

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 3 June 1999

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

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): I move:

That the Environment, Resources and Development Committee investigate and report on the functioning and operation of the Environment Protection Authority and the Environment Protection Agency, with particular reference to—

- (a) the adequacy of the current legislation to enable the agency to achieve its aim;
- (b) the adequacy of the resources provided to the agency;
- (c) the adequacy of the monitoring and policing functions of the agency;
- (d) alternative interstate and overseas models for the administration of the environmental protection legislation; and,
- (e) any other relevant matters.

It has come to the attention of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee on numerous occasions during other briefs that there are problems associated with Environment Protection Agency legislation and the manner in which the agency is able to police and monitor its functions. As a result of this, and after discussion and deliberation within the committee, it was decided that the committee would like to take on the brief to examine the abovementioned details of the Environment Protection Agency.

A number of issues of concern have been raised by councils, individuals, conservation organisations and community organisations in respect of the EPA, and it is appropriate that the Environment, Resources and Development Committee look at this brief.

Ms KEY (Hanson): I support the motion. As the member for Chaffey said, a number of constituents have contacted my office with concerns they have about the inadequate resourcing of the Environment Protection Authority and, having spoken to some of the members of the Environment Protection Agency, I believe there is obviously an issue about being able to deliver on enforcement, a matter that is quite often raised on that committee. I think that all members of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee would agree that more and more issues are being put before us from community groups and councils saying that evaluations, testing and surveying are necessary, but the resources are not there to follow up on some of the inquiries—not just complaints—raised by the community.

The Environment Protection Agency's workings and resources do need to be looked at and the Environment, Resources and Development Committee voted unanimously yesterday to take this on as a very special brief.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I rise in support of this motion also and to briefly state that, although not a member of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, in a number of instances in my own electorate where the EPA has been involved in disputes, or in cases where it has been called upon to monitor and police certain actions, it has become apparent to me and to my local councils that the resources are

not adequate, but also there is some question in my mind as to the effectiveness of the EPA in policing some of the environmental breaches that have occurred in my local area. I know particularly of instances of environmental breaches with respect to dumps in my area where there has been a lot of criticism by local councils and local residents about the effectiveness of the EPA.

There are also complaints from my constituents about the response by the EPA in areas such as monitoring noise pollution. Certainly, a lot of my constituents do not feel that the EPA is able to work effectively in either its monitoring or its prosecution role in regard to those breaches. I support the motion. It is about time we had a good look at the way the Environment Protection Agency is operating in this State.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I make a couple of observations about the proposition, and they relate to the general thrust of the basic principle that underlies what we are proposing to do here. A number of Government agencies operate in the real world and the Environment Protection Agency is one of them, as is the Environment Protection Authority. Those agencies, in common with other similar agencies, are part of the arm of government. What we need to do here is distinguish between industrial and political flatulence to draw some attention to the underlying principle we are getting at. The role and function of these agencies within the current set up, is to review decisions that are made at arm's length from the Government itself—not the political arm, but the administrative and executive arm—and ensure that an appropriate process has been followed in arriving at a particular recommended outcome.

They are not there to provide policy advice to Government but rather to ensure that, within the framework of the law, the policy advice adopted by Executive Government and Cabinet is in the public interest and that a process has been followed which satisfies that need. I am saying that we do not need, in these agencies, to duplicate the expertise that has been paid for in terms of the hired staff of the Government departments that have provided Ministers and Cabinet with their advice. I am sure, though, that we need to satisfy ourselves that the the Environment Protection Authority and the Environment Protection Agency are not impaired by a lack of resources to perform that work. There is public disquiet abroad which obviously warrants some debate as to whether there are adequate resources.

So, my second observation is that the purpose of this motion, I guess, is to reassure the public that the resources are available or, alternatively, identify the particular aspects of their structure and function which are inadequately provided for. I will be curious to discover if there are big deficiencies in their resources impairing their ability to function as they were intended, according to law, and to work symbiotically with the Government departments to establish enterprises which also provide us safe, pleasant surroundings to enjoy, while we generate the prosperity we seek by applying our brawn and brain collectively to the task.

If we make the mistake, as I have seen in other countries, in other constitutional jurisdictions, of failing to provide a clear definition of the way in which these organisations integrate with the existing structure and function of departments, as well as serving the needs of our industry, then we will unbalance the power sharing and their role of checking and balancing, whereupon we will be guilty of political flatulence. It will stink everywhere! Let me finish that in a

way that ensures honourable members understand what I am saying.

Ms White: We understand!

Mr LEWIS: It will mean that we are incompetent as a Parliament to understand the structure of the organisation that should serve the public interest and provide us as a Parliament through government with advice about the direction in which the law ought to go and the development of policy and the administration of that policy so developed. We will just have things going in all directions with no-one coordinating them, and it will be a stinking chaotic mess that will drive capital away from our society and deny us the prosperity we seek to obtain.

So, I commend the member for Chaffey for bringing forward the motion. I am anxious to ensure that the inquiry is conducted within the framework to which I have referred, so it is understood that what we are doing here is not revisiting the decisions that are made by government on any particular issue but that we are examining the framework within which these two environment protection organisations, the authority and the agency, function in collaboration with and symbiotically with the other agencies to get the outcomes we need.

I guess if some of the people like Bob Brown in Canberra had been around and running government 100 to 150 years ago, we would have never built the port at Port Adelaide. Light would not have been allowed to survey the City of Adelaide where he did, and we would not be here now in this Parliament, because we would have not quarried the limited resource of the marble at Kapunda. The good building stone is gone. But we are now happy to accept what we have done and, quite justifiably, we are indeed proud of it. Our purpose must be to ensure that we do not cut off our nose to spite our face.

If this inquiry is conducted in the manner in which the committee can conduct it, it will serve those very useful purposes. But, if it is to be effective, it must not get into a witch-hunt of what is wrong with other parts of the structure of government and recommend duplication of it in the way the Indonesian and Filipino armies have done it. They are pretty hick. They have a replication of almost every other government agency within the Army, to the extent that the Army provides scholarships to the most outstanding scholars to go to polytechnics and universities to get educated and professional in reviewing what other arms of government do. That gives even more power for this one group, the Army, to interfere within the structure of Government, and that is bad.

What this Parliament has always been about and what it must continue to be about is reviewing the way the public good is served and the public policy is determined and delivered, and that, through these two agencies, when the delivery process is on foot, due process has been followed in the course of those decisions to secure development of a sustainable future.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I also want to contribute briefly on this matter because it is, after all, something that underpins our future. In my experience over the last 18 months I have observed several tensions in the area of environmental policy. Particularly it reflects the tensions at the moment in many spheres of government in seeking to achieve a balance between educating and enforcement.

There has been considerable emphasis in the environment areas, in consumer affairs and in industrial relations, to look at educating employers to do the right thing and not placing

much emphasis on enforcement, yet when we started moving towards a trend of educating as a way of achieving outcomes, a study under the New South Wales Greiner Government indicated very clearly that educating was most successful when it was accompanied by a very firm measure of enforcement. While we hear about this in the schoolroom, we do not hear about it in relation to environmental protection or worker protection nearly sufficiently.

Another important tension is that between the short term and the long term, particularly when we are faced with a situation in this State where development is imperative. Often we are so overwhelmed by the need to develop that we do not take into account all the long run interests that might be involved. For my part, I am still not satisfied that we did do that properly in relation to the West Beach groyne. If we have made a mistake, we will be living with that mistake for a very long time, and it will cost us a great deal of money to fix it up.

At the moment we cannot feel confident that we are always getting the advice we need because we have so many experts telling us different things, and it makes it extremely difficult indeed, with the pressure of a development project in front of us, in trying to work our way through it. Also we have the tension between the rights of industries and the rights of residents to peace and harmony and a clean environment, and that is occurring with the expansion of the suburbs, even though that is slowing down.

We still have quite a number of legacies of the fact that an industry was there and along come these residents who suddenly do not like the industry to be there. The complexities in that area are really quite difficult to manage. In my electorate, for instance, many of the residents are assaulted by the aromas coming from the mushroom farm. The mushroom farm rightly contends that it has been there for a very long time and the residents have come later. Quite rightly, the residents say, 'Well, I did not smell the mushroom mess when I bought my house.' The aromas are usually present only after 7 o'clock at night, and most houses are open for inspection during the day. I have experienced this twice in the south, and the first occasion was when I built a house at Hackham West. About three weeks after moving in I was very disturbed to smell the aromas from the meatworks at Noarlunga. I did not know that such smells were allowed in a residential area. I visited my home almost daily as it was built over a 12 month period and I had never encountered those aromas before.

I was warned of the mushroom farm, but many people who first went there were not. Residents today are increasingly looking for peace and quiet to be provided by their Government. The environmental authorities have an important role in trying to balance the rights between the residents to the comfort that they are seeking and industry to the development that they, and all of us, need.

I have also found in some of the matters that have come before the Public Works Committee that there has not been confidence from many residents in relation to the environmental protection processes when the provisions of the State Development Act are used. I would, in fact, urge the Environment, Resources and Development Committee to consider that aspect as part of its inquiry. Is it able to provide comprehensive environmental advice when we are trying to fast-track an important project?

Another tension is between the in-house experts and the consultants who are employed. While it is very difficult for us to really assess how much money is paid to various

consultants these days, the indications are that it is indeed considerable and far higher than what was paid to ordinary public servants. This presents another anomaly in that people who have paid a lot of money for advice, which is supposedly independent, are rather inclined to stick to that advice; when ordinary citizens question it, the citizen is told, 'Well, we have this expert consultant who has advised us'. The expert consultant is in no way accountable: the authority is accountable because it has accepted, or otherwise, that advice. The process of accountability becomes very difficult indeed, and it is something that I think Governments will have to grapple with a lot more in the future. These are some of the issues that I consider need to be considered in this review of the environmental authorities, and I wish the committee well in its deliberations.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

RACING (SATRA—CONSTITUTION AND OPERATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 27 May. Page 1459.)

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I shall not delay the House very long. From what I see of this legislation, it is fairly short and concise in its thrust. It ensures that there is appropriate representation for people from rural and regional South Australia in the South Australian Thoroughbred Racing Authority. The Bill is fairly narrow. It does not address other aspects contained in the principal legislation which enables other breeds of horses to be raced and matters such as that. It ensures that everyone across the board gets reasonable representation because, at present, that is not the case.

The legislative changes we have made in recent years resulted in our writing such provisions out of the framework through which people, who are involved in the industry from outside the metropolitan area, can have their explicit interests represented, as it were, not as delegates but as full and responsible members of the organisation. It also ensures that those people who work within the industry, such as jockeys and apprentice jockeys, get some say in what happens.

As a member of the Liberal Party, I am quite happy to see the same principle in which we believe within our own Party enshrined in this kind of legislation. The President of our Rural and Regional Council is a member of the State Executive. We have other ways in which we ensure that people from right across the length and breadth of the State participate in policy decision making. So it should be within the thoroughbred racing fraternity where the deliberations of this body, which is dealt with in this legislation, affect outcomes for their industry, outcomes for their personal enterprise and outcomes for their profession and their vocation. To that extent it is democratic and equitable.

During the time that I have been in Parliament, most of it has been spent in Opposition. Good ideas often come from the Opposition, and good work is done by members of the Parliament in examining the effect of laws on society and the way in which desirable change can produce even more desirable outcomes for society at large. Not all wisdom resides on the benches of the Government or in the heads of the advisers to the Ministers on the Government side. Indeed, if all wisdom were to reside there, Parliament as an institution would never have grown up in the way it has to serve the interests of a peaceful democratic society in which we have

Her Majesty's Government and Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. The very word means that you debate the way forward to determine what is supposed to be in the best interests of society.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: That may be so. At the end of the day, when you reflect on history, it is not just might that is right; you will not have peace unless everyone is heard, so that might, that is, the majority, is not necessarily right. However, if you want peace, and if you therefore want certainty in the fact that you can go about your daily business within the framework of the law, knowing that others respect that and will do likewise to enable you to do it, you have to listen to the arguments and concerns of the minority. If those arguments and concerns are properly and well represented in places of decision making, such as the Parliament, they will influence the direction in which changes to the framework of the law takes in describing what society can and cannot do and what its citizens can and cannot do.

I have sat frustrated and annoyed with the absolute—I will not use an expletive—mischief perpetrated by Governments when I have put forward opinions about changes to the law which were needed and which were based on good science and fact, only to be told that the Government was doing an inquiry itself, or that it would adjourn the matter, or that it would simply vote it down because I was wrong in that I did not cross a T or dot an I somewhere in the legislation. That is not okay; but I can take it. However, what happened is that the idea to which I drew attention about where the law needed to be changed did not as soon or as often as it could have.

Accordingly, I have sympathy for well researched and well prepared propositions put by any member of this place regardless of their political affiliation or lack of it. I treat them on their merits in the context of what needs to be done and what can be done best to ensure more satisfactory outcomes for everyone who has to participate in the world in which we all live and who is affected by that law. More plainly, if you cannot get something done that will be to the benefit of everyone and to the detriment of either very few or none, because the law prevents it, the sooner we change the law the better. If it makes for a fairer society, the sooner we change the law the better.

If it means then that there will be greater peace and more productive enterprise in industry, the sooner we change the law the better. Therefore, I say on this measure, notwithstanding that there is a general inquiry going on, it is a good signal for the Parliament to send to the people involved in that inquiry that we want a more representative and democratic organisation in SATRA than we have at the present time. I support the Bill.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): From the outset, I compliment the shadow Minister for introducing a very well constructed piece of legislation which attempts to put, and I think succeeds in putting, a structure forward that balances the needs of racing, the needs of the industry and the requirements of Government, and gives a good basis and grounding for the industry to go forward. I want to make a contribution against the backdrop that, at the time, I was the shadow Minister for Racing when the initial major restructuring of racing was undertaken in this State. I acknowledge the member for Bragg as the then Minister of Racing being the architect, but we worked in a reasonably cooperative manner to bring about some significant changes. At that time, as the member for Bragg would recall, I certainly expressed concern that we

were putting too many layers in place for racing, having RIDA and, below RIDA, SATRA and the greyhound and harness authorities. There were simply too many layers of bureaucracy. From the outset, my preference was for a much flatter structure.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: At the time we were talking about racing commissions and all sorts of things and, as the then Minister would recall, I expressed a view that we needed a flatter structure. I do not think he was necessarily against that either, but he had some political hurdles to jump and so RIDA was born. I would have to say on reflection now that clearly what we did establish was not the best structure. I think that any objective assessment of RIDA could only come up with one conclusion, that is, that it has been an absolute failure. I came to that conclusion fairly early in the piece and realised that we had put in place too much complication and too many levels of bureaucracy. I realised we had put a straitjacket around the effective operations of the racing industry in South Australia.

