

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 18 February 1999

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

**SECOND-HAND VEHICLE DEALERS
(COMPENSATION FUND) AMENDMENT BILL**

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

**COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES
(DEFINITION OF CHARITABLE PURPOSE)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Order of the Day: Private Members Bills/Committees/Regulations, No. 3.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (19)

Armitage, M. H.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Condous, S. G.	Evans, I. F.
Gunn, G. M.	Hall, J. L.
Hamilton-Smith, M. L.	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Lewis, I. P.
Matthew, W. A.	Meier, E. J. (teller)
Penfold, E. M.	Scalzi, G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wotton, D. C.	

NOES (23)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Ciccarello, V.
Clarke, R. D.	Conlon, P. F.
De Laine, M. R. (teller)	Foley, K. O.
Geraghty, R. K.	Hanna, K.
Hill, J. D.	Hurley, A. K.
Key, S. W.	Maywald, K. A.
McEwen, R. J.	Rankine, J. M.
Rann, M. D.	Snelling, J. J.
Stevens, L.	Thompson, M. G.
White, P. L.	Williams, M. R.
Wright, M. J.	

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 713).

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): This is an interesting piece of legislation. Of course, as members realise, it is only a matter of two clauses (less than one page). As the member for Torrens has pointed out in the course of her second reading contribution, it seeks to add quite simply to the definitions and interpretations the means by which it is possible to include provision of welfare services for animals. Neither I nor any other member that I know on this side of the Chamber has any difficulty with that as a matter of principle, but what we want to understand from the member for Torrens is whether or not this includes that group of organisations—

not the RSPCA but those other organisations—that are in the lunatic fringe such as some of those—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Well, not even the ALP is in that group. Some people have rather weird ideas about treating animals as though they were humans and defining fish as animals, and so on. If there is any reservations in our mind at all it is in understanding the definition of the words ‘welfare services for animals’ and, if we do have any difficulty, that is where we have the difficulty. Accordingly, if the member for Torrens can reassure us that the legislation will not provide this kind of assistance and protection to idiot outfits then, quite happily, the measure will pass on the voices.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I support this Bill introduced by my colleague the member for Torrens. I am a little disappointed that this Bill has been delayed, because it seems a relatively simple Bill and one which I thought had support from most of the members of this Parliament. The sooner we fix up this matter the better. The member for Torrens’ motive for introducing this amendment in this way is to fix up what is an anomaly in our laws governing our charitable institutions; that is, that under that Act any person or charitable organisation collecting money for the benefit of their organisation has to be licensed and subject to some regulations. However, collections by organisations that are for animal welfare purposes do not come under those same regulations, and this Bill seeks to address that.

Members of this Parliament, as well as the community, recognise that the collection industry, if I can call it that, is growing. We are getting more demands and more organisations are doing it on a regular basis, and therefore our laws do need to be upgraded. It is a simple measure and one that should have wide support. So, I urge members to support this measure without delay and fix up what has simply been an anomaly in our current laws.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I urge members to support this Bill. It is a very simple Bill. As the member for Taylor has said, it merely rectifies an anomaly in the legislation and so I urge everyone to support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

Mr LEWIS: Does the member for Torrens have any restriction on the organisations which would be covered by the statement ‘welfare services for animals’, or does that include every madcap outfit that sets itself up, saying that it is there for the purposes of protecting the interests of that species or just animals in general? Can I say by way of background explanation to the Committee that my concern is that we will have the RSPCA covered by this—and I strongly support that notion—but I have strong reservations about providing the kind of status and support which this legislation, the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, in the principal Act, provides for groups which are opposed to fishing, collecting money to interfere with people who want to engage in their recreational fishing activities or groups that are opposed to hunting of any kind being allowed to collect money from the public to oppose hunters and do the things which they then choose to do.

One group that comes to mind immediately is Animal Liberation. Their interest is not principally looking after animals in distress that are not in the wild population, but in

preventing the legitimate, lawful activities of people involved in hunting and fishing, and indeed Animal Liberation is involved in being antagonistic to farming of animals, and that worries me. Equally, the groups which are formed to oppose duck hunting and the way in which they have proselytised that cause worries me. I say in all honesty, the reason I am worried about that is that I have seen some of the bovine excrement from the male gender that has been put out by Animal Liberation about kangaroo harvesting, for instance, which does not represent the truth.

I have seen some of the same sort of material put out by people who are opposed to duck hunting which does not represent the truth. They are not really about looking after the welfare of a particular animal in a particular set of distressing circumstances; they are there as an antagonist group to other people who are doing what is legitimate in law. Hunters, on the other hand, do not have any provision in charitable purposes for their clause to be exempt from certain Government fees and charges, yet they will be confronted by a group which has status, a group which will masquerade behind logos and slogans on one hand, yet engage in activity, as has been the case with Animal Liberation in relation to kangaroo hunting, which has been quite wrong, on the other. That is why I ask the question: does the honourable member believe that we ought to specify in the schedule the names of the organisations which are so licensed? For example, in the schedule we could put 'RSPCA'. If the honourable member believes that, then I know that no other member on this side of the Chamber would have any difficulties with the legislation whatever and that it ought to therefore pass subject to that small amendment.

Mrs GERAGHTY: My intention with this Bill is to catch organisations which are out there collecting under the guise of concern for the welfare of all animals and to make them accountable. That is all I intended: to make accountable organisations which are collecting moneys from the public and which do not have to explain where those moneys go. We can go out there and collect money, but we do not have to say where it goes. There is just no accountability at all. That is all that this Bill is about: accountability.

We have organisations which collect for the welfare and well-being of human beings and which have to be accountable. The RSPCA is a very accountable organisation, and all I am trying to do is make accountable those other organisations that go out and collect under the guise of concern for the welfare of animals.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I move:
That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): As the Bill comes out of Committee, I commend the sentiments and objects of the member for Torrens in having brought the legislation before us to enable what she seeks to do to happen, but I see—and some may say perhaps in a sinister fashion—another problem with it to which I have drawn attention in the course of the second reading debate. In other words, organisations that do collect money for animal welfare will now have to register. Once they have registered, what the sods will do—and I am not including the RSPCA in this remark—is say that they are a charity registered for collection under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, and they will use that to legitimise their operations and existence.

Accordingly, I believe what we have to do is what the member for Torrens has set out to do, but we further have to prevent organisations that are not really engaging in something that is accepted by the wide community as a worthy cause from doing as I have suggested. That is, legitimising their existence and purpose in the minds of the unsuspecting public, who are confronted by a collector, by saying they are registered and collecting money and using it for these other nefarious and silly activities that none of us really endorse.

Whilst I will not personally oppose the legislation in its passage through this Chamber, I believe that we can probably sort that out in the Legislative Council to include provisions in the schedule that will address the matter. I commend the member for Torrens for her thoughtfulness in that respect and trust that in the fullness of time it will not result in an adverse consequence for society at large.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSTITUTION (CITIZENSHIP) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 719.)

Mr CONLON (Elder): I do not have a prepared speech so I imagine that my contribution will not take long. There is in my view a responsibility upon members of this Parliament to exhibit leadership in legislation and in the community on certain issues. We have seen in Australia in recent years a remarkable lack of leadership and bipartisanship on matters associated with race, and that is regrettable. Whether the honourable member who proposes this legislation understands it or not, notions of citizenship are intimately connected in Australia with notions attached to immigration, one's loyalty to the nation and ultimately to questions of race. On those issues, we so often have seen in recent years very unfortunate shallow politics, politics of jingoism, and politics ultimately of racism.

As I have said, we need to be very careful in this place to make sure that anything we do offers leadership on those matters and does not feed into some prejudices that have unfortunately been fed into in recent years. For that reason, I think the honourable member moving this Bill has honestly made a serious mistake. He has not made a proper analysis of what his Bill does or the sorts of attitudes it feeds. It is ultimately jingoistic and it also suffers from being intellectually and legally fundamentally flawed for the reasons I will describe.

There is a fundamental misunderstanding as to the legal nature of citizenship arising from the honourable member's Bill. Citizenship is not as it is treated here: something that was the central building block of our Constitution when it was first enacted in 1901. In fact, the legal concept of citizenship is something that arises from a post Second World War Bill. Prior to that time—

Mr Atkinson: In 1948.

Mr CONLON: I am assisted by the learned member for Spence. The original Australian Constitution, just like the entitlement to participate in any of the colonies, was based upon the requirement of being a subject of the Crown—a very inexact definition. Be that as it may, it has always been the fundamental starting point for constitutional rights under our Constitution. I note that Australia is engaged in a debate at present as to whether the term 'subjects of the Crown' should continue to be the starting notion for Australian constitutional

rights. I will participate in that debate later, and I certainly hope that the term 'subjects of the Crown' will no longer be the basic starting point for constitutional rights.

Let me say this about the concepts of citizenship and some of the things that have not been considered by the honourable member in his jingoistic approach to this matter. Citizenship in Australia is a matter conferred not by some sort of natural order but, as I have said, by the Citizenship Act and in other countries quite often by legal mechanisms often unknown to the person who is in receipt of citizenship. I can only offer my own circumstances as evidence.

I was born in Northern Ireland, which is an unhappy place for a number of reasons. One of the reasons it is an unhappy place is something that attaches to this debate about citizenship. I was born in Northern Ireland; thus I was a British subject and a subject of the Crown. Therefore, I was entitled to come to Australia in 1966 and be treated as an Australian just like the rest of you. That is something that I found all my life to be a little hard to understand: how a child born in Northern Ireland could come to Australia and, as soon as I turned 18, was entitled to vote and to take part in this marvellous democracy. The greatest thing that ever happened to me in my life was my family's decision to come to Australia, because I have become a lawyer, which I never would have done; and I have become a member of Parliament, which I never would have done. I suspect that I might have found myself in rather more trouble than being in Parliament if I had stayed in Northern Ireland.

Mr Atkinson: You might have made it into Stormont.

Mr CONLON: I may well have made it into Long Kesh, or the Maze, or Stormont, as the member for Spence points out. Be that as it may, I came to Australia and automatically received all the rights that people born here have because of some peculiarities in our Constitution. Again, I say that the greatest thing that ever happened to me in my life was coming to this country. I owe this nation an enormous amount, and it has my undying loyalty and devotion. I am advised by the member for Spence that, because of the policy of the Irish Free State, I am entitled to Irish citizenship.

Mr Atkinson: In the Republic of Ireland.

Mr CONLON: Citizenship of the Republic of Ireland. Courtesy of the then Mayor of Norwood, I was granted Australian citizenship. I point out these things to demonstrate that these actions have little to do with my devotion or loyalty to this country. First, they are a legal Act that I would rather not have occurred—it was the outcome of several hundred years of history and a source of great trouble there; another I did not know about; and the other I chose of my own volition and with a great degree of pride.

I am an extremely loyal citizen of this country and a subject of the Crown according to the Constitution. I am entirely devoted to it, but the truth is that I was born in Ireland. It is a fact, just as much as it is a fact that when I go out in the sun I get sunburnt easily. It does not make me any less loyal. If the honourable member thinks that my choosing not to disregard my history, where I came from, the things that make me what I am, if he thinks that that makes me any less loyal or as good an Australian citizen as he, he is, frankly, a dope. Mr Speaker, I have that off my chest.

Mr SCALZI: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I find being called 'a dope' offensive.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been here for a long time and I think over those 20 years that sort of expression does not warrant taking a point of order. If the member

for Elder wants to respond to the member for Hartley's taking offence, he can, but I will not put any pressure on him.

Mr CONLON: I will change that comment by saying that the Bill is dopey. We should give leadership. This is an amazingly great country—and I say that with genuine sincerity. One of its great features is the enormous diversity of backgrounds and talents that we have. If we change that and be inward looking—

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr CONLON: Does the honourable member suggest that he is a better Australian than me? Is that what the honourable member is saying?

Mr Condous interjecting:

Mr CONLON: Mr Speaker, I take offence at that and I ask the member for Colton to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Colton is behind the pillar. The Chair did not hear the remark but, if the remark was offensive to the member for Elder, I would ask him to withdraw.

Mr CONDOUS: I am not withdrawing, Sir. I am of ethnic background and I feel more about this country than he does and I will not withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am advised that the remark was not unparliamentary. The Chair personally did not hear it, but I am prepared to accept that advice. I ask the member for Elder to continue his remarks.

Mr CONLON: I suggested earlier that, if Joe believed something, he was a dope. I now have no doubt that the member for Colton is a dope.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I make one last point before this debate proceeds. Whilst I did not ask the member to withdraw the word 'dope', I would not like it to become part of the tenor of debate here, because the inference drawn from a word can make it something which becomes offensive. I just caution members.

Mr CONLON: I find it extraordinary that I am to be insulted by being declared a less loyal Australian than the dopey member for Colton and that I am not allowed to call him a dope. I will conclude with those remarks.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I did not want to speak to this Bill because, as I said to some of my colleagues earlier, I think this is a little vexatious and I do not think that this is—

Mr Condous interjecting:

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

Ms CICCARELLO:—within our province.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come to order. The member for Norwood is trying to make a contribution behind him.

Ms CICCARELLO: This is a Federal issue and, therefore, I do not think that we should be wasting the time of this Parliament discussing it. For the honourable member's edification, he should know that the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (Hon. Philip Ruddock) has set up the Australian Citizenship Council which is currently looking at contemporary Australian citizenship. It was formed in August last year. An issues paper has been released by the committee, and one of the key issues it will be considering is that of dual citizenship because it recognises that Australian citizens are discriminated against in comparison with citizens from another country. If Australians become citizens

of another country, they automatically lose their Australian citizenship. This is at odds with what other countries are doing, and we know that citizens of the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, New Zealand, France, Italy and many other countries do have dual citizenship.

We keep talking about globalisation and improving the economy. It would be an advantage with globalisation for people to have dual citizenship so that they can move freely between countries and not be disadvantaged. As a member of Parliament I want to have exactly the same rights and responsibilities as all the citizens that I represent. I do not want to be marginalised. Already we are told that we are different and that we should not have different—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

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

Ms CICCARELLO:—rights and responsibilities from other citizens. If we are to represent them properly, we should be entitled to exactly the same conditions. I was born in Italy. I have told my story many times. I did go back to Italy for a trip of six weeks but ended up staying for four years because I fell in love with the country. I had not seen it since I was six years of age. However, when I arrived there, even though I thought I was going back to my homeland, I was considered a foreigner in Italy. I came back to Australia when my father died, and I came back because citizenship is not just about a piece of paper. It is about where you choose to live, where your family is, where you think you can contribute to a community—and this is where I think I can most contribute.

I have been back to Italy no less than 17 times for periods ranging from five days to nine months. I love the country and I make no secret of it. However, this is my home and this is where I want to make a contribution. I do not know what will happen after I leave Parliament, but I do not expect that any conditions given to me while I am in this Parliament would disadvantage me when I leave this place. We are transients in this place. We are here for a short time, and I do not see why legislation should be changed just for the period we are in here.

As Mayor of Norwood I had the privilege of conducting hundreds of citizenship ceremonies, and I am proud to say that Patrick Conlon was one of the people to whom I did accord Australian citizenship. I can assure the member for Hartley that all the people who made a choice of becoming Australian citizens were fervent about their reasons for doing it. Some had been here for a short time; and some had been here for 30 years before they decided to become Australian citizens because they had thought about it. Prior to that they could live in this country; they did have some of the same rights that citizens have but they wanted to affirm their loyalty to Australia.

As an analogy, how many people take a vow in marriage to honour, love and, in some instances, obey their partner? They do that before God. How many of those people disobey the commitment and loyalty that they proffer? Citizenship is just as important but in this instance the member for Hartley is misguided in what he has done. Perhaps his intentions were good, but a change in the legislation will affect only a few members—some of the 47 members in this House and 22 members in the Council. Why have we wasted the time of this Parliament discussing something such as this when the member for Torrens has spent 12 months trying to get a Bill through the Parliament in respect of the safety of children? The Federal Government will be discussing and making a

decision on this and other matters at the end of the year, and we will bound by its decision.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): This is an absolutely stunning Bill: it has no logic, it has no merit, it has no fairness and it is totally immoral. For the honourable member to present a Bill of this nature, which provides that a member of Parliament cannot have dual citizenship because that person will then be less loyal and less able, is crazy speak. There is no logic to that whatsoever. What is being said is that it is all right for the broader community—all those people whom we are charged to represent—to have dual citizenship, but that the people who are elected to the House of Assembly and to the Legislative Council, by some divine right, have to give up their dual citizenship because they would not be able to represent people properly. What absolute nonsense! What absolute rubbish!

Mr Lewis interjecting:

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

Mr WRIGHT: It is absolute nonsense to bring in a Bill that provides that members of Parliament cannot hang onto their dual citizenship because it means that they cannot represent their communities properly. It is okay for the masses to hold dual citizenship but, members of Parliament, who because of their election are charged with the responsibility of representing people, can no longer hold dual citizenship. The argument has no merit, it has no logic, it is immoral, the Bill is an absolute joke, and the honourable member should be disgusted with himself for bringing such a Bill before this Parliament. He does this Parliament no justice whatsoever in bringing forward a Bill that is a complete joke. As for the comments of the member for Colton that our member on this side had got into the gutter, let me say that he is the one who has got right into the gutter, where he belongs.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SECOND-HAND VEHICLE DEALERS (COMPENSATION FUND) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 December. Page 581.)

The SPEAKER: I note that a message has been received from His Excellency the Governor recommending the appropriation of any necessary revenue incurred by this Bill. I reiterate my previous ruling that the Bill clearly does not appropriate any revenue. That has already been achieved by clause 3(3) of schedule 3 of the principal Act.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Industry and Trade): The Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Compensation Fund was established under section 28 of the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983 and continued under the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995. The fund is administered by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs. It exists to compensate persons who have suffered loss during a transaction with a second-hand vehicle dealer and who have no reasonable prospect of recovery of that amount.

Of particular concern to the second-hand vehicle industry is the issue of whether transactions with unlicensed dealers, or backyarders as they are known, should be the subject of claims on the fund. This Bill incorporates changes to the

compensation fund provisions so that claims on the fund are limited to transactions with persons who are licensed dealers or who the claimants reasonably believed to be a licensed dealer at the time of the transaction. Where the claimant did not deal with a licensed dealer, the onus will be on the claimant to satisfy the court that the claimant had reasonable grounds to believe they were dealing with a licensed dealer at the time.

This measure represents an appropriate balance between the interests of consumers and dealers. There are some other matters that the Government would like to see incorporated in this Bill, and they will be attended to in another place.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): The Minister has just captured the intent of the Bill, and everybody in this House supports the intent. We acknowledge that there was an anomaly in the legislation and that people were seeking compensation from the fund when they had dealt with someone who they knew was not a licensed dealer. We have cleared that matter up.

