David Hill, actually said is that this was the very minimum that this Government had to provide to ensure that we had an opportunity. I will put my credibility before David Hill any day when it comes to comparing David Hill, an honourable Federal Labor candidate, with any member on the other side, because they are hypocrites when it comes to supporting economic opportunities for this State. Labor members in this State are hypocrites when it comes to genuine support for soccer. They are hypocrites when it comes to supporting young people and encouraging them to get off the streets. All they want to do is attack someone who is doing a damn good job.

As I have already said, members opposite attacked former Minister Ingerson, and I condemn them for that. They played the man and not the ball, but former Minister Ingerson got on with it. He had the guts and strength to realise what was in the best interests of South Australia. He will leave a legacy that the people will appreciate—a decent, international Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. I congratulate him and the people, because this will not take money away from health, education and welfare. The money for this will come out of a budget line that already exists. It will tie in with another great heap of economic opportunities that are positive and proactive for the people of South Australia. I condemn in its entirety the Labor Party in this State.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That the motion be amended by adding:

‘and that this House calls on the Government to:

- (a) secure the land on which the stadium and its facilities are established and rename it the Hindmarsh Stadium; and
- (b) establish a trust controlled by Government appointed business managers and also comprising a representative of each of the bodies which are regular users, to manage, set fees and charges and decide the use of the facility for all sporting and commercial purposes.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: No, it’s not the Ingerson stadium. We have just heard the usual hysterical, biased, emotional contribution from the member for Mawson, and we will probably hear one of equal calibre from the ex-Deputy Premier. I take umbrage at the assertions and accusations by the member for Mawson that Labor members of this committee were biased and wanted to wreck this initiative for political purposes.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: You can have your shot, ex-Deputy Premier, when it’s your turn. I take umbrage at that and at being called a Labor stooge, which I think both the ex-Deputy Premier and probably soon to be ex-Premier said of me and the member for Reynell in the press on a couple of occasions. It is interesting to think about who is the stooge in this situation. The final report of the Public Works Committee was 4:1. I think there was only one stooge, and that as we all know is our erstwhile friend, the boy at the back, the member for Mawson.

Mr BROKENSHERE: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the compliment from the member for Elizabeth who acknowledges that I am rather youthful—a young boy. However, I understand that that remark is not parliamentary and that I should be addressed as the member for Mawson.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order, but I point out that the member for Elizabeth, after referring to you as the boy at the back, also referred to you as the member for Mawson.

Ms STEVENS: When we talk of stooges and political behaviour in relation to this report, let us all remember that the final score was 4:1: two Labor, one Liberal and one Independent.

The second point that I wish to make is that I find it amazing that, when members question the line put up by the Government, they are accused of being anti-soccer. I am the patron of the Elizabeth City Soccer Club in the northern suburbs. It is a growing club in its first year in the premier league. I think it is important that we support soccer, as I certainly do. I want to see young players achieve and clubs grow strong, but I am not sure that spending \$18.5 million on stage 2 of the Hindmarsh Stadium redevelopment is the way in which to do that. Perhaps we should spend a little more in the northern and southern suburbs where we need to develop more talent. I do not like being accused of being anti-soccer because I am a strong supporter of soccer, especially in my own electorate.

I now turn to the report itself. Much has been said about this report. I have spoken at length on the interim report which was noted some weeks ago. I want to make some brief comments about an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday 25 August under the heading ‘Lights, music and action’. This article is about the concerts plan in connection with the \$18.5 million stadium upgrade. It is interesting to note that the picture depicts the existing grandstand, the new stands and an electronic scoreboard which looks very much like the one at Football Park. It will be interesting to find out whether that scoreboard, as the picture suggests, represents the \$3 million or thereabouts option or whether it is still intended to have the \$100 000 option proposed in the submission. That is an interesting detail. The *Advertiser* article states:

The development report, released yesterday by the Urban Planning Minister, Ms Laidlaw, says that while the monetary return from the stadium would not justify the cost of the project ‘the provision of a world-class facility will lift the profile of Adelaide and attract interstate and international visitors’.

I was not at all surprised to read that a monetary return from the stadium would not justify the cost of the project, because that was ably proved by the committee. It will be interesting to note also how this will fare when the Memorial Drive upgrade is completed and whether those two venues, which I imagine are roughly the same size, will compete for these

planned concerts. The article written by Phillip Coorey states further:

Once the stadium is upgraded, the biggest problem would be a lack of car parking. At present, only 87 spaces are available for spectators.

As members are aware, this is a major issue which was constantly raised by the committee. The article continues:

The report envisages soccer match crowds of 9 000 to 15 000, crowds of 18 000 for 'special non-soccer events' and up to 24 000 for the Olympics matches.

The figures in which I am interested are the soccer match crowds of 9 000 to 15 000 because, as members would know having read the previous reports of the committee, the evidence provided to the committee put soccer crowds at, generally speaking, about one-quarter of that number. So, there would have to be a huge increase. They were the figures that were provided to us by Tony Farrugia from the Soccer Federation.

I have moved the amendment to the motion today because in its final report the committee, having been forced to report by this Parliament, again outlined its continuing concerns, one of which was the future ownership of the stadium. The report states:

Accordingly, the committee remains concerned as to whether the interests of the public and soccer are protected in the longer term, when the ownership of the facility is still not secured.

That is why I included the first paragraph in the amendment. We believe that the second part of my amendment, which would establish a trust to manage, set fees and charges and decide the use of the facility, is necessary in light of the varied use to which the stadium will be put and because during our deliberations we were not given information to satisfy us that this was being done in a satisfactory way.

We come to the end of this long saga but I believe that we will hear a lot about this stadium over the years to come. The Public Works Committee will be watching it with interest, as will, I hope, the Auditor-General. I am sure that we will learn a lot in the future. I believe that what the committee has said and the committee's concerns will be borne out in the future, and I will be interested to see that.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): I would like to make a few comments in relation to this development, having been involved in it on two separate occasions and having listened to a fair amount of the nonsense and diatribe that has been put forward in this House. It would not hurt to put down a few facts and a few points of issue that might help in the general discussion.

As Minister, I spent a considerable amount of time putting together submissions for this committee, and I might add that most of the questions that were required to be answered by the Minister ended up in press releases or information in the media without there being any intent of going through the normal, standard procedure. I believe that that is a pity. The fact that the final report happened to get out to the media before any members had it was, in essence—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: No, I will get to that in a minute. It was a pity. The security of the reports within the Public Works Committee ought to be something that this Parliament looks at. I believe that that is an issue that all the members of the committee ought to be asking about and having a good look at, because it is quite ridiculous that the media, whoever it is—whether it is the print media or the TV

media—should be given reports prior to the committee getting them.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I do not know who did it but I know it happened. All members know that it happened and that they ought to be doing something about it. The whole purpose of the development of the Hindmarsh Stadium was the Olympic Games: it was no more or no less than that. Stage 1 was put together as a development and it was suggested that stage 1 would be practical in terms of the Olympic Games. When the matter was looked at by then Minister Ashenden, it was very clear that there would need to be expenditure of about \$10 million (and I believe that that is the exact figure) to put the stadium into Olympic mode and, at the end of that period, there would be nothing left—in other words, exactly the same as the Grand Prix.