One of the surprises out of that structure was SATRA, which showed very early that it was an effective body to administer the thoroughbred racing industry in South Australia. SATRA showed early signs of excelling itself, albeit with its limited role and flexibility in dealing with some major issues, given that it had RIDA hanging above its head. Any of us who witnessed some of the money that RIDA was able to spend in recent years on its marketing and advertising campaigns would have to question how the decisions were made to appropriate those quite large sums of money when racing was in dire need of critical funding at its core levels.

We must abolish RIDA. We certainly should not establish a racing commission. As someone who had a view some time back that we needed to shake up the racing industry in South Australia, I am now firmly of the view that that cannot and should not be done via a racing commission. The best way to do it is to put a simple structure in place that will complement racing itself—and you Mr Speaker, as a former Racing Minister, know these issues perhaps much better than I do. It needs to be a simple structure, one that has power and independence, and one that is able to offer the supervision that the industry needs. It does not need the dead hand of Government because, if RIDA is any example of what happens to racing when Government has a very heavy hand on it, no more needs to be said.

In terms of how the member for Lee has structured SATRA, we obviously have the perennial problem of how we appoint, elect or have members constituting SATRA. The new model put forward is excellent. There is no doubt that the former model under which SATRA was simply appointed by the SAJC was a nonsense. I felt uneasy about it at the time but there were many threats thrown around and all sorts of pressures put on us in terms of the principal clubs and concerning the issue of how appointments were made. At the time I think we gave in to the pressure that it had to involve the SAJC. I do not think it would be news to anyone here that I do not have a high opinion of the SAJC in South Australia as it is presently constituted in terms of its administration of racing in recent years and, more particularly, I think the SAJC has made some very significant errors in the way in which it has conducted itself in recent years.

It would be remiss of me not to point out that, for the first time that I can recall, the SAJC as a body involved itself in the politics of this Parliament, and in a very partisan fashion. The present SAJC Chairman, Mr Birchall, when we had a raging political debate over an issue involving the member

for Bragg, felt compelled to come out in a very partisan manner to support the then Minister. I do not begrudge anyone having private and personal views about anything, but the SAJC in that instance showed it was ready to enter into the world of politics in a very partisan manner. I was somewhat surprised and taken aback that the SAJC Chairman, Mr Birchall, would have been prepared to enter the world of politics as he did. I cite that as just one example of where the SAJC's judgment has been lacking.

Clearly, in recent years the thoroughbred racing industry in this State has not performed well, and we cannot just be critical of RIDA. We have to also critically analyse the role of everyone, as the member for Bragg says. I agree. Clearly, things have not been managed well at the SAJC. It has been a period of high turmoil. We have seen people dismissed, and I mention again that for some reason not to the SAJC's liking someone such as Merv Hill would have been involved in administering racing in this State. Now we have Merv Hill appointed to the deputy's role in New South Wales, and this is yet another example of where the SAJC's poor judgment saw a person whom I believe to be an outstanding racing administrator being lost to this State because of the petty and nasty politics of the SAJC and perhaps others. That is just another illustration of the situation.

I am giving a strong view about my personal dislike of the way in which the SAJC operates. Clearly, as someone who hopes one day to be the Treasurer of this State, I see as relevant to me how we spend and administer the proceeds of the SAJC. As a Parliament, we have to have confidence in the racing industry's being able to use those scarce resources to the best of its ability. I just do not think that that can occur if we have RIDA or the SAJC by *de facto* appointing, or if SATRA becomes a *de facto* body of the SAJC. So, the member for Lee is correct—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Deputy Premier please go into the gallery.

Mr FOLEY: The member for Lee has been very clever in the way in which he has been able to structure it, ensuring that the SAJC has representation—I am not saying that it should not, but it is not in a majority position. However, the establishment of the new body, the Thoroughbred Racing Advisory Council (TRAC), will bring in a whole array of other participants and create another role for them in terms of participating in putting forward a nomination. But probably most importantly (and this is a signal and an appeal to the Independents and those opposite who are members in rural constituencies), it also gives country racing a level of involvement that it has not enjoyed previously. And let us remember that racing is not just about the SAJC's view of this world: it is about the whole of South Australian racing, and you cannot have a suburban based jockey club making the fundamental decisions that affect racing right across the State. I commend the member for Lee for picking up on that. I am confident that the Independents will support it and I hope that many members—indeed, all members—opposite will do so.

I challenge the Government to show the same degree of bipartisanship that I and my colleagues were prepared to give it when the original reform went through. Let us sit down together and agree on these principles and make a united stand for racing in this State, not a divided stand. I have had my moments with the member for Bragg in recent times, but he was prepared to be bipartisan: the challenge is now for you, Mr Evans.

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

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

LISTENING DEVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the sitting of the House to continue during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Bill.

Motion carried.

ONKAPARINGA CATCHMENT WATER LEVY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith:

That the levy proposal forming part of the Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board Annual Review 1998-99, laid on the table of this House on 25 May 1998, be disallowed.

(Continued from 27 May. Page 1465.)

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Here we are again, as members of Parliament, being asked to fix up a mess brought about by the Minister for Environment. This is the fourth time that one of these plans has been lobbed into Parliament as a result of the Minister's incapacity to deal with the matter in the way in which a competent Minister would. Part of the reason for that, of course, is the Minister's interference in the proper operations of the board. We do not mind interference if it is competent interference but, in this case, of course, it is not.

The background to this issue is that the board, in its annual review of the levy to be imposed in the Onkaparinga region, put a proposal to the Minister to introduce a tiered levy system this year. That arose out of its consultation with its constituency and community, which brought about many complaints. In its review—and, as a member of the Economic and Finance Committee, I have studied this—the board report shows that there was initially last year very little consultation about the system imposed. So, they had this 12 month period and did the consultation, and lots of resources and time were put into that. They came up with a system—in this case, a tiered levy system—and the Minister overturned it. The letter that the Economic and Finance Committee saw contained no explanation: just that the Minister, in her usual arrogant, non-consultative and incompetent way, had decided to overturn what had been proposed by her board. The Minister might like to comment on what she sees as the incompetence of her board, because the Opposition does not concur with her.

Last week, we moved this motion in the House, and the Minister declined to speak at that stage. We gave her another week to try to see if she could sort out this mess. I understand that, on Monday, Cabinet considered this matter. This had to go to Cabinet, mind you; this is a matter that should have been sorted out by the Minister and it had to go all the way to Cabinet to sort out. Following the Cabinet meeting, the Minister held an urgent meeting with the board and she advised the board—surprise, surprise—that there would be a tiered system.

I understand that the Minister has told the board to negotiate with the council regarding the collection system. I might just point out some of the pressure that was brought to bear behind the scenes in this matter because this affects the Premier's constituency in the Onkaparinga catchment area.

All members of Parliament, I believe, have received the letter from the Apple and Pear Growers Association, telling of its disquiet and disgust at the way in which the Minister has handled this issue. I understand that Premier Olsen has issued a press release to the *Mount Barker Courier* that there will be a tiered system. So, the Premier has told his Minister, I understand, and overturned his Minister.

The Minister went back to the board this week, I understand, and told it to negotiate with the council regarding the collection system. However, apparently, the Minister has received some Crown Law advice that it is not up to the Minister to negotiate, or the board to determine the method of collection; that is up to the council. The board set the total amount to be collected by the council based on property values but it is up to the council to work out how it goes about it.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms WHITE: Yes, good on Crown Law: how convenient! I ask the Minister whether that is correct. She will have an opportunity to respond in a moment. Given that scenario, I am sure all members will realise that, theoretically, councils could do anything they wanted. We have the Premier issuing guarantees to his constituency that there will be a tiered system. He has told the Minister that she must abide. The Opposition is asking the Minister (who, I understand, freaked out at all this: any member who witnessed some of the arguments in the corridor would concur with my description of 'freak out') to guarantee that there will be a tiered system and that the board's rating system will be implemented.

The Opposition is watching this Minister very closely. This is yet another example where, time after time, we have to come into this Parliament and other people have to sort out this Minister's mess. These four matters that have come before Parliament over the past 12 months—two in the last week—have come about because the Minister is stubborn. She will not consult with the people to whom she needs to listen; she dictates to the community. She does not know how to go about implementing what is best for our constituents and the constituency of the members of this House and has to force these issues into Parliament to sort out messes that she cannot sort out herself.

The Minister forces issues to be sorted out by Cabinet because she cannot sort them out herself. When will this Minister start saving our resources and time and start doing her job properly? This has been an absolutely incompetent performance by this Minister and we have seen it happen time and again. I am getting sick of it, the people of the Onkaparinga area are getting sick of it and the people of the Northern Adelaide Plains are getting sick of it, and this is just one aspect of the Minister's portfolio (there are many); and, as we all know, the Premier is getting pretty sick of it, too.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): At the outset I need to make the point that I feel very strongly about the matter that we are debating this morning, to the extent that I have made it clear that I will cross the floor if this matter is not resolved. As most members in this place would appreciate, I am totally committed to catchment management in this State. On the whole, I am delighted with the achievements made as a result of many of the programs introduced over the past few years to assist with our goal in achieving total catchment management throughout South Australia.

Regrettably, there are those who appear cynical about the responsibilities given to the catchment management boards under the Water Resources Act but, overall, I believe the

boards have worked well and achieved much. I will be doing everything I can to ensure that the establishment and responsibilities of the catchment boards are supported as set out under the provisions of the Water Resources Act. However, I do feel very strongly that this legislation is now in need of review. I was totally satisfied with the legislation when I introduced it, but I must say that amendments introduced during the debate on this legislation need to be revisited.

One of my concerns has brought us to the difficult situation surrounding the issues and this particular debate. If I were to cross the floor on this issue it would be only the second time in over 24 years that I have been forced to do so, and it is not something that I look forward to. In regard to the review of this legislation, I think it can be said that all legislation as significant as the Water Resources Act, because it is major legislation, should be reviewed after a certain period. Generally I would suggest after five years, at least. I realise that it is not that long since the legislation was introduced, but I do believe that there is a need for the legislation to be reviewed as a result of some of the issues we are now recognising.

I have been concerned and have expressed concern about the inequitable levy system, should that have been maintained within the Onkaparinga catchment. As other speakers have said, regrettably, through no fault of the board, the initial levy for the Onkaparinga catchment was implemented without adequate consultation but, in contrast, there has been considerable community and industry consultation and input, particularly through the levy review reference group consultants and the general community discussion that has taken place in an attempt to introduce an equitable and more acceptable levy regime.

I support the introduction of a tiered rating system, or an alternative system, very strongly. In turn, this system would remove the significant impost on primary producers in the catchment while, at the same time, the principles contained within the management plan should not be jeopardised. I was informed on Monday that a tiered system would be put in place in the Onkaparinga catchment. Reference has been made to the Premier's press release and the prominence that it has received in the local paper, the *Courier*. That release states:

Under the new system secured and finalised by Premier Olsen today, higher value properties such as farms will pay a reduced levy. Premier Olsen intervened in the issue after property owners in the Onkaparinga catchment area expressed concern they were being unfairly penalised by the current proportionate system. Under the new tiered system to be in place for the 1999-2000 financial year, those with higher value properties in the catchment area such as primary producers will pay a reduced levy rate.

The press release further states:

This will ensure for example that property owners are not being penalised for environmental initiatives that have increased the value of their properties. The new tiered system is fairer and takes into account the valuable contribution of primary producers to this State.

The release concludes:

It is important that the Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board continue its work and the new tiered system will ensure that the board's funding is equitable.

I must say that I am not exactly sure how this is to be achieved. I understand there is to be further consultation with councils within the catchment, and I am sure that the Minister will be able to throw light on the process that will be adopted in achieving this system. However, I am assured, through the press statement in the name of the Premier, that a tiered

system will now be put in place. I understand and appreciate the concerns of landowners, particularly in the catchment, who have expressed strong opposition to the inequitable levy previously proposed, particularly when the vast majority of those landowners are doing the right thing in assisting with the cleaning up of our waterways.

One of the most important issues emerging from these catchment programs is the responsibility that has been adopted by landowners themselves in assisting with the cleaning-up process through working with the boards, the community and the strong voluntary support that is now being shown by so many South Australians for this program. Obviously, I will be monitoring this situation very closely to ensure that the commitment made by the Premier is in fact carried out, because I believe it is the appropriate way to go, and that a tiered system, or an alternative system, that provides a more equitable process for the payment of the levy is achieved.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I will not take up the time of the House other than to make a few short comments. I believe that members of the House fully understand and appreciate the importance of providing the Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board with an appropriate budget to enable it to formulate and to progress its comprehensive management plan, its water allocation plans (which are so desperately needed in the Willunga Basin) and its ongoing works and education programs. Effectively, this is a single decision for the House today. While processes have previously followed a consistent path, the recent concerns that have been expressed by the Economic and Finance Committee, in particular, has led to a re-examination of what needed to be done and how it needed to be done.

Therefore, in accordance with legal advice, I wish to advise the House that the levy proposal put forward by the board as part of its annual review and now under consideration consists of only the amount specified by the board to be contributed by the constituent councils of its catchment area for the next financial year. This amount is \$2.04 million. My understanding is that this has never been a matter of contention. In consultation with councils, I formulated the basis of the levy. In this case capital value is the most common approach to determine the share that each council must contribute, as required by sections 135(3) and (4) of the Act. Both the basis of the levy and the councils' proportions require approval by the Governor and gazettal. As to the method of collection, this responsibility rests with the constituent councils.

This leads me to the much discussed tiered capital levy system. It is a system that is favoured by the board, and it is also looked upon very favourably by the members of the Economic and Finance Committee. It is one about which I have written to the board, encouraging it to develop it further. The Government has strongly supported the view that the tiered levy system can provide fair and equitable outcomes and, to this end, it will encourage the councils in the Onkaparinga catchment to use this approach in raising their share of the levy. I ask members of the House of Assembly to support this important levy proposal so that the Onkaparinga board can get on with the job that it was appointed to do.