The other matter has been the charade that we have gone through, which was inflicted on us by the Attorney-General, on the question as to whether or not people other than the Government can be legitimate legislators in this place. It has been nothing other than a charade and it has brought some burden to this House. It was clear from the outset that the Bill added no burden to the State in relation to moneys. It seeks to correct an anomaly dealing with moneys which are not even the moneys of the State. I am delighted, Mr Speaker, that you have reaffirmed the right we all have to be legislators in our own right. We do claim that right. On being elected to this place, we assume that right on behalf of the people who elected us, and it is ridiculous to have barriers put in our way. I am delighted that this Bill is now proceeding.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I seek from the member for Gordon an explanation as to those people who are entitled to the benefits of this fund. It has been put to me by dealers that the amendments that we are considering improve the Act. However, there is still a view among certain sections of the second-hand motor vehicle industry that people who really should have no right to do so will have the ability to access the fund, that they will still be able to slip under the net.

If a person buys a second-hand motor vehicle, surely the old adage of buyer beware applies. Before completing the transaction, and if the buyer has any doubt, the buyer should have the wit or the wisdom to seek from that person a copy of the registration. We realise what caused all the problems and how the fund was run down by people who were able to access smart lawyers and get around the provisions. The constituents who brought this matter to my attention are still very concerned that they are going to be paying into a fund to support the activities of dealers and others who make no contribution whatsoever and that the people they sell a vehicle to—and in many cases these vehicles are less than sound—will be able to claim back on the fund. I seek information from the member for Gordon why this clause has been drafted in this manner and whether the concerns expressed to me by my dealer constituents are valid.

Mr McEWEN: This is a valid question and I thank the honourable member for it. It is worth making the point at this stage that the Government supports the Bill and that an identical Bill was introduced by the Government. The

member for Stuart questions whether the Bill allows people to seek compensation only from a licensed second-hand vehicle dealer. To some people that was going a little too far. A person could have believed he was dealing with a licensed second-hand vehicle dealer but found after the event that he was not: at the time of dealing with them, the person might have had reason to believe he was dealing with a licensed dealer.

The Bill provides that, if people have reasonable grounds for believing they were dealing with a licensed second-hand dealer, they will be given protection. For example, someone could have a car yard in a town with a sign up saying 'licensed second-hand vehicle dealer' and the person walks in and deals with the dealer. Unbeknown to that person, a week before the dealer lost his licence. The person genuinely believes at the time the transaction was conducted that the dealer was licensed. Therefore, I believe in that set of circumstances people should be given the protection of the compensation fund.

To go further, a customer would have to go in and seek evidence in advance that the dealer was licensed to ensure protection under the Act, but that is going too far. I do not think that someone who walks into a car yard, as a starting point, should have to go to the office and demand to see the documentation—the paid-up licence. People are not going to do that, but they would have every reason to believe through the signage and otherwise that they were dealing with a licensed dealer. It applies in those circumstances, and in those circumstances alone. The onus would be on the purchaser to establish that they believed that they were dealing with a licensed dealer. There is a margin in there and I think the margin ought to remain because it protects unwitting buyers in that set of circumstances. However, in no circumstances does it protect a buyer who goes into someone's backyard and buys a car. It is obvious that that person is not a licensed dealer.

Mr LEWIS: The problem to which I wish to draw the Committee's attention is one which I will explain by referring to the circumstances that concern me. A couple living in Murray Bridge bought a Harley Davidson motor cycle in New South Wales when they were in New South Wales. They applied there for it to be transferred to their name and it was, after a check was made by the relevant authorities to see if the motorbike had been stolen. On being told that it was not stolen and having their registration and transfer of ownership application approved, they brought the bike back to South Australia and in due time, according to law, applied for the registration of the bike in South Australia, presenting to the police and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles in South Australia their proof of ownership of the vehicle, as is the case when a vehicle's ownership and registration is transferred from one State to another.

Yet again, the South Australian police and the New South Wales police checked to see if the Harley Davidson motorbike had been stolen. It was discovered that it had not been stolen and it was registered in their name in South Australia. The new owners spent more than \$6 000 in addition to the \$10 000 or so they paid for the bike on further repairing and improving the bike. Early this year after the interstate liaison between South Australian, New South Wales and other State police uncovered a ring of thieves who were operating, it was discovered or believed that the number on the frame of this bike had been altered and that, in fact, the bike had been stolen.

In the belief that it was a stolen bike, the police, without any notification or anything else (for understandable reasons—they did not want it to be squirreled away somewhere), went to the premises of the owners and simply removed the bike, saying that it was stolen property. How would the member for Gordon feel if the police arrived at his home, possessed some item such as a motor car or motorbike—by this time worth more than \$20 000—from his ownership after they had said and provided statements to the effect that it was not stolen, not only in this State but in the other State—if they simply repossessed it and said, ‘You have not got your bike any more (or your vehicle, your truck or whatever); it is gone, because we believe it is stolen’?

The police produced no proof to the owners that it was stolen, neither at that time nor at any subsequent time—and that annoys me—but they can do it and they have done it, and the owners are left with no redress whatsoever. They cannot get the bike back; they cannot recover the investment they made in the bike; the police hold the bike and it is their intention, after the evidentiary provisions necessary for the prosecution trial is satisfied, to return it to the people they allege are the rightful owners of the bike. The police have given no proof that the frame number on the bike has been altered. There has been no proof as to the original owners. Whether or not they can do that forensically, I do not know. They may well be able to do so, but they have given no proof. They will not respond to my requests about that.

Now that I have placed my grievance on the record, I wish to ask the member for Gordon whether, in these circumstances, given that the bike was bought from a dealer, this fund would apply, first, if the bike had been bought interstate, as was the case in this instance and, secondly, if the bike had been bought from a South Australian dealer in this instance? What will be the consequence?

Mr McEWEN: I missed for some time the point of the question but I now understand that the main intent was to get on record a matter of due diligence having failed someone. I must make the point that that particular example is totally outside what we are trying to do, because obviously that vehicle was purchased in New South Wales. The short answer to the first part of the question is ‘No.’ If it was bought in New South Wales, there is no protection under the Act. Under the Act, the definition of ‘dealer’ is clear and it is also clear that the provision operates only in South Australia.

The answer to the second question is ‘Yes.’ If someone believed they were buying a vehicle from a licensed second-hand dealer, had the protection in terms of ownership and found out later that that was not the case—and it was not of their making or fault—they would gain the protection which they should gain under this compensation fund. This is one of the reasons why this compensation fund has been set up. In that regard, if they believed they were buying the bike from a licensed second-hand dealer, they would have the protection. If they bought that bike from a backyarder after having read an advertisement in the paper on the weekend, gone into someone’s home and walked into the backyard to purchase the bike, the ridiculous situation at the moment is that they could claim out of the fund. But they have no right to claim out of the fund because it is the second-hand dealers who are putting the money into the fund. They are putting the money into the fund to protect each other. It is that anomaly, and that anomaly alone, that is being removed by this minor amendment to the compensation fund under the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I move:
That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I congratulate the member for Gordon on his persistence with this Bill, the provisions of which are wholly desirable. After the member for Gordon introduced this reform, the Attorney-General sought to gazump him by copying his reform and then, having copied his reform as a Government Bill, tried to stop the progress of the member for Gordon’s private member’s Bill on the spurious ground that it was a money Bill. I am pleased that the Attorney-General has been proved wrong in his judgment and that it is clear to the House now why he persisted with the untruth that this was a money Bill: it was for the basest of political motives to prevent the member for Gordon proceeding in the normal way. I congratulate the member for Gordon for overcoming that and adding a small but worthy change to our statute law.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STAMP DUTIES (EXEMPTION FOR CROPS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 5 November. Page 207.)

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I move:
That this Bill be discharged.
Motion carried.

GLENTHORNE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hanna:

That the Environment, Resources and Development Committee investigate and report on options for future use of the Glenthorne Farm site, taking into consideration:

- the proposal for a wine industry training centre on the site;
- the Premier’s public statement that there would be no housing development on the site;
- the value placed on open space by the local community; and
- the historic and cultural significance of the site,

which Mr Hill had moved to amend as follows:

By leaving out the words, ‘Environment, Resources and Development Committee investigate and report on options for future use of the Glenthorne Farm site, taking into consideration,’ and inserting in lieu thereof the following words, ‘Premier include the member for Mitchell, as the local member, on his committee to investigate and report on options for future use of the Glenthorne Farm site; and the committee should consider and publicly report on’.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 722.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Members will recall that, when we last dealt with this motion, I pointed out the potential problems of our insisting that the member for Mitchell be on the committee that the Premier is setting up to examine Glenthorne Farm. It is ironic that the member for Bright, the Minister for Year 2000 Compliance, even though he would have more constituents in adjoining areas compared to the member for Mitchell, would not be included. It would be outright discrimination, and it would set a dangerous precedent to insist that a local member be on such a committee purely because the area in question fell within his or her electorate but not allow on the committee another member

who may be more affected. This is why I have great difficulty in supporting this motion; in fact, I cannot do so.

Last week I highlighted the case of the working group that the Premier has set up for Yorke Peninsula. If we use Mr Hill's argument, then clearly I, as the local member, should be on that committee. However, I am not on the committee. The committee was appointed by the Premier, and I fully accept the Premier's judgment to appoint such people as Roger Cook and Michael Geddes to that committee, along with other local people in whom I have full confidence, belief and faith and who can assess the situation very well. Why does a local member have to be on every committee? Am I supposed to be the one running around, seeing whether there are fairies at the bottom of the garden, being scared if something is not considered? Of course not! The local member can give evidence and make sure that what he or she believes are important issues for that area are presented to the committee. There is no difficulty at all with that.

We are setting a dangerous precedent by insisting that the member for Mitchell should be on the committee. It is quite clear that he is doing it for political motives only. He is trying to get some publicity out of it. I can see the headline already, 'I had a victory; I got on the committee.' Big deal! It will not prove anything at all. It is a great shame that the members for Bright and Fisher will not be on the committee. They have just as much right to be on it as anyone else does.

Surely, if we are petty enough to want to ensure that local members are on every committee that gets to this Parliament, we are missing the point regarding why we are here. Surely we are above that. I do not believe this will be in the best interests of the committee, the way in which Parliament should operate or indeed the way in which the Government should seek to appoint committees. If the Government has been elected to govern, surely it is in a position to determine what is right and in the best interests for any area, and I have highlighted several examples to show that.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I move:

That this House recognises the importance of the River Murray to South Australia and is totally opposed to any attempt to lift the cap on water diversions from this major river system.

This is an important subject and an important debate, and I hope there is no dissent whatsoever thereto from any member of this House. By the early 1990s, rivers in the Murray-Darling Basin were literally running out of water. Nearly half the mean average rainfall from the basin was being diverted for urban, industrial and agricultural use, and year by year these diversions were increasing.

Something had to be done as the whole system was showing signs of stress. There was no certainty that the riverine environment was sustainable and no margin of safety for an adverse impact on water quality, salinity, algal blooms and increased turbidity, to give some examples. Rainfall and inflow to the basin's rivers varies enormously from year to year, as we all know. If the amount of water promised to users is too high, in dry years there is not enough water to go around. This will occur more often as the amount of water extracted increases.

Quite simply, overallocation reduces security of supply, whether you are a farmer or whether you work in a city hospital—it becomes increasingly risky. As I said previously, taking water from the basin's rivers has an adverse environ-

mental impact. Less obvious are the changes in river flows, such as fewer small and medium floods, colder river temperatures and unnaturally stable water levels. The loss of places to live, good water quality and altered flow patterns lead to the decline of many native plants and animals. On the other hand, European carp—that feral fish—and blue green algae are well adapted to the altered conditions and can reach plague proportions. It could be argued that that is the case at the moment.

As Chair of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, I know full well of the adverse impact this would have on South Australian inland fisheries. The committee has been investigating this whole issue of our inland fisheries, and I can say that the riverine environment is very finely balanced. To see it deteriorate any further would be disastrous.

In response to these matters of concern, the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council at its June 1995 meeting decided to introduce an interim cap on diversions of water from the basin. In December 1996, this was later confirmed as a permanent cap from 1 July 1997 and agreed to by all States.

This was seen as an essential first step in establishing management systems to achieve healthy rivers and sustainable, consumptive uses. In other words, the council determined that a balance needed to be struck between the significant economic and social benefits that have been obtained from the development of the basin's water resources, on the one hand, and the environmental uses of water in the river on the other. The cap itself attempts not to reduce basin diversions but merely to prevent them from increasing. The ministerial council decided that preventing any increase in diversions from the basin was essential to arrest further decline both in river health and security of supply for existing water users.

I now refer to how any increase in diversions, particularly in New South Wales, will adversely affect South Australia and, in particular, Adelaide. From time to time, we are faced with the problem of the Murray Mouth closing. The closure of the mouth disrupts the natural migrating patterns of fish species such as mulloway and greenback flounder. These and other affected species form the basis of an important recreational fishing industry. Closure of the Murray Mouth could, under certain flow conditions, cause flooding not only at Goolwa but also at other areas as far as 50 kilometres upstream. Obviously, this will also affect the Coorong, the Murray Mouth and the Lower Lakes, as they represent a wetland of international significance both to the local and the South Australian economy.

The natural and cultural heritage of the Coorong and Murray Mouth supports extensive tourism and recreation which, in turn, supports local and regional communities and economies. Notwithstanding this, we can envisage what the adverse impact will be upstream. The irrigation areas of the Riverland and dairy farmers at Murray Bridge, Monteith and Wellington will suffer if New South Wales forces any changes. As stated, the riverine environment will suffer, the fisheries will suffer, increased salinity will result, blue green algae will proliferate, and the dreaded carp will only exacerbate the current problems. Not only will these problems escalate further, but have we considered the effect on the metropolitan water supply and the increased cost involved in coping with that? This is the most important issue.

Adelaide now relies very heavily on the Murray River to supplement its water supplies. In no way can Adelaide's

reservoirs sustain its water supply. We do not need or want to think about the consequences of the diversion or the loss of water should anything happen to the water if we had to stop pumping from Mannum. The consequences for the city and for South Australia would be enormous. I stress: there are no solutions or alternatives to this. So, what does Adelaide do if it cannot pump water from Mannum? What do we do? Have members ever thought about that? What are the alternatives? There are none. This is a very serious question, and it is one that this Parliament ought to address with or without the current debate about the cap. This does highlight a problem which many of us have not considered and which others do not want to consider because there are no answers.

In the Barossa last year the Premier announced that additional off-peak water would be supplied to the Barossa to support the ever increasing vineyard developments in the region. Work is currently in progress to meet those demands. I can assure you, Sir, as the member representing the Barossa and its regions, that I would be most displeased if that supply was jeopardised in any way, shape or form. If we let New South Wales 'zap the cap', that is exactly what will happen: the supply, not only to the Valley but also to other regions around the State, would become tenuous.

Under the current cap, we get only 6 per cent of the river's water. It appears that New South Wales' attitude, or its forecast attitude, will be contemptuous. There is another name for New South Wales' attitude, a name I shall leave to members' imagination. I strongly oppose any attempt to lift the cap. I commend this motion to the House and hope that it has the unanimous support of all members.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUNBOAT II

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House congratulates the crew and staff members of Prince Alfred College on regaining the world record achieved by the college's solar powered *Sunboat II* and on providing the rest of the world with an excellent example of the advantages of solar power as an important source of energy.

I have spoken on this subject previously; in fact, I was able to commend the college and the crew on their success in 1993 when they won their first world record. In this House late last year, when I had been made aware that they were about to attempt another world record, I wished them well and am pleased now to be able to commend and congratulate the crew and the staff of the college on their success in regaining a world record. I know that I have the support of the member for Norwood, because both the honourable member and I were present when the boat completed its trip in January. It was a very exciting day for everyone.

Back in 1993, *Sunboat I* achieved a world record by covering some 2 000 kilometres. In regaining the world record this time, it covered well over 4 000 kilometres. It was a great effort on everybody's part. The House would be aware that as a result of winning the world record in 1993 the school was presented with an Advance Australia Award for its work in the development of solar power.

The craft was designed and constructed by students and staff. That is one of the good things about this whole exercise: from the word 'go' the students of the school have been involved. It was a tremendous feat in designing and constructing the craft, and, of course, regaining the world record just topped that off.

The project is the largest of its kind to be undertaken by an educational institution in Australia. It is no wonder that there is significant pride within the school because of that. Since the 1993 world event, the craft has been upgraded significantly. The total power capacity has been increased by 40 per cent, and I am pleased to say that that effort has now been well recognised overseas in a number of publications.

As I said earlier, it was great to be in attendance when the boat came in. It was brought in with significant ceremony, which was well deserved, because those of who had the opportunity to look at the daily program for those young people—I must be careful because women were also involved—saw the amount of effort that went in on the part of the students as well as the staff who gave them tremendous support.

I was also delighted that the importance of the occasion was recognised by the receipt of letters from the Prime Minister—I wish I had a copy of that letter—and the Premier; and I have now received a copy of the letter that was directed to the headmaster of the school by the Deputy Premier in his capacity as the Minister responsible for energy sources. In that letter he quite rightly commended the school on the importance that it has placed on the use of solar energy in this way.

I do not want to speak at length on this issue. Obviously, I am very proud, this House should be very proud, and I know the member for Norwood is very proud—and I hope she will tell us so. Again, I commend the students and staff of Prince Alfred College. I make particular reference to Mr Malcolm Gray, because he has been involved with this project right from the start. I think that he probably brought this concept to the school. I also commend the Headmaster, Dr Brian Webber, particularly as this is his last year, because he, together with the whole of the school community, has given this project and many others huge support.

It was great to see the number of parents and well wishers who were there to see the boat leave and, in particular, to see it come in. To all those people I offer my congratulations. It is with much pleasure that I support the motion that the House congratulate the crew and staff members for a magnificent achievement.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I briefly want to add my congratulations to Prince Alfred College and all involved with *Sunboat*. As the member for Heysen has indicated—and I will not go into detail—I was also present in 1993 at Goolwa when the first record was achieved. As Mayor of Norwood I was able to confer on those crew members and staff an Australia Day award for their achievement. This second achievement involved an even longer distance, so the teachers and students must be commended. It would not have been easy. We looked over the boat and we saw that there was not a lot of space inside. It probably would not have been very comfortable for the people involved, but they did a wonderful job.

Not everyone might know that Prince Alfred College is situated in the Norwood electorate. I am extremely proud of everything it does. It was a special day because there were many people at Murray Bridge waiting for the boat to come in. Just after that happened, I ducked across to Tanunda for the end of the Tour Down Under race. So, it was a pretty special day.