Having run the Grand Prix for two years, I know that we spent in the order of \$10 million every year putting it up and taking it down and, at the end of the day, we have some nice little bits of road out there. In essence, the Government made the decision that, if it was to spend \$10 million to put things into Olympic mode, it ought to leave something behind afterwards. In other words, it seemed a pretty reasonable decision for the Government to make that, if you are going to spend—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: You would not know anything. You ought to go back to the Department of Labour, where you were brought up, and stay there.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: You would not know anything, so just go back to your department. You were not very good in the department when I was there.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address his remarks through the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Have a look at WorkCover and see how good we have been. The issue was that we needed to make a decision, which the Cabinet did make: should we spend \$10 million and have nothing left afterwards or should we put it into a development that would leave something. We were encouraged by Soccer Australia, and David Hill (who I understand is a Labor candidate in New South Wales) has made it public that soccer—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Absolutely. I have no problem being lobbied by people who ought to be getting the best outcome. But David Hill put it to us, as did the Olympic committee, that we ought to consider whether we left behind a major stadium or whether we just made it a temporary condition. Cabinet made a decision to spend the money. It was a Government decision, a Cabinet decision, to go ahead and spend the money, and Minister Ashenden announced that the amount of, I believe, some \$13 million would go into the budget some two years ago to develop and finish stage 2. Since that time, that whole program has been modified to the program we have today, which is some \$18 million. That amount includes the shifting of a considerable number of people off the site.

As members would be aware, there is an agreement between the Government and the Belarusian Church to shift it to a new site and to pay for the relocation, and that is worth the \$18 million. That has been lobbied by many members of

Parliament, and I believe that the outcome is in the best interests of the church and the stadium: there is absolutely no question about that. Meals on Wheels and the bowling club have been relocated. So, at the end of the day, we will have a clear site for a multi-use stadium.

I have been fascinated by the argument that stadiums have to pay their way. If any member of the committee can find me a stadium, other than Football Park, here in South Australia that pays its way, I would like to know where in the world it is, because—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: No, that does not pay its own way.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It does not pay its own way, because it has a magnificent debt on a huge grandstand. If you put all that in together, you see that that does not pay its own way now.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Go and ask SACA: it will tell you. Clearly, there are no stadiums and, if you were to build a stadium with that premise, you just would not build it. It was a Government decision because of the Olympic Games and, we believed, in the best interests of soccer in this State. And I believe that that is still the right reason for wanting to do it.

One of the other things that happened during the negotiations is that rugby clearly had made its decision to leave Adelaide—or considered leaving Adelaide and then finally did—and an option arose for it to use the stadium for the other half of the year. Clearly, that means that, if that situation is taken up by the—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It is a bit like the thuggery that you go on with too, mate. Yes, it is. Number one thug in Adelaide: go and ask the business community. The member for Hart is the number one thug out there but Mr Nice Boy in here.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I think that the former disgraced Deputy Premier's referring to me as the 'number one thug in Adelaide' is unparliamentary and I would ask that he withdraw those remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would suggest that the member for Hart's comments about the member for Bragg are as much out of order as those to which the honourable member—

Mr FOLEY: I withdraw those comments, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call on the member for Bragg to withdraw his comments.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I withdraw, but everyone knows it is correct.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Bragg to withdraw the comments unconditionally.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I withdraw them, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: All the issues put forward by the committee have been dealt with to some extent by the Government. As I have said, issues involving the Belarusian Church, Meals on Wheels and multipurpose use are being dealt with. Interestingly enough, I remember writing to the committee and also talking to the Chairman at length about the Government's position in terms of ownership which,

clearly, the Government realises must be remedied. The Chairman is aware of that position, because I have spent some time discussing it with him.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The request was given to the Chairman to inform him; if he did not, that is his problem, not mine. Clearly, the issue of ownership is a major one, and it always has been a major issue concerning the Government, soccer and the council. It is an issue that has to be satisfied either with a trust or in some other form. I have reported that to the Chairman on many occasions.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Even well before the member for Mawson made his contribution today, I wanted to say that I have been extremely disappointed that members of the Government have said from time to time—and of course the member for Mawson repeated it today—that the Opposition is opposed to soccer. I reject that outright. I think it is most unprofessional and quite disgraceful for various members of the Government to make accusations of that kind against Opposition members.

Apart from the member for Elder, every other member on this side does actually like soccer. We are strong supporters of soccer, and we are disappointed not only with Government members but also with our own member for Elder, who does not support soccer. However, you can rest assured that we are trying to educate him: we are doing our very best, unlike Government members who are not making any attempt to re-educate members on their own side. I know that the member for Peake, in particular, when driving around the streets of Adelaide for the past six months or so, has been trying to re-educate the member for Elder—and we will get there. We will get the member for Elder to the soccer and we will certainly bring him up to scratch with what a great game it is. However, the issue is not whether or not members of the Opposition are opposed to soccer.

I am a strong supporter of soccer, as are many members on this side of the House. Our two members on the Public Works Committee have certainly brought to this House a number of very strong points in relation to what has transpired in terms of the \$30 million injection into the soccer stadium. I remind the House, both Government and Opposition members, that David Hill said that if Hindmarsh was not upgraded we would not be getting Olympic soccer matches. He did not say that there were not any other suitable venues in South Australia, and I remind members that international soccer has been played at Football Park. We must take account of not only the \$30 million being outlaid for soccer but whether that money is being best spent for soccer and for sport. How do we justify that when we have competing interests, for example, Football Park? Football Park would be very pleased—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I apologise to the member for Lee. I ask members carrying out the meeting at the rear of the Chamber to either take their seat or leave the Chamber.

Mr WRIGHT: How do we resolve this position concerning money that will be made available to sport when other sporting bodies come to us cap in hand asking for a contribution from Government? I do not quite know how we go about that. What seems to be missing here is the process involved regarding the \$30 million that will be outlaid for the soccer stadium. I wonder what sort of matches we will receive. I hope in all sincerity that we get the very highest quality international matches and Olympic matches at Hindmarsh

Soccer Stadium, but I strongly doubt whether that will occur even with the \$30 million injection.

I strongly question the process that has taken place in relation to the upgrading of the soccer stadium. I stand corrected, and I hope I am proven incorrect, when I question the calibre and quality of the matches that are programmed at Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. I suspect that, at the end of the day, we will get Olympic soccer matches that will not draw significant crowds, and I will be surprised if we draw to South Australia some of the high quality international teams which draw large crowds. I will be surprised if our soccer stadium is filled to capacity, because I do not think that during the Olympics we will get a program of quality international matches for which one would hope. However, I will be pleased if I am proven incorrect.

But, most of all, I strongly reject the criticisms and unprofessional comments made by various Government members that Opposition members are against soccer. I totally reject that, and I totally support the probity of the members for Reynell and Elizabeth and the way in which they have gone about their business in ensuring that some process and some accountability has occurred through the Public Works Committee. That is certainly in question and it is something that should be considered.