Motion negatived.

**TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION (SALE OF
PRODUCTS DESIGNED FOR SMOKING)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 27 May. Page 1461.)

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): The Government supports this private member's Bill. I am sure that the honourable member will be pleased to hear that. Herbal cigarettes, which this amendment to the Act tackles, frankly are a health risk to young teenagers and, therefore, should be put in the same category as tobacco products. This Parliament has previously taken the decision that confectionary cigarettes should not be sold to children. That is because confectionary cigarettes tend to encourage the development of smoking with tobacco products. Here is a product that is significantly worse than confectionary cigarettes so, therefore, it should be treated in a similar manner.

I commend the honourable member opposite for introducing this private member's Bill. I am pleased that she takes a hard stance on tobacco products, similar types of products and smoking. I do, too. My stance on this is well known: anything to discourage young people from smoking is very good indeed. I will highlight what concerns me greatly. Some recent surveys have shown that there has been an alarming increase in the level of smoking amongst 12 to 17 years olds. For 15 year olds, the survey showed that 25 per cent—one in four of those people—are smoking on a regular basis. About 30 per cent of 15 and 16 year olds are smoking on a regular basis. That is alarming. Despite all the efforts of the community and all the publicity—the sort of publicity you see on the sides of buses and on television—about the damage caused by tobacco smoking, it is still on the increase. In the early 1990s, the level of tobacco smoking amongst teenagers decreased. Now it is on this alarming increase again. I am sure that the honourable member will equally support the stance that I announced earlier this week, whereby we are determined to get tough on those retailers who are selling cigarette products to people under the age of 18 years.

I was amazed to find that, when the *Advertiser* went out with a young person and tested the buying of products on Monday afternoon after my announcement, nine out of the 10 retail outlets sold cigarettes to someone under the age of 18 years without even querying their age. I find that an appalling lack of responsibility by the owners of those retail outlets. They have an obligation to try to determine the age of the person and to make sure that they are not selling cigarette products to someone under 18 years of age. In her response to this Bill, I hope that the honourable member will equally come in behind the campaign that the Government is currently launching to get tough. I have indicated for too long that, despite previous warnings, retailers have just ignored the law and have been willing to go out and flout it and sell cigarettes for their own personal gain. We need to clamp down on that. Equally, we need to clamp down on herbal cigarettes. I support the Bill.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I, too, support the Bill and congratulate the member for Torrens for taking another initiative, running with it and making a difference. I am pleased to see that this time the Government has responded to this initiative.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Round one of the member for Torrens's initiative fell off the Notice Paper because the Government did not respond. It is pleasing to see that the Government has responded to this one.

It is quite clear that the sale of these cigarettes should be outlawed. They are clearly a health risk, and I support that. Regarding the matters raised by the Minister, I will refer to two issues, the first being the initiatives he raised earlier this week in the *Advertiser* about getting tough on retailers. Secondly, I will remind the Minister of his Government's commitment to spending \$3.9 million per year on the tobacco control strategy for the foreseeable future in order to reduce smoking levels to 20 per cent in five years.

I will deal with the second matter first, and I am glad that the Minister is in the Chamber. I raised this issue yesterday in a grievance debate. I call on the Minister to reiterate the clear commitment and undertaking given in this Parliament by the former Minister for Health on the spending of \$3.9 million per year on this strategy. This figure was reiterated by the current Minister, Minister Brown, last year. He received a great deal of commendation for that, and I applauded him, as I applauded the previous Minister when we agreed that that would be the case as part of negotiations on a Bill in the last Parliament. I note that the Minister is not meeting my eye as I say this. However, it is very important that you actually deliver on this, because people suspect that you will not do so. I note among the things that you announced—

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The pronoun 'you' is not generally acceptable in this House when addressing members. Comments should be directed through you, Sir, as Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is technically correct. I ask the member to observe Standing Orders.

Ms STEVENS: I noted on World No Tobacco Day on Monday that, in his press release on what had been spent in relation to the \$3.9 million, the Minister's announcement came to about \$700 000, and there were also some extensions of programs that did not have dollar values against them. However, they could not come anywhere near the \$3.9 million per year that he promised. I will be watching this, as are many people in the community who are aware of that commitment. If we are serious about cutting down on smoking, we need to follow through and introduce a range of strategies that will enable us to reduce smoking to 20 per cent over five years, in accordance with the stated target and the stated funding commitment. That has been done in California using funding levels of that magnitude and our State Government said that it would do it, so we are waiting, Minister, for this to be delivered.

I would like to comment on being tough on retailers. I too believe that it is very important that we look to stopping the sale of cigarettes to minors, but I was very concerned at the comments the Minister was reported in the paper as having made, and I am surprised and concerned that he has not made a full statement to this House about what he has in mind on this matter. It seems to me that what we need to do to make a difference here is, first, work very closely with retailers and shopkeepers, being very clear with them about their responsibilities and working through how to deal with any issues where they foresee problems for themselves in carrying out their responsibilities. To me, that is the first and very important step one would take.

I believe that what has happened in relation to hotels and the sale of liquor to minors is a model that could easily be adapted to delis. Young people are now used to having to provide ID, and the issues that were raised when that law changed are the same sorts of issues that will be raised here in relation to the sale of cigarettes. That is where we should be going and how we should be approaching this matter. My concerns lie in the Minister's proposal to pay young people to entrap shopkeepers into selling them cigarettes. In other words, the Minister is suggesting—according to the news reports, because we have not heard—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

Ms STEVENS: Hang on, just let me finish. We have not heard from the Minister himself in this House but, according to news reports, the Minister is considering recruiting young people and paying them to go in under the supervision of Human Services staff and try to purchase cigarettes; then, of course, whoever sells those cigarettes to the young people will be trapped. I have a problem with that. Entrapment should only be used in limited circumstances.

Mr Atkinson: According to law.

Ms STEVENS: According to law. I have a real problem with our placing young people under 18 in that position. That is not the way to go about it: that is the wrong signal to send to young people about being involved in entrapment, about themselves breaking the law in order to trap someone else. I want to be tough on cigarette smoking for young people, but I do not think that is the right way to go about it and that other alternatives should be pursued.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I support the legislation, for the same reasons as other members (particularly the Minister) have noted. I commend the honourable member for having brought it to us. I refer members to my remarks made earlier this day on another measure: it is a good idea and it deserves support. In saying that, I commend this Minister for having been so gracious as to accept that it is a good idea whose time has come, instead of trying to obfuscate, dodge, get around it and then bring it back in some form in a few months' or a year's time, to try to demean the effort that has been made by the member for Torrens in bringing it to us today. I also want to draw attention to the concern that I have as a reformed smoker. Smoking is not a good thing to be doing.

The Hon. R.B. Such: Maybe you are a non-smoker, but you are not reformed!

Mr LEWIS: In grammatical terms the member for Fisher is correct. I am a non-smoker now and I was previously a smoker. In consequence I got cancer on my bottom lip. It took four weeks or so to get the appointment that I needed with the plastic surgeon to have the thing removed. By that time it had already split, bled and grown and then stopped itching, but every week or so it would split, bleed and grow again. By the time he got around to removing it, it was bigger than the top of my little finger inside my bottom lip. I was told that, if I had not had it removed at that time, within five to seven days cells would have broken loose, got into the lymph glands in my neck next to my carotid artery and I would have been dead within eight weeks. I tell everyone that story in the hope that it will enable them to understand just how serious it is.

The point at which the cancer developed was precisely the point on which I used to hang the Log Cabin fine cut roll-your-own cigarettes while I was shearing—just to the left of centre on my bottom lip. I would light up, shear three sheep and not even remove the cigarette while I was doing that. I

would flick the butt off my lip with my tongue, out through the door into the count-out pen after I had finished the third sheep.

With that anecdote I move on, and say that I do not share the concerns of the *Advertiser's* editorial or of the member for Elizabeth. Damn it, the law says that you do not sell to minors, so how are you going to catch the people who are breaking that law? I believe that the penalty is inadequate for people who sell to minors under the age of 10. That is very obvious and blatantly bad; it is extremely detrimental. In years, decades and even centuries gone by we did not know that tobacco was bad for our health; it has only become recently possible for us to identify through Koch's Postulate the cause and effect of tobacco smoking to cancer of our exposed parts (the mouth, oesophagus, lungs and so on) and the damage that it does to our blood vascular systems.

So, we as legislators need to say stop: enough is enough. This is a damn dangerous substance—leave it alone. And whilst we as legislators acknowledge that a huge percentage of the population 20 years ago used to smoke and think nothing of it, and that gradually we are winding that back, still too many people smoke. Worse still—and this is the point that this legislation makes—they are selling it to young people, and advertising targets young people to get them to start smoking.

What the advertisers say that it is meant to shift allegiance between brands, is piffle: you have to be nuts if you believe that. I agree with the Minister: this is the only way to catch the crooks—and that is what they are, people who will deal in death. Not everyone who smokes will die in consequence of doing so, but the majority will and the death will be a terrible death. In consequence, the penalties need to be appropriate to stop retailers from making a profit out of selling to youngsters, substances that cause death—tobacco, in this case, and other products as well. Therefore, because the offence is that of selling to a minor it is essential to recruit appropriate people to do the work of detecting whether or not retailers commit those offences.

I have no problem whatever with appropriate recruitment and payment of minors to do that work, because it is directed at detecting the offence. Indeed, I believe that they ought to be wired, so that they can then go to the retailer, ask for a packet of cigarettes, hear the retailer's response, obtain the product from the sale and then tell the retailer that they are there, as it were, in surveillance of the Tobacco Products Regulation Act.

Mr Hanna: Why not just bug all the delis, if you're going to go that far?

Mr LEWIS: No, you cannot because you would not know when an illegal sale occurs. It costs too much to put surveillance equipment in all the delis. You simply do as the police do. I have no problem with entrapment. It has to be done if that is the nature of the crime which is being committed, and it is done all the time. Otherwise it is a nonsense. So you ensure that it is done within the framework of the law and, if the law is not adequate, change it. Having obtained the evidence, prosecute the offenders and get rid of the problem. There is no other way to deal with it, otherwise we will have this hangover of a large percentage of people, not being reduced at a sufficiently great enough rate, who are becoming addicted to tobacco and about whom and towards whom we feel a bit sorry. For some reason or other we do not ban the substance straight-out.

I reckon that the time has come when we ought to do for tobacco what we have done for cannabis, and that is to make

it an offence to use it, and expiate it if someone is caught committing that offence. I would also require all used car dealers to remove all ashtrays from motor vehicles and to introduce an Australian Standard that prevents the fitting of ashtrays to new motor vehicles.

Mr Hanna: There would be more butts on the street.

Mr LEWIS: There would not be because it would be an offence to smoke, so people should not have the means by which to dispose of the butt. I am telling members what I see as being the ideal next step to discourage smoking. We have taken ashtrays and the like out of buildings and offices: we have put them out on the street. Now that people understand that it is for the health of others, if not just themselves, that they must not smoke in confined spaces, that they must go outside and do it, the time has come to get them to understand that it is simply not in their interests and we are not going to pay taxes for them to get sick and have us meet the health costs of trying to repair their health. I had my own operation done at my own expense because of my moral view of that matter. I have been privately insured for all my life and, accordingly, I believe that I did the right thing. I am not being holier than anybody else in that respect: I am just saying that I am consistent in my remarks. I commend the Bill.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I was very pleased to hear the comments of the Minister and other members in support of this Bill. As I said in my second reading explanation, these products are every bit as dangerous to the health of consumers as nicotine-based products, so I urge everyone to support this measure. For the sake of accuracy, I point out that in my second reading remarks I commented that as far as back as 1985 Mexico banned the sale of clove cigarettes. It was in fact New Mexico, so I mention that for the sake of accuracy. I also thank the mother of the young girl who brought this to my attention and who has given Parliament an opportunity to rectify this anomaly.

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

CONSTITUTION (CITIZENSHIP) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Atkinson:

That the second reading of the Constitution (Citizenship) Amendment Bill be rescinded owing to the Bill being an amendment to the constitution of the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council and failing to gain the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House on its second reading on Thursday, 4 March 1999, as required by section 8 of the Constitution Act 1934.

(Continued from 25 March. Page 1277.)

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I note the interjection of the member for Spence that someone has written something for me. In opposing this motion and again supporting the Bill, I speak on a principle, unlike the member for Spence whose main aim is to protect his Leader. Try as much as he wants, at the end of the day—

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order. I have moved this motion for a particular purpose and the member for Hartley is imputing improper motives to me and I ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think it is very marginal as far as a point of order is concerned. I ask the member for Hartley to be cautious if there is a suggestion that he is imputing

improper motives. I am not sure that he did so technically on that occasion.

Mr SCALZI: Thank you, Mr Speaker. If that is the interpretation, I withdraw because I do not want members to infer that the honourable member was protecting the Leader or himself. If members read *Hansard*, they will discover the motives of the member for Spence in moving this motion. The honourable member has lost the political debate. I am not a lawyer. I am not a legal expert. All I know is that the Bill, which passed through its first, second and third readings in this place and which is now in another place, was accepted by the members in this House. The argument was lost by the member for Spence, but that was not enough. Now he is trying to rescind it on a technicality. Since 1969, 51 Bills which sought to amend the Constitution Act have been introduced, of which 37 received assent. Of the 37 which passed, the Speaker of the day—

Members interjecting:

Mr HANNA: I rise on a point of order. I cannot hear the member for Hartley, and I want to listen to his argument, because the member for Stuart is shouting at the member for Spence and I cannot hear over that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order in that all debates should be heard in silence, but I also advise members on my left that, before they criticise members on my right, they should ensure that their side of the House maintains decorum at all times, including Question Time.

Mr SCALZI: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Of the 37 Bills which passed, the Speaker of the day drew the attention of the House to the need for an absolute majority in nine cases. Of the 14 which did not pass both Houses, three were not voted on at the second reading and the Speaker made statements in relation to six others. In total, 48 Bills were voted on to at least the second reading, of which only 15 attracted the Speaker's attention in terms of section 8.