To the Principal, the teachers, the students, the parents and the whole of the school community I extend my congratulations. It is wonderful to see that the school is leading the way

with regard to alternative energy sources. It needs to be commended and we need to encourage more people to do the same thing.

The SPEAKER: Order! It's flushing out the old reds. The member for Schubert.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Thank you, Mr Speaker. Talking about reds, there are a few in this House of which you, Sir, are one as well as the member for Heysen, the member for Light and myself. I am proud indeed—as, no doubt, is the member for Heysen and you, Sir—of our old school's achievements. We expect it of our school, because it has been a high achievement school for over 100 years. I was particularly tickled to follow the progress of the latest attempt. There were a few problems early on, and we watched day by day as the record drew near, and we all cheered when they got it. A distance of 4 000 kilometres in a boat in cramped conditions and in intensive heat was no mean feat for these students: 4 000 is a lot of kilometres in river miles.

As the member for Heysen said, Malcolm Gray was my arts master of many years ago. I am not exactly a great artist, but I remember the man with fondness. He was imaginative and outgoing, and I congratulate him for having the thought to put this together—certainly in respect of *Sunboat I*, and I gather in respect of *Sunboat II* as well: the 2 000 kilometre record and now the 4 000 kilometre record. I am proud of my old school's achievement: it was a wonderful effort, a great feat, and no doubt the school community is as extremely pleased as are we old scholars.

The school has been at the forefront of applied and research technologies for 100 years. Student involvement has been at a high level during that period of time. The outreach of the school and its community is obvious to everyone in this State, not just to us and the school community. The tradition continues.

I want to say 'well done' to all those involved—the students, the teachers, the school and the State—because to have a world record such as this takes some doing. I thank all those people, it is a great achievement, and I extend to them my congratulations. I hope that *Sunboat III* is in the thought processes and that it will continue the glory of the school and the State.

Motion carried.

COONGIE LAKES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hill:

That this House calls on the Minister for Environment and Heritage to ensure that applications to grant wilderness status to the Coongie Lakes wetlands be processed forthwith and calls on the Minister to ensure that Coongie Lakes wetlands be given the highest possible level of environmental protection once the exploration licences for the area expire in February 1999.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 724.)

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support the motion of my colleague. The Coongie Lakes wetlands is a beautiful area. It has an abundance of flora and fauna which is interesting and diverse. I particularly want to state my opinion about this matter as I have responsibility for mines and energy for the Opposition. Santos has explored the Coongie Lakes area extensively. You can clearly see some of the older seismic survey lines crisscrossing the area. Indeed, Santos has surveyed the area extensively even recently.

I am pleased to note that the environmental management of the seismic survey lines has improved considerably. It is easy to see where the recent survey has been carried out because the vegetation and the environment around those lines is recovering quite noticeably compared with the older and cruder techniques involved in previous seismic survey lines.

Santos has explored this area thoroughly and has chosen, so far at least, not to exploit it. One can only assume that that is because there is no commercial reason to do so. Santos's exploration licence expires in February 1999 when it will no longer have exclusive rights over that area. One presumes again that, if Santos were keen on exploiting the area for oil or gas, it would already have those processes in train. I am aware that other groups are very keen to get into the Cooper Basin area. Some junior miners are keen to go back over Santos's work, look at it and see whether they might exploit the oil and gas reserves. In general the Opposition has taken the view that other explorers should be able to get into the Cooper Basin wherever possible, that there should be competition in there for the exploration of oil and gas. However, given that Santos has chosen not to exploit this area and given its beauty, diversity and value as a natural resource, it is reasonable and responsible for the shadow Minister for the Environment and member for Kaurna to call for this area to be preserved with wilderness status so that it can continue to be home to the diverse flora and fauna that it is at the moment.

It might be said that it would be more valuable as a tourism resource as well as an environmental resource—far more valuable than any small value that might be got from exploiting oil and natural gas reserves that Santos has not considered it worthwhile to take advantage of. It is therefore a practical and sensible approach. It has been recognised in this country that there are environments that are worth preserving, despite possible commercial applications of mining or any other form of exploitation. The Coongie Lakes certainly falls into that area. The wetlands are home to a large amount of bird life and it would be widely regarded amongst the South Australian community as important to maintain that diversity and ensure that that bird life continues to thrive in the wetlands and that those birds continue to thrive elsewhere. The wetlands is an important area in the life cycle of many of those birds. In conclusion I again reiterate my full support for this motion. I am sure it would not encounter too much opposition from the mining community.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

TOUR DOWN UNDER CYCLING RACE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this House congratulates the organisers, competitors and sponsors involved in the inaugural Tour Down Under international cycling event on its outstanding success and recognises the strong support given to the event by the people of South Australia and our local media organisations and acknowledges the enormous benefits a unique event of this nature offers our State.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 729.)

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): For somebody who does not want to say too much in this place, I am having a busy day. I add my congratulations to all involved with the organisation of the Tour Down Under, including Mike Turtur, Major Events, Tourism SA and the Hon. Graham Ingerson, the former Minister for Tourism. I bumped into Graham at

Gawler and he was having a great time watching the race. He was proud of having had an input into the organisation of that event. It did transform Adelaide for the period it was here. For a couple of weeks before the race many international cyclists were already in South Australia, practising here and enjoying our lifestyle and the countryside. I spoke to many of the teams, particularly the Italian teams, and they were really pleased to be here and impressed by the state of our roads. They look forward to coming back in future.

I had the good fortune of attending all bar the race that finished in Victor Harbor and it was great to see all the local people out. It certainly would have been a boost for the economy of many of the small towns in South Australia through which the tour went. I make no secret of the fact that I have been extolling the virtues of cycling for many years and I hope that the advent of the Tour Down Under has raised an awareness of cycling in South Australia and that more people will now get out on their bikes as well. It is also very opportune to note that a conference—VelOZity—started yesterday and finishes tomorrow in Adelaide, with about 300 participants talking about cycling and how conditions can be improved.

South Australia has a strong cycling tradition and it is good to see a resurgence in the sport. The *Sunday Mail* had the Six Day Tour and it was very popular. I cannot conclude without mentioning Norwood and its cycling tradition. The velodrome in Norwood was a very popular venue until the early 1980s, when the council demolished it and turned it over to residential land. We have the Norwood Cycling Club of which I am the patron and which is the oldest and one of the most successful cycling clubs in Australia. Its members contributed to the Tour, including Nino and David Solari and Phil Mittiga. Commendation to all the organisers. I look forward to the race being back in South Australia next year, although it does clash with the parliamentary bowls carnival being held in Perth, so we might have to change one of the dates. To all the participants and organisers, I commend the motion and again congratulate the former Minister, Hon. Graham Ingerson, for his energy in securing the event.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to also support this motion by the member for Schubert. Like the member for Norwood, I place on record my appreciation to the then Minister for Tourism (Hon. Graham Ingerson) not only for the Tour Down Under but a range of other initiatives that are coming to the forefront in South Australia. Both he and the current Minister (Hon. Joan Hall) are doing a fantastic job. If you lead from the top and have a good Public Service working with you, as well as those from the private sector, in a partnership, there is an enormous amount of opportunity one can generate for your State.

The Tour Down Under was one of the greatest major events I have seen in South Australia. Whilst the Grand Prix was always an icon and in its day served the community well, this event had more to offer than the Grand Prix because it allowed the community across a large section of South Australia to get involved. It was not costly for them; in fact, they did not have to spend a dollar to witness the event if they decided not to. On the other hand a lot of people came to my electorate and to the Fleurieu Peninsula and strongly supported the small businesses, the craft stalls, flea markets and other local activities held in conjunction with this event.

My first chance at witnessing this race was standing on the corner of Dyson Road and Beach Road watching the cyclists come up from Glenelg and following them through my electorate—McLaren Vale, Willunga (to the king of the hill) and through to Victor Harbor and the finish. It was a proud day for me as the local member and a southern resident to see how much support the southern community gave the Tour Down Under. I place on record my thanks for the way the community of the south got behind this event. McLaren Vale was ultimately awarded the elite prize for its efforts and I congratulate the McLaren Vale Business and Main Street Association, all the traders and the community generally that got out there and made sure that we won that award. Willunga, interestingly enough, received special commendation for its efforts. Certainly the Willunga Basin got behind this event.

The other issue within my portfolio was the fantastic work done by the police. As Minister for Police I was fully briefed on all the logistical planning that went on behind the scenes. Whilst I have had nothing but praise from the community about the way the police delivered their services that day, a lot of intense back room work was done on getting this event to happen. Probably members here would recall that this is perhaps the first time in the State's history that they have been able to have roads opening and closing almost as the event went through an area. Members could appreciate the logistics behind that. To be able to see officers temporarily stopping traffic, letting the Tour Down Under proceed and the traffic then flowing again shows the capability of our police and the way they are so able to control both crowd and traffic issues in South Australia. There were also all the other services. I saw the CFS there in the towns, ready for any emergency that might come up, and the St John volunteers and South Australian Ambulance Service all out in their positions in case there were any major hazards. Fortunately, I understand there were very few incidents, and again that probably gets back to the fact that the event was so well planned.

I understand that economically this had a great impact on South Australia directly but also indirectly in that this event was broadcast internationally to potentially 200 million right across the world. To see those words of which my colleague the member for Bragg is so proud, 'Sensational Adelaide' splashed right around the world is fantastic, and I would encourage and hope that in the future we continue to keep up that generic message about Sensational Adelaide so that that impact continues to go right across the international spectrum. One of the problems we have had at times is that we have tended to change the message and focus of what we are doing in tourism, and Sensational Adelaide lets people know exactly what is going on here. They saw it with the tennis and they are about to see it with the big V8 race coming up in April.

Another important aspect of this is the fact that people felt proud of South Australia. One of the things we still need to do is believe in ourselves, as I have often mentioned in this House. If there was ever a time when we could reflect and see just what we have to offer and how well we do things in South Australia, certainly this was one such occasion. I am delighted that we will have the Tour Down Under back here again next year, and I know that my community in our electorate of Mawson are very keen to be active participants and will certainly continue to get behind this great race. I thank all those involved and congratulate in particular the

public servants who did such a great job in coordinating this event for South Australia.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the member for Schubert. I also congratulate the Government on its faith in giving financial and other support for this inaugural Tour Down Under. While it did not attract the same locally concentrated crowd as the Formula 1 Grand Prix event did, it attracted an enormous number of spectators, probably more overall than the Grand Prix. Over the whole State it attracted enormous numbers of spectators along the roads and through the towns that the race proceeded through. As the Minister said, it also gave the opportunity for an interstate and world market to see what South Australia is like. Whereas the Grand Prix really showed only the Grand Prix track and race itself, this event gave many millions of viewers interstate and overseas the opportunity to see what the State has to offer in the way of tourism as well as the actual bike race event.

Another great aspect as far as I was concerned was that it gave country people the opportunity to see something big, and to have a big event pass through and in some cases start or finish in their towns created an enormous amount of interest. It was great for many country people who are away from the action much of the time when big events are held in Adelaide and other capital cities. It gave them a great chance to be involved—and involved they were: they came out in enormous numbers. I saw a couple of stages of the race and was very impressed by the enormous interest that was shown by people in the country areas, and it was great for them.

The race is based on the Tour de France, which has the biggest viewing audience of any sporting event in the world. It is viewed by many millions of people on the roads in France itself and also all over the world on television. When I raced on bikes I was a sprinter and I could not see much sense in riding 200 kilometres when one could ride 200 metres in less than 12 seconds. However, I do appreciate that road racing is a particularly good sport. As spectacular as track racing is, I am sure that road racing is even more spectacular. Even though I was a sprinter I did race in some road races. The member for Norwood mentioned the *Sunday Mail* tour. I remember I rode in the first *Mail* tour in 1953 as a junior rider. I rode in several of them and then, more as a token effort, I rode in the twenty-first *Mail* tour in 1974. That was about the last road race I rode in. It was a good experience and, while not a top class road rider, I still enjoyed it.

The race this year was a great one for me in particular because, since I was 12 years of age I have dreamt about seeing these world class road riders—the Tour de France riders—perform. I thought I would have to go to France or Europe to see them, but this gave me the opportunity to see them here. It was great to see a current world champion and stage winners of the Tour de France competing locally, and I am sure they did not let the crowds down. Another thing that was great for me on a personal level as a former Port Adelaide rider and life member of the Port Adelaide club was to see one stage of the race start at Port Adelaide on the Friday. An added advantage was that the eventual race winner, Stuart O'Grady, is also a Port Adelaide club member. To see Stuart in his own club area, racing with this world field and eventually winning the race was like a dream come true.

I will dwell on Stuart O'Grady for a few moments, because after his tremendous performances, particularly last year in the Tour de France and other big European events, it

was great to see Stuart ride the brilliant race he did here. I watched several stages and I was impressed by the way Stuart was always in command. He always looked as if he was racing very easily and he was always well positioned. Apart from being a marvellous athlete he is a brilliant tactician. He is never far from the front and never gets caught back at the tail of the field when there is a move up in front; and he was always in command as I saw him during the race. Stuart has gone back to Europe now and is preparing for the European season, culminating in the 1999 Tour de France in which I have no doubt he will star again. I think that as a young rider he will go even better than he did last year, when he held the yellow jersey for three days, won a stage and finished third in the final stage.

I also pay tribute to the police at this event. The police did a brilliant job as they have always done. I have liaised with them over the years during the *Mail* tour race and other major events. The police do a magnificent job, assist wherever they can and do more than they are paid to do, in my view. I also thank the Minister for Recreation and Sport (Hon. Iain Evans) for the assistance he gave. I led a delegation to see the Minister last year with a view to getting some legislative change to enable the roads to be managed in a better way to assist this and other bike races. The Minister organised some Road Traffic Act amendments which were passed in this House last year, and that helped enormously with the way the roads were managed during this event, and I thank the Minister for that. Phil Liggett, the number one cycle commentator in the world who comments during the Tour de France and other big races in Europe, made the comment that the organisation and the way the event was run was fabulous. Similar accolades have been given over the years to the Formula 1 Grand Prix and that augurs well for the V8 race coming up in a few weeks.

It proves once again that South Australia does things very well. We always have, and I am sure we always will. In South Australia we have a lot of disadvantages in the way in which we are geographically placed but, because of the way that South Australians get together—from Government down to sponsors and even the ordinary people who come out and support these events—we do it well. All these major events are very well organised and gain world acclaim. I would also like to comment on the boost that it gave the local economy. The event, which ran over a week, brought in an enormous number of people from interstate and overseas, and this must have been a great fillip to the local economy and proves again that we can do these things well.

I would like to congratulate everyone involved: the Government (for having the faith to back this event), the sponsors who took part, and all the officials and riders who made the event what it was. I particularly congratulate two people: one is the race Director, Mike Turtur. As has been noted, the former Olympic gold medallist did a great job. He has a lot of experience and directed the race in an impeccable manner. The other person I would like to thank is the former Minister, the Hon. Graham Ingerson (member for Bragg), who did much of the initial work to get this race up and running. I spoke to him at the stage finish in Gawler and he was very pleased with the event, so full credit to the former Minister.

In closing I would like to say that it was a great inaugural event and I hope that it will continue for many years to come and that we can resist any moves by Kennett and Premiers of other States to take it from us. I look forward to next year's race and say, 'Well done, South Australia.'

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): It is a real privilege for me to speak in this debate for many reasons, one in particular being that I had the privilege of being the Minister at the time of developing this from a very simple idea to the final event. Whilst I thank all members for their comments on my role, the real idea came from a think tank of people we called together after the loss of the Grand Prix in Adelaide; this idea of having a road race or special cycling event in South Australia was one of the major ideas that came from that. Bill Spurr (who is now the Chief Executive of the Tourism Commission) and John Heard (the then Chairman of this committee and also Chairman of Australian Major Events) were the people who really picked up this special cycling event and encouraged the board of Major Events and the Government to do a bit more work in this area.

One of the people who was involved very early in the event is former Australian Ron Webb, who has a very significant role with the Tour de France. He was a very good cyclist back in the early 1950s who went to Europe and became involved in the Tour de France. He acted as prime liaison between the Government of South Australia and the teams that were set up to run as part of the Tour de France. Very special mention needs to go to Mr Webb, because he has worked very hard behind the scenes to help the Government and the organisers get the event to South Australia. One other person who needs special mention, because it would not have happened without his support, is Michael Turtur who, as members would all know, is the manager of our velodrome and who was seconded to take over as the prime race organiser and controller of this event.

As we all know, Michael Turtur was a magnificent gold medallist, but what he has shown in this event is his ability not only to organise the event but also to be able to attract teams and people with whom he was directly involved at the time he was racing. Importantly, he has been able to keep long-term relationships with those teams since then and will, I believe, into the future. Whilst many accolades must go to many people, the role of Michael Turtur cannot be underrated. Again, we should also be proud of the fact that he is another South Australian who has not only been a world class athlete but is now becoming a world class organiser of events.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Okay, he comes from Port Adelaide, again! But Michael Turtur played a significant role. I would like to spend a little bit of time on the Major Events support team. When we lost Grand Prix there was much criticism from the media and the community generally that we would never be able to do anything again. One of the things that came from the Grand Prix was the formation of the Australian Major Events group. Bill Spurr and a whole range of other staff I will not name have now developed into what I and most people in this community would say was a world class group of people. That is something we ought to be proud of: that this group of young people—and they are all young people, both male and female—have come together to show again that we can do what we want to in South Australia if we have the idea and the opportunity.

I also put on record the fact that then Premier Dean Brown was very much involved in supporting me at Cabinet level to make sure that the finances were made available, and our current Premier (John Olsen) carried that on to make sure that this event occurred. This event has been covered by two Premiers and supported very strongly by both, and I think it important that the public of South Australia be aware that Cabinet at the highest level was very supportive of this event.

The competitors were fantastic. To get so many world class teams prepared to come and be part of the event is very special. I have been told that they all want to come back but that they want to do one other thing: they want to come a week earlier and bring their wives or partners so that they can see how good South Australia is and, in particular, how good our countryside is.

I do not think that any of them could believe that so close to a capital city you could have such diversified but magnificent countryside. I have been told that the hospitality they were given is nothing they have ever seen anywhere else in the world. And of course, that is what South Australia is all about, from a sporting and tourism potential.

I would also like to put on record the support that the member for Price and the member for Norwood directly gave to the event. It is good to see a bipartisan approach to these national and international events. As to the member for Price, in particular, whilst he was very modest earlier we know that he was a very good competitor in this field, and I thank him for the support that he gave behind the scenes to help Mike Turtur and others and to make sure that the event was bipartisan. I thank the member for Price for the support that he has given behind the scenes, because it is very important that in events like this there is very strong bipartisan support. There is absolutely no doubt that when we run good things here in South Australia we get magnificent community support.