I conclude by saying that, after the performance of the former Deputy Premier in this House today, there is nothing like listening to a former Deputy Premier, nothing like listening to a sacked Minister, trying to justify a position and backtrack on how this messy situation has unfolded as a result of no correct process and no correct accountability of Government money.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for MacKillop and remind him that he has approximately three minutes.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Thank you, Sir; I was aware of that, although I am a little disappointed. I do not want to take too much of the House's time but I thought I might run slightly over three minutes. Quite a few issues came out of the committee's deliberations on the Hindmarsh Stadium—it is almost worth calling it the Hindmarsh Stadium Affair.

This project has been overtaken by politics. When I first went onto the Public Works Committee, I thought that the committee, as indeed with all committees of this House, would be beyond the theatrics that are evident in this Chamber and that we could get on with examining some serious matters of concern to the taxpaying public of South Australia.

Even though the committee did a reasonable job in that field, its deliberations were hampered by politics. In my opinion, we delved into a lot of areas beyond the scope of the sort of consideration involved in normal committee hearings. For example, we spent an inordinate amount of time questioning witnesses—at considerable cost to the witnesses and to the taxpaying public of South Australia, because these witnesses were by and large paid from the public purse—about such items as ongoing maintenance at that stadium. Certainly, it was within our reference to query ongoing maintenance, but this was blown out of all proportion and in fact extended the deliberations of the committee for some weeks on minor matters such as that, for purely political purposes. The member for Bragg and the member for Mawson alluded to that, and I agree with their comments.

It has been mentioned—and also by way of interjection during this debate today—that the final report was adopted by a majority of four to one. At the time of voting for the adoption of this report I did tell the committee that I had compromised my position somewhat to try to make sure that there was a majority report in order to salvage the good things and the good work of the committee. One of the most important issues before the committee involved car parking. It has been stated that there were only 85 car spaces for this development. That is correct—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The time for consideration of standing committee reports has expired.

PRIMARY INDUSTRY FUNDING SCHEMES BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT REPEAL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FINE ENFORCEMENT) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CITY OF ADELAIDE BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendments Nos 12 to 15, 17 and 18 and 22 to 31 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed, and that it did not insist on its amendments Nos 16 and 19 to 21 but had agreed to the alternative amendments made by the House of Assembly.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION (DISSOLUTION OF SPORTS, PROMOTION, CULTURAL AND HEALTH ADVANCEMENT TRUST) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 August. Page 1879.)

Mr FOLEY (Hart): After much consideration and debate, the Opposition supports this legislation. I was on the Economic and Finance Committee when it inquired at length into Living Health (formerly Foundation SA). It was a former Labor Government initiative, and I am pleased to say that it was a very appropriate reform at the time. Like all regulations, it was open for scrutiny at varying times to assess whether or not it had achieved its objectives. I served on that committee with my colleagues Mr John Quirke (now Senator Quirke), a former Treasurer of this State, the Hon. Frank Blevins, Mr Brindal, Heini Becker (Presiding Member), the current member for Light and, indeed, the member for Florey at the time, Mr Bass. It was a fair collection of objective minds that scrutinised the—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Mr Blevins had a long held view, as he would often tell us and as the Minister would know: he was the only Minister in Cabinet to oppose the establishment of Foundation SA and was quite chuffed when former Health Minister Cornwall mentioned that fact in his memoirs. Frank held the line that he did not believe Governments, even his own Government, should hypothecate taxes in such a fashion. Everyone had their different views. Senator Quirke had his views about what he considered to be inappropriate use from time to time of free tickets and other things that went along with that. The former Presiding Member had some views about the allocation of grants. Everyone had different views, but it boiled down to whether Living Health or Foundation SA had achieved its objectives. On any analysis of smoking trends in this State, on evidence provided to us, it had not been successful. In particular, it had not been successful in significantly reducing the incidence of smoking among young women. We noticed that there had been continual rises in those terms.

It may well be that the Government of the day chartered Living Health with too hard a task. Perhaps we did have high expectations and hopes for Living Health that it would always find very difficult to achieve. We on that committee felt that its charter had become too broad. Again, in fairness to the organisation, that was not necessarily its fault: perhaps it was a fault with the drafting of the legislation. We found that it had broad roles in terms of having to achieve a reduction in smoking, to achieve good healthy living and other various lifestyle issues—the Sun Smart campaign, for example—and that these were all very appropriate programs for Government.

The committee felt that, having it locked into Living Health and diluting the moneys available, was not the role that Living Health should be fulfilling. I am always ready to say that that does not necessarily mean that we were right: it was just the view of the committee and, as we have seen subsequently, the Government has shared that view. We felt that Sunsmart, some of the Healthy Choice programs and some of the lifestyle issues that Living Health were addressing were more appropriately placed within the Government proper. They are programs that are more the function of the Health Commission, the Education Department, the sports agency and other Government areas rather than being undertaken by a statutory authority.

There were a couple of reasons for that view: first, it was a hypothecated tax and, secondly, it was a duplication of effort and administration and was very much at arm's length from the Government. While it is important to have some things at arm's length, the committee of the day felt that there are some things that should not be at arm's length. There was a mix of views and, as my then colleague Frank Blevins so eloquently put it, Governments are elected to spend money, to make decisions and to do things.

Mr Clarke: You'd always spend it.

Mr FOLEY: I said 'Governments'—I did not say me. Governments are elected to spend, allocate resources and raise taxes and, at the end of the day, if the community does not believe the Government has spent money wisely, they vote it out or, as was the case with this Government, they return it with a very reduced majority. My then colleague Frank Blevins would always say that one should limit the amount of discretionary money unelected people are given to disburse. There is a reasonable argument for that, which is why we have Governments and why we are elected to this place. That is why we form Executive Cabinet and we live

and die or fail and succeed on the community's perceptions and beliefs in how well we have appropriated that money. So, it was a good philosophical debate but also a real debate. In all of this I am not wanting to be critical of Living Health. There were functions of Living Health about which I was critical, but that debate has moved on.

This was a debate of some 18 months or two years ago and we do not need to revisit many of those issues but, in fairness to the officers involved, the Chief Executive Officer Barrie Robran and others, they did a fine job, given their charter, the legislation and their responsibility. At the end of the day the committee felt that the same moneys could be allocated under Government departments and we did not need to have a separate statutory authority. Given that this body has been in existence for over 10 years, in our view it was not inappropriate to have a sunset clause and to make some changes.

I must admit I was a little surprised when the Government picked up on the Economic and Finance Committee's report. I am probably talking a little out of turn but, if we looked at the archives and all the reports of the Economic and Finance Committee and the former Public Accounts Committee, I doubt whether any of them have ever been adopted. This is probably the first or certainly one of very few that any Government—Labor or Liberal—has adopted. I suspect it is the first time such a report has been adopted in total.

We then turn to not just the simple issue of repealing the Act but what we do once the Act has been repealed. I notice the Government has given a commitment that this Government will continue to allocate about \$13.4 million for the life of this Government. We welcome that so far as this Government is concerned. It will be a decision for future Governments as to how much they allocate. All this Government can do, obviously, is make a commitment about what it will do over the next three budgets. The money will still be available for distribution. I know my colleagues in the Opposition share my view that we will be very mindful about how the money is allocated. The Government has Labor Party support on good faith as well as good policy, that is, we expect the Government to administer these moneys appropriately to ensure fairness and equity and to ensure that there is little or no pork barrelling of favoured constituencies.