As I said, I am not a legal expert and I do not pretend to be, but I do have an understanding about citizenship and multiculturalism and that has been accepted by this House and in the community. That is not in question. 'Constitution' which the member for Spence refers to does not apply in this case. 'Constitution' in the absolute sense refers to the make-up of the House. That is not the case.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: That is not the case. The members in this Chamber, including me, and I trust in the other place, will accept your ruling, Sir. It is quite clear that the Crown Law advice in this case is that the member for Spence has—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Would you say that outside this place?

Mr Atkinson: Yes, I have.

Mr SCALZI: And the honourable member wants to be a future Attorney-General!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The Chair is having difficulty hearing the member for Hartley.

Mr SCALZI: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The constitution in this case does not refer to the make-up. If it referred to the make-up as we have seen by the other ruling, then the honourable member would have a case. But the honourable member has been quite hypocritical on this because, on 5 May 1994, when this clause was taken out after agreement from both sides, it was passed—

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on other motions.
Debate adjourned.

HAYES, Mr C.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): I move:

That this House mourns the passing of Colin Hayes OBE AM and his contribution to the racing industry in South Australia, nationally and internationally.

I feel very honoured to move this motion as a tribute to Colin Hayes. Colin was a person who touched my life for only a very short time but had a profound effect upon my views of life and of racing in particular. His enthusiasm for life was always apparent to me, even when he was ill. He was a person who was a great listener, particularly in terms of my radical plans to change the racing industry. He did not always support some of my views but always went about quietly giving his lifelong experience in the racing industry to further encourage my thoughts.

He often invited me to Lindsay Park where we talked for many hours about the industry, about the people in it, about the structures for governing the industry, about the potential of the industry and what could be done to achieve this potential, about the TAB, about fixed odds betting—for which he had a particular passion—about the need to revitalise the breeding sector of the industry in South Australia, and about the need to increase State money, but often it was to talk just about life.

I always came away from these meetings feeling that I had been reinvigorated to go on with the difficult task of changing the industry. On many occasions I got follow-up faxes about the issues we had discussed, often adding further points to those that had been agreed. However, most of the time the faxes provided alternatives for issues we did not resolve.

I was not aware then of his lifelong motto which I understand guided his life. That motto was: the future belongs to those who plan for it. It puts our meetings into a better perspective for me now. From experience I know that you also need to have the desire, the will and a capability to carry out plans. Colin Hayes obviously did. Much has been written about his training achievements. They are best summarised by a table of statistics, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Is the table purely statistical?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Yes, Mr Speaker. Leave granted.

C.S. HAYES	
Some of his numerous training and breeding feats	
Licensed to train: 1950	
Retired: 1990	
41 training premierships	
Adelaide 28	Melbourne 13
World records	
Most winners one day 23/1/82—10 on city tracks	
5 group winners one day—7/2/87	
6 group and black type winners one day—12/9/87	
British Commonwealth records	
5 333 winners to 31/7/90	
Most winners in a season to 31/7/90—1989-90	
278 (57 black type)	
Australian records	
Most money won in season 1988-89—\$6 107 537	
(to 31/7/90—1989-90—\$9 729 71)	
Most group 1 races in season 1989-90—13	
Group races won season 1989-90 to 31/7/90	
Group	113
Group 2	9
Group 3	9
Listed	26
	57
Most metropolitan winners in one season 1989-90—226	
Horses in training: 100	

Among feature races won (some several times)	
Melbourne Cup (2)	VRC Sires
Caulfield Cup	Futurity/Newmarket Handicap
Cox Plate (3)	Australian Cup
VRC Derby (4)	VRC St Leger
Blue Diamond	Sydney Cup
Rosehill Guineas	Queen Elizabeth Stakes
Golden Slipper	Queensland Oaks
Australian Derby	WA Derby
Adelaide Cup	SA Derby
SA Oaks	ATC Derby

Lindsay Park Stud
To 30/4/99

Bred 3 615 winners of \$136 058 572 and won 12 959 races

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: When you look at those statistics, you see that Colin started training in 1950 and retired in 1990; he had 41 training premierships—28 in Adelaide and 13 in Melbourne; and his world records included the most winners in one day, five group winners in one day, and six group and black type winners in one day. He holds British Commonwealth records of 5333 winners, and the most winners (278) in a season. His Australian records include the most money won in a season; the most group 1 races in a season; 57 group races won in a season (1989-90); the most metropolitan winners (226) in one season (1989-90); and almost every feature race in Australia (as listed in the table). At Lindsay Park he bred 3615 horses that won 12 959 races and a total of \$136 million.

When that is put into perspective regarding individuals in their industry, he has probably been one of the greatest Australian performers in any sporting pursuit in our country. It is also indicated that his best horse was *Dulcify*, and those who know a little about racing know the tragic end to which that horse came.

I will always remember attending a few training sessions in the early morning mist at Lindsay Park, first at the dirt track and later at the uphill grass track. The words 'boss', 'Dad' and 'CS' echoed through the little wooden boxes as the horses galloped past. They were the voices of one of the staff, of Peter his son, or of Tony McEvoy. Colin would be talking to me about some issue when suddenly he would stop and say, 'That was a good gallop'; 'He's okay'; 'What was the time?'; 'Good chance next Saturday'; 'That other one, though, looks a bit sore, and we had better put him back into the paddock.' Then quietly he was back talking to me, Peter or Tony about what we were previously discussing.

It was a unique insight for me, a rank outsider, into what professional training was really all about, and also, of course, what team work was all about. *Barossa Class* galloped past, and I learned about Colin Hayes' interest in and support for his local community, particularly young people. At the instigation of a teacher at Nuriootpa High School, he arranged for students from the school to be involved directly in the training, racing and spelling of a racehorse. This horse was called *Barossa Class*, after the school class. The idea was to show the job opportunities to young people in all facets of the racing industry but particularly the ones at Lindsay Park. Colin Hayes did all that as part of encouraging young people to learn a little about the racing industry, particularly in his home town.

After the gallops, Colin proudly showed me the unique non-skid, non-slip track that he had developed over the years—also a first in Australia. This track was introduced to reduce jarring and injury during the hard training schedules of the modern racehorse. His advice on this type of training track was widely sought both interstate and overseas.

Finally, we always adjourned to what was the best part of the day for me—breakfast with the staff. Again, the affectionate boss, CS, was prevalent as staff came and went. The interesting thing about the breakfast was that you could have anything—bacon and eggs, steak, fish, chops—the whole lot. It was really like a cafeteria. With the special acknowledgment by his staff of his position, their obvious support was something more than I had seen in any business I had ever visited. He was clearly ‘the boss’.

I had the pleasure on many occasions of being shown over Lindsay Park, the magnificent breeding complex with its own veterinary clinic. It was his dream, his reality, the fulfilment of his plan. Colin Hayes was an enthusiastic promoter of this complex. He was very proud of being a leader of the breeding industry in South Australia. He was one of the best salesmen and ambassadors of our State in this area. He brought many great stallions to Australia, including *Without Fear*, *Godswalk*, *Atilla*, *Romantic*, *At Talaq* and now *Jeune*, to name just a few. He also promoted locally bred stallions, such as *Rory's Jester*, *Euclase* and *Military Plume*. *Military Plume* was bred in New Zealand so by ‘local’ I mean within Australasia. His legacy to the breeding industry will continue for generations.

Colin Hayes and his family have also invested in the town of Angaston via the Angas Park Fruit Company. This business was purchased by the Hayes family in 1987 with 150 employees. Today it is the largest dried fruit manufacturer in Australia, employing 330 people full time and, in season, up to 900 people part time. The company now widely exports these fruit products to the world.

Colin Hayes also made a contribution to public life. He was Deputy Chairman of the TAB from February 1991 to February 1994. He encouraged the management to be more consumer oriented and, of course, to be more profitable. He believed that the TAB was the saviour of the racing industry. I mentioned earlier his interest in fixed odds betting which he pushed very vigorously during his time on the board. It is also important to note that he was involved in encouraging the three metropolitan clubs to amalgamate into the SAJC as we know it today. He was also on the committee of the Oakbank Racing Club and a prime mover of the creation of the Australian Breeders Cooperative.

His involvement in racing was world wide, with partnerships in breeding and racing with such notable people as Robert Sangster and Sheik Hamdan of Dubai. He was asked sometime ago by the Shah of Iran to set up racing in Tehran, Iran. Colin Hayes retired in 1990 but I know that he never really retired. He just changed some management involvement but never the interest. I know his background support for Peter and David continued right up until his death.

Colin Hayes had a very strong commitment to his family and he had wonderful lifelong support from his wife Betty. He loved his family, particularly his grandchildren. He was acknowledged by all as a gentleman, a person of the highest integrity, a man of great courage, and a man with incredible foresight, with an enormous capacity to work, and with extraordinary powers of negotiation and compassion.

Colin Hayes inspired and motivated people by example. He made people believe in themselves and their own capabilities. The accolades we have heard in recent days for Colin Hayes have come from people from all walks of life and this is not surprising. He was a great South Australian, a great Australian. I will finish with the following three paragraphs from an article ‘The boy who could catch horses’ by Les Carlyon, in a summary of Colin Hayes’s life from last

week’s *Bulletin* which makes it clear how he lived his motto, ‘The future belongs to those who plan’, right to the end:

When, a few months ago, he knew his heart was wearing out, Hayes began to plan again. If he was going to die, four things had to be right. He had to be at Lindsay Park. He wanted to die in his sleep. He wanted his family around him. And, no matter how feeble his body became, he wanted to keep his mind. He achieved all four.

Several days before his death, he spoke by phone to a long-time friend, Melbourne race caller, Bryan Martin. ‘Everything’s in order,’ he said. ‘David and I have been through every horse on the place today. When I kick the bucket. . .’ He paused to chuckle. ‘When I kick the bucket, everything will be in order.’

A few months ago, he visited the Angaston Cemetery, down the road from Lindsay Park, and picked out a plot. That’s where they buried this tough and tender man the other day. The boy who could catch horses had come a hell of a journey. And, for most of it, he had drawn all the maps himself.

The racing industry, in my view, will miss Colin Hayes. My thoughts go to Betty, Peter, Jan, Kerrie, and David. I was privileged to be a friend of Colin Hayes, AM, OBE.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing I am pleased to support the motion and I am also pleased that the member for Bragg, as a friend of Colin Hayes, had the opportunity to move and speak to the motion as the mover. Colin Hayes was a remarkable South Australian who dedicated his life to horse racing and people. A talented, intelligent and hugely popular man, Colin Hayes made an enormous contribution to racing in Australia and, in particular, South Australia. Apart from winning a series of top class races during his career of more than 50 years, Colin Hayes was an integral part in building the long-term future of the industry in his home State of South Australia.

Whilst he is largely remembered for his efforts on the track, Colin Hayes’s contribution to the breeding industry and his willingness to teach others within the racing industry was unrivalled. Good examples are his two sons, Peter and David, who have now established themselves as quality thoroughbred trainers themselves. In 1965 Colin Hayes established the now famous Lindsay Park stud in the Barossa; the rest of course is history. The state of the art complex not only helped him achieve so many high points in his racing career, but it set the benchmark for thoroughbred training and breeding facilities in Australia, if not the world. With a reputation that stretches around the world, Lindsay Park has been an unqualified success.

More than 120 people are employed at Lindsay Park and it regularly produces more than 200 winners each racing season. The member for Bragg has tabled a detailed summary of Colin Hayes’s achievements and I direct members’ attention to that paper. During his distinguished career Colin Hayes trained something like 5 333 winners, won 41 trainers’ premierships and was the leading trainer in Melbourne for 13 seasons. He holds the record for the most winners in a city racecourse in one day, which is 10, and this was matched with five group one winners also in one day.

Not surprisingly Colin Hayes was awarded an OBE and an AM. Throughout his career Colin Hayes remained a passionate and proud South Australian. He was loyally supported by his wife Betty and they formed a great partnership. His insight and knowledge of racing was respected by Governments, sought after by Ministers, and respected by industry and punters alike, and his efforts on and off the track took horseracing to a new level. Colin Hayes will rightly be remembered as one of the true gentlemen of horseracing and one who will be sadly missed. On behalf of the Government

of South Australia I offer our deepest condolences to his wife Betty, their children and their families.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): On behalf of the Opposition I would like to express our condolences on the passing of Colin Hayes. The racing industry is certainly in awe of this great individual. He was a unique individual. He truly was a legend of the racing industry. Not only was he a great trainer but he was a great horseman. He was a thorough gentleman and he really did achieve his mark over many years in the racing industry. Many of the comments since the passing of Colin Hayes have highlighted not only his great achievements over many years but also the way he conducted himself. We need only look at some of the comments and quotes which have been attributed to a broad cross-section of people, from former Prime Ministers, jockeys, trainers, business people, punters, you name it, universally across the racing industry, to see that there is little doubt that Colin Hayes goes down as one of the great icons of the racing industry.

He well deserves all the accolades he has received. He really has been a pioneer in the training of horses and the way in which he has been responsible for moving debate in certain areas in regard to the racing industry. Here in South Australia we owe him a great debt, but more than that so does Australia and the world, in respect to his achievements and the way that he has been responsible for many of the great innovations that he brought to the racing industry. Undoubtedly, the greatest legacy that he leaves is Lindsay Park. This is a unique environment for horses. It is something that is truly Colin Hayes and it is something that the racing industry world wide has certainly learnt from. Many trainers, not only in Australia, but around the world have tried to model their practices on the way Colin Hayes went about training horses, the environment he established for horses and the way he has gone about business.

I said earlier that some of the quotes attributed to various people highlight the broad cross-section that the racing industry can touch. I draw to the attention of the House a few of those. Former Prime Minister Bob Hawke said of Colin Hayes:

He was one of the greatest figures in the Australian racing industry.

Robert Sangster said:

I would travel anywhere for him.

Jockey Damien Oliver said:

He was an absolute legend.

Jockey Darren Gauchi said:

He was an absolute gentleman and an absolute professional.

Wolf Blass talked about his being a great ambassador. The comment that struck me the most and the one that will stay with me for a long time was from Bruce McAvaney, who was so true when he said:

He reached for the stars all his life. He did not want to be the best trainer in South Australia—he wanted to be the best in the world.

I suspect he probably was the best in the world. His record stands alone. He was a magnificent trainer, the like of which I suspect we will never see again. I wish to conclude by saying that the Opposition would like to pass on to his family our respects on his sad passing.