I do not think I have seen so much support for an event, particularly after that first night with the little street run around Adelaide. To see so many people rushing down that final straight towards the East End of Adelaide brought back to me (as Minister involved with the last Grand Prix) some visions of that last Grand Prix. It really shows again how much support we as Governments can get for these special events here in South Australia. I was very proud to be a South Australian that night, but so was everyone else in the crowd—and that is very important. The tourism value is fantastic. We set out initially to try to get some international coverage, and in the end we had something like three hours of it. You cannot buy that in tourism dollars.

To be able to use the Sensational Adelaide theme and to continue that theme through, which was used in the last Grand Prix, has been very important for Adelaide in psychological and marketing terms. It has given us tremendous international coverage. I will be staggered if, next year, the event does not secure a very large European sponsor. It was mentioned earlier that not only did the police do a fantastic job but I think they also enjoyed it. They were happy to again be part of the community. I have never seen so many police motor patrols and cyclists so involved with the crowd.

That, in itself, is a tremendous public relations opportunity for the police because, in a policing sense, we do have the best police force. This event brought together the community role of the police, and that is quite fantastic in its own right. On behalf of the Parliament, I pass on to the police, through the Minister, our thanks for a fantastic job, not only in monitoring the event but also in being part of the community involvement. I had the privilege on the Friday, as the member for Price said, to be in one of the lead cars and follow the event through. I was quite staggered as the event passed through the Adelaide Hills—even though I was Minister for Tourism for some time—at some of the fantastic places you can visit.

When we reached the Barossa Valley and went past Lindsay Park, in which I have a special interest, that was even

more important. That day was really about Gawler and finishing at Gawler. The event started at Port Adelaide and finished at Gawler, and to see the people in the country areas being part of the event, I think, was quite fantastic. I congratulate every one involved in staging the event, particularly Bill Spurr and his staff at Australian Major Events. I congratulate all who have been involved and, as I said earlier, I am grateful for the support that has come from members on both sides of the House in making sure, again, that this State puts on not only the best event but a world class event for South Australians.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Lewis): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before I call the member for Lee, I would like to draw to the attention of the House two related matters: first, according to Standing Orders and the conventions of this place, remarks should be addressed through the Chair. Members should not use the first person pronoun 'I', 'mine' or 'we', or the second person pronoun 'you' or 'yours', but rather they should address their remarks to the Chair. If a member wishes to refer to an honourable member opposite, they should refer to that member by their title or, if a group of members in the Chamber have addressed remarks to the Chair, by using the third person pronoun 'they'. This has the effect of avoiding using pronouns as pejoratives in a heated debate which can raise the temperature rapidly in an accusative manner.

The other remark I wish to make is that, by using the names of individual members, we are again breaching the conventions of the Parliament. We should use the title of the member, if they hold a higher office in the Chamber, or the name of the electorate they represent. We are not here in our own right as people: we are here as representatives of the 20 000 people who elect us.

Ms WHITE: I rise on a point of order, Sir. You just said that we were not to use the first person pronoun.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The first person or second person pronoun.

Ms WHITE: How does one, such as the member for Taylor, address matters about herself without saying 'I'?

The ACTING SPEAKER: You can do that if it is referring to yourself, and to that extent I take the point the honourable member makes. However, using the second person pronoun is not an appropriate address because it becomes accusative if there is contention.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Mr Acting Speaker, if I have done that in the past, I apologise. I will use the correct form in future.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Unfortunately, I received only a 'C' for matriculation English but I will do my very best. The Tour Down Under was certainly a magnificent event, a superb event, and we should all be very proud of it. There is not a whole lot that I can say because members who have preceded me have gone into very eloquent detail about the success of the Tour Down Under and how people reacted to it. Of course, they have acknowledged various individuals who played a very vital role. I would like to congratulate the Government. It deserves to be congratulated because the Tour Down Under was a huge success for South Australia.

It was a very major event. The people involved with Major Events are to be congratulated because, quite obviously, the planning, hard work and sowing of seeds by Major Events and other people have proven to be extremely well worth the exercise and very successful. I also acknowledge the great work of Mike Turtur. He is certainly a leader in his field, as

has been acknowledged. He is also a great athlete in his own right but now, and in recent years for that matter, he is recognised as a very important administrator in the area of cycling. This concept, based upon the Tour de France, is certainly a winner and we look forward to its returning to South Australia.

The way that South Australians responded to this event was nothing short of magnificent. To all of the South Australians who responded to this event so strongly, I heartily offer my congratulations, because whether it be in the metropolitan or country areas—irrespective of where this event went—South Australians responded as one. They sent a very loud and clear message that they were going to support this event, and they supported it in droves. For those people who did not go to the Tour Down Under, they should make sure that they are there next year because they do not know what they missed out on.

Even for those who are not cyclists or who do not enjoy cycling, this is an event that certainly warrants and captures people's attention. It was fabulous to see the crowds that responded right through the metropolitan and country areas. I spoke to some of the people involved, and Mike Turtur and Michael Flynn, who works for Cycling Australia, were just amazed at the response they received from people in country towns such as Strathalbyn and Victor Harbor. They cited figures of the crowd response and just could not believe the turnout. It was something which, I think, excited all South Australians and which can only get bigger and better in subsequent years.

When I attended stage 1 of the event I saw the member for Price and other members of Parliament. There was a huge turnout. A couple of things struck me which I would like to share with the House. I attended stage 1 with my wife and our two children, Alexandra and Victoria, who are aged eight and six. I was very surprised that they focussed their attention on the event the whole time we were there. On alternating laps I had to put either Alexandra or Victoria onto my shoulders, but not for one moment were they not interested in the event. Every time the cyclists went past, the excitement in their eyes and voices surprised me, particularly at their age.

All of the people around us were feeling the same way. There was no way that our two daughters were going to leave that event before stage 1 finished. Even more than that, when it finished, Alexandra, our eldest daughter, said, 'There has to be more to this. There is more coming; I want to stay.' I am sure that young people respond in a very positive fashion to this event, which is fabulous. Cycling is a sport that we should encourage. South Australia has a lot of cyclists, particularly in the metropolitan area.

One has only to look around and see the number of people who use it as a form of sport and recreation to know that cycling is a very popular sport—and it is growing all the time. It is a very popular recreational pursuit. It is a very clean sport—and I am now talking about the activity; I am not referring to some of the drugs that are associated with cycling. That is not a topic to be discussed now; it is a separate issue. Cycling is a sport and a recreational pursuit that I believe we should encourage, and this is another way of doing that. This event is the showpiece of the sport, from the point of view of road racing, and what better way to encourage people to become involved in a very clean sport.

I also was delighted that the Port Adelaide Lighthouse was used as the starting point for Stage 4—a very important symbol for those in the north-western suburbs—and we had a great turnout at the Port Adelaide Lighthouse. The former

Minister and the member for Price have already spoken about the benefits for tourism. They are significant, and a very important component of our economy. The more we can do and the more we can encourage, the more we attract people to activities and events such as this and draw people into our State, the better we will all be for it. There were significant benefits for tourism and, obviously, the ripple effects that result in relation to employment and demand in various outlets throughout the State are extremely important.

I also congratulate Stuart O'Grady—who, of course, was the winner. Stuart is an impeccable athlete. At a recent dinner for the Lindy Awards I had the good fortune to sit next to Charlie Walsh, and he told me that Stuart O'Grady is a super athlete—in fact, he rates him, along with Kelly, as one of the two best cyclists that he has ever coached. That is an enormous wrap. He also told me that Stuart O'Grady will not touch drugs—will not even go near them. He also said that, unfortunately, in the current climate, due to the way some athletes and some teams are able to work around the rules, the only thing that would stop Stuart O'Grady from becoming a gold medal winner, or winning an event as big as the Tour de France, is that he does not take drugs and other athletes do. What a shame it would be if his career were to finish on that note. He has a long way to go, and let us hope that the sport is able to clean up its act with respect to some teams being involved with drugs. If there is a downside to an event such as the Tour de France (I am not talking about the Tour Down Under) and most elite athletes in the cycling world, it is, unfortunately, that drugs are involved.

All South Australians are to be congratulated for their support for this magnificent event, as is the Government. The former Minister is to be acknowledged for his role, and all the more credit to the people who were involved in making sure that this was a winner for South Australia.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I add my congratulations to the organisers, the sponsors and, very importantly, the competitors in the Tour Down Under. I am a cyclist myself. I cycle as a means of transport, for relaxation and pleasure and, when I am in a particularly competitive mood, to beat my friends at something.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms WHITE: The Minister wouldn't take me on, because I would beat him, too. The Tour Down Under was a successful and very exciting event, and it is the sort of event that I throw my full support behind. I attended a couple of the stages of the event, and they were very exciting. I attended along with other South Australians; I did not receive an official invitation. I am a little disappointed about that, and I ask the Government whether I can have an official invitation next year, because I quite liked the calibre of talent that we had in Adelaide for the event—and I am referring to the cyclists and not all those hangers-on who were putting on very bad Italian and German accents in the nightclubs trying to impress the girls.

Mr Hill: What were you doing in a nightclub?

Ms WHITE: Trying to meet the cyclists, of course. So, next year I hope that the Government will invite me, because I would like to be part of more of the festivities. My very capable colleague the shadow Minister for Sport, Recreation and Tourism mentioned that cycling is a clean living sport. I do not know about that language, but it is a very healthy sport, or recreational pastime and, as a member of one of the cycling organisations—Bicycle SA—I know that a lot is done to promote that aspect of cycling. We have a very good

network of bicycle tracks around the State. I hope that we will continue to improve that network because, in comparison with other States, we have some very beautiful cycling tracks along the Torrens and in other areas that are within easy reach of the centre of Adelaide. I like to put my bicycle in the back of the car and travel all over the place to go on rides with various cycling clubs—and the participation in South Australia amongst cyclists in these sorts of activities is quite significant. Of course, I am sure that all members of the House like to consider very carefully their fellow South Australians when cyclists are on the roads.

To Stuart O'Grady, the winner of the inaugural Tour Down Under, I pay particular tribute. It was a magnificent feat and it just goes to show what home-grown talent can do. During a couple of the stages of the event I was accompanied by some young children and I was surprised, given that we do not really have a lot of media coverage of cycling in South Australia—or, I suppose, in Australia generally—at how these young children of five, six and seven knew quite a lot of the cyclists' names and what they looked like. They were quite the little fans. I found that to be the case not only with the children who accompanied me but with quite a lot of the children of Adelaide who attended the event. The interest is there, so I hope that the Government gets the message that we could do with more events in this sport and greater support of cycling from Government.

Finally, I wish to say a quick word about Major Events and the Tourism Commission. It was a job well done. It was good thinking in the first place to attract an event such as this in a sport where we have not had a huge number of events. It was a success, and I hope that it encourages the Tourism Commission to plan many more events such as the Tour Down Under.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I also support the motion. I commend the police officers who were escorts during parts of the race. I was standing on Grand Junction Road outside the shopping centre with many people from the community when the police came along waving, with their sirens on and lights flashing, which really enthused the crowd. The children were very appreciative of it and were drawn into the excitement of the event. So, I very highly commend the police for their community spirit and thank them for that. The people who I was standing with were very pleased with them and commented on the fact that they became so involved with it. So, I thank the police, on behalf of those who were standing alongside me.

Motion carried.

RING CYCLE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.C. Wotton:

That this House congratulates the State Opera of South Australia and the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra on their superb presentation and Australia's first full scale production of Richard Wagner's *Ring* cycle and further congratulates the Government and in particular the Minister for the Arts on the significant vision and support provided to enable the staging of this magnificent production in Adelaide.

(Continued from 26 November. Page 451.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): It was so long ago that I brought this motion before the House that I have just about forgotten what I said, but I certainly have not forgotten the performance. Certainly, we are talking about my desire—and I hope that of the House—to congratulate the State Opera of South Australia and the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra on

their superb presentation of Richard Wagner's *Ring* cycle. Much has been said in the media since that performance and I want to speak only briefly in further support of this resolution. I mentioned the support of the State Government and, in particular, the Minister for the Arts, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, because, if it had not been for that support and particularly the support of the Minister, the *Ring* cycle would not have taken place in South Australia.

I certainly recognise that some five years had elapsed between the time when the idea to stage the *Ring* in Adelaide was first discussed and the actual performances. I also recognise that it has been one of the country's most important cultural events. Much mention has been made of the contribution to the economy coming out of that event, but I can say that the economic contribution has exceeded the original estimation of benefit to South Australia of some \$14 million. It has been very worthwhile as far as that is concerned; it has been extremely worthwhile in putting Adelaide on the map; and, more importantly, it has been very worthwhile in giving recognition to the State Opera Company and to the South Australian Symphony Orchestra.

I commend particularly Stephen Phillips, who is the Managing Director of the cycle, and also William Gillespie, who was the artistic director. Both have made significant contributions. Both have been quoted at length in support of the State Opera Company and the Symphony Orchestra. We were extremely fortunate to have Jeffrey Tate in South Australia for the duration of the performance and for some time prior to that during rehearsals. Overall, the performance was absolutely superb.

I do not think we hear enough in this place about the importance of the arts in South Australia, particularly in regard to the State Opera and the South Australian Symphony Orchestra. The orchestra was founded as a radio ensemble in 1936. It performed its first public concerts in 1937 and now each year more than 100 concerts take place in Adelaide and South Australian country centres. The Symphony Orchestra is enormously versatile with programs ranging from great classics, family concerts and popular outdoor events to contemporary music programs. The ASO has a strong commitment to education, and every year thousands of young South Australians experience a live orchestral performance with concerts aimed at preschoolers through to secondary students. I know that members of my family have enjoyed those performances and have learned considerably as a result.

As I said in the brief comments I made when I originally moved this motion, one of the most exciting things about the performance was not just the superb music and the production but also the enjoyment that was gained by people from throughout the world who came to Adelaide to experience the *Ring* cycle in South Australia. For instance, the people sitting in front of us had come from Munich to Adelaide specifically for the production and the people sitting behind us had come from South Africa. As I said earlier in the contribution, it was exciting, when the bells rang and people were invited to go back into the auditorium, that the notice was provided in three different languages, recognising the importance of those who were visiting South Australia at that time.

I am sure that the House will join with me in congratulating the State Opera of South Australia, the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra and all those who were involved. Again, I particularly recognise the Minister for the Arts because of the significant vision and support that she provided to enable the staging of this magnificent production in Adelaide.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I am very pleased to support the motion moved by the member for Heysen. In the couple of minutes I have available, I will make a few brief comments. It was Australia's first, full scale production of Richard Wagner's *Ring* cycle. I was very pleased on a personal level that the member for Heysen was able to attend and enjoy this great event. I know that the honourable member thoroughly enjoyed it and it was great that he was able to attend even though it was a parliamentary sitting week. The honourable member mentioned the number of interstate and overseas visitors who attended. Once again, this shows that South Australia is more than capable of organising and running important events in a world class manner.

Due to time constraints, I will finish off by saying that it was a great event, which was very well run by South Australia, as is usual for these sorts of events. As were the Tour Down Under and the Formula One Grand Prix, this event was very well organised and conducted, and it was great that it was so successful. It will also have an impact on the local economy with regard to tourism in that people who came to Adelaide and liked the place will come back later to have a further look at our great State. Congratulations to the State Opera, Arts SA, the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra and Australian Major Events. Once again, I say, 'Well done South Australia.'

Motion carried.

JET SKIS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hill:

That this House calls on the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning to prepare regulations for submission to the Governor in Executive Council under the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993—

- (a) that provide for the regulation, restriction or prohibition of motorised jet skis in specified waters within 1 kilometre of the seashore adjacent to metropolitan Adelaide and other coastal cities and towns in the State;
- (b) that take into account the views of local government councils that have areas adjoining those waters to ensure that appropriate regulations, restrictions or prohibitions are in place to protect public safety and to allow the public to enjoy the beaches without unreasonable disruption or disturbance; and
- (c) that provide appropriate exemptions for jet skis used by surf life saving clubs,

which Mr Lewis has moved to amend; in paragraph (a), by inserting the word 'or' after the word 'regulation', by leaving out the words 'or prohibition', by leaving out the word '1 kilometre' and inserting the word '200 metres', by leaving out the words 'other coastal cities and towns in the State' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'specified off-river areas along the Murray River'; and in paragraph (b) by inserting the word 'or' after the word 'regulations', by leaving out the words 'or prohibitions'; and in paragraph (c) by leaving out the word 'appropriate' and inserting after the word 'clubs' the words 'and in other appropriate cases'.

(Continued from 26 November. Page 454.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): A lot has transpired since this motion was moved originally and the amendment was proposed by the member for Hammond. The member for Karna would be aware that the Minister introduced regulations under the Harbors and Navigation Act in December to endeavour to bring in some restrictions in relation to the use of jet skis—or, as they are referred to in the regulations, personal water craft (PWCs). The Minister makes very clear that these regulations are an interim measure to see how they operate during this summer. Therefore, they have been

limited to the metropolitan beaches—basically from Outer Harbor to the southern end of Sellicks Beach and 200 metres seaward of the high water mark—and also to all creeks, tributaries, lakes, lagoons and other bodies of water connected to the Murray River between the border of South Australia and a line joining the upstream sides of the landings used by the ferry at Wellington, with one exception.

Therefore, I believe it is appropriate that this House allow the Minister to see how things have progressed over this summer. In fact, in about two weeks, summer will be officially over—not that that means that water sports will be over, as they will probably go on for another couple of months. As the member for Kaurna has pointed out to this House, there is no doubt that there are concerns about the use of jet skis and restrictions do need to apply, but I believe that the Minister, by the introduction of regulations in December, is seeking to have this matter addressed and, as she indicates, there will be further consideration of what needs to be done for the summer of 1999-2000. It is important that this House does not leave things in abeyance during that time.

The Minister should be congratulated for having sought to bring in the regulations and waiving the four month delay in operation, which is one of the restrictions that can apply these days because of the comments of the Legislative Review Committee.

Debate adjourned.

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

WOMEN'S STUDY RESOURCE CENTRE

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to maintain a level of funding to the Women's Study Resource Centre for the purpose of retaining the coordinator position was presented by Ms White.

Petition received.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 218 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to fund intensive care facilities at the Noarlunga Hospital was presented by Mr Hill.

Petition received.

PARINGA, FILTERED WATER

A petition signed by 398 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to fund the provision of a filtered water supply to the Riverland township of Paringa was presented by Mrs Maywald.

Petition received.

WATER OUTSOURCING

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Yesterday, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked three questions without notice which continue to imply some impropriety in the contractual arrangements under the water outsourcing contract for the provision of capital works. The Deputy Leader's questions

assert that the original request for proposal prohibited the successful bidder from undertaking the design work on capital projects and that, by awarding such work to United Water, the Government is breaching such a condition.