This money must definitely be handled in a way that can give rise to no complaints, criticisms or judgments that money has been politically dished out. I put the Government on notice that we will closely monitor that, as I am sure the Government would expect us to do. I would be interested to know from the Government how some of the other functions are being bedded down in other Government departments. It may be that this Minister is not able to answer that and it may be that those questions will be put to the Treasurer in another place, but it is important that we do have a better feel as to just how the money will be distributed and handled in the Sports, Health and Arts and Cultural Heritage Departments. The Opposition was obviously lobbied by many sporting bodies large and small—

Ms Stevens: And the arts.

Mr FOLEY: Forgive me; let me not forget the arts community. I would never hear the end of it if I did not appropriately mention the arts industry as well, which was and still is the recipient of Government moneys. The large sports and arts organisations that approached the Opposition and no doubt the Government and other members were, first, mindful that they could lose their share and, secondly, were lobbying for their particular agency. I do not have a problem with that, because that is what healthy democracy is all about.

At the end of the day I have certainly firmed up with the view, even since the time of the Economic and Finance Committee, that they need to be decisions of Government, provided the Government has the appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure that there is no cronyism, corruption, pork barrelling or any other inappropriate allocation of moneys. I think it can be handled eminently within Government.

That was not necessarily the entire view of my side of politics, as no doubt it was not the entire view of members opposite in total either. It was a debate that did cause some emotions within the respective Parties, with some very strong feelings about whether we should or should not sustain Living Health. The reality is that, now that we have reached this point, those debates are well and truly over. The organisation has been wound down as I understand it and Government agencies are now picking up the functions, and we are left with no choice but to dissolve the organisation formerly known as Foundation SA and Living Health. With those few words I think I have more than adequately covered the views of the Opposition. No doubt some of my other colleagues will want to make a contribution, and I look forward to the debate as it continues this afternoon.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I would like to make a contribution about Living Health. Things have really moved on as a result of the High Court challenge to the States' collection of revenue from tobacco, alcohol and petrol. The States have no power to do this and so the whole Act in relation to hypothecating a percentage—I think it was a maximum of 5.5 per cent—of tobacco revenue into this fund no longer exists because the State is no longer collecting this revenue. Essentially, time has moved on, and the Act needed to be amended to reflect the new situation.

I have made comments in the House before about my position on Living Health. Initially, when the Economic and Finance Committee brought down its report, I supported that report. I had been critical of the level of smoking still existing in our community. Although some positive steps were taken towards reducing the incidence of people taking up smoking in earlier times, it had plateaued out in recent years, and it certainly needed an extra effort. I made those comments earlier in the year when we debated the Tobacco Products Regulation (Licence Fees) Bill.

At that time, I became aware that the amount of money being allocated directly to anti-smoking initiatives by Living Health simply did not stand up to the amounts of money that were making a difference in other parts of the world, for instance, in California, where a much greater amount of money allocated directly to anti-tobacco strategies has made a significant difference to the level of smoking in that community. I remember making those points earlier in the year.

However, since then—and I have said this in the House, too—I noted that Living Health did respond to those criticisms. I noted that, in its most recent allocations, it had significantly increased the amount of money that was to be directly put into tobacco control strategies. It went up from about \$500 000 a year, which is what it had been for some time, to about \$1.4 million. If we put that with the \$2.5 million the Government agreed last year to put in each year, specifically in relation to tobacco control, we in this State had an opportunity to hit tobacco smoking. I know that the Minister for Human Services has announced that he will implement a tobacco control strategy and has carried that \$1.4 million with the \$2.5 million. I am glad that that has

occurred and the Government has not reneged on the undertaking it gave the House last year in that regard.

I certainly agree that there were some problems with Living Health. The criticisms that were levelled at the amount of money that went to the administration costs of Living Health were justified to some degree. I was concerned—and concerns have been raised with me—about groups in my own area that seemed to miss out. It seemed that there were some problems with the way they allocated money through peak bodies. If the peak bodies did a good job at reaching out to their grassroots, that is one thing. However, if they did not, a lot of groups missed out. I certainly had that said to me. I am not saying that there were not problems with Living Health. However, we should not forget that Living Health made some remarkable achievements. If we walk into Football Park, we find it is smoke free. If we walk into other major sporting and arts venues, we see the evidence of the work that Living Health has done. We probably have all noted the children wearing hats in primary schools in our electorates. There is almost 100 per cent coverage in primary schools, with most of the little children wearing hats. This has had a lot to do with the campaigns that Living Health—

An honourable member: 'Slip, slop, slap.'

Ms STEVENS: Yes, and Living Health did a lot in relation to those sorts of activities. It was not all bad. There were some problems, but it has done many good things as well. I do not disagree entirely with hypothecation. Strategically, a small amount of hypothecation can be useful. It enables a government to target money towards a specific outcome. It is something that a community responds to and likes. I note that tomorrow the Federal Opposition is likely to announce a quite substantial hypothecation of tobacco taxes into a health fund that will go towards public hospitals. In this day and age, when the community very much distrusts politicians, strategically placed hypothecation enables communities to see where their dollars go. I know the purists, such as treasurers, do not like it, because they give the argument—and I know my ex-colleague, Frank Blevins, the former member for Giles said this many times—that it is up to the Government and the Treasurer to allocate the funds and make the decisions. A little hypothecation used strategically can be good and beneficial. I am not necessarily against that.

In some ways, I am sad to see that this fund is now going, because it was established in law and therefore, to that extent, we established in law that tobacco advertising was harmful. It was an acknowledgment of the harmful effects of tobacco smoking, which are undeniable, and it forced the Government to use money in this way, and it was established in law. It was a stronger commitment. All of us will have to fight to ensure that this continues in the future. I certainly will.

I have some questions on this matter, and I hope that the Minister can answer them. I note that the commitment from the Government has been to provide \$13.4 million each year, but it is only for the term of this Government. If that is so, will the Minister clarify that and say whether the whole thing will be looked at again afterwards or will it be ongoing? My concern is that it is not indexed. As I said, under the Act, a maximum of 5.5 per cent of tobacco excise could be collected by the State and, of course, that could change each year. This is a flat amount. I note that it is not indexed, and that could mean that we come off with less than we would have had if the Act continued.

The major reason for the demise of Living Health is that it was taking up too much in administration costs. What were those costs? Will the Minister give us a breakdown of Living

Health's administration costs in recent years? What reasonable percentage of total revenue should be spent on administrative costs? In other words, what was the basis on which the judgment was made that Living Health's administration costs were too high? My concern is that we now have three agencies distributing the funds instead of one.

I would like a guarantee that the administration costs of the three bodies will be less than the cost of this one body, Living Health. How can we be sure that that is the case? My final concern is that, with the three different agencies of sport and recreation, arts and health, how do we ensure that, in respect of anti-smoking campaigns, we have a cohesiveness in the health menage? What structures or mechanisms will be in place to ensure that we get a consistent message from the three departments? My solution for Living Health was to fix the problems that were there rather than dispense with the whole body. However, the Government, as is its right, has chosen to do otherwise. We have to wait and see now, and watch and hope that we will achieve better outcomes from this new way of doing things.