We are delighted that the tradition will live on through his family. Both Peter Hayes and David Hayes have made their own names and will continue to do so. They are great trainers in their own right. David in recent times has been extremely

successful in Hong Kong and I daresay he will return to Australia one day and we look forward to that. Over the past few years Peter Hayes has been responsible for Lindsay Park and has done a wonderful job. We look forward to the Hayes name continuing and we look forward to the tradition living on. Of course, it will always be there when we have such a great place like Lindsay Park, which is the showpiece of the Hayes empire. I wish the family all the best, and I certainly pass on the Opposition's deep sympathies and respect for a man who will never be forgotten.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I am honoured to represent in this place a region full of wonderful assets: natural, fixed and personal—those being our people. Last week, the Barossa, South Australia and, indeed, Australia, lost one of their finest people assets. Colin Hayes is an icon—not was. He is an icon and his is a name that rolls off the tongue of all Australians, whether they be connected with the racing industry or not. C.S. Hayes has instant recognition Australia-wide.

I am honoured to report that Colin Hayes was a valued constituent of mine and, as his member of Parliament, I met him often. He did not often give me any political advice, but he occasionally did, and certainly it was always food for thought, and valued. And, likewise, members of his family, with whom I have worked in various aspects in the Barossa (Paul Mariani being one), always treated me with respect, and certainly I appreciated the advice that came not only from Colin but also through his family.

I recall a very memorable occasion that I will long remember where I had a three-way discussion with Colin and Robert Sangster at an Oakbank feature held at Yalumba about two or three years ago—and I think that the member for Bragg was there. The man had a calm aura about him and an extremely wise counsel. People like Sangster would always seek Colin's advice, and his circle of friends stretched far beyond Australian shores. I also enjoyed Colin Hayes's humour (because he was always one for a joke), particularly if he was talking about those horses he had just missed at an auction, a horse that he thought he should have bought and did not and, when it turned out not to be such a flash horse, certainly he would laugh about that.

CS, as he was affectionately known, was certainly one of the best in the business—he was the best in the business. His motto—and we have all heard it: the future belongs to those who plan for it—was shown in everything he did. He made it happen and never waited for it to happen. What a great adage that is for us all to abide by.

As previous speakers have said, Colin's success on the race track is well known and well documented. He had 5 333 winners, including two Melbourne Cups. What a wonderful record. But his success in the community is also recalled at this time—and the member for Bragg has reflected on that. Nuriootpa High School (which is, I believe, one of the best high schools in South Australia) is Australia's first school to have a racehorse and—you guessed it—it was leased in partnership with CS.

Barossa Class, the first school racehorse, commenced her racing career in 1997 and scored her first win in the following year. Mr Kevin Hoskin, the agricultural coordinator teacher at Nuriootpa High School, has said how grateful the school is for the physical, financial and emotional support of Mr Hayes in the venture. The school will produce a commemorative release of Barossa Class port in honour of

Mr Hayes (certainly, I will add a bottle or two to my cellar), and this is another success story of Nuriootpa High School.

Lindsay Park will live on as a lasting memorial to a great Australian, South Australian and Barossian. It extends over 2 000 acres of the most beautiful country in the State (and probably Australia) to breed and to train racehorses. Some 120 people are employed there, so it is a significant employer, particularly for the Barossa. Also, Angas Park Fruit (to which another member referred) is a wonderful business. It is also a tourist icon, and most people coming to the region will call at Angas Park Fruit to purchase a very wide assortment of natural produce, most of it produced in the region.

I attended the funeral last week in the cathedral and joined hundreds of mourners. I noted many prominent Australian figures there—and they have already been named in the media. It was a wonderful service and a fitting tribute to a wonderful man as a husband, father, friend, community man, businessman and mentor. CS has gone but his memory will live on. He certainly had an aura about him and he had the total respect of all. I commend the member for Bragg on his motion today, and I fully support him and the sentiments he expressed. CS was everything that the Barossa stands for. To his treasured family—his wife Betty, his children Peter, Kerri, Jan and David, their partners and 15 grandchildren—our sincere condolences.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I commend the member for Bragg and support the comments that he and others have made in this House. I have the privilege to be involved in horse racing with my wife's family. It is a great family activity and it brings us together often. We spend many hours poring over videotapes of previous races, talking about how the horses are going, and often my father-in-law drags me out of bed before dawn and we head off out to the track. He sometimes actually watches the wrong horse as it goes around and tells me how well it is running. It is all part of a family being involved in horseracing: it is a great thing. But the one thing that we all fear is Hayes. Wherever we go, one of the first questions is: 'What have the Hayeses got running?'

Across the whole of Australia, one of the first questions that anyone racing a horse or planning a schedule for a horse will ask is: 'What have the Hayeses got in this race?' for one reason, and one reason only: they are the most fierce and feared competitors anywhere in Australia. That is a compliment that the whole thoroughbred racing industry would pay to the Hayes family—and, of course, it started with Colin. It is very professional and very well done, and one knows that any horse that has been entered in any race by owners and trained by the Hayes family will do its very best: it is not there for any other reason than to perform and to win. And the punters know that as well. The punters know that they can rely on any horse nominated by the Hayeses to do its very best; to perform as best as it possibly can. I do not think that you could pay any higher compliment than that to Colin and his sons, because that is the respect and the confidence that Colin has achieved around the whole of Australia amongst owners, the racing public and punters.

It is a privilege to be involved in racing: it is a great activity. It is an activity that saw my family win a Mount Gambier Gold Cup. I will not win the Gold Cup tomorrow but I would hope that, in the presence of the Premier, a horse of mine will win tomorrow. I will be delighted to be in the company of colleagues in the South-East when the Premier watches one of my horses perform particularly well—and I am delighted to say that, at this stage, there is no Hayes horse

in that race. Therefore, I am confident of getting over the line first.

It is true that a great leader, a great statesman and a great man has been lost to the industry, but his name will live on in the industry forever. The respect for the Hayes name that started with Colin will live on as long as there is thoroughbred racing in this nation.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): I thank all members for their contributions today. I will put together all these comments and make sure that a copy is sent, on behalf of the Parliament, to the Hayes family.

The SPEAKER: In putting the motion, I associate the Chair with the thoughts expressed by honourable members present and support them fully. I also assure honourable members that a copy of this debate will be forwarded to the members of the family.

Motion carried.

WINE EQUALISATION TAX

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the House notes that the—

- (a) Federal Government through the proposed 29 per cent wine equalisation tax (WET) intends to effectively increase the current 41 per cent wholesale sales tax on wine to a 46 per cent tax rate equivalent, raise an additional \$147 million in revenue and tax cellar door sales;
- (b) increases in wine prices caused by the introduction of WET contradicts the Prime Minister's assurance that prices will not rise by more than 1.9 per cent under the GST;
- (c) wine industry estimates that the proposed tax would cost 500 jobs nationwide and will have a disproportionate adverse effect in South Australia, including small wineries; and calls on the Federal Government to reduce the WET proposal to the revenue neutral rate of 24.5 per cent and provide exemptions of at least \$100 000 for cellar door sales, tastings and promotions.

I am pleased to have the support of a number of members in this House, obviously. This is an important issue and one that is extremely important to the wine industry in this State. My motion states that the tax will disproportionately affect South Australia because South Australia produces most of the wine in this country. It is a very important industry for this country and for this State in particular, especially in terms of our export sales. The history of taxation on wines is uneven, to say the least. In 1986 wholesale sales tax was 20 per cent. In 1993 it was increased to 31 per cent.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Yes. It was reduced to 22 per cent in October 1993. It crept up to 24 per cent in 1994 and then 26 per cent in 1996. Following that, in 1997 the High Court made its decision about State franchise fees, which meant that States could no longer levy those franchise fees, and that decision was taken on board by the Federal Government. As a result, the wholesale sales tax on wine was increased from 26 per cent to 41 per cent, and that is the current rate of tax. Under this arrangement, that 15 per cent tax is rebated to the State Government.

When the Federal Government proposed the GST, it was suggested that wholesale sales tax be abolished on all goods and replaced by the 10 per cent GST. That would have made a dramatic difference to the price of wine. But the Federal Government then decided that it would introduce a 29 per cent tax on the wholesale value of wine, and that was called the wine equalisation tax. At the same time as the Govern-

ment was proposing the GST, it also said that people would not be worse off and that prices would rise by no more than 1.9 per cent.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Yes, the Federal Government said that. In looking at the detail of this wine equalisation tax (WET), we see that, when it is implemented, it will increase the amount of tax raised by an additional \$147 million. The wine equalisation tax will, in fact, cost industry and consumers much more at the rate set at 29 per cent. Modelling has shown that wholesale sales tax, the additional tax, should be 24.5 per cent to achieve the equivalent of what is now paid in taxation through the wine industry.

This motion calls on the Federal Government to revisit its tax proposal and to reduce the WET to a level under which the Federal Government would reap the same amount of tax from the wine industry as it does now: that would mean that the revenue neutral rate would be 24.5 per cent. We also call on the State Government to do more effective lobbying on this issue. First,—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: I am told that it is happening but I would like the State Government to be, I suppose, a little more public and confrontational about this issue. This is one case where the State Liberal Government needs to very much stand up to its Federal colleagues and say, 'This is not good enough.' Our wine industry is not that strong. It is a growing industry. Certainly, it is doing well currently but it faces a great deal of competition from overseas producers and winemakers; and it is important that the industry should continue to grow in order to just maintain its place.

We know that a lot has been invested in the wine industry in recent years and, in many cases, that investment has yet to be returned. This is not the time to create a massive dent in the confidence of this industry. South Australia should be in the fortunate position of having good representation in the Federal Cabinet. We have Senator Nick Minchin, who is supposed to be close to the Prime Minister; we have a senior Minister, Alexander Downer; and we have Amanda Vanstone and the Speaker, Neil Andrew, whose electorate contains a great deal of wine growing areas.

So, South Australia should have good representation within the Federal Cabinet and the Federal Government, but it does not seem to be bearing much dividend at the moment. If lobbying is happening behind the scenes, I think it needs to be a bit more up front. I do not think that other Liberal Premiers in other States would be so quiet if the Federal Government were to impact so heavily upon major industries in their States.

I am also disappointed in the Democrats, because they were in a position to do a lot of negotiating on the GST. As a result of their declared support for the GST they gained a number of concessions about basic food, whatever that is, and some environmental issues. They did not look at any concessions for the wine industry. That is not to say that the wine industry is particularly seeking a lesser tax: it just wants a tax equal to that which it has now. It wants to hold the Prime Minister to his promise that prices would not increase by more than 1.9 per cent. We are, in fact, looking at price rises of about 5 per cent for bottled wine. Admittedly, cask wine may not be so much affected but we are still looking at significant price rises. The Democrats did not pursue this case, even though their Leader and their Deputy Leader are based in South Australia and must surely know the import-

ance of the industry to South Australia. We have also seen a failure by the Democrats.

Small and medium wineries will be most affected by this measure, particularly in terms of the cellar door sales proposal. My motion calls on the Federal Government to provide exemptions of at least \$100 000 for cellar door sales. We all know that cellar door sales are important to smaller wineries. People go to cellar doors to try the products and the wineries therefore gain a reputation. We have seen in the past that many of these small wineries have led the way in innovation and have been a very important part of our wine industry. They give jobs to many people—not only to those involved in the wine industry but also to the service providers and the restaurateurs whose businesses flourish around the wine growing areas. Tourism is an essential part of this aspect, too. We do not need to be told of the domestic, interstate and international tourism benefits that come from thriving wine industries in the Barossa Valley, McLaren Vale, South-East and, increasingly, the Riverland areas, where people enjoy going to the cellar door and trying wines.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: And Clare.

Ms HURLEY: And Clare.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Adelaide Hills and Gilles Plains.

Ms HURLEY: That's enough! And other areas. It is an important part of the ambience of those regions that this opportunity to taste wines be available to wine connoisseurs and tourists. A great many important and interesting events have evolved around this cellar door industry. Every wine growing area has its festival to which people are invited to come in and try food and wine at special weekends. This has become an important part of our tourist calendar.

There is some debate within the industry about the nature of the tax—whether it should be an *ad valorem* tax, which I understand is favoured by the larger wine makers, or a volumetric tax. I will not enter into debate about this tax; that should be sorted out within the industry, bearing in mind the interests of the consumer and the general economic interests of Australia. However, I want to emphasise the importance of revenue neutrality in this instance. There is no reason why this wine industry should be hit by an extra tax as a result of the GST proposal. I call upon the Premier of South Australia to publicly state this case. Although there might be lobbying from within the wine industry, I do not know that the general public is so aware of that matter.

Mr Venning: It's already done.

Ms HURLEY: But it's not a part of the public debate. I do not think there is a general appreciation of what is about to happen. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has successfully sold the line that there will be no price increases as a result of the GST. People will be very surprised when they see the price of their favourite bottle of Australian wine increase. There is a great deal of competition from the cheaper—but nevertheless good—wine growing areas of Spain, some parts of France, Chile, as well as South Africa. We may well find that the domestic consumption of wine shifts to some of those other countries, and that would be a very great shame. It would impact greatly on the wine industry. It was Alexander Downer who said that people would get a reduction in taxation, so they would not mind price increases in wine. We will find that that is not so. People will go to a cheaper bottle of wine, and that may very well be a bottle of wine that originates from overseas.

Given some of the interesting developments that are occurring in our wine industry with new varieties of wine and

different ways of treating wine, investors might find themselves struggling to recoup their investment, so we might see a reduction in that. It is a great shame that we have not seen a more public debate on this matter in South Australia. The public should be enjoined to the debate and to the lobbying. The Premier should raise his voice very strongly in this debate and make crystal clear that we in South Australia do not agree with this price increase. He should make crystal clear to his colleagues in Canberra that this is not to be tolerated and that there was a promise of no more than a 1.9 per cent increase in prices. That should be one of John Howard's core promises and not one of the ones that is easily discarded. I also call on the South Australian Democrats to more strongly pursue the case for South Australia with regard to the wine industry. I call on them to join with Labor in the Federal Parliament and ensure that the WET tax is not put at the 29 per cent rate.

Mr VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House notes the considerable hardship suffered by farmers in the north-east of this State due to the exceptional circumstances, including drought and insect plague, and the refusal by the Federal Government to grant assistance to these farmers while it has assisted farmers suffering similar hardship in the adjoining areas of New South Wales and calls on the State Government to more actively lobby its Federal colleagues to support the north-east farmers in their applications for financial assistance.