Such a claim is inaccurate, which is, of course, unfortunate for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The variation to the contract, which seems to cause the Deputy Leader such concern, deals with what could be called the allocation of design work, and the request for proposal is absolutely clear on this point. Not only was there explicit provision for design work to be carried out by the successful bidder but the request for proposal, which went to both successful and unsuccessful tenderers, specifically requested all bidders to submit proposals for the utilisation of existing design expertise.

While I do not intend to bore the House with extensive references to the text of the request for proposal—and, indeed, its commercially in confidence nature would constrain me in any case—I will refer to a couple of supporting statements contained in the RFP document, namely:

SA Water may consent to you performing engineering design for certain projects.

And:

Current capabilities include. . . Water and waste water engineering, including capabilities in investigations, planning, process design and specialist disciplines. . . Please submit your proposals as to how these capabilities could be developed and utilised in the best interests of the SA Water industry.

I repeat the statements I made earlier this week. Design work was envisaged in the request for proposal, a broad agreement on its application was documented at the time that the outsourcing contract was signed, the finer details of that agreement were then negotiated and the variation to the contract was subsequently approved. I submit that it is both dangerous and pointless for the Opposition to continue to raise such unfounded allegations without an understanding of the facts, particularly in the face of my ministerial statement earlier this week.

I would suggest to members of the Opposition that, if they have a copy of the water contract, as they persistently claim, they should read it.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Industry and Trade (Hon. I.F. Evans)—

Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee—Report, 1997-98.

QUESTION TIME

NATIONAL POWER

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier inform the House of the nature, the extent and the results of the probity audit conducted by the Government on the British electricity company, National Power, before it was selected by the Government to build and operate a power station at Pelican Point?

National Power has been persistently criticised for its business and consumer dealings in a series of reports by Britain's Office of Electricity Regulation. In January 1999, the Government power watchdog criticised generating companies, including National Power, for charging too much for electricity by manipulating the system. Last year, following similar claims, there was a major inquiry that was

most critical of National Power. Last week, the Law Lords in the British Court of Appeal unanimously found that National Power and another company, National Grid, acted unlawfully in taking hundreds of millions of pounds in surpluses from the Electricity Supply Pension Scheme to pay for voluntary redundancies and to reduce future liabilities.

According to the Murdoch newspaper *The Times*, pensioners who accused the electricity industry of illegally raiding pension funds have won a legal battle worth several billion dollars in a ruling expected to benefit 200 000 pensioners. Will the Premier, remembering the water outsourcing contract, publicly release his probity report on National Power?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Here we go again. Here is a company that has come to South Australia to invest \$400 million without a cent of taxpayers' money being put into this project. Is this not the pattern of Opposition members? Regarding any company that comes to South Australia, they will pick on it and put it through the wringer, and they will try to drive away future private sector investment in this State. We saw it with EDS and with the outsourcing of the water contract, and we are seeing it with National Power. National Power's commitment to South Australia is not only a \$400 million development, which saves the taxpayers of South Australia in meeting peaking demand in the period 2000-2001, but also it has paid South Australians for the right to come here in a very good bid. Not one cent of taxpayers' money is exposed in this.

What do we get at the end of the day? We get a competitive marketplace. Instead of the ETSA monopoly, we have in South Australia a private sector company generating, when completed, up to 500 megawatts of capacity and feeding into a national electricity market to give competitive bids and prices to the public of South Australia—commercial, industrial and, eventually, household. It is giving a choice, the freedom of choice, to South Australians from whom they purchase their power, to put in place a competitive bid to bring down the price of power. That is what has been achieved by this Administration.

In relation to probity questions and the checks, of course those checks took place. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Treasurer in another place and ask him to respond specifically to the question. But I appeal to the Opposition: get off the back of any company that invests in South Australia. We know what its objective is. It has a baseline objective. It wants to stall the economy of South Australia for base political purposes at the next ballot box. That is what it is on about. I can assure the Opposition that the electorate is listening, because the Opposition is still stuck on 34 per cent primary vote—the same as in 1993.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for flouting the Chair.

STATE EXPORTS

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Can the Premier outline the significance of this week's ABS figures on South Australia's overseas exports? I understand that the trade figures covering the first six months of the 1998-99 financial year to the end of December—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Elder.

Mrs PENFOLD:—are now available and that they show another excellent performance by the State's exporters.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I thank the member for Flinders for her question, because it has direct relevance to product coming out of the sea next to her electorate and the further investment that is being made in the aquaculture industry in the seat of Flinders. The ABS figures released this week show that 1998 was this State's best ever year for exports and we as a Government for five years now have had a focus on developing South Australia as an exporting State in this nation.

Last year, we exported \$5.113 billion worth of goods. In the six months to December, South Australia's exports grew by 5.4 per cent compared with the same period in the previous year, that is, \$2.64 billion. During this period, Australia's exports overall in goods and services grew by 1.7 per cent, so South Australia grew three times the national average in exports. Our export performance in recent years has consistently led the nation. These latest figures show it continuing to do so.

The State's export performance and its likely continuation—as a Government we will be giving policy support and facilitating the export effort, even if the Opposition is opposed to that—was recognised last month by the respected independent forecaster Econtech, which predicted that in the 1998-99 year as a whole South Australia's exports would grow by 6.5 per cent, the highest of any State, while Australia's exports overall would not grow at all. No growth in Australia but 6.5 per cent growth in South Australia, which means that we are leading by far every other State in Australia.

This performance comes despite the impact of the Asian crisis. While exports to Asia dropped in the six months to December, successful diversification of markets has more than made up for this in markets such as the Middle East, up 120 per cent; New Zealand, up 19 per cent; and the European Community, up 2 per cent. South Australia now exports to more countries than any other State in Australia. That is something of which we ought be proud. In terms of commodities—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will come back to the member for Peake in a minute. In terms of commodities, it is particularly significant that agricultural and fisheries exports grew 11 per cent in the six month period, wine exports went up another 19 per cent on top of over 40 per cent growth in 1997-98, and fish and aquaculture exports increased by 22 per cent. That is a very significant effort and it is having great economic input, with activity and job creation, as a bottom line, in country and regional areas of South Australia.

Much of the 22 per cent growth in aquaculture derives from the success of the Port Lincoln tuna industry. That is the multimillion dollar industry that the Opposition was doing its best to sabotage earlier this week by spreading stories about disease and imported pilchards. This big increase in food and agricultural exports shows the impact that the Government's Food for the Future plan is already having. This excellent export performance and the quick response in diversifying markets to minimise the impact of the Asian crisis is a tribute to the State's exporters. It shows a strength of entrepreneurial spirit in the State and what our businesses can achieve with the right Government policies locked in behind them.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There he goes again. I wonder if the member for Peake is one of those who is joining the

4.30 faction leaders meeting of the Labor Party this afternoon. I do not have an agenda for the meeting, but I wonder whether the member for Peake will be there. I wonder where it will be held. I am not quite sure whether it will be in a telephone box with the members for Elder and Hart, or whether the conference room has been booked because the Labor Party has got so many factions now that they will all turn up to the meeting!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: If the Leader wants to bring in some of his interstate colleagues, I am more than happy to remind him of what Bob Carr was reported as saying in the paper today, namely, that he had had a gutful. He said:

I have had enough of the Labor organisation. If I could press a button and get rid of the whole [expletive deleted] lot of them, I would.

Bob Carr, Premier of New South Wales, said that about their privatisation policy of New South Wales's power assets! Yesterday, Theophanous—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interjection on my right.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: They are a little livelier today; they are starting to catch up, Mr Speaker. Yesterday, Mr Theophanous in Victoria was turfed off the Victorian front bench because he said that Labor needed a new direction.

Mr CLARKE: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The Premier will resume his seat.

Mr CLARKE: I draw your attention, Sir, to Standing Order 98, in the forlorn hope that the Premier might actually address the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! As long as the Premier sticks to a factual reply, he can continue. I have no control—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not need assistance, either, from the member for Schubert. As long as he keeps to a factual reply, the Premier can continue.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The relevance of this question is that our exports are breaking all records. We are beating every other State in Australia.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I know that the member for Peake does not like us outperforming every other State in Australia and creating jobs, but this is about policies, this is about having a direction. I am quoting from eminent Labor Leaders interstate who want a direction for the Labor Party, but they are not getting it, much the same problem as we have in South Australia. Look what they did to Terry Cameron! He had a policy direction and they turfed him out. Then we have No Policy Pat. I was very interested to watch the Channel 9 news last night.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on another point of order. I draw your attention again, Sir, to Standing Order 98, in the forlorn hope that for the second time the Premier might answer the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. The Premier is straying into debate. I steer him back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I know that I have not talked about the member for Ross Smith, but I will include him in an answer if he wants so he does not feel left out. What we are on about is policy direction for South Australia's future,

and the vacuum that exists on the other side. We have a policy direction, which the ABS figures clearly point up, with benefits being reaped by South Australians in terms of jobs, versus an Opposition which wants to target any company that invests in this State and which is not interested in policy development as an alternative. The channel 9 news showed that last night. The member for Elder said that he had been here such a short time that he was still learning how to sit down and stand up and when he had to do it. That is called musical chairs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

Mr ATKINSON: My point of order is that the Premier is straying from the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. I ask the Premier—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for the second time for flouting the authority of the Chair. I ask the Premier to keep to the facts and wind up his response.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Exports are important and I would like the Labor Party—the Opposition—to start focusing on some policy direction and alternatives. Musical chairs are one thing. It depends when the music stops which seat you are in.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is starting to flout the Chair. I ask the Premier to come back to the substance of his reply or I will be forced to withdraw leave.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The diversification of our economy into export markets in the future has enabled us to attract a range of new private sector companies into this State. I have demonstrated how, over a range of economic indicators, South Australia is clearly outperforming other States of Australia. We have achieved that through the strength of the entrepreneurial spirit of individual small and medium businesses in this State and what our businesses can achieve with the right Government policies underpinning them.

However, they deserve some wholehearted, bipartisan support if we are to continue this momentum to ensure that we expand our markets, get new investment and create jobs in South Australia. Targeted market development assistance, overseas trade trips that help build personal links between South Australia and overseas buyers and the expansion of the overseas offices network are all having an important influence on the State's export effort. It is encouraging to have the Federal Department of Trade acknowledge South Australia's efforts in its overseas offices, its trade missions, its targeted assistance and its focus on the export market, and it should be an example to other States of Australia. These things just do not happen: they are a result of deliberate policy. They are a result of bringing major international companies such as EDS, Company Generale des Eaux, Thames Water, North West Water, Motorola and National Power—these companies coming into South Australia—

Mr WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Premier is clearly flouting your ruling. For how long will he be able to answer this question?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. Under Standing Orders, if the Premier moves into debate, he will be pulled up. He was pulled up, and he has been directed back into a factual reply. Other than that, the Chair has no ability

under a Standing Order to constrain the Premier on the length of his reply, provided he sticks to facts.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I understand why the Opposition does not like good positive news for South Australia. It is an indication that five to six years of solid policy work by a Liberal Government is starting to demonstrate clear and positive rewards for South Australia and, importantly, it will bring about job creation for South Australians. Exports are a key to economic growth and job creation. The policy is working. We will continue to do that, because this State's exports have risen 36 per cent in the life of this Government. I and colleagues on this side of the House happen to be proud of that record and that achievement. It stands in stark contrast to the no-policy vacuum of the Opposition in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling for the next question, I direct my remarks to the member for Mitchell and other members. The use of private mobile telephones in this Chamber is simply not on. If members wish to use their private mobile telephones, they are requested to go to the lobby at the rear of the Chamber.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Given your statement on 3 December 1998 that any recommendations from the clinical services review would still have to be considered against community needs and services, will you now rule out closing the maternity services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? On 3 December 1998, the Minister issued a statement headed 'Assurance given on obstetric services.' The statement said that suggestions that maternity services would be closed at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital were 'alarmist and irresponsible' and were causing 'unnecessary alarm to expectant mothers and their families'. The clinical review into the obstetric services plan, released by the Minister this week, recommends that maternity services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital be closed.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What the honourable member did not read was the fact that I gave an assurance that the obstetric services would continue until the end of 1999. She did not bother to read that part.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That's right. What the Opposition, and in particular the member for Elizabeth, was saying publicly is that women who were already pregnant and expecting a birth would not be able to go to the hospital into which they had booked. That is what she was saying at the beginning of December. I indicated that a clinical review was under way. I find this interesting because I think the honourable member was there earlier this week saying that she did not know about the clinical review. Now she acknowledges the fact that at the beginning of December I was talking about the clinical reviews being carried out, including obstetrics. As I indicated at the time, the clinical review was under way. I knew the clinical review would have to go to the board, staff and others involved with an interest in this. We made a conscious decision to give a guarantee to anyone in the western suburbs who was expecting to use the obstetric services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that they would be able to go ahead and use those. We gave no guarantee beyond the end of 1999.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That's right, because we knew the clinical review was under way. All I would ask—as

I said in the House the other day—is that the honourable member, who purports to represent the Opposition in health issues, have the decency to allow the clinicians—the people who want to make sure that they maintain quality standards—to have their say and for their recommendations to be heard by the appropriate bodies, including the board of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Mr Foley: Shame, shame, shame!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There is no shame in this, because it was the Labor Government in 1986 that was urged by Uhrig to have a look at clinical issues in planning metropolitan hospitals, and in 1986 it rejected that.

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Opposition is doing the very thing that I know a lot of the specialists themselves are concerned about, that is, taking a clinical review—a review carried out by the doctors, the specialists, the very people who are concerned about the quality of care and the quality of delivery of health services in this State—and trying to turn it into a political football. That reflects sadly indeed on the Opposition. The clinical reviews are there. I have given the honourable member a copy of those reviews. I ask her to do the decent thing for the medical specialists who drafted those reviews and now allow them to be considered in an appropriate way without bringing in cheap politics, as she is now attempting to do.

OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise the House of the benefits to South Australia of the 2000 Olympics?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: South Australia is showing the way regarding how a community and State can benefit through not only community but also business involvement in the Sydney 2000 Olympics. I note figures released this week by Miss Frost from the SOCOG General Manager of Communications and Community Relations of the Sydney organising committee. She claims that South Australia has already won about \$20 million worth of business in relation to pre-olympic training. I am sure that that will interest the member for Ross Smith, because the member for Elder is undertaking an extensive preolympic training program, out running every morning over the Christmas period, mainly over in Ross Smith, rounding up members just in case opportunities arise! I am sure the extensive Olympic program that the member for Elder has undertaken will be of interest to the member for Ross Smith.

Also, the figures revealed that the Olympic contracts achieved by the Sydney office in relation to business for South Australia is about \$26 million. On top of that, they have also picked up non-olympic related business to the tune of about \$43 million. As the article in the paper revealed, it is about an \$80 million bonanza for South Australian businesses and the business community which, of course, is good news. The types of products that are being used in the Olympics that are coming to South Australia might interest the member for Peake; for example, retractable seating, Symonite panelling, tiles, tree grates, electrical accessories and automation systems, relocatable housing, drink dispensers, trees, stormwater pipe and, of course, the Olympic gold rose licence.

Outside the Olympics, the South Australian Government Sydney office has also picked up some significant contracts such as toilet partitions, steel formwork, and a significant amount of work in relation to the precast concrete industry. And, as the member for Schubert has quite rightly pointed out, Vili's has its pies, pasties and cakes contract to the tune of about \$15 million. So, a significant amount of business has been generated within the South Australian community through our involvement in the Sydney Olympics.

Of course, the Prepared To Win program has been operating for some time. Some 18 countries will come to South Australia between now and the Olympics to use the South Australian facilities to train for the Olympics. Of course, we hope to be able to announce that more countries will use our facilities in the near future. In answer to the honourable member's question, South Australia will certainly benefit to a significant extent from the Olympics, and I encourage other businesses to take the opportunity to look at how they can benefit from the Olympics as well.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is again directed to the Minister for Human Services. Following the announcement of the Government's plan to close the maternity and cardiac services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, will the Minister tell the House why the western suburbs community should lose these services and how, for example, women having babies or elderly people with heart conditions and no private transport will access alternative services not located in the western suburbs?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Could the honourable member re-read her question so that I hear it fully.

The SPEAKER: Will the member for Elizabeth please re-read the question.

Ms STEVENS: With pleasure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Can we have some silence in the Chamber on both sides.

Ms STEVENS: Thank you, Sir. Following the announcement of the Government's plan to close the maternity and cardiac services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, will the Minister tell the House why the western suburbs community should lose these services and how, for example, women having babies or elderly people with heart conditions and no private transport will access alternative services not located in the western suburbs? On 15 February it was announced that, after a series of secret reviews, services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be cut—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to have this explanation being repeated as well.

Ms STEVENS: The report said:

A gradual erosion of services at the QEH will see the maternity section close first.

Further:

... the maternity closure will be followed by a concentration of cardiac care services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Today in this House the Minister refused to rule out closing the maternity section of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital but restated that he had previously given no guarantee after 1999—one year.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I heard very well the first time, but I just wanted to make sure that every member of the House heard very clearly the introduction to that question: 'following the announcement'. Every member of this House knows that that is an untrue statement—absolutely untrue. The honourable member knows it is an untrue statement. I pick up another point that she mentioned. She talked about the 'secret review', to use her words. Only five or 10 minutes ago the honourable member claimed that she knew at the beginning of December about these clinical reviews. Were they secret or were they not secret? The honourable member knew about them. They had been given publicity back in early December, late November. That is exactly what generated the story back at the beginning of December: not that they were secret but the fact that they were out there and staff at the hospital were commenting on them.

Of course, the honourable member's final claim in the question was that a few moments ago I 'refused to rule out'. How do you match my statement that I 'refused to rule out', which means that no decision has yet been made, with her opening statement of, 'following the announcement'?

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order. Sir, as you know only too well, the Minister should address his comments to the Chair—not to the backbench.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. That is a frivolous point of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I highlight for you, Sir, the fact that the honourable member used the phrase that I had failed to 'rule out' a few moments ago and yet she said in her opening comments, 'following the announcement'—that obstetric services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital would close.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Peake.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It highlights how inaccurate and how loose with her comments the honourable member has now become in being willing to stand up and throw any accusation—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member is willing to stand up and throw any accusation across this Chamber to gain a cheap political point. She knows—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Elizabeth for the second time for flouting the authority of the Chair.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member for Elizabeth knows—because I told her when I handed her the clinical reviews the other day; I have given her all four copies—the process and that they are open for public comment. In fact, the honourable member raised the point as to whether three, four or five weeks would be long enough and wanted to make sure that there was adequate time for public comment. So, how can the honourable member possibly make statements like that and then stand up and claim that we have already announced the closure of obstetrics. In fact, if you look at my statement to the media last Monday, I reasserted the fact that no decisions have been made and that obstetrics would continue at Queen Elizabeth Hospital at least until the end of 1999—if not beyond.