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): I will not say that I will try to be brief: no-one ever seems to believe me.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: There is a time limit when you are not the lead speaker. I rise somewhat reluctantly in support of this Bill and somewhat in sadness. I declare a personal interest in so far as my sister works for the organisation and will be ceasing employment with Living Health at the end of December: because she is not a public servant, she does not have an automatic right to go back into the Public Service. Be that as it may, I nonetheless recognise that there were a number of shortcomings in the Living Health organisation, for a number of reasons which have already been pointed out by the member for Elizabeth and also by our lead speaker, the member for Hart.

However, when Living Health representatives were examined by the Economic and Finance Committee, it was a bit like a heretic appearing before the Grand Inquisitor in the Spanish Inquisition. I do not think they had a chance in hell, given the membership of that body. The member for Playford as he then was, now a Senator, had a particular view about Living Health that would have made the Grand Inquisitor look like an absolute paragon of virtue, in terms of approaching the issue with an open mind. It is also true that the then member for Giles had a very firm view about hypothecation of Government revenue to particular causes instead of its going into general Treasury, with the Government of the day being allowed to spend whatever sums of money on programs that it deemed appropriate.

I think the Living Health body made a number of mistakes. First and foremost, over a number of years its public relations were very poor with members of this Parliament and also with local sporting and arts groups. It tended to provide money to the peak bodies; I am more familiar with sporting bodies than with the arts community, although I am a great friend of the arts, as is well known.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: Yes, they certainly do, but I am more familiar with the sporting organisations. I know that a number of local sporting clubs in my electorate would often complain about Living Health because they saw the funding go directly to their peak bodies and the money that those peak bodies were in turn to re-route to local sporting groups was not forthcoming or, if it was, it was infinitesimal. I know that the

peak sporting bodies would say that they spent the money on junior development and various things of that nature which indirectly assisted local clubs but, when you go down to the local clubs, you see the enormous amount of work put in by the mums and dads—particularly by the mothers in washing the socks and guernseys and so on—who are out there helping to put junior football, soccer or netball onto the courts or fields each week. If you wanted to get a few extra thousand dollars to assist those clubs in meeting certain objectives to improve their canteen facilities so they themselves could earn more money to keep the club going but were knocked back by Living Health because the money had gone into the peak sporting bodies, it was hard for the local clubs to have an affinity with Living Health—or Foundation SA, as it then was.

That is where Living Health made its mistake. It effectively signed its own death warrant when it put its trust in peak bodies, believing that those peak bodies would be able to communicate effectively with the affiliated individual clubs by saying, 'We are able to do these things for you directly so that you see the benefit of the Living Health money.' Indeed, during the campaign when there was speculation about Living Health being wound up, all of us received letters from various sporting bodies protesting against Living Health potentially being closed down. But I did not get one letter from any of the individual sporting clubs in my electorate protesting about Living Health being closed. I did get them from the peak sporting bodies, as we all did, but not from the Kilburn footy club or other clubs in my local electorate, because they did not see the connection between their well-being and Living Health. That is sad, because they did get a benefit, indirect as it was.

I hate cigarette smoking. I am an asthmatic and it drives me to distraction and significant ill health when cigarette smoking is engaged in to a significant degree in a confined space. As new clubrooms were built at the Kilburn Football Club, I wanted us to ban cigarette smoking. It is a club that unfortunately has a number of smokers in it, but it is also a great community club and a lot of children come into those clubrooms and I wanted cigarette smoking banned completely on the premises. But the club management would not do it, because its members feared the loss in bar trade. I said, 'They will come back.' They said, 'That's all very well, but we have these new clubrooms and we have this debt to meet; we can't take that risk.'

So, I approached Living Health about a subsidy on the bar revenue that would taper out over, say, three years. This is in an electorate which has significant asthma and smoking problems, and I have no doubt at all that, although this is partly because of the heavy industry build-up in the area and all the rest, it is also due to heavy smoking at home and in other environments where children are present. I wanted us to make an example of an entirely smoke free environment. But Living Health could not come up with one fundraising idea so that I could go to the club and say, 'Let's ban cigarette smoking and see how it goes over the next two to three years. Your bar revenue will be protected to this extent; it will taper out over time.' Had we been able to achieve that, it would have been to the benefit of the long-term health of every young person who went along to those clubrooms, it would have been a much healthier environment and it would have brought a smoke free environment more to the attention of parents and others who use those clubrooms. But it did not happen. That is sad.

Living Health could have played a much stronger role in providing that sort of assistance to help provide smoke-free environments in significant sporting bodies. Unfortunately, it did not do it and in the end no-one loved it sufficiently to want to save it. I think the former Minister for Health, the member for Adelaide, did try to do that, but his own relations with members on his and our side of the House in the health area—he was so arrogant—were such that he was not the person to be its champion. So, Living Health had no effective champions in this Parliament. It had plenty of knockers and people like me who could point to complaints about the way it was handling the matter, but it had no champions.

Now we will see this money put back into consolidated revenue and then reallocated—theoretically, at least—to the same amount back through mainstream Government departments. Heaven help us if we rely on Treasury to do that. Treasury is composed largely of grey suited men of limited vision. They are there to collect money and they detest spending it. Never put in the charge of Government the task of coming up with creative ideas and the creation of visions in this State and think Treasury will do it. It is incapable of doing it, because simply its task is to collect money and by their very nature its members hate spending any money. As I have often said to the member for Hart as the shadow Treasurer, his is the easiest job of all the shadow Ministers. He has only to think up ways of collecting the money, whereas other shadow Ministers have the difficult task of thinking of creative ways of spending it. That is a debate for another day.

We are also putting into question the continued support of sporting bodies, be it through the peak sporting bodies or through local clubs. I would hope it would be more through local clubs than peak sporting bodies, because I tend to think they have used that money for themselves and have built up their own sense of grandeur and aggrandisement at the expense of real resources that could be used at the local level. But we have also put into the hands of Government Ministers a useful ploy for patronage either at a local level or at a State level, whether it be in the arts or in sporting arrangements. It must be tempting for any Government, particularly one such as this which is hugely unpopular in the electorate, to try to curry favour in marginal seats by dispensing moneys to favourite clubs and the like and for Ministers and unelected bureaucrats, without transparency or true accountability, to put their own value judgment on what should or should not be supported and by how much. Those are the sorts of fears that I have.

As the member for Elizabeth pointed out, it was interesting to see today's announcement by the Federal Labor Party hypothecating an additional tax on cigarettes to be put directly into a public hospital trust account for the rebuilding of our great public hospitals. I think that is laudable. Even though smokers will not like having to pay more for cigarettes, at least they will know that, if the money goes into a dedicated trust account, it will be used to rebuild our public hospitals. They will get some satisfaction, even if it is small, from knowing that this money will go towards building up our public hospitals rather than into a big open pit of consolidated revenue where that money may be spent for any reason other than health.