Exceptional circumstances funding is available where farmers have suffered considerable hardship due to exceptional circumstances. The farmers in the north-east of this State have had a very difficult time over the past couple of years. They have had insect plagues, including crickets and locusts, and they have suffered from drought.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Ever since I represented the shadow Minister in the Lower House. Ask me anything about barley or pilchards. I understand that the Federal Government has refused this application. I am told that it is because it is not regarded as exceptional circumstances, which are defined as something that might happen once in about every 25 years. The argument here is that the circumstances are not exceptional enough. However, the South Australian Farmers Federation is querying the Federal Government's motives in this. In the *Advertiser* of 2 April, Sandy Cameron was quoted as saying:

... it could be argued that Queensland and New South Wales farmers had received help recently because marginal seats were involved.

Those marginal seats were given the exceptional circumstances funding shortly before the last Federal election. An area in New South Wales just adjacent to South Australia was granted exceptional circumstances assistance. However, just across the arbitrary border in South Australia, those exceptional circumstances were not regarded as being exceptional enough. That is a great shame for those struggling farmers in the north-east of our State. They are looking now to plant their crops. I understand that banks, in their normal fashion, are withdrawing support at this crucial stage, and farmers are finding it difficult to secure loans to carry out their planting. As I was saying in the previous motion, we need to have a

much more rigorous campaign by the current State Government to ensure that the Federal Government reconsiders—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: Again I am told by Government members that the lobbying is happening. However, I suggest that very few people would know that that is occurring. I suggest that the people of this State would not know that the South Australian Government is standing up for the interests of their constituents. That is what I hear all around the country—the Government does not care about the country areas of this State, that it is hostage to big business and to the city interests of the Liberal Party and that the regional areas and the farmers in those areas are being ignored. Sometimes I sit back and hear reports about Liberal Premiers—about Richard Court and Jeff Kennett—complaining vociferously about the lack of Federal Government support where that is appropriate.

Yet rarely do we hear this State Government criticise any of its Federal colleagues publicly. Although I am told that behind the scenes lobbying is going on, I must say that the recent history of this Government suggests that its lobbying has not been very effective. The Premier went to lobby about the GST funding for our State and came back \$47 million short, after having been promised during the GST debate that no State would be worse off. It seems to me that this is fairly typical of the lobbying efforts of the current Government; that it falls considerably short of what is required. Maybe this Government should try another tack: maybe it should try a much more public lobby. Maybe it should be out there in public, in print, on television, saying that we are not getting a good deal from the Federal Government and demanding of its colleagues in Canberra that something more be done in order to assist the struggling regional areas of this State.

I will finish there. I hope that the Government will respond to this. One has only to travel to those areas to see that considerable hardship is being suffered; that the farmers in this area do need the exceptional circumstances funding in order to get themselves back on their feet; and I hope that the Minister for Primary Industries will put in a much more concerted and stronger public effort than he has in the past.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): It is unfortunate that the honourable member is not aware of what has taken place. I am very familiar with the people involved with these difficulties, and the person who is chairing the Committee for Exceptional Circumstances, Mr Malcolm Bailey, is as well known to me as any person in my electorate.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You just listen: I don't know whether you will understand, but just listen and I will tell you the facts in real, plain Australian terms. Minister Kerin received a letter from the Orroroo-Carrieton District Council on 28 April this year requesting exceptional circumstances support for graziers in the area. And may I say that the best thing that has happened in the past few weeks is that they have had nearly an inch of rain up through Carrieton-Orroroo. That is the best thing that has happened. Further, PISA Adverse Seasonal Conditions Monitoring Task Force group met on 6 May to discuss the request, and determined to meet with local representatives. This offer was conveyed to the Minister for his response. On 14 May PISA staff Bill Davies, Gary McPhee, Steve Hogg, Philip Warren and Albert Singer attended a meeting of approximately 40 locals in the Orroroo Golf Club. At the meeting the current conditions were discussed and contrasted with the criteria.

It was agreed that PISA staff and the community representatives would collate all relevant data and meet again to further discuss the matter. On 1 July PISA staff met with the community representatives to review the available information and it was agreed that the data did not support the case; further information was required, including a survey of landholders to be done by the rural counsellor with PISA's assistance, including climatic data, livestock data etc. The PISA Adverse Seasonal Conditions Monitoring Task Force group met on 10 July to review the situation. A further meeting with the community reference group and PISA staff was held on 4 August 1998. The response to the request for land-owner information had been poor and it was agreed to seek more voluntary information.

On 10 September PISA staff met again with the community reference group and agreed to collate all information in a report that would be submitted to the Minister. PISA staff prepared a report of the situation in the central north-east and submitted it to the Minister. The Minister agreed to the recommendation that sufficient evidence existed to justify the submission. State Cabinet agreed on 16 October to support the submission to the Commonwealth requesting a declaration. PISA staff arranged a visit to the area by the Rural Adjustment Scheme Advisory Council, and the RAS people toured the area on 2 and 3 December. Throughout December 1998 and January, February and March, PISA and community members provided additional information to RAS for consideration on a number of occasions.

On 1 April Minister Vaile announced that it would not be declared. On 20 April a meeting of PISA staff and the community representatives committee decided to continue to gather information. On 7 May a meeting was held at Orroroo with me, Minister Kerin, Federal member Wakelin, PISA staff, members of the RAS secretariat, and other members and the local community. It was decided at that meeting to proceed to gather further data that would support another application. It is clear from that information that the Minister, his staff, the local community and the district council have made an exceptional effort to ensure that the application is given the best possible chance of success. At that meeting at Orroroo, I made my views very clear to the representatives from Canberra in the most precise terms, so that there could be no misunderstanding.

Immediately, the Federal Minister made his decision—he did not actually make the decision, the decision was made by the advisory committee. I wrote to the Federal Minister and said, 'If this is the best you can do, this scheme, it is only a stunt; you might as well wind it up, because it's only unduly raising people's expectations.' I also made clear on that day that, if these people did not qualify for exceptional circumstances, I do not know who did. Following that meeting, the three representatives from Canberra were taken on a tour. It was a very lengthy meeting. Even more important, since the original decision was made, the President of the South Australian Farmers Federation (Wayne Cornish) has been put on the committee that makes the decision, which is certainly a step in the right direction.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I would think that the South Australian Minister had a fair bit to do with ensuring that Mr Cornish was put on that committee. I wonder who was responsible for putting on the people who made the decision. Let me just go through the list and see where they came from. You have John Watson, Chairman, Chairman of Pivot; you have Ross McDonald, who will represent the States, and he

is Chairman of the board of Rural Adjustment Finance in Western Australia; and now we have Wayne Cornish. There was not one person on the previous committee who solely depended on agriculture for their living—not one. That in itself was a very bad situation. The chairman was Neil Inall; there was Ross McDonald, who is still on it; John Watson, representing the NFF—as I said, he was Chairman of Pivot; he will be getting a fair number of directors fees—you had Mrs Fran Rowe, special expert member, who is a rural counsellor; Margaret Thompson was the special expertise member; you had Professor Elizabeth Woods; there was Mr Brian Plane, another with special expertise; Bernard Wonder, from the Commonwealth (he was a real wonder); and Dr Roger Stone, another with special expertise.

I think he was fairly blank, because when these people came there, I am told by my constituents, some of them showed little interest in what they were looking at.

Debate adjourned.

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

STUDENTS, TRAVEL SUBSIDIES

A petition signed by three residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to make travel subsidies available for students in the High Intellectual Potential program was presented by the Hon. M.R. Buckby.

Petition received.

GAMING MACHINES

A petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia requesting that the House support the legislation on poker machines that supports measures to give local residents the power to object to their installation, bans on their advertising and have them phased out was presented by Ms Bedford.

Petition received.

GROWDENS

A petition signed by 118 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to make funds from the Industry Subscribed Indemnity Fund available to former investors in Growdens was presented by Mr Scalzi.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Education give South Australians an unequivocal guarantee that he will deliver on the pledge made to Parliament last year of the benefits that could flow to education services from the sale of ETSA, and will the Minister give an undertaking to step down if they are not delivered? The Minister told Parliament on 24 February last year that, with the money freed up from interest rate payments made on State debt, he would be able to employ an extra 40 teachers per day, employ an extra 70 school support officers every day, aircondition every school and preschool in the State within 40 days of the ETSA sale, and build 170 state-of-the-art child-care places every day.

In addition, the Minister said that he would build a new TAFE campus every week, eliminate the current school maintenance backlog in one month, provide 1 000 computers for students every day and build three or four special education units every day. In other words, this Government has promised people that they will go to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —heaven before they die if they sell ETSA.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will come to order! If the Leader of the Opposition proceeds once more to continue to debate when I am on my feet, he will be named instantly. I direct the same warning to members on my right. When the Chair calls the House to order, members will not all continue in chorus to interject.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I do not believe that a vote on ETSA has been taken in the other place, so this is purely fictitious.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: Hypothetical.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: It is a hypothetical question, and we will have to wait and see what the outcome is.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: We will wait and see what the outcome of that vote is.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Can the Premier inform the House of the importance of a quality international airport for South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I thank the member for Colton for his question. As he rightly points out, the standard of the Adelaide International Airport is particularly important for presenting South Australia as it is. At the moment the airport has, effectively, two tin sheds masquerading as domestic and international terminals. The impression that gives international visitors to South Australia is not the impression that ought to be given. We are a sophisticated manufacturing society, and we have substantial research and development capabilities, higher educational institutions and an economy that in many parts is outperforming that of the other States of Australia.

What we need as a gateway or first point of entry for air travellers in South Australia is a quality terminal depicting what this State stands for and where the State is headed in the future—an international, focused, global trading partner that is able to produce a range of goods and services and can access the international marketplace on price, on quality and certainly on reliability of supply.

It was to that end that the South Australian Government, upon taking office in 1993, pursued with the Federal Government in the first instance an extension to the runway at the airport. It was simply untenable to have a position where a fully laden 747 on a day with a hot north wind was unable to take off with a full payload to Singapore, Kuala Lumpur or Hong Kong without refuelling en route. Fresh aquaculture such as prawns or crayfish would be at the airport and, if the weather conditions were unfavourable, the pilot would simply leave a couple of containers out of the hold, and that meant that the restaurants that were expecting that produce did not get it on time. In some instances, the containers were left on the tarmac and one does not need to be Einstein to work out

what the quality of the produce was after a few hours on the tarmac.

We negotiated past that, which was the legacy of the former Labor Government which did nothing at the airport. We negotiated the 500 metre extension with the Federal Government. Most importantly, that got our products to the market. The next component was to ensure the upgrade of the terminal facilities. As the Qantas and Ansett agreements for upgrading their facilities fell due, we negotiated with them a standstill agreement. That meant they would not proceed with the upgrading of their part of the leased terminal facility but would commit those funds to a new, integrated, multi-user terminal. To their credit, Qantas and Ansett maintained that position through the negotiation phase initially and, when the Federal Government indicated that it would be privatising the airports via a long-term lease, they maintained the standstill agreement.

Yesterday, the ACCC signed off in terms of the passenger facilitation charge that applies overseas for ticketing of this nature. There is also a charge on every ticket at Sydney airport for noise abatement and control in suburbs around Sydney airport. It is the same principle. That will enable a \$193 million new, multi-user, integrated terminal facility to be built at the airport, and I welcome that. It is the culmination of about four to five years of hard work with the respective parties to broker and facilitate that sort of arrangement.

It will be an important addition to our tourism market in South Australia. There has been an increase of 14 per cent in the number of tourists from France and there has been a very substantial increase out of Japan. Up to 18 000 visitors from Japan come to South Australia on an annual basis, and that number is growing. Our target is 30 000 visitors from Japan in the next 18 months. They stay on average three days, two nights and include Kangaroo Island in their visit. That is the sort of economic activity that spins off facilities such as this.

I am advised that further work will have to be undertaken with the Commonwealth Government, which is willing to assist and facilitate a timely consideration of the building applications and the other necessary steps, so we will have a new, integrated terminal with a minimum of 10 aerobridges by August 2001. That will be a very significant improvement to our airport facilities and, in addition, create jobs for South Australians in the construction phase. We can add that to the Federal Court building, which has been signed off, of some \$70 million; the performing arts centre, which has been signed off; the Convention Centre, which will be announced shortly; the National Wine Centre; and the David Jones building.

In other words, the stalemate that had been created as a result of the previous Government's policies has now been fixed: we are moving forward, and the construction industry in this State and jobs created by it will be significant in the next few years, all to the benefit of the economy of South Australia.

ELECTRICITY, PRIVATISATION

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Given the Premier's undertaking that all proceeds from the sale of ETSA will go to debt reduction, will he now give South Australians an unequivocal guarantee that his Government does not create any additional new debt, and will he now introduce a mini budget—

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY:—to cut expenditure and eliminate additional debt already built into this budget? This year's—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: A very excitable mob over there, Sir.

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

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: Mr Speaker, according to Erskine May, the question being asked is one of a hypothetical nature, unless I have not been informed of something in the last two hours. Therefore, I ask you to rule it out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It is the view of the Chair at this stage that it is not a hypothetical question. I will let it proceed.

Mr FOLEY: Thank you, Sir; they are obviously scared by the question.

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

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

Mr Wright interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Exactly. Mr Speaker, with your leave and that of the House—

The Hon. M.H. Armitage interjecting:

Mr FOLEY:—and if the Minister can just control himself, this year's budget increases Government spending by \$450 million, with 5.2 per cent real growth in outlays. Professor Cliff Walsh of the Centre for Economic Studies at the Adelaide University was reported on 1 June 1999 as saying:

The 1999 budget papers reveal that budgets will continue to add to taxpayer-funded debt and on a cash basis for at least the next two years and that on an accrual basis they will go on adding to net liabilities for the foreseeable future.

Live within your means, John; live within your means.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, Mr Speaker, I have heard some hypocritical questions in my time, but this would actually have to take the cake. Here is an Opposition in which the member for Hart was an adviser to former Premier Lynn Arnold. The Leader of the Opposition was a Minister in a Government that presided over the collapse of the State Bank and \$3.5 billion worth of debt, and you have the audacity, the hide, to come in here and ask questions about deficits. How dare you! You were the Government that crippled this State. You were the Government that dampened economic activity. You put people on unemployment queues.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will tell you what is in the budget papers.