The honourable member knows—because she was on the radio at the same time and came in and commented after I had commented (I think it was on ABC or 5AA on Monday morning)—that it will take some considerable time even to implement any of the recommendations that are finally made

out of the clinical reviews. My concern is this: that the public hospital system in metropolitan Adelaide needs a clear vision and picture about where it is heading over the next 20 years. It is wrong for every one of the public hospitals to believe that they can become world class specialists in every single area, especially with the hi-tech nature of medicine today.

I am prepared to provide the honourable member with television coverage of what, for instance, one of the specialists said on television the other night, that with the high cost of equipment today and the very specialised nature of some of these areas today you cannot possibly expect to maintain the standards right across every metropolitan hospital in Adelaide. Therefore, it is logical to have some idea about where you want this to be in 10, 15 or 20 years in terms of where the demand is in the metropolitan area and where the specialist services can best be rationalised. I might add that, if you look at most of those services, they are talking about making sure it is available to the south for the broader metropolitan area and the central part of Adelaide and then in the north. That is a very rational decision, because much of the growth in metropolitan Adelaide is occurring, whether we like it or not, in the south and in the north. Once again I ask, first, that the member for Elizabeth only use fact and not stand up and misquote me—

Ms STEVENS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask that the Minister address the question, which was: how will mothers or elderly people with heart problems access alternative services?

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order at this stage, but I would ask the Minister to come back to his reply. I also point out that we have only had five questions so far and we are more than halfway through Question Time. I encourage Ministers to shorten their replies if they can.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I ask simply that the honourable member stick to the facts, that she allow the public discussion and decisions to be made on the clinical reviews and that that be allowed to go through the due process which any reasonable person who had a concern about health care would allow to occur.

TOURISM, MAJOR EVENTS

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister for Tourism advise what action the Government is taking to ensure that its investment in major events is encouraging more tourists to our State and generating increased economic activity?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The Leader obviously does not like the question. I always thought my questions about tourism—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will give his question and explanation, or I will withdraw leave.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: As a former Minister for Tourism, I am surprised he is not here.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is flouting the authority of the Chair. He will get on with his explanation or I will withdraw leave.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: The recent Tour Down Under international cycling event highlighted how successful major events in South Australia can be. Given the full calendar of events scheduled for the autumn period, will the Minister explain how we are ensuring their success not only as major events but also from the tourism perspective?

The Hon. J. HALL: I thank the member for Bragg for his question and I also thank him on behalf of so many of us for the enormous contribution he made to the benefits that South Australia is now reaping from a vast array of major events. I am delighted to inform the House on how significant the economic activity is that has been generated from a number of these major events. At last count, 56 major events have been or are being staged in 1998-99 and are being supported through Major Events, through the special events and festivals program and the regional and strategic sports programs. These events are estimated to generate around \$46 million worth of economic benefit to South Australia and are estimated to attract around 18 800 visitors to our State during this financial year alone.

I am sure the House will be interested to know that AME has secured and has indicated support for a number of future events to be held in 1999-2000 and the years beyond and the current projected economic impact of that is \$44 million plus. The House I am sure would be pleased to know that since 1994, when AME became an entity, it has generated in excess of \$153 million in economic activity and has also promoted our beloved State as an event and quality tourist destination to a potential worldwide audience of some 950 million people through free to air, pay television and other media across the world.

A primary component between the linking of our major events activities and the Tourism Commission is to ensure that we target the right events to ensure that we attract maximum tourist numbers to South Australia, thereby ensuring we get maximum economic benefit. The latest activity (and I am delighted to read from a couple of bits of it, as I will forward this rather stunning A4 full colour brochure to all members of the House) shows that we have actually turned the corner in terms of marketing expertise because it invites more than 100 000 people to visit South Australia through autumn. Whilst it particularly targets the Oakbank Easter Carnival, the Barossa Vintage Festival and Sensational Adelaide 500—

Mr CLARKE: On a point of order, Sir, I draw your attention to Standing Order 107:

Ministerial statement

A Minister, by leave of the House and so as not to interrupt any other business, may make a statement relating to matters of Government policy or public affairs.

It is about time some of these Government Ministers used Standing Order 107 instead of using up Question Time.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order in this case, but while there is a lull, I ask that, while the Minister is reading from the publication, she not use it as display material in the House.

The Hon. J. HALL: Of course I would not dream of using it as display material as I will forward a copy to all members. One of the lines that would be of interest to a number of members is that it says, after it has promoted the three particular events, that if those three events are not enough there is also the Coober Pedy Opal Festival, the Glendi Greek Festival, the Port Lincoln Cup, the Wooden Boat Festival and many more. It is important to understand quite what event-based tourism is doing to help the economy of our State. I would have thought that the member for Ross Smith and a number of his colleagues would have been quite proud of it. This brochure is important because it is one of the first times that there has been such a coordinated and professional approach to packaging our State as a quality destination. Whilst it might irritate some members of the

Opposition, it is important that they understand some of the enormous effort that is going in across the tourism sector generally to promote this State to South Australia, interstate and internationally, and I urge them to take some pride in what the commission and the industry is doing.

YOUTH AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Ms KEY (Hanson): My question is directed to the Minister for Youth. What skills, attributes and experience were required by the Minister when assessing suitable persons to undertake the review into the funding arrangements for the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia (YACSA, as it is known). Given the revelations made on the radio this morning, was the Minister aware at the time of the appointment of the three person independent review committee that a member was also a member of the Minister's own Liberal Party branch? The Minister claimed on radio this morning that the review is independent and completely at arm's length from him. However, the Opposition has been advised that the Minister suggested to the Multicultural Youth Network on 5 February this year that, if it was unhappy with the performance of YACSA, it should put in a submission to the review and that the Minister would consider redirecting some of the funding currently allocated to YACSA to them.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I have much pleasure in answering this question.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Elder for the second time.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Education will come to order.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The answer is 'absolutely' and 'yes'. I have never ruled out anybody from being on the committee with which I have been associated because they were a member of the Labor Party—I am told I have appointed such people—nor because they were a member of the Democrats—and again I am told I have appointed such people—and I categorically refuse to rule out people of talent merely because they happen to have a political view which is not congruent with my own.

To the substance of the question, when I became Minister for Youth I was informed that YACSA had not been reviewed for 10 years. Minister Such when Minister signed a triennial funding agreement with them which, on my taking up the position, had in fact lapsed. Minister Hall informed me in the takeover that an agreement of extending funding for this year was in fact that YACSA be reviewed. I then sought three young people of talent to review them. It is not a major role. YACSA and Youth SA together have commissioned and produced quite a good paper and that paper suggested that the Government should involve more people on its boards and committees. So I went out to look for young people who had the potential to fulfil the review.

Mr Foley: How much did you pay them?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: It is absolutely interesting that the Opposition finds it abhorrent that—

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. I request that the member for Hart withdraw the comment he made across the House when he implied that the Minister might have paid a fee to somebody. That is a reflection on the individual.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member who is aggrieved is in the Chamber and is in a position to respond. I did not

hear a response from the Minister concerned, and on that basis I will allow the Minister to continue his remarks.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The review has been set up to be at arm's length from me. Three people are on the review, one of whom was previously known to me. Let me inform the House that that person is young, and I make no apologies to this House for putting young people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for the second time.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I make no apologies for giving young people with talent the chance to look at matters that concern young people. That person has an outstanding academic record, is currently in their final year of law at the University of Adelaide, has previously completed a Bachelor of Arts and Economics at Flinders University, has completed Honours in Arts at Flinders University, is President of the Adelaide Students' Law Society, is a member of the Honours Review Committee of the Faculty of Law and is a Fresh FM (a community youth radio station) presenter. That person, along with the other two, has qualifications, and they have my confidence. It is important that this House understand that, since the review was instituted and I spoke to them to welcome them to the panel, I have had no contact, nor have I sought any contact, nor has anybody I know had contact with anybody on that review committee, nor do I intend to until the review is completed.

Finally, let me address the issue of the meeting of 5 February to which I was invited and which took place in the Vietnamese community and concerned the Migrant and Multicultural Youth Group. As was said in the question, they put to me that they had some concerns with YACSA. I put to them that as Minister I had initiated a review of YACSA, that that review was outside my province and that it was being conducted at arm's length from me. I suggested—I think very properly—that, if they had concerns about YACSA, they should address those concerns to the review committee. I make absolutely no apology for encouraging every South Australian youth group, whose peak body YACSA claims to be, to contribute to the review. If it is the peak body for youth in this State, the reviewers and the review will come through absolutely glowingly for YACSA. If it is any less than it claims, this Government and this Parliament deserve to know it.

If I can help today by encouraging people to contribute to that review, I will do so. I certainly know that YACSA has written letters to every youth body, encouraging them to participate in the review. So, I make no apologies for the young people on the review. I hope and have every confidence that they will do a good job. I do not resile from the fact that one was known to me. I emphasise, however, that I have had no contact and will have no contact with any of them until the review is completed.

HANCOCK, Ms C.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Given the Minister for Tourism's answer to the House yesterday, will she now tell the House why she agreed to a pay-out of more than \$210 000 to Ms Carole Hancock, former CEO of the Tourism Commission, without ensuring that it was an agreed final pay-out; and what is now the total amount of Ms Hancock's claim against the Government following the termination of her employment only one year into her contract?

The Hon. J. HALL: I answered that question in part yesterday, and I must confess that I was talking with the Government Whip during the early part of the question so I missed one or two of the particular instances that the honourable member referred to. However, the termination of Ms Carole Hancock's appointment with the Government ought to be set in some context. I believe it is important for the House to know the sequence of events because, since the termination just prior to Christmas, the appointment of a new Chief Executive and new senior management of the commission has been put in place. I would say that this has been greeted with very widespread support within the industry, across South Australia and certainly from the interstate tourism sector. That ought to be put into perspective.

The sequence of events regarding Ms Hancock's termination is as follows. A special meeting of the board of the South Australian Tourism Commission was held on 17 December, at which it was resolved:

The board lacks confidence in the Chief Executive, Ms C. Hancock. The board recommends to the Minister that the Chief Executive's appointment be terminated as soon as possible.

Following that, the Chairman of the board, Mr Roger Cook, wrote on that day to advise of the board's actions and requested me to accept its recommendation. After obtaining advice from the OCPE and Crown Solicitor, I wrote to Ms Hancock on 18 December asking her to provide reasons why I should not proceed with the termination of her appointment by 21 December, and I invited her to meet with me. At Ms Hancock's request, this time line for the provision of information was extended until 22 December.

On 22 December, Ms Hancock's solicitors wrote to me advising that Ms Hancock believed that the board had no valid reason to express any lack of confidence in her as Chief Executive—and I might say they did not give a reason—and they were seeking reaffirmation from me of her appointment and referred to the possibility of taking legal action. Despite my invitation to Ms Hancock and her solicitors, they did not provide me with any reasons, or basis, for why I should not accept the board's resolution. I proceeded to make the recommendation to the Governor that she be removed from her appointment. After further consultation with the OCPE and Crown Solicitor's office, I then wrote to Ms Hancock on 23 December (twice, in fact), initially advising of my intention to terminate the agreement and refer the matter to the Governor, and finally advising that the Governor had in fact terminated her appointment. The South Australian Tourism Commission Board also met later that day and was advised of those decisions.

Ms Hancock has since been paid out the amounts that I referred to yesterday. The Government has had no further contact from Ms Hancock or her solicitors since these payments were concluded, and it is not my intention to personalise this issue as the Opposition tries to do on so many occasions. I have no intention of joining them in muddying Ms Hancock's name. As I said earlier, on 21 January the South Australian Tourism Commission Board recommended to me the appointment of Mr Bill Spurr as the Chief Executive, and Ms Belinda Dewhirst and Mr Andrew McEvoy to the two senior positions. As I said, the appointments have been widely welcomed and I believe that the Government should be congratulated for taking such swift and decisive action to put stability back into the tourism industry which, as we know, is one of the most important industries and economic generators for this State. It would behave the Opposition to be very cautious in its questioning on this issue.

BELAIR NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Environment outline details of a major proposal to upgrade facilities at the Belair National Park and, in particular, will she highlight the public consultation to be carried out before the project can be given the go ahead?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I certainly thank the honourable member for his very important question and acknowledge his continued interest in all matters environmental. Belair National Park, for many years, provided South Australians and visiting tourists with an ideal outdoor experience in close proximity to Adelaide. I am very pleased to inform all members of a proposal that seeks to upgrade and redevelop within areas of existing facilities of the park for the enjoyment of its visitors. The proposal comes from Murtfam Pty Ltd, which is the current lessee of the existing caravan park and the Belair Country Club and Golf Course.

It includes plans to improve the conference and function facilities at the existing country club, an extensive upgrade of the caravan park, provision of new camping sites and eco-cabin accommodation. As a result, more visitors to Belair will be able to enjoy the experience of holidaying in this unique area of our State's environment. Murtfam estimates that, when operational, the development will create up to approximately 50 new jobs. The upgrade would also preserve and improve the park environment by removing hard surfaces and enhancing natural bushland character in an area of the park which is largely degraded.

Three areas containing significant vegetation will be protected and the proposal will include a plan for appropriate revegetation of parts of the development area. This will entail the planting of thousands of native trees and shrubs, using seed stocks from plants already growing on site. I am sure that visitors will certainly welcome an upgrading of facilities carried out in a manner which is sensitive to the park's natural character and which would enhance enjoyment of the park. Approximately 280 000 people visit Belair National Park each year, making it already one of South Australia's most popular national parks.

I wish to assure members, however, that before this proposal proceeds there will be extensive community consultation. Over the coming three months a process of consultation with community stakeholders will be carried out; and, furthermore, a review of environmental, biological, Aboriginal and heritage values will be undertaken. The Government will work to ensure that the project meets stringent environmental and park management standards. The consultancy firm Hassell Pty Ltd will undertake the community consultation and invite key stakeholders to comment on the proposal prior to the development of a draft management plan amendment. The upgrade will require an amendment to the existing park management plan. No decision will be made in relation to the proposal until there has been absolutely open and full community consideration of the proposed plan. South Australians will have their say on a plan which seeks to improve one of our State's great assets.

SENSATIONAL ADELAIDE 500

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Can the Premier inform the House of the outstanding success so far of the V8 Supercar event at the Sensational Adelaide 500 to be held in April?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, I can, and I thank the honourable member for his question. There is no doubt that the Sensational Adelaide 500 race is going from strength to strength. Approximately 53 entries have been submitted for the race, which expands on the number of grid positions of 40; and, so, on the Friday of the three day event, two additional practice sessions will be held. A qualifying session will be held to break down the field from 53 to 40 entries. There will then be what is called the Super 10 shoot-out (an additional race) on the Friday, which will determine the 10 pole positions on the grid for the race.

People buying tickets for the V8 race will have three days of very keen, competitive racing on the track. It will not just be a practice session but a keen, competitive race to break that field down from 53 grid positions to 40. On the basis of the entries submitted, we are moving well towards being able to challenge Bathurst as a pre-eminent V8 event in Australia given that 88 per cent of the corporate platforms are sold, that the chicane is sold out—even though we added, I think, 1 500 additional seats—and that over 50 per cent of the grandstand seating is sold out.

Add to that the 400 construction jobs currently being taken up by South Australians, which will lead into approximately 240 full-time equivalents or a \$57 million contribution to the economy of South Australia. One key aspect of this event is that we have a five by five year contract, so that Jeff can look but he cannot touch. Given the event and the advertising that will take place—particularly as, I am told, it will appear just before the Grand Prix in Melbourne in a few weeks—the message will be, ‘Come to Adelaide to this outstanding event where the ticket prices are about two-thirds the price of a Grand Prix ticket in Melbourne and you will have three days of excellent, outstanding sporting event.’

This is building on the activities of the Government and Major Events, to which the Minister referred and which the member for Bragg pursued as Minister. When we lost the Grand Prix under the former Administration, we just did not leave it: we got on track to say, ‘What will we do to ensure that we bring in a series of events over a period of time—not just a one week event but a series of events?’ We have had Wagner’s *Ring* cycle, the Australian Open and the Tour Down Under. The V8s are coming, we will have the Australian Masters Games and, this weekend, we have Womadelaide. This series of events are spreading out during the year for the tourism and hospitality industry, underpinning a range of new economic activities, and that is good news for the economy of South Australia.

HAMMOND, Dr L.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Late last year the Opposition raised the issue of the level of the termination payment to the Chief Executive of the MFP Development Corporation. I undertook to report back to the House. On 9 February this year I advised of progress. I advise the House that the final detail is not yet complete. However, I expect to be able to report to the House, in full, shortly.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I bring up the eighty-ninth report of the committee, on the Bolivar Waste Water Treatment Plant for a proposed activated sludge plant and ancillary works, 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.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Yesterday in the Parliament I asked a question of the Minister for Tourism about the termination of employment of Ms Carole Hancock. The Minister replied that Ms Hancock was paid out \$210 000 and that there may be potential litigation with respect to that matter. Today, in a subsequent question to the Minister, I asked about the agreed final payment—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr WRIGHT: —and whether Ms Hancock’s claim against the Government following the termination of her employment was still pending. The situation is that we do not know why Ms Hancock’s contract was terminated, nor do we know whether we have seen the end of this matter.

I jotted down a few notes and, hopefully, I will repeat accurately what the Minister replied in Question Time today. The Minister referred to a special meeting that occurred on 17 December when the Chairman of the board wrote to the Minister informing the Minister that it had a lack of confidence in Ms Hancock. The Minister went through due process in writing to Ms Hancock and then extended the time; Ms Hancock wrote back to say that there was no valid reason for the termination but, ultimately, this led to the situation where the Minister concurred with the decision of the board in respect of the termination of Ms Hancock’s appointment.

Unless I have missed something, it does not appear that the Minister has been made aware of the reasons why the board, all of a sudden, had a lack of confidence in its Chief Executive Officer, Ms Carole Hancock. This is the same Chief Executive Officer about whom not long ago we were told in this Chamber in relation to the production of the booklet, *Book of Best Kept Secrets*—what an outstanding success it was and how it would generate, I think, off the top of my head, an extra \$250 million to the tourism industry. We all welcomed this initiative and grabbed it with glowing arms but, in a short time, despite the overwhelming accolades that were put in this House about Ms Hancock’s achievements as author of this great publication, Ms Hancock’s contract was terminated.

We do not know why Ms Hancock’s contract was terminated. It is one thing to say that the board lacks confidence but does the Minister know any more than that? Does the public know any more than that? Were there valid reasons for the termination? Yesterday, the Minister said that there is still potential for litigation. Already \$210 000 of taxpayers’ money has been used to settle this situation. I would have thought that the normal procedure in any termination is that,

when you get a settlement, that is the end of it; there is nothing left. If the Government does have any bargaining chip in settling this dispute, \$210 000 has gone already to Ms Hancock.