In conclusion, I lament the fact that we have reached the point of closing Living Health. I think that its change of name from Foundation SA to Living Health was a mistake, because the general public did not understand what Living Health actually meant or did. I think it was a disgrace that Living

Health was leant on by the State Government to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on Sky Show, which promoted only one commercial radio station simply because the Premier of the day did not want to lose that event. I enjoy Sky Show as much as anyone else, but it advertises a commercial radio station. If they cannot fund it, so be it.

I did not see it as part of the charter of Living Health to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on a Guy Fawkes celebration when that money could have been far better used by such clubs as the Kilburn Football Club, encouraging that club to have a smoke free environment in its clubrooms. That money could have helped to protect that club's revenue for a couple of years until patrons got used to the idea and continued to use the facilities of the club. That is what that money should have been used for, not for a giant fireworks display, which is more properly the province of commercial interests that want to promote their own products or services.

Many of the officers of Living Health and its predecessor Foundation SA did an excellent job. I refer to such people as Barrie Robran and others who performed their duties with the utmost sincerity and dignity. Those who served on the committees, including a former Chairman Mr David David of well-known fame in this State—and deservedly so—performed their tasks admirably. I am sorry that, in a sense, they lost their way and, in particular, their PR with local members of this Parliament and, more importantly, with individual constituents, sporting clubs and art groups. Those persons saw a real stake in maintaining Living Health and keeping it going rather than just at the peak body level. With those few words, I sadly support the passage of this legislation.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I, too, support the proposition for much the same reasons as have been given by other speakers before me. It is with regret that I see the demise of the means by which not just with bipartisan support but with the support of the whole community of South Australia a group of problems could be addressed which otherwise would not have been taken up. We have heard how through the Living Health program the number of people dependent upon tobacco and the level of tobacco consumption have been substantially reduced. That can only be good.

I do not have any sympathy for the shareholders of any tobacco companies. They know, as well as you and I, Mr Deputy Speaker, that smoking tobacco or using tobacco of any kind is bad for your health. It is bad for your heart and blood circulation system, it is bad for your lungs—it gives you cancer—and it is bad for your brain. Indeed, there is nothing about it that is good except that the people who grow it make a profit if they sell it for processing and further value adding down the line to the point where the consumer purchases it. It has been part of the economy, but it is totally unnecessary.

Living Health is a part of our history. It will no longer continue. The explanation given by the member for Ross Smith of how it met its demise is pretty accurate. Other members have made the same observations about how the organisation was left almost rudderless because it was not adequately accountable for the way in which it spent its money. I do not think that was a fault of its leadership, nor do I think that the fault lay within the domain of any of the people employed by Living Health.

I want to pay my respects to David David for the work that he did and to people such as Graham Cornes and Rachael Sporn, who have supported the organisation from time to time

over the years and given it a public face with which I think the vast majority of people would readily identify because these people are healthy, not only physically but mentally, and they adopt healthy habits as well. I further commend them for the way in which they did their job. We would not have had the level of awareness that we now have in these days of dangerous solar radiation that is likely to cause skin cancers and similar programs were it not for Living Health. The Slip, Slop, Slap program was outstanding for the way in which it drew attention early in life to the need to cover up and protect ourselves from detrimental ultraviolet radiation. So, I thank very much Karin Puels, the General Manager, and Julia Angove, the Public Relations Manager, for what they and other members of the organisation have done during its existence. This Bill simply formalises what will now happen to the remnants of Living Health.

I did not rise to put those comments on the record just for hearsay. I participated in this debate to place on the record my strong belief that more funds than have been expended through Living Health and similar programs should be provided for educational purposes to ensure that the public are in no doubt whatsoever about the dangers of certain habits which they might otherwise adopt. I am referring not only to smoking cigarettes but to smoking other substances and to the excessive consumption of alcohol. Indeed, without Living Health I worry about the future of the independent program that is run in schools. Whilst it does not rely on Government legislation to raise revenue for this purpose but rather on the efforts of committed members of the general public and others such as even me, I am concerned that it may disappear if we are not careful and if we do not value it. I am talking about Life Education.

If we do not have those programs, what we are really saying is that parents have that responsibility. Clearly, parents do not have the knowledge: so how can they exercise the responsibility to teach their children why it is not good science to adopt personal habits that are destructive of their own lives? There may not be much difference between the life they have today and the life they expect they will have tomorrow but, over time, the scientific evidence clearly shows that there will be very detrimental consequences for their lives. That is where compassion comes into it. As members of Parliament, we have an obligation to compel Governments formed in this institution to address those problems. Governments must exercise that responsibility and show that they too are compassionate in the process of providing the information, ensuring that it is understood and getting compliance with desirable behaviour patterns.

But it goes even further than that. It is not just that lives suffer because of people's stupidity, based in ignorance. It goes much further: it goes to the point where those who love them suffer. I am sure that there are many members in this place who have had one or more members of their family suffer a stroke in consequence of substance abuse, and I am equally sure that there are members in this place who have suffered other coronary disease or respiratory tract disorders or cancers on their skin. I am equally sure that, like me, they have found themselves distressed when they have had to face the reality that, instead of what could otherwise have been a healthy, happy, productive life with a more normal approach to and experience of death, they will suffer long, uncomfortable—indeed, extremely painful—deaths. And it is equally painful for those of their family who love them when they are confronted with the need to give them support during those final months—even years—right up to the end.

Living Health achieved so much by going down this path, using the concept and the goals that it was given originally in its object. We now find that that entity no longer is there and that its function may become a simple part of several different Government departments that pick up the responsibility to engage in these programs. I worry that, because it is not the core business of any one of those departments to do that work, it now will not be done. It will be done next year, because of the remarks that we make today in this Chamber in debating this legislation, and there will be a carry over to the year after. But I will bet that, unless we do something as a Parliament to make sure that the funding is continued and that the program becomes core business of some part of Government somewhere, it will take only four or five years for lip service alone to be paid to it. We will reach the position where Ministers are given speeches by Sir Humphrey to read about what they are doing, and the amount of money involved and the beneficial consequences that arise from its expenditure will fall to the point where the program is insignificant and will just vanish in less than a decade.

I cannot bear the thought of that happening without saying something about it, because we in South Australia will be the poorer for it. We have set an example through Living Health that has been followed in other places, and we have shown that it is possible to get people to understand. It is for that reason that I do not want those other places and other societies that look at us now to come to the conclusion that it is undesirable to have such programs. All of us know that it is not only desirable but vital.

My plea to the Government is that, in spite of the fact that we are repealing the Tobacco Products Regulation Act—or amending it to the point where these kinds of funds go into different departments—we nonetheless use our wits in the months ahead of us, before the end of the year, to find the means by which we can bed down in Government administration a small cell of experts who have a responsibility to keep producing awareness of the problems and informing the public accordingly, to keep producing programs that address those problems and correct the underlying behaviour that causes the undesirable consequences for us all. We should make it possible, therefore, to still achieve the desirable outcomes that we have been able to achieve over the years that Living Health has existed. That is my plea.