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will tell you what is in the budget papers: \$738 million of interest payments next year—all of your work. The Labor Party created the debt. We are paying up to \$2 million every single day because of your incompetence as a Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: You cannot have it both ways.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The Opposition cannot have it both ways. Not a day would go by that members opposite do not request expenditure of funds on a range of projects; not a day goes by where these people opposite do not want us to spend. They do not want us to tax; they do not want us to go in deficit. It is that type of looney economics that got us where we are today, and it was only this Government, since 1993, that took your \$350 million a year expenditure over income and brought us towards a balanced budget position; in addition to that, took the escalation of the deficit towards \$9 billion and brought it back to \$7.5 billion. That is the prudence and economic management of this Government.

Do not be hypocrites about asking for more and not putting up a plan, an alternative. We are yet to hear from the Leader of the Opposition or anybody opposite on how they would manage. They just say 'No' to all the policy initiatives, but they do not put forward one plan. It is like Kim Beazley in the Federal area, on the GST, where he dealt himself out of the equation and became irrelevant in the policy development. I can remember the Labor Party in the 1970s who were policy oriented. They were a Party that looked to policy development. What has happened to the modern day Labor Party? It is irrelevant and it has cast itself irrelevant because it has no policy, no ideas on any issue.

The other point I want to tackle is this. Should legislation pass this Parliament eventually in relation to the option to lease, we give an absolute commitment that we will not from 1 July this year collect the Rann power Bill levy increase. We will get out of the hip pocket—

Mr Hill interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Kaurana says 'That is pathetic.' The member for Kaurana was closely associated with the Labor Party at an organisational level when it was destroying this State. What did the member for Kaurana do or attempt to do then to tap a few people on the shoulder and say, 'Get your act together.' The member for Kaurana sits back there, wearing this teflon coat. He does not want to get dirty hands, because he is looking at the opportunities along this front bench. That is what he is doing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I can understand that he is a little sensitive and embarrassed about it at this point. The other point I want to make is this: should legislation eventually pass the Parliament that would enable us to lease our power utilities, we will not proceed with that \$186, on average, increase in power bills annually for people. That will stop. That will mean from 1 July that the revenue built into the budget will not be there, but we are prepared for that short-term position, on the basis that the leasing arrangements being put in place will in the long term rebuild the finances of South Australia. This Parliament is poised to make a historic decision about giving the financial freedom and flexibility for our kids in the next century, and it is no less important than that.

WORKPLACE PRACTICES

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Can the Minister for Government Enterprises advise the House of some of the benefits of enabling flexible workplace practices in South Australian workplaces? Small businesses in my electorate are consistently approaching me noting the flexibility achieved in the Federal workplace and asking what the Government

intends to do about bringing the same changes and advances to South Australia?

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I thank the member for Waite for a particularly important question. It is brought into sharp focus today because of events which occurred earlier outside the Chamber. It is an undeniable fact that there will be a vast array of benefits which will flow to South Australian workplaces by providing flexibility and choice. The primary benefit would be where one has the opportunity to have an individual agreement and to work between individuals as employers and employees. That unleashes creativity in the workplace, which is exactly what Australians in general are well known for.

The opportunities also are enshrined in legislation which may well pass another place and which has very severe penalties for people who in fact offend against these tenets of individual choice and flexibility, and who might coerce any of the employees. I guess it is also important to say that, when one looks at these things, one sees opportunities to be creative, and one might see that in certain circumstances there is actually no relevant award for some workers in South Australia.

In fact, what has occurred is that legislation which might pass would see that, if there was no award, then a rate of pay, no less than an applicable award that might apply, would be expected. So, there are lots of benefits that will flow from having an individually sorted out agreement. We are most interested in creating an environment which will also encourage employment, which is another benefit from having flexibility. It is a pity that the demonstration earlier today was clearly defined along ideological battlegrounds, or the old fashioned class war of the about 1930s and 1940s—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The left wing choir, as the Deputy Premier says. It is interesting to note one of the little flyers given out to help publicise the demonstration today. I would be interested to know, which I never will, how many were given out, because there were about 250 people present, which I would say was an incredibly bad strike rate. One of the most interesting things about this little business card, which members opposite have quoted before, is that it says, 'Nine experts from South Australia's three universities.' I was fascinated to look at the *City Messenger* of 26 May and the headline on the front page was 'Out of left field' and the subheading is 'Adelaide is launching a batch of books giving a left and/or alternative view of economics, history and society'.

It is fascinating to note when you go into the *Messenger* that the chief honcho who is quoted there is a man called John Spoehr. This is clearly a case of 'bring on the usual suspects' because what John Spoehr has done has been to get a whole lot of people together who are clearly fellow travellers and who have criticised the Government's legislative efforts.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: An outstanding fellow traveller—an outstanding intellect. That is a fascinating interjection that this man is an outstanding intellect—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The member for Reynell said he was an outstanding intellect. I happen to be responsible for the Ports Corp and a report was brought out by a fellow called Quiggins and a fellow called Spoehr—yes,

indeed, this same fantastic intellect—who said that the Government would have to get a certain price if it was going to have a decent deal on the Ports Corp. What this outstanding intellect has done, this fellow traveller with the eight others, presumably branch members of the Labor Party (although may be they are not)—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I assume that this outstanding intellect has a tenured position at a university: what John Spoehr actually did in his report about the Ports Corp was to include in his valuation of the Ports Corp the jetties. However, the jetties were taken out of the Ports Corp about four or five years ago when it was corporatised. Here is this outstanding intellect—

Mr CONLON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister is required to answer the substance of the question. I have now been waiting 30 seconds to find out what valuations of jetties in the Ports Corp have to do—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. There is no point of order.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Thank you, Sir. So this outstanding intellect makes broad generalisations and gets the basic facts wrong. This is apart from the fact that this man is quite prepared to have incorrect facts in his assessment and the fact that he is actually teaching the next generation at university, which I thought was about having the correct interpretation of facts rather than silly interpretations of fancy—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Apart from that fact, why would anyone give any credibility to anything that John Spoehr says? Clearly, he is prepared to gild the lily and put things into Ports Corp that are not actually there to make an argument—

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order and refer to Standing Order 98, which states:

In answering such a question, a Minister or other member replies to the substance of the question and may not debate the matter to which the question refers.

The question was about small business and industrial relations. The Minister is talking about the Ports Corporation.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: On a point of order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am ruling on a point of order. I do not uphold the point of order. My interpretation of that Standing Order relates more to if the Minister strays into an area of debate. If he does, I will pull him up but at this stage he is not.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Thank you for that ruling, Sir. This indicates how little the Opposition actually cares about the institutions of Parliament because small business was not mentioned in the question. The question was about the benefits of flexible working hours in South Australia. The whole point is that John Spoehr and his eight fellow travellers, presumably also fantastic intellects, clearly, in putting out assessments of the Liberal Party's Workplace Relations Bill, are absolutely biased. It is as simple as that. Why would anyone bother? The fact that many people were on the steps—

Mr FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister cannot display material in the House as he is.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The Minister knows that displays are out of order. I ask him to now get back to the substance of his reply.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The fact that there are a whole lot of people out there being duped by people who are actually prepared to put incorrect facts in their assessments is sad. There are huge benefits which will flow to the workplace and to South Australia's economy from having flexibility in the workplace. All of these sorts of things were in the Government's policy which we took to the election and upon which we are now acting.

ENVIRONMENT FUNDING

Mr HILL (Kaurna): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage give South Australians an unequivocal guarantee that she will deliver the benefits she said could flow to the environment from the sale of ETSA, and will she give an undertaking to step down as Minister for Environment and Heritage if they are not delivered? On 25 February the Minister told the House that, following the sale of ETSA, there would be an extra \$2 million a day that could be spent on a new air monitoring system, water quality in the Mount Lofty Ranges, improved outcomes in the re-use of sewage, accelerated resource recovery and waste management, an additional 100 park rangers, new strategies for pest plant and weed control, water meters for every irrigator, automated barrage gates on the Murray, salinity mitigation schemes and a new scheme to control water from the Artesian Basin.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: If my memory serves me well, I think the member for Kaurna has rewritten all the suggestions that could have come out of aspects of environmental improvement that were stated at the time. The member for Kaurna well knows that his question was hypothetical. This Government has continued to deliver all of the aspects of environmental improvement that the Labor Government never even thought of. Heaven help this State if a Labor Government, with its no policies and which cannot see economic progress in this State at all, were in Government. Perhaps the list the member for Kaurna has just read out would be a good start for the Labor policy initiative that it might like to put forward in the future.

WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Can the Minister for Environment and Heritage outline some of the activities that will take place on Saturday to celebrate World Environment Day?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I think perhaps the reaction from members of the Labor Party does them absolutely no credit at all, when we are talking about something as important as the environment—and Saturday is World Environment Day. It is important to recognise that we do have a very special and particular day that acknowledges the environment as a whole and in terms of world environment. That particular day was established in 1972 by the United Nations General Assembly. Since that time, World Environment Day has given us all an opportunity to focus on the role that the natural environment plays in our lives and what impacts we, in turn, have on the environment. The focus for this year's World Environment Day is: 'Our earth, our future: just save it.' It is an unambiguous message, which this Government shares. In all areas of our natural environment, the Government has taken action to conserve, to protect and, where possible, to rehabilitate.

I mention some of the programs which this Government has been involved in and which have been recognised world wide. They include: the Bilby recovery program; the passage and the implementation of the Water Resources Act 1997; the establishment of the Waste Management Committee; and, as announced yesterday, the strengthening of South Australia's successful container deposit legislation. These schemes are just a few of the many programs that this Government has initiated to improve environmental outcomes for present and future generations.

One of the most successful and potentially long lasting programs launched by the Premier in 1997 is The Parks Agenda, which is a \$30 million commitment to parks and wildlife management in South Australia. In the 1999-2000 financial year alone, some \$5.5 million will be allocated to a mixture of conservation and visitor service projects. As part of The Parks Agenda, and to celebrate World Environment Day, the National Parks and Wildlife Festival will take place at Belair National Park this Saturday.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of the cameraman to filming of members on their feet and not general panning of the Chamber.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Since we are talking about wildlife, I am not surprised either. It is anticipated that up to 10 000 people will attend the festival and the inaugural Walk for Wildlife this year. His Excellency the Governor demonstrated his support for our wildlife by hosting a Walk for Wildlife around the perimeter of Government House this morning. Saturday's Walk for Wildlife will involve a walk of more than five kilometres from the Belair railway station to the Belair National Park to link up with the parks festival.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I draw your attention to Standing Order 107, 'Ministerial statement', which provides:

A Minister, by leave of the House and so as not to interrupt any other business [like Question Time] may make a [ministerial] statement. . .

It seems to me that the information being given by the Minister should be in the form of a ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. If there were fewer interruptions, the Minister might be able to conclude her remarks.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I was advising the House that there would be a walk of more than five kilometres from the Belair railway station to the Belair National Park to link up with the parks festival. This event will act as a major fundraiser for the National Parks Foundation, which is an independent, non-profit, voluntary organisation that receives dollar for dollar support from the Government for works to conserve and sustain South Australia's biodiversity. I also look forward to opening the parks festival on Saturday and to presenting community members who have provided long and meritorious service to the National Parks and Wildlife Service with their life Gold Pass entitlement cards.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ross Smith for interrupting the House.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: It is a sure sign that the future of our environment is in good hands when we have so many volunteers who are so dedicated to preserving the environment. So, it is fitting that, on World Environment Day, we will celebrate such community commitment and the successful implementation of the policies that have led to an improved situation for our environment now and in the future.

HOPE VALLEY RESERVOIR

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment. Following the Minister's extraordinary answer yesterday, did the Minister note today's report that confirms that the Hope Valley Reservoir has again been polluted by Sixth Creek, and will the Minister now act on the commitment that she gave to this House on 4 August 1998 to ensure that our water storages are not polluted?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I would still refer the honourable member to the answers that were given yesterday. There is no change to those answers. If the honourable member does not like the answer that she is getting now and would like to ask me another question, I would not mind reiterating all that I said yesterday.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Will the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services outline how the new emergency services levy will improve equipment and training for our outstanding State Emergency Service?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I appreciate the member for Stuart's question, particularly in light of the significant and magnificent work that the SES does throughout the far northern areas and on the major highways up through the Port Augusta area.

Tonight I will have the pleasure of commissioning two new rescue vehicles and a trailer for the Metro South State Emergency Service. That is a good news story for the people who provide those fantastic emergency services through the southern part of the metropolitan area. Sadly, as I have moved around the State, I have not always heard good news stories when it comes to the equipment of the SES, particularly when one looks at asset management strategies and the like.

I give an example of an area that I am very concerned about at the moment with respect to equipment that is not up to standard. The vehicle at Mount Barker is very important, and the 20 SES volunteers there are doing a fantastic job. I have been told that, if they could have a sustainable budget, it would be possible to grow the SES up through Mount Barker by an additional 50 volunteers, which would take the Mount Barker SES to about 70 volunteers. We all know, sadly, how much road accident rescue work the SES carries out through the South-Eastern Freeway area, with all the traffic movement heading towards Victoria and the South-East. However, at the moment the Mount Barker SES, as one example, is working out of an implements shed on the property of one of the volunteers, which is admirable but not sustainable and not conducive to the sort of long-term requirements of an SES organisation. Its vehicle is also very old, and the SES has not had the opportunity of being able to work on an asset management strategy for ongoing replacement.

The Government, through the Minister for Tourism, has done a magnificent job in developing Innes National Park, at the bottom of Yorke Peninsula, to the point where I understand there are about 130 000 to 140 000 visitors a year. However, the radio communications down through the Innes National Park simply do not work and, at times, the SES there has a lot of work to do. The service is very good with respect to its training for vertical rescue and the like, but we have to

continue to ensure that we can develop more training opportunities for those volunteers.

What this levy will do—and I hope that the member for Elder is listening to this—is allow the SES for the first time to have a budget that it can work right across this State in a fair, equitable and sustainable way and with continuity—whether for training for SES volunteers or replacing jaws-of-life or general equipment.

I would like to again thank so much those SES volunteers for the great work they do. We saw an example of it when they went to New South Wales recently to assist with the hailstorm damage there—and I might say that, at the moment, we would have difficulty in being able to accommodate that sort of disaster in South Australia. However, through the principles of the emergency services levy and through the support of our volunteers, we will be able to improve safety and protection of life and property for all South Australians in the future.