I think a number of questions remain. Why was the contract terminated? Why was \$210 000 paid if there is still potential litigation? Will the Minister table the termination agreement? Will the Minister table the board minutes regarding Ms Hancock's termination? When will this matter be finally settled? When will we know that the bottom line has been drawn on this matter and that we can go ahead and promote this State in the most effective manner? We have now had three Chief Executive Officers of the Tourism Commission and we have had a number of Ministers.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I had hoped to ask a question of the Deputy Premier regarding the Natural Heritage Trust but, if my counting is correct, I think we got only five questions this afternoon so I did not have that opportunity. I want to use the time available to me now to mention a couple of concerns that I have regarding what I see as an excellent program.

The question I would have liked to ask the Deputy Premier is: will the Minister explain to the House the importance of the voluntary involvement of community members to the success of the Natural Heritage Trust and also the importance of a partnership approach between the Commonwealth and State Governments to support their efforts?

First, I commend my colleague the Federal Minister for the Environment for introducing what is an excellent program. Some marvellous achievements have been made in a short time as a result of funding being made available through the NHT program. I wish to recognise the significant job that the Federal Minister is doing in what is a difficult portfolio and I commend him for the way in which he is carrying out that responsibility.

However, I am concerned about funding issues relating to the Natural Heritage Trust. I realise that it is early days of the NHT process and that there is quite a bit of frustration, I would suggest, in the community coming from delays in Canberra relating to the administration of the grant system. While there needs to be a balance between good decision making, audit requirements and getting on with the job, I believe the system needs to be streamlined. The guidelines were established by the Commonwealth to meet its requirements and to ensure a uniform system Australia-wide.

I am aware that the Deputy Premier has written to Senator Hill on the issue of process and seeking a review so that it may flow better this year. I have been made aware of a number of organisations and individuals who are very concerned, very disappointed and frustrated at the delays in the provision of funding through this program. In fact, I have been made aware that some individuals and organisations are now being requested to fill out application forms for further funding when they have not yet received funding as a result of their last application. I think that is disappointing. The volunteers do have a significant part to play in the whole process in what we are trying to achieve through the Natural Heritage Trust. If people are being frustrated, if they are moving away from those organisations and moving away from what they are hoping to achieve, the environment will suffer—and I know that is not what Senator Hill would want to see happen.

The Deputy Premier has provided me with a copy of a letter he has written to Senator Hill. I do not have time to read all the letter, but a section of it states:

We have now reached a crucial stage whereby community support is waning daily and much of the good work in engendering support from people in the country is being eroded away. I have received complaints from soil boards, landcare groups, catchment groups and members of Greening Australia. Each are highly critical of the delays in making a decision on funding. Many of these projects are in their own right a good project and potentially a good news story. However, these delays have led to frustration and those potential good news stories are rapidly becoming negatives.

I am sure that the benefits of the program outweigh the complaints, but it is important that we keep the community with us and the current time frame from submitting an application to receiving funding can exceed 12 months. I look forward to your response.

I would support that. I am aware of people who are working in a voluntary capacity, who are frustrated and who want to support the program, but they are concerned about delays in funding coming through that excellent program.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I speak to acknowledge the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights in December last year. There was a march that night organised by a coalition comprising Amnesty International, Caritas Australia, Community Aid Abroad, the Global Education Centre, the South Australian Council of Churches Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and the United Nations Association of Australia.

The marchers were celebrating a great milestone: the creation of a living document that has grown in stature and respect over the past years. What began as an articulation of shared values bearing moral weight on United Nations member states has become a primary building block of customary international law that demands respect from the entire world community. Direct reference to the Universal Declaration is made in the national constitutions of numerous countries. Human rights advocates world-wide invoke its principles and indigenous Australians seek equity through it.

As individual human beings, we each have an innate sense of the fundamental rights and freedoms that belong to us and it cannot be denied by any Government. A basic understanding and recognition of human rights is in our nature. The notion of human rights can be traced through the linguistic, literary, cultural and political structures of all societies. The world's major legal systems all bring important contributions to our understanding of human rights, as do the most widely practised religious beliefs.

Specific laws have been written to provide concrete protection for the rights of the individual within the larger framework of society, and I refer to documents such as the British Magna Carta and the US Bill of Rights. These and other emerging international standards did little to stop the inhumanity of World War I, with its trench warfare and poison gas. I feel that it is appropriate to acknowledge here the work of Adelaide's own Sister Patricia Pak Poy, whose work on the eradication of landmines, that curse of modern warfare which kills and maims so many, was recognised with an award on the day of the anniversary.

Shortly after World War I, the League of Nations was established, leading on to the creation of the International Labour Organisation. In spite of these important international developments, commitment was thin and World War II followed the war to end all wars within two decades. Before the end of that calamity, in 1944 there was a conference which met to discuss how peace might be maintained for all

time. The world is still pursuing that goal. That was the beginning of planning that led to the declaration.

When representatives of around 50 nations gathered in San Francisco on 25 April 1945 (coincidentally the day all Australians recognise as Anzac Day) to form the United Nations, they brought with them a hatred of war combined with a spirit of respect for human dignity and worth, and it was at that conference that the Governments of the world legally committed themselves to promote and encourage respect for the inalienable human rights that belong to every man, woman and child, and confirmed their intent to preserve human rights both in principle and practice.

The UN charter led to the drafting of the UN declaration, an arduous task that lasted almost three years. Through their difficult work, the framers of the declaration produced 30 articles. Among them is article 23, which states:

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
2. Everyone, without discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration, ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.
4. Everyone has the right to form and join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

These basic principles remain vital and pertinent to the workers of today, when so many of the hard fought struggles which were won by the labour movement and shared by all workers, enshrining these principles as part of daily life, are under threat.

In recent times we have seen savage attacks on several of the principles enshrined in article 23, most importantly, the right to work. So many people are now denied employment in an ever-shrinking job market, much like the game of musical chairs, where the ratio of players to chairs is excessively cruel. Being denied the chance to participate and contribute to society leads to a loss of self-esteem. Work by Dr Fran Baum of Flinders University, which came to my attention soon after my election, shows dramatically the impact of this preclusion on a person's state of health. It is false economy to leave this situation unaddressed by every available minute of debate in this place and every ounce of effort that we can muster.

Bold steps must be taken to turn this situation around, for we will surely and inevitably pay a greater price in the cost to society through spiralling health budgets, which are already struggling, an increase in suicides and the incidence of stress and mental health problems. It will also be felt in the area of law and order, where those who have not coveted those who have. We must invest in our people. People who work pay tax, consume goods and contribute to society in many other ways. We face the very real prospect of wasting the enormous human potential inherent in each and every person not working, a catastrophe similar to the waste created by war.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I am moved to speak this day because of my concern over the destruction of over one-third of the Ngarkat Conservation Park during the last week of January and the first week of February this year. Even more than those concerns is my amazement at the ministerial statement made in this House on Tuesday by the Minister for Environment and Heritage. The Minister rightly praised the efforts of the firefighters and other supporters during the

suppression of that fire. She went on to explain the fire management procedures in an effort, I believe, to excuse the destruction of a large portion of this important park and ecosystem. However, her most inflammatory comments were:

It is unfortunate that there has been some media scuttlebutt and incorrect statements made in this House about the way in which the fire was fought, pre-empting the results of the review.

I believe that was designed to stifle community debate, to allow a review to be carried out behind closed doors—in secret, out of the public gaze.

In a moment, if time permits, I will quote from some of what the Minister refers to as scuttlebutt, and members might draw their own conclusions. As to her reference to 'incorrect statements made in this House', from my recollection the only previous mention of the incident in this House was in the form of a question from me to the Minister responsible for the CFS as to who was ultimately responsible for managing the effort against the fire. Again I direct members to page 737 of the *Hansard* so they can draw their own conclusions as to whether that question was incorrect or would adversely impact upon any subsequent review of the incident. The Minister went on to talk of the fire prevention plans and programs and made the incredible statement 'and the plans work'.

The question that the local CFS volunteers and local residents want answered is why the fire was allowed to get out of control in the first place. The fire started on Wednesday 27 January, late in the afternoon or in the evening, I believe. The local CFS in Bordertown have their training night on Wednesdays and I have been told that CFS personnel in a four-wheel drive vehicle attended the fire and reported back to base that it could be controlled within a few hours if available equipment were mobilised. I have been told that, unfortunately, the National Parks and Wildlife Service declined the offer of help and stated that it would have crews there the next morning. That proposition prevailed and, apparently, by the time the crews arrived next morning—and I am told it was around 10 a.m.—the fire was uncontrollable and the rest is history.

The Minister and the House may be interested to know that, on Christmas eve last, another fire occurred in the park. The locals at that time insisted on attacking the fire immediately, due to the impending holiday, and I am told that the incident was all over in a matter of hours. Time will prevent me from quoting much from the print media, but I direct all members to the Thursday, 4 February edition of the *Border Chronicle*, which is published at Bordertown (it is available in the library reading room), and which devoted almost two pages to this incident. If one were looking for scuttlebutt particularly designed to pre-empt any review in that edition, I suggest that the most irresponsible quote is attributed to the Director of National Parks and Wildlife South Australia, Mr Alan Holmes. The article states:

Although lessons will be learnt, he believes the extent of burn is acceptable in terms of park management objectives, with less than half the park burning. 'You get these severe fires in dry years. There will be an impact, but given the size of the park, the diversity of vegetation and diversity of fire history, we are seeing natural ecosystems at play,' he said.

That was the second major fire in the park in less than 10 years, in addition to other more minor events. I suggest that the Director is certainly at variance with the opinions of both Dr David Paton of the Adelaide University's Department of Environmental Biology and John Samuel-White, Chairman of the Murray Mallee Consultative Committee, who are both

quoted extensively in that newspaper. Mr White said that the State environmentalists are calling for an inquiry because:

... there has been a lack of appropriate response this decade from the department in protecting the place. There has been a management plan around for 12 years and nothing has been done.

I call on the Minister to encourage public input into the review process and to recognise that the parks are our parks, that this is not nature at play when seen in the context of the balance of the type of area left, and the influence of the management practices on the area. It is not the role of the Minister to hide or cover up any deficiencies but to ensure that appropriate management regimes are in place and that we continue to learn from our past mistakes.

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

Today the Minister for Government Enterprises attempted to draw a red herring across questions that I have been asking about the United Water contractual arrangements. He said that the design work was anticipated in the proposal and that it was specifically requested that all bidders submit proposals for the utilisation of existing design expertise. The Minister for Government Enterprises should recognise that that existing design expertise meant the expertise of the South Australian water engineers, who have capabilities, to quote the Minister, in water and waste water engineering, including capabilities in investigation, planning process design and specialist discipline. The proposal documents stated:

Please submit your proposals as to how these capabilities could be developed and utilised in the best interests of the SA water industry.

The Minister should know that it did not mean the works at Bolivar but that it meant developing outside water interests so that the capabilities or the expertise of those SA Water engineers, which had been built up over many years within the South Australian public service, could be usefully put to the interests of South Australia.

It did not mean handing United Water a design contract on top of its project management fees, which gave it a \$63 million slice of a \$200 million project. The project is excellent, but we must ask questions about the conflict of interest and about how the project managers, United Water, which under the contract is supposed to have a 7 per cent management fee, ended up with a 30 per cent fee by including its own design work. I draw members' attention to the conflict there. We only have to look at the problems that exist in design work on the lights at Adelaide Oval. What happens there if the project managers are also responsible for the design work? Will they pursue those design deficiencies? No, there is a conflict of interest there and this Government, which is setting up a pattern of poor contract negotiation, is happy to let that situation exist. We have to ask why the Government is handing United Water such an increase, from 7 per cent of the \$200 million up to 30 per cent, when the understanding of the other tenderers for that contract was that they would be allowed to bid for that \$200 million worth of work, including the design work.

The Minister for Government Enterprises tried to make out that the design work contemplated was that design work, when it was design work that would usefully occupy the existing expertise within SA Water. He knows that this is a complex issue and he is trying to cloud the issue so that it is not generally understood how badly this Government has run the contract. The Minister should address the issue of why United Water was given such a hefty increase. Why were other tenderers not able to bid for that work? Would other

tenderers have come in at a lower cost? Would they have done the job better? We will never know, because United Water was handed this \$63 million fee on a plate, and that is bad process. The Premier criticised the Opposition for concentrating too much on process. I would suggest to the Minister for Government Enterprise that, rather than it being dangerous and pointless for the Opposition to ask these questions, it is dangerous for this State for the Government to continue with these poor processes with regard to contracts—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

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

Ms HURLEY:—and ultimately pointless for the Minister to try to divert attention from answering good questions by introducing—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

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

Ms HURLEY:—red herrings into the debate and selectively quoting from the contracts and the requests for a proposal document. The select committee showed that the other tenderers expected to be able to bid for that \$200 million worth of work, and they have been denied the opportunity by the Government giving that work to one single preferred tenderer, and they have not satisfactorily explained why.

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I rise today to speak on what I consider to be a very important matter, one that has occupied pages of news space and air time in recent weeks, and has seen some extraordinary comments made in this place. In speaking today, I do so specifically to ask all members, including you, Mr Speaker, to consider what options are available to Miss Edith Pringle to clear her name and present her version of events against the allegation of perjury made against her by the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber. On Thursday afternoon of last week—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. HALL:—the Leader of the Opposition stood in this Chamber and, under parliamentary privilege, made serious allegations against Miss Pringle. The Leader described Miss Pringle's evidence as blatant lies and accused her of perjury. We all know that perjury is a criminal offence. Like so many people I am concerned that this high profile case, involving charges of common assault, contains issues of very significant public policy such as the guilt or innocence of the accused, not the character of the victim. They are issues that women in particular fought hard for through the 1970s and 1980s, and I had hoped we had made progress.

The vicious and malicious attack on Miss Pringle by the Leader of the Opposition has raised the questions of serious and deliberate allegations of perjury made against an individual in Parliament, under privilege, when no charges have been laid. Neither the court nor the Director of Public Prosecutions has accused Miss Pringle of perjury. In another place, earlier this week the Attorney-General reported Mr Rofe as saying:

After certain evidence given by Miss Pringle, particularly yesterday afternoon, I find myself unable to discharge my primary duty as prosecuting counsel to put the case to the jury. I have concerns with some aspects of her evidence and cannot therefore ask the jury to return a verdict of guilt based on the evidence.

The SPEAKER: Order! The cameras will operate on the speaker.

The Hon. J. HALL: Mr Rofe has expressed concerns about some specific aspects of Miss Pringle's evidence, but he has not suggested that the claims of domestic violence made by Miss Pringle were false. Mr Rofe has certainly not cleared the name of the member for Ross Smith, as he claimed himself in this place earlier this week. In his statement to the House on Tuesday of this week, the Leader of the Opposition said:

People unfairly smeared in court or in Parliament should have the right of reply—the right to defend themselves against untrue accusations. That should be the basis of justice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. HALL: Clearly, the Leader of the Opposition has misrepresented the facts and accused Miss Pringle of a crime which she has not been charged with. He has used parliamentary privilege for his own benefit and faces none of the potential consequences that a witness in court could. Mr Speaker, therefore, I ask all members of this Parliament to consider what options are available to Miss Pringle to clear her name on the allegation of perjury, made by the Leader of the Opposition against her. What right does she have to defend herself and how can she have the opportunity to present the facts as she sees them?

LOTTERY AND GAMING (TRADE PROMOTION LOTTERY LICENCE FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 February. Page 743.)

Mr FOLEY (Hart): This Bill was debated in the Upper House before being introduced here. I use this opportunity to highlight, yet again, the very strange and somewhat difficult situation we have where the Treasurer of this Government sits in another House. For the past many years of this Parliament, Bills such as this have always been introduced in the Lower House. I simply highlight the fact that so many Treasury Bills now commence in the Upper House and find their way to the Lower House in a very cumbersome and at times confusing manner. The reality is that this Bill was dealt with well before Christmas and has found its way here. The Opposition supported it in another place and we support it here. It involves a minor technical change to the Act. It has our full support and we are happy for it to go through to the third reading.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I have only one observation to make, namely, that this is about gambling and gaming and that therefore it is about the way in which people's money can be taken from them during the course of their perhaps well advised or ill advised participation in these games—whether they are sufficiently solvent to be able to risk whatever sum they are risking in the process. For the Government to take unto itself the power to make regulations as it pleases, as envisaged in new section 14B(5) of the principal Act, is a worry for me. It is not my view that the way in which gambling is regulated in this State ought to be determined by the mandarins in Treasury. It ought to be

determined by statute. I am saying that statute law is better than regulation.

I have one other point to make, given that we are debating the Lotteries and Gaming Act, and it relates to lotteries in general and all Government sponsored or Government controlled gambling—that means the lot. I strongly disapprove of the way in which the various agencies of Government are currently advertising what they call their 'products'. I believe that any reasonable test under the Trade Practices Act, if it were to be applied, for instance, to the kind of advertising which is undertaken by these Government agencies, would find that they are deliberately misleading. They set out to create the impression in the public mind that the way to become wealthy is to gamble, and that is a barefaced bloody lie.

We all know that the odds are stacked against the punters quite deliberately. There is a deliberate percentage, on a balance of probabilities, which will always go to the provider of the service and to State revenue—and that is a fact, and I happen to support that proposition. But for the advertising to misleadingly create the impression in the public mind—those gullible members of it—that you can make a lot of money and be sure of doing so if you go to the Casino, buy scratchies tickets or get involved in lotto is, to my mind, not just wrong but wicked.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC (PROOF OF ACCURACY OF DEVICES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 February. Page 778.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): This is a Bill that amends the evidence provision of the Road Traffic Act. The evidence provision of that Act is contained in—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: Sir, is it somewhat unusual that there is no Government Minister in the House?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Such): Your observation is correct, but we now have a Minister: whether it is the correct one is another matter.

Mr ATKINSON: It is very kind of a Government Minister to enter the House to listen to what the Opposition has to say about this Bill. It would be even nicer if we had the Government Minister who is responsible for this portfolio area. Notwithstanding, it is normally bad manners to refer to the presence or absence from the House of members, but Government members persistently during Question Time refer to the presence or absence of Opposition members; unfortunately, I have joined the slippery slope. However, it is desirable to have a Government Minister in the House at all times.

As I was saying, the Bill before us amends the evidence provision of the Road Traffic Act, and it does so for the purpose of extending the validity of proof of accuracy of speedometers and traffic speed analysers, which I presume are speed cameras. As things stand, under this evidence provision the readings of police stop watches and speedos on police cars are deemed to be valid for 14 days before and after they are tested. The Government, by this Bill, wishes to extend the proof of accuracy of speedos to three months before and after the testing. So, it reduces the frequency of testing of police car speedos.