I support the legislation, and I trust that the Government will take my remarks on board and do what I know every other member who has spoken on this measure seeks—something with which I am sure those who have not spoken on the measure would also agree we ought to be doing.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): I thank all members for their contribution this afternoon.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I think I am wearing a grey suit today. I do not believe that you will ever be Treasurer, either, following that. The reason for this Bill, as the member for Hart correctly indicated, arose from a report from the Economic and Finance Committee regarding the operations of Living Health. The committee particularly felt that not enough of Living Health's allocated money was being spent on conveying an anti-tobacco message to the community—and that, after all, was the prime purpose of Foundation SA (as it was originally). To that end, one of the things that we found was that, in relation to the target audience (which we considered to be the 12-19 year old age group), when we

looked at the amount of money being spent in schools, we found that in the past financial year only \$7 000 had been spent on anti-smoking programs. The Hon. Frank Blevins and I were both particularly concerned about that because, after all, that is the age at which young people start to encounter and be tempted by smoking.

To answer the member for Elizabeth's questions, to the best of my knowledge, this Government has committed \$13.4 million over the next three years. I do not believe that it is indexed but I am having that checked at the moment, and I will inform her of that when I receive the answer. I believe she is right in saying that 5.5 per cent of that additional tobacco tax was to go to Living Health, and I believe it is correct that that is not indexed either. In terms of the administration of the funds between the three Ministers, to the best of my knowledge, a committee is to be formed between the three Ministers and, with their departmental people, allocation will be made according to a specific percentage already determined by Living Health: for instance, if arts has been getting 40 per cent, sport 40 per cent and health 20 per cent, it will continue along those set percentages that have previously operated.

I agree with members who have spoken about the problem with the allocation of money to peak bodies. Like the member for Ross Smith, I heard from none of the individual clubs within my electorate about the folding up of Living Health: I heard only from those peak body organisations, and I believe that that was one of the faults of Living Health. As the member for Elizabeth also indicated, the money just did not flow down to the club level: many clubs would have been quite prepared to take up an anti-smoking campaign had they been offered money from those peak body organisations.

I believe that this measure will result in better administration of these funds. From memory, I believe that about \$587 000 was spent on administration from the fund—and it may have been more than that: that is just a figure that comes into my mind. After discussion with Ministers, the belief was held that the administration within the departments would be able to handle much of that work and that the services of no Government officers from Living Health would be terminated: the officers concerned would be relocated within those three departments to continue with the administration of those funds.

As the member for Hart indicated, some duplication was occurring because, for instance, health was already running a health promotion which in many areas was being duplicated by Living Health. I will restrict my remarks to those comments. I believe it is a good decision by the Government and certainly one in respect of which the expertise of the Economic and Finance Committee and the work it undertook in researching and questioning the spending by various Government bodies has been justified.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): Yesterday, in answer to a question from the member for Schubert, the Minister for Environment and Heritage made her third attempt to address the outrage and anger generated by the decision of one of her officers to

shoot two pelicans at Renmark—or as the Minister said in her first response to my question on the issue, 'The birds were euthanised because of their behavioural problems.' In reply to my second question on the issue, the Minister spent most of her reply attacking me for my throw-away line on ABC radio that, if she euthanised birds with behavioural problems, then we ought to be thankful that she is not the Minister for Education.

In her third attempt at answering a question on the issue, the Minister attacked me again, claiming that I had misled the House. Well, this is a very serious charge, and yesterday I sought leave to explain to the House that I had not misled it, and I called on her to withdraw her remark. She chose not to do so. So, I now feel obliged for the sake of the record and my credibility to address her charges in greater detail—and I apologise for making something of a Stormboy in a teacup on this issue.

The first point I make is that I wonder how a question in this place, based on information provided by the public, can possibly be construed to be misleading. In relation to the question I asked on 20 August, I put a set of allegations to the Minister and invited her to address them. That she was inadequately briefed last Thursday was obvious, but that hardly means that I misled the House. As I stated yesterday, the information was provided to me by a senior member of the Renmark Paringa District Council in good faith.

Each of the statements made by me by way of explanation in my question were adequately qualified to make clear that the statements were allegations, not statements of fact. There were three particular allegations put by me to the Minister to which the Minister wrongly and misleadingly refers as 'claims by the member for Kaurna'. The first was the allegation that two pelican bodies were found in a Department of Environment dumpster bin at the Renmark caravan park. This allegation was qualified with the phrase, 'The Opposition has been informed by the district council', making clear to the House the source of the allegation.

Yesterday, the Minister told the House that there is no department dumpster next to the caravan park. I accept the Minister's word on that, but it is not the central issue. The central issue which the Minister has still to address is: were there or were there not two dead pelicans in a bin near or in the caravan park? If there were, were they the same pelicans shot by the departmental ranger? It is interesting that the Minister does not answer and has not answered this question. The Minister said:

When the media pursued Mr Hill's claims it seems that no-one was able to clarify that pelicans had been dumped in a dumpster, or any bin for that matter, because no pelicans were to be found.

I point out that the phrase is not 'when my department' or 'when my office', but 'when the media pursued' the claims. There are two points to make about this. One journalist pursued this issue with me and I gave her the name and contact number for my source of information: a senior person in the district council. Unfortunately, the journalist sought the informant after 6 o'clock and I am not surprised that she was unable to confirm the allegation—but that is hardly my fault.

The second point to make is this: why has not the Minister herself verified the truth of the allegations by contacting the council? The second allegation put by me on Thursday last, and also qualified, was:

I have also been informed that the two bodies had earlier been found floating in the river.

Interestingly, the Minister made no reference to this yesterday, so I can only assume that the truth of this issue has been established. The third allegation put by me to the Minister, also qualified, was:

We have been told that the ranger involved in this incident sought approval to make a public statement after the incident, but was warned by the Minister's office to remain silent.

The Minister claims that, rather than being silenced, the ranger was encouraged by her to speak out. If the Minister tells the House that this is what happened, then I accept that, but I do not see how asking the question misleads the House. I also find it curious that the Minister was not able to answer this question last Thursday when I asked it; if she had encouraged the officer to talk to the media, surely she should have known then. Why did she not tell the House that last Thursday? Why did she wait until yesterday before answering that question in the way that she did? Perhaps the Minister suffered from a memory lapse. I will let the House make up its own mind on that point. These were the issues raised by me in Parliament. The Minister then proceeded in her answer yesterday to raise other issues where she claims that I misled the House. She said:

The member for Kaurua falsely asserted that a single child was hurt by the pelicans and that the action of the wildlife officers was as a result of a single complaint by a tourist.

The Minister is referring to statements made by me on radio, statements based on a report in the *Advertiser* of 13 August. On 13 August the *Advertiser* carried a report written by Anna Cock which states:

The officer shot the birds after the parents of a small boy complained one of them bit him on an arm. . . The parents, understood to be from New South Wales, said a pelican approached the boy from behind, grabbing a sandwich from his hands and cutting his arm.

The basis of my statement that it was done as a result of one child being interfered with was a report in the *Advertiser* some two weeks ago. At no stage has the Minister corrected that, so there is no reason why anyone would believe anything other than what was in the *Advertiser*. The Minister then goes on to claim that the council is divided on the issue and that the council has approached the department to do something about the problem. It is true that the council referred the complaint to the department, and the *Advertiser* of 13 August states:

The council referred the complaints to the local Parks and Wildlife office but says it did not expect any executions. 'We see this as an absolute last resort,' Mr Burfitt [District Council Manager] said. 'My understanding was that they were going to be relocated.'