The 14 day provision was inserted in 1938 and, like most things in the evidence provision of the Road Traffic Act, it is there to establish a presumption, to say that if certain things are asserted in court they will be deemed to be valid in the absence of evidence to the contrary. The Opposition is quite happy to go along with this extension of the presumption of accuracy for speedos and also for speed cameras. I understand that, in New South Wales and Victoria, police car speedos are tested on purchase and sale only; that in Queensland they are tested every 60 days; in the Australian Capital Territory, between six and 12 months; Western Australia, three months; and in the Northern Territory, irregularly. It seems to me that, by the standards of other Australian jurisdictions, the Government is still testing police car speedos frequently.

I turn now to the question of traffic speed analysers or speed cameras (as I presume that is what we are talking about): they are tested and the proof of accuracy is deemed to be effective under this provision for that day on which they are tested. The Bill extends that proof of accuracy to the following day. Often police stay out with their speed cameras during the evening and into the early hours of the morning of the next day and they want the presumption of accuracy to apply to those hours. That seems to be a reasonable request and the Opposition is willing to acquiesce in it. I understand that car speedos are tested by the RAA at a cost to SAPOL, and the saving will be \$24 000 to \$30 000 if this Bill, allowing less frequent testing of speedos, is passed. Furthermore, the Government tells us that, between April 1997 and July 1998, 1 352 tests were carried out on police car speedos and none were inaccurate.

The Opposition supports the Bill. We have only a couple of questions relating to the other chattel mentioned in this provision dealing with speedos, namely, police stop watches. The proof of accuracy of stop watches will be for only 14 days before and after they are tested. I wonder why the Government is not moving to extend the presumption regarding stop watches. Indeed, I am wondering whether stop watches are used at all now by police in measuring speed. If the Minister answers those two questions in his summing up of the debate, the Opposition will be satisfied with the Government's position.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I thank the honourable member for raising points in the debate. I will have the Minister answer the points raised and come back with a reply as I do not have someone here at present. They were scheduled to be here but they were not expecting this matter to be on so early in the afternoon. I thank the honourable member for his comments on the Bill. It is a small Bill in technical terms and our concern is to ensure that on technicalities people cannot get out of being caught for speeding, and on occasion that has occurred.

Mr Conlon: They should not speed—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They should not speed at all, and of real concern to all of us is the extent to which speeding is still occurring. I see people speeding when going to Victor Harbor in my electorate. Unfortunately, it is often young people with P plates. In my electorate we have had some tragic accidents this year. The classic one involved a lad with P plates who was heading towards the top of Willunga Hill from Mount Compass on a straight stretch of road. If he had had the patience to wait another 200 or 300 metres—less than a minute—he would have been on a full divided road down Willunga Hill. Instead, impatiently, he pulled out and tried

to pass vehicles and it would appear, without wanting to prejudice anything that might occur in the courts, that he exceeded the time out on the wrong side of the road, got to a bend and, by the time he was pulling back, cars were coming around the bend; his car ran into the oncoming traffic and two people were killed.

There have been similar accidents elsewhere in the State, and they highlight that speed is still one of the major factors. Invariably it involves younger, inexperienced drivers. On one occasion, heading back from Victor Harbor, I witnessed a vehicle that pulled out and passed me one night on a double white line—absolutely blind in terms of the driver seeing whether vehicles were coming. Fortunately nothing was coming. I caught up with the vehicle as we were going up the cut hill and the vehicle slowed down behind another vehicle. I had the chance to sit behind that vehicle and, lo and behold, a few kilometres further on I saw that vehicle again pull out and pass a slower vehicle, again on a double line. I have reported both incidents to police with the number of the vehicle, but it disturbs me that we still see this occurring. It is an attempt by the Government to ensure that people cannot get out of speeding offences through a loophole. I thank the honourable member for his comments and hope the Bill is passed quickly.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): In the time I have been out door knocking over the past three years in my electorate, one of the most frequently raised topics has been that of parents' rights. Many parents have told me that they have no rights any more and that they feel under threat in terms of the way they can bring up their children. This message came through so consistently and from such a wide variety of parents that I decided that it needed further investigation, and I registered this topic as one for the parliamentary interns scheme to investigate.

I was very pleased that Ms Lynne Clark showed a decided interest in taking up the topic and explored the issue with great talent and great vigour. We decided that the best way to approach the topic was by asking local parents to talk more about just what they meant when they said that parents had no rights. Community centres in the electorate—Hackham West, Reynella and Christie Downs—were all extremely helpful in allowing Ms Clark to meet with parents in a comfortable and informal way and allowing them to spell out just what were their concerns about the lack of parental rights.

The types of issues that came up were, first, that some parents were unsure whether or not they were allowed to smack. They did not want to smack with things like wooden spoons or belts, but they still believed in smacking. They were afraid to leave a mark on the child for fear of being reported to Child and Youth Health or FAYS. There was confusion about how far they could go and parents were scared to ask questions in case they were reported.

They said that there was no automatic respect for parents and that they need new ways to exert their authority. They believed that we are now living in a more dangerous environ-

ment and that they need to set new limits but they are struggling with how to do it. They still wanted control, but the old ways of getting control did not seem to be working. They believed children are answering back more and saying, 'You can't make me' as a common response. They also very much feared a child running away in response to parental discipline or restrictions, and believed that children were at great risk if they did run away. They believed it was too easy to leave home and receive Government assistance.

Because of the many demands placed on parents now and the lack of support for many of them, they have run out of energy and patience due to all these other demands. They consider that kindergartens and schools are telling children about feeling safe but not explaining how to distinguish real danger from the simple fear of being in trouble because of misbehaving. They believe that children know the teachers cannot touch them and that this affects their behaviour at home. They say children threaten to call police or tell teachers if their parents smack them. Some of the parents had been abused for smacking in public. They believe that the media increase the guilt factor on parents when they are not totally ideal, and single parents in particular feel that they are under the spotlight. They believe that schools do not have the time or resources to deal with problem children, and especially they believe that there is a lack of support for parents of teenagers, and that FAYS is not balanced in the way it treats parents.

Based on these points raised in discussion, Ms Clark designed a very simple questionnaire which she distributed to other parents in and outside Reynell. The same sorts of issues came up, but there were a few extra ones. Those were that parents feel frowned upon for using physical discipline; they believe children rather than parents are now ruling households; and children are using 'having rights' as a form of manipulation. They were very worried about trivial things being used against them. When I talked further in the electorate about these findings, the overwhelming response from parents was that, yes, these are their fears and these are their reactions. So, Ms Clark looked at the basic question whether parents have lost any rights in the past few years and particularly as there seemed to be a belief that the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child had removed those rights. She found unequivocally that no formal rights have been taken away by any legislation passed in the time that she could find. Certainly, despite many people's fears about it, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in fact reinforces parents' rights as well as their responsibilities in relation to children.

Her analysis and that of the social commentators whom she reviewed found that the real issue is the increasing complexity of the world in which children are raised. There is so much more media attention focused on them; children are exposed to much adult media; as I have mentioned, parents are subject to many other demands in their lives; and so many parents now are isolated from their natural forms of support in their own family. All this adds to the pressures that parents find in trying to undertake this most difficult and absolutely important of all jobs in the world—raising children.

Many seemed to believe that 95 per cent of parents smacked. However, an *Advertiser* survey of types of discipline used by 400 Adelaide parents conducted in 1996 found otherwise. In fact, the most commonly used methods of discipline were a simple explanation of what was wrong, followed by sending children to their room, the removal of

television privileges, the removal of other privileges and then a light smack, with only about 33 per cent of parents reporting the use of that method of discipline.

The conclusions that Ms Clark drew were that the main need is for parents to have more direct and more relevant forms of support available to them. They need to feel comfortable in asking for support because, while all the community centres in the electorate have courses for parenting, parents often feel that just by attending them they are acknowledging that they do not know how to do their job. This is particularly true for parents who do not have fortunate experiences with education. Anything that smacks of any form of schooling is something that they find very difficult to deal with.

Lynne also found that, despite much television advertising, many parents were still unaware of the 24 hour parent help line. The number for this is 1300-364100, and I certainly found it very difficult to locate this very important line in the phone book. I consider myself somewhat experienced in dealing with large documents such as the phone book, but I ended up having to ring Parent Advocacy and ask for the number. I was told that I could find it under Child and Youth Health. If I were a frustrated parent at 2 a.m., that would not have been the least bit of help to me. So, my first recommendation to the Minister is that he move immediately to having a separate entry for that important line in the phone book.

Other recommendations relate to the need to recognise just what are the circumstances of today's families when developing Government policy. I know there is a requirement for a family impact statement, but that does not always recognise the complexity of today's families.

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

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): As you know, Mr Acting Speaker, I take every opportunity to promote a greater understanding of the wonderful electorate that I have the privilege to represent. Eyre Peninsula is a vibrant region of South Australia and has enormous potential in fishing, farming, mining and tourism enterprises. This potential is only just beginning to be realised and, in the case of the farming sector, has been greatly assisted by the comprehensive and cohesive approach of the Eyre Peninsula regional strategy. The Eyre Peninsula regional strategy came about due to a series of adverse events which coincided over the 1990-94 period. These exceptional circumstances were devastating to farmers on the Eyre Peninsula and consisted of record summer rains that damaged and downgraded cereal crops; loss due to a substantial mouse plague; the combination of poor coarse grain prices and drought in the 1993 and 1994 seasons that made it impossible to operate profitably during that period; and hail and frost which damaged crops.

Eyre Peninsula suffered greatly as a result of these adverse events. Many farmers were burdened with significant levels of debt. The sustained poor seasonal conditions meant that they were incurring increasing levels of debt during this period, coupled with very high interest rates. The net result was a serious drain on the social and economic base of Eyre Peninsula which people were not then in a position to be able to address. The need for a comprehensive scheme to assist farmers and other regional enterprises became obvious and led the Commonwealth in partnership with the State Government to trial a regional strategy approach to alleviating or eliminating some of the more acute and ongoing problems. A task force headed by the Hon. Caroline Schaefer MLC was

charged with the task of developing a package of measures for the Minister for Primary Industries.

The package was to address farm business reconstruction and related natural resource issues on Eyre Peninsula. The task force believed that, in order for any strategy to work, it had to be community owned and community driven. Five hundred organisations and individuals were advised of the task force's mission in an effort to ensure that solid community input was obtained. The Eyre Peninsula Regional Strategy was formed as a result of task force recommendations to the Government. Various bodies such as the Natural Heritage Trust, the Rural Adjustment Scheme, the Australian Council for the Arts, the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association, Festivals Australia, SACAT and DEETYA are actively involved in the strategy and have a stake in its success.

The strategy is being conducted as a pilot program for the rest of Australia and is based on information and recommendations received from Eyre Peninsula residents during the public consultation phase. The strategy seeks to educate our farming community in a multitude of areas which include: property management planning; farming and land capabilities; soil, water and vegetation management; and sustainable farming practices. Farming communities have traditionally been extremely conservative and followed the practices of generations past. Our rapidly changing economy and increasing knowledge of our impact on our environment dictate that many traditional farming and business practices can no longer be followed.

The objective of the Eyre Peninsula Regional Strategy is to facilitate rural adjustment, which contributes to the enhanced viability of farm enterprises through encouraging environmentally sustainable resource use, long-term profitability through increased farm productivity, effective property management and assisting farmers without the prospect of long-term profitability to leave farming with the improved ability to adjust to life after farming. The Eyre Peninsula region involves approximately 1 600 rural holdings from which 3 000 farmers earn a living.

The region is a highly effective agricultural producer, as 10 per cent of the State's farmers actually produce and earn approximately 13 per cent of the State's agricultural income. The Eyre Peninsula annually produces 40 per cent to 50 per cent of South Australia's wheat, 20 per cent to 30 per cent of South Australia's barley and 15 per cent of the State's sheep flock. The adverse years in the early 1990s clearly demonstrated that farming can no longer be considered just a way of life but must also be considered a business; therefore, it is necessary to establish a positive business planning ethic in farmers on the Eyre Peninsula.

The Eyre Peninsula Regional Strategy plays an important part in providing training for farmers in advanced management skills. The strategy coordinates field days to demonstrate and share with farmers knowledge of such practices as reduced tillage, clay spreading, desalination systems and

sustainable crop management practices. The Cleve Field Day is a biennial event at which agricultural exhibitors can display and demonstrate their products and services. The 1998 field day exhibited displays featuring satellite communications, the Internet, differential global positioning systems, yield mapping and vehicle guidance systems.

A farm technology expo held at Wudinna has allowed for transfer of information between local and visiting researchers and farmers across the whole of the peninsula. The sharing of dreams, ideas and information is probably the most potent component of the whole strategy. In turn this has fostered a culture of cooperation within the community, promoting a philosophy of working together to promote and support self-reliant businesses and sustainable land management practices. Another project associated with the Eyre Peninsula Regional Strategy is the Better Business Centre's network concept, which was developed with the support of the Eyre Regional Development Board's 10 member councils to provide a shopfront agency.

The Better Business Centres provide a direct link to the business community in each council district. The service will assist local communities to identify employment and training opportunities in their area, increasing employment prospects for people living in rural Eyre Peninsula. The Eyre Peninsula Regional Strategy is community owned and community administered. The committee is comprised of representatives from various communities and interest groups which gives it a broad network and range of experiences on which to draw. The vision of this group for integrated, sustainable, viable and progressive industries based on self-reliant businesses that present a positive image of Eyre Peninsula is being realised through the efforts of the team.

Where the community has a vision of what can be achieved and the will to pursue that vision then there is no end to what can be achieved. I commend all those who have participated in the Eyre Peninsula Rural Strategy and made it the great success that it is.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MINING ADMINISTRATION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SENTENCING— MISCELLANEOUS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.16 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 2 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16 February 1999

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

BUS IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

11. **Mr HILL:**

1. Is the Transport ID Bus Identification System to be trialled on Adelaide buses?

2. How many visually impaired persons regularly use Adelaide buses and what systems are currently in place to assist these persons?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:

1. There is no proposal at this time to trial the Transport ID Bus Identification System.

The developers of the system have spoken to a number of staff from the Passenger Transport Board (PTB), TransAdelaide and Transport SA. During a meeting with the developers, PTB staff raised a number of concerns in relation to marketing and operational issues. An offer was made by TransAdelaide to assist the developers increase their understanding of current technology used in buses and the related physical and operational demands on their system. This resulted in the developers visiting both TransAdelaide and Transport SA. No formal requests have been received from the developers to trial the system following the visits.

2. As at 5 November 1998, PTB records indicate 1 640 South Australians are holders of a blind pass. However, it is not possible to quantify the number of people with vision impairment who use their pass, as they are not required to validate them.

Twelve months ago, following a nomination by the Royal Society for the Blind, the PTB received an Equal Opportunity Achievement Award presented by the South Australian Equal Opportunity Commission.

People with vision impairment who wish to access public transport are supported in a number of ways, including the following:

- Both SERCO and TransAdelaide utilise the expertise of people with vision impairment to maximise the extent to which printed information meets the needs of people with vision impairment.
- The Low Vision Centre linked to the Royal Society for the Blind assists individuals with the provision of flash cards which are then displayed by the holder to communicate to bus drivers.
- SERCO and TransAdelaide have electronic versions of timetables available to assist people with vision impairment who have access to computers using speech programs and enlarged viewing facilities.
- Operational practice, encouraged by both SERCO and TransAdelaide on roads where only one service operates, is for drivers to stop and ask a person standing at a bus stop (who appears to have impaired vision) if they require a bus.
- PA systems on all new buses enable drivers to communicate with people with vision impairment who request information related to bus stops.
- New buses have bright yellow handgrips and uprights designed to maximise contrast with the surrounding interior, and therefore improve visibility for people with impaired vision.
- The PTB has revised its timetable design and bus information units, which is enabling people with vision impairment to access information more effectively.

Two years ago, efforts by the PTB to ensure the needs of all people with disabilities were addressed, have resulted in South

Australia being granted an exemption under the Disability Discrimination Act. The latest progress report to the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission prompted the Acting Disability Commissioner, Chris Sidoti, to acknowledge 'that South Australia remains in the forefront' of service provision to people with disabilities.

LASER GUNS

13. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Are laser guns being operated from police vehicles parked in the northern safety ramp near the Marion Road overpass of the Southern Expressway and, if so, is this practice to continue?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has been advised by the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services that officers from the Southern Traffic Police Division have engaged in laser speed detection at various locations on the Southern Expressway. The northern safety ramp in the vicinity of the Marion Road overpass is one such location.

The safety ramp comprises a long pit of pea gravel, separated from the main carriageway by a concrete barrier. The entry and exit points to this ramp are delineated by a row of collapsible bollards. It is designed such that any vehicle entering the ramp will be slowed by and eventually brought to a stand still, bogged in the gravel. Such vehicles will then need to be towed out of the exit.

Police officers working laser guns at this location have parked their vehicles at the exit end of the ramp, not the entrance, to ensure that they do not in any way impede the proper use of the ramp should an emergency situation occur. The width of the service lane at this location enhances the safety of both the officers and any offending drivers directed to stop.

Monitoring the Southern Expressway and other locations across Adelaide will continue in line with standard traffic policing objectives.

PASSENGER SAFETY LEVY

51. **Mr HILL:** How much revenue has been collected by the Passenger Transport Board through the 1 per cent passenger safety levy on taxi fares and how much has been expended?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No revenue has been collected by the Passenger Transport Board (PTB) from the 1 per cent safety levy on taxi fares.

The levy is paid through the meter as a contribution to the safety of taxis. When the levy was implemented some 23 months ago it was recognised that drivers and owners have the most immediate interest in the safety of the taxi as a working environment. They are in the best position to assess the safety measures which are the most suitable for their particular circumstances, taking into account the skills of the drivers, the hours and primary regions of work and other risk factors. For these reasons the levy is not collected and distributed by the PTB.

On the basis of taxi meter earnings given in the 'Adelaide Taxi Industry Baseline Study 1996' the 1 per cent levy would have raised an average of \$1 630 per taxi to date.

Expenditure on safety measures adopted by the taxi industry includes global positioning systems. Ninety eight per cent of Adelaide's metropolitan taxis currently use one of the Centralised Booking Services (CBS')—and all of the CBS' now operate global positioning systems and reap the associated safety benefits. Indeed, compared to all other capital cities in Australia, Adelaide is now in the enviable position of having virtually all of its drivers and their cabs backed up by global positioning systems.

The Taxi Safety Taskforce Report identifies other items of safety expenditure in cabs to date. These include a very limited number of large ticket items such as surveillance cameras and protective screens.