Local residents are horrified by the shootings, while the Deputy Mayor of Renmark and Paringa, Mrs Trish McAuliffe, said the action had tainted 'a great tourist attraction'. 'We're all incensed about it,' she said. The Mayor, Mr Rod Thomas, said he was 'astounded' the wildlife officer had killed the birds. 'They're lovely old things—they strut and waddle about,' he said.

If the council is divided on the issue, there is certainly no evidence in this report, and certainly no evidence has been brought to my attention, about division in the council. To make very plain what the council's position is, I will read into *Hansard* from a letter, a copy of which has been provided to me, written to the Minister by Rod Thomas, the Mayor of the District Council of Renmark Paringa. The letter states:

Dear Minister, Re: Renmark's Pelicans. You are no doubt aware of the considerable public outcry over the destruction of two pelicans at Renmark by a departmental wildlife officer recently. Council and the general community are particularly concerned that this action was taken when relocation could seem the most fitting action, at least as an initial response. I submit that pelicans and the Renmark riverfront

have been integrated for decades and council is determined that the remaining pelicans are protected from this action unless as an absolute last resort, following full consultation with all local stakeholders. Despite questioning the legal ability of a warden to destroy such birds other than in a dedicated reserve, council would also seek copies of written requests to have the birds destroyed.

I would like to see those requests as well. It continues:

Council has received only two verbal reports of feeding behaviour; however, no-one has requested that they be destroyed. Also, I make the point that the departmental officer did not advise any council staff of the proposed destruction of the birds. Council therefore seeks your assurances as follows. . .

This clearly demonstrates that the council is not divided on the issue: the council is horrified by what the Government has done in relation to this issue. After hearing this letter I invite members to make up their own mind as to who has been misleading the House and the public on this issue. The Minister got it wrong and her department got it wrong. Rather than address the issue, the Minister has decided to attack me in this House. Sadly, there are three things that can be said about the Minister: first, she cannot take a joke; secondly, she is a joke within her own department; and, thirdly, she is a joke within the community.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage): Obviously, when the honourable member says that the Minister cannot take a joke it exactly ratifies and confirms the very attitude with which he has chosen to deal with a very serious issue that relates to wildlife. Thank goodness this Party and, in particular, those who look to protect the wildlife of this State are on this side of the House rather than the shadow spokesperson for the Department of Environment and Heritage. My previous statement in the House, when I took to pieces the honourable member's very impertinent question that related to the wanton destruction of wildlife, was a very definite means of identifying to the House that this honourable member chose to come into this House and through fabrication and falsehoods place a question to the Minister, a Minister of the Crown, that should be of an imperative nature—

Mr HILL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Minister has just accused me of making falsehoods in the Parliament. I ask her to withdraw that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is improper for the Minister to suggest that the honourable member is making falsehoods. I ask the Minister to take that into account and to proceed.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I point out to the House that, even though these are exactly the same words that I used in a statement yesterday, the honourable member did not choose to take a point of order, because he knew that what I was saying was the truth. If there is a defence to anything in this House in regard to talking about fabrications and falsehoods, it is the defence of truth. The truth in this matter comes from this side of the House. The one thing which is very serious in terms of the honourable member's accusations and which he obviously seems to have forgotten is that by asking the question and continuing in this ridiculous manner today he has questioned the integrity and character of officers of the department—rangers of National Parks and Wildlife—who in an operational manner have to deal with many such instances in the field.

The honourable member is also talking about senior inspectors and rangers of National Parks and Wildlife who have many years of experience. The officer in charge of this issue is a gentleman who has 25 years experience in this field

and who is a senior specialist ornithologist. So, when the honourable member stands in this place and makes accusations which I proved yesterday to be totally untrue, in effect he is challenging the integrity and character of rangers of National Parks and Wildlife. I can take the criticisms of the honourable member if they are just and reasonable, but in this instance I will not stand here and allow the honourable member to impugn the reputations of rangers of National Parks and Wildlife.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Minister will not address her comments through the Chair: she is staring at the honourable member. That is not the way it should be done.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: It is quite amazing that when members opposite hear the truth they cannot handle it. It is quite all right for members opposite to stand in this place and to abuse rangers held in high esteem throughout South Australia. However, the honourable member is not ingenious enough to realise that, in presenting the falsehoods and fabrications to this House, he has impugned the reputations of these people. I will rise in this place in their defence every time that occurs. This is not acceptable under anyone's terms. To put this matter to rest, I will tell members exactly what happened.

Four rangers took in hand the two pelicans causing problems. The pelicans were removed from the riverbank, placed in woolpack carriers, taken to a national park, euthanased—and I point out to the member for Kaurna that the word is 'euthanased' and not 'euthanised'—and then buried on the site of the national park. The honourable member's question in terms of whether or not two bodies were floating in the river was put to rest yesterday. Not only do the honourable member's contentions today continue the falsehoods and fabrications but they are a means of continuing—

Mr HILL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I draw your attention to the advice you gave the Minister earlier when she used the word 'falsehood'. The Minister seems to be ignoring your advice.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is inappropriate if the Minister is indicating that the honourable member has misled the House, but I believe that there is no point of order.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I refer to the *Murray Pioneer* article, part of which was read to the House by the member

for Kaurna. I will put it in the context of the people in the Riverland. The *Murray Pioneer* editorial of Friday 14 August stated:

News that two pelicans were put down by wildlife officers at Renmark last week has sparked a frenzy among the Adelaide media not seen since Port Lincoln decided to cull their galah population last summer.

The member for Kaurna is attempting to discuss a totally emotive issue in a very illiterate manner. The article goes on:

The decision to kill the pelicans will outrage animal lovers.

Mr CONLON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I distinctly remember the member for Kaurna reading something from a news clipping, which would give the lie to the description of him as illiterate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I thought I had already proved that with the member for Kaurna's mispronunciation of 'euthanased' as 'euthanised'. The editorial continues:

However, there are several factors which should be reiterated. The man responsible for killing the birds—wildlife officer Tim Fraser—isn't in the business of killing animals. He has had international experience in animal management, working in national parks here in Australia and North America, and dealing with the complexities of people friendly wildlife. He spent time observing the behaviour of the offending pelicans last week and based this course of action on what he saw. The two birds were apparently very aggressive and showed no fear toward humans. They bit children and chased others, sometimes towards nearby Murray Avenue, which is a busy thoroughfare most days. Mr Fraser decided these particular pelicans were a danger to the public.

This matter should be put to an end because, as I said, the main objective of the member for Kaurna is to attack the very integrity of these rangers out in the field who make operational decisions every day, and some of them are not necessarily decisions that officers of my department would wish to take. In the wild some harsh things happen, and the member for Kaurna needs to understand that, when he comes into the House and purports to give information that is incorrect and when he makes charges against other people's reputations when they cannot come in themselves and seek redress, instead of standing by his incorrect words he should be apologising sincerely to the rangers in the field who do a damned good job for this State.

Motion carried.

At 5.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 27 August at 10.30 a.m.