ANTI-SMOKING STRATEGY

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. How much of the \$3.9 million per year initiative announced last year to reduce smoking in South Australia by 20 per cent over five years has been spent, and will the Minister guarantee that the commitment of \$3.9 million per annum for five years will be honoured? On 27 May 1998, the Minister told this House:

For 1998-99 and beyond \$3.9 million will be dedicated each financial year to the most significant tobacco control strategy yet undertaken in South Australia.

Will the Minister keep that commitment?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, let me say that we were the first Government to make this sort of commitment in terms of an anti-smoking campaign in South Australia. In fact, we are the first Government in South Australia to make that sort of commitment. We are the first State Government in Australia to ban smoking in restaurants, and we have put in place a number of other key initiatives which are seen as leading the whole of Australia. I am still far from satisfied with a couple of areas. One is the specific area of education within schools, and I have had discussions with the Minister for Education on that matter because there needs to be a much more comprehensive education program. We are working through the details of that and how much it will cost.

The other key area is the sale of cigarettes to minors. One can see that South Australia got very poor scores in those two areas in the AMA's annual assessment of all the State Governments of Australia. In most of the other areas we scored extremely well compared to the other States but in these two areas our score was far from satisfactory. We had been planning this for some time, but on Monday I announced that we intend to impose a very significant campaign on retailers. The first is an education program. We will then try to identify, in a positive way, those retailers who are deliberately selling cigarettes to people under the age of 18, even though they know it is a clear breach of the law.

In fact, I was horrified to see in Tuesday's *Advertiser* that the *Advertiser* itself sent someone under the age of 18 into the community and that nine of the 10 shops sold that person under the age of 18 a packet of cigarettes without even asking their age. That highlights the sort of problem we have.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am coming back to the honourable member's question. The honourable member

raised in the Parliament this morning details about the costings of the program I announced on Monday. They were only a small part of the total program. It does not cover areas such as administration, the education program I have talked about—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will contain herself.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —and a range of other initiatives. We are still working through the full cost implications of all our programs and, when the honourable member gets to Estimates later this month, I will be able to give her the full costs of all the programs and how we are spending the money to ensure that we meet our commitments.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): How is the Minister for Human Services arranging the processes through which we can deliver better health outcomes for Aboriginal people and, if he is not attempting to achieve better outcomes per million dollars we spend, why not?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I appreciate the question from the member for Hammond. The inference from the honourable member's explanation is that a lot of money is being spent on Aboriginal health or other issues without always an effective outcome. I would have to agree with the honourable member on that point. I believe that ineffective money has been spent. As a result of that we have identified four key areas in Aboriginal health that need to be tackled: first, asthma; secondly, diabetes and kidney disease; thirdly, hypertension (in other words, high blood pressure); and, fourthly, ear and eye problems.

One of those key areas, of course, is renal disease and diabetes. The Aboriginal renal health summit was held last weekend. It was held at Iga Wata, which is very close to Nepabunna east of Leigh Creek. About 150 people attended this quite unique renal summit. Those people who attended included a broad range of representatives from Aboriginal communities around South Australia, as well as kidney specialists from the major hospitals, CEOs and other key people from the major hospitals, representatives from State and Federal Government and a range of other people working in the health area, particularly with indigenous people.

I want to highlight the sort of problem we have, first, with Aboriginal health in general. The life expectancy of indigenous people in Australia is at least 20 years less than for non-indigenous Australians. When one looks at the Aboriginal issues one cannot help but conclude that Aboriginal health is the most important single issue that this nation must confront. I am concerned that, for instance, 16 per cent of the indigenous population has serious kidney illness or renal disease. Experience is that in recent years this has increased very substantially. In fact, there is some indication that it might have more than doubled in the past 10 years alone. This summit was aimed at how we put in place practical programs to start to tackle this renal disease.

Some of the key findings that emerged from the summit—because I am summarising here what was 2½ days of discussion—were, first, improved nutrition for pregnant women and young children, and especially making sure that they are eating adequate fresh fruit and vegetables. That is easier said than done because it is very difficult in remote Aboriginal communities such as the North West to ensure that fresh fruit and vegetables are available in those areas. A

classic case was an example given at Coober Pedy where a young indigenous woman was identified as pregnant and the health worker offered to take her down to the shop next morning and show her the sorts of fruits and vegetables she should now be buying and eating in large quantities. When they arrived at the store at 9 o'clock the next morning they discovered that all the fresh fruit and vegetables had virtually been eaten, except for a few rotten apples that had been left, and those rotten apples were selling at a very high price.

That is the sort of problem these people confront. So, we are saying that we must look at how we get fresh fruit and vegetables effectively to the children and, in some ways, I believe that is best done through the schools by providing lunch for children at schools no matter where they are; and, secondly, particularly to the pregnant women. The second issue is to ensure that there is regular screening and to identify any protein in the urine so that immediate action can be taken. That early screening program, very much like breast screening, can be a very effective way of commencing early and effective treatment.

The third issue related to alcohol and substance abuse, in particular petrol sniffing, excessive consumption of alcohol and very heavy tobacco smoking. The fourth issue involved greater support, particularly in education, within the indigenous communities. Again, there is a great lack of information and understanding about the relationship between diet and health on these issues. I particularly refer to diabetes and its consequences. The other important area is cardiovascular disease and how the diets of these people invariably leads to a much higher level of cardiovascular disease than one would find in the rest of the Australian population.

The fifth area is more effective treatments, particularly in the hospitals that are closer to these communities. I am delighted to say that, as I mentioned to the House recently, we have just installed a new dialysis machine at Ceduna and the indigenous community is already starting to use that machine. There were very practical outcomes. I think that one of the outstanding features of this summit was the very heavy involvement and significant participation by indigenous people themselves. They made an enormous contribution and that was very valuable, I think, in setting the framework that now will allow us to try to tackle renal disease within the Aboriginal community of South Australia.

AUGUSTA ZADOW AWARD

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises, whose intellect, I have observed, may be outstanding but who needs help to work the computer. Can the Minister advise of the reasons for changing the Augusta Zadow Award from a grant to a prize? I am pleased to know that, following my earlier question, the Augusta Zadow Award for excellence in women's occupational health and safety will be conducted again this year. I am advised that, following a review, this award will now be a prize. Given that the award was established to enable projects to get off the ground, I am interested in what leads the Minister to believe that a prize will be more successful than a grant in promoting best practice in women's occupational health and safety.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: First, I thank the member for her acknowledgment that I do have an outstanding intellect. That is very nice of her. Secondly, I point out to the House that I did not know the password. That is the first time I have used that computer. I usually use my own computer.

I now know that we have to go to the Attendants to get the password. So I have learnt something; that is good.

An honourable member: What's the password?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: That just indicates the sensitivities of the member for Hart, because the whole point of having passwords is for protection, and that is what the Attendants were—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: It certainly did that! However, I now know that there are two Attendants we have to ask who can get us on there if we want to use it here rather than use our own computers in our offices, and I do that all the time. In relation to the Augusta Zadow Award, I was surprised to find that, in one year—and I will get back to the honourable member with the exact details of this—I think it was 1998, there was a distressing lack of entrants who would have satisfied the criteria. I note that the honourable member is nodding. It was felt that, rather than having a number of years where perhaps there was no award because of reasonably strict criteria not being met or inappropriate things being put forward, the criteria would be altered so that the important matter could be addressed on a yearly basis. There is nothing sinister; it is just that in one year there were not appropriate applications.

TOURISM, MAJOR EVENTS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Minister for Tourism inform the House what major events or festivals are being sponsored or managed by the Government through the Australian Major Events Unit and how these events are being leveraged to attract more tourists to South Australia?

The Hon. J. HALL: I thank the member for Schubert for his question. As we all know, because he reminds us so often, his electorate is, luckily, host to many major events in South Australia. I am sure the House will be interested to know that the success of major events over the past 12 months has been greater than ever before. I would like to give a commitment on behalf of the Government that we will continue to make them bigger, better and with a much sharper focus.

For the record, Wagner's *Ring* cycle opera, the Tour Down Under, and the sensational Adelaide 500 helped to pump more than \$46 million into our economy during 1998-99. We all know the spinoff effect that that has in the area of employment, as well as the economic effect. There is another component of staging major events in South Australia, that is, that fairly unquantifiable component of the enormous pride that it gives us in our State and our capacity to host international and major events.

As we know, South Australia and Adelaide in particular is large enough for the major infrastructure to exist, but it is small enough for us to be able to put the focus on some of these events that are so important. Over the next 12 months, we will be putting a particular focus on marketing some of these events—and I am sure the House will be interested even if the members for Hart and Ross Smith are not. One event is the Tour Down Under where we are embarking on a particular marketing campaign throughout Europe. With regard to the Clipsal 500, we will be putting a focus through New Zealand, because enormous interest was expressed by a New Zealand colleague in motor sport. The Adelaide International Horse Trials has attracted great attention, and Tasting Australia, which will be held in October, will have an enormous economic impact because of the great trade

opportunities and enormous tourist potential it will generate for the State.

In addition to that, we have the World Solar Challenge and the Seventh Australian Masters Games, and each of those events will be important for us as a State. Then we have the Credit Union's Christmas Pageant. These major events are in addition in the AAPT Men's Classic and the Barossa Music Festival, which is of particular interest to the member for Schubert. There is the Golden Oldies Rugby, which I am assuming some members opposite will be participating in, and the World Gliding Championships.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ross Smith.

The Hon. J. HALL: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker, from such a bully sitting opposite.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Schubert. I ask the Minister to continue or to draw to a conclusion.

The Hon. J. HALL: I would have thought the House would be interested in some other aspects of major events. We should remember that, for six days in January this year, there was a 100 per cent accommodation occupancy of the five-star hotels in this State. It is generally thought that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for the third and last time.

The Hon. J. HALL: There is another figure that I would like to share with the House, that is, in the December quarter of last year, occupancy rates in this State were up around 83 per cent. It is interesting to compare that with the same quarter for the last year that we held the Formula One Grand Prix, when that figure was 65 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation on my right. If members want to talk they can go out to the lobbies.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ross Smith for the last time.

The Hon. J. HALL: We all get used to the bully-boy tactics of the member for Ross Smith. The other figure that is very important for us, because of the enormous economic impact and employment implications, concerns the advent of Singapore and Malaysia putting on extra flights, with more than 30 000 international seats, additional, having been booked for the next 12 months by people coming to South Australia. I would have thought that that is fairly important. Our Major Events Unit is highly professional, very important and we should be proud of it.

TEACHERS, SERVICE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Will the Minister for Education give the House details or information on the average number of years' service for teachers in this State's public education system, how that average compares with statistics, five, 10 and 15 years ago, and how these figures are broken up by gender?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I thank the honourable member for her question. I do not have those details in my pocket at the moment, but I will get them for her and supply her with the answer.

MARIJUANA

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Human Services advise what action the Government is taking to ensure that the law takes account of modern hydroponic methods for cultivating cannabis? It has been brought to my attention that large amounts of cannabis are being grown using an advanced hydroponics method, and this was not the original intention of the Act.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Hartley is quite correct: there is evidence from the police that people are now growing up to 10 plants using modern hydroponic techniques and engaging in substantial commercial production and distribution of cannabis.

Ms KEY: On a point of order, Sir, I understood that this matter was before the other place.

The SPEAKER: It may be before the other place, but it is certainly not before this House. I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I did not know of any hydroponics before this House, but you never know: perhaps we should check some rooms up on the top floor. This is a very important subject, because all members will, I am sure, be aware of the enormous extent of drug abuse within the community. The Government this morning has finally gazetted amendments to the regulations under the Controlled Substances Act. As a result, the number of plants that can be grown before a criminal offence is committed is now three. If anyone is growing more than three plants it will be a criminal offence with substantial fines.

The maximum fine ranges between \$50 000 and \$500 000, or 10 years up to 25 years imprisonment. In fact, for supply or sale of cannabis to someone under the age of 18, the maximum fine can be up to \$1 million or 30 years imprisonment. The important thing for people to realise is that it is still an offence to have one, two or three plants. Some people in the community wander around believing that you can have a small number of cannabis plants and not be committing an offence under the law. That is not the case at all.

Any possession of cannabis is an offence under the law. Up to and including three plants is now an offence with an expiation fine of \$150. I am sure that all members would welcome the very significant move by Cabinet today to reduce the number of plants above which a criminal offence is committed from 10 down to three.

EDUCATION, CAPITAL WORKS

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Despite hard times, this Government can still come up with the goods. We have still managed to increase the capital works budget for the education portfolio by \$27.51 million. But let us look at those figures. The capital budget is no longer split between the old Department of Education and Children's Services and TAFE but is now all inclusive to reflect the new structure. The 1998-99 capital works estimated expenditure was \$110.12 million; for 1999-2000 the figure is \$137.63 million, an increase in this budget of \$27.51 million. No doubt the Opposition would like a further breakdown of these figures.

The capital investment activities figure for 1998-99 was \$64.729 million; capital investment activities for 1999-2000

are estimated to be \$79.418 million, an increase of \$14.689 million this year. The capital operating activities figure for 1998-99 was \$45.387 million; capital operating activities for 1999-2000 are \$58.209 million, an increase of \$12.822 million this year. I believe that there are members opposite who may need further clarification of the nature of these figures and how they relate to previous years.

Yesterday in the House the member for Taylor claimed that I misled Parliament in relation to the capital works program. I did not mislead the House and, for the benefit of the honourable member, I will explain some of the intricacies that seem to have escaped her. She asked three questions. Question 1: was Parliament misled about the amount of money allocated in the 1998-99 budget for capital works on school projects? My answer is 'No.' The Treasurer in his 1998-99 budget speech of 28 May said that the allocation for capital works programs in schools, preschools and child-care centres was \$84 million. On 30 June I also told the House that the figure was \$84 million. No inconsistencies: nothing misleading.

Question 2: was the Estimates Committee misled on 19 June 1998 when it was told that the budget for education capital works for 1998-99 was \$110 million? No, it was not. The Treasurer in his 1998-99 budget speech said, as the member quoted yesterday, that there was \$110 million for capital works on schools, preschools, child-care centres and TAFE. In answer to a question in Estimates about capital works for the education portfolio, I stated the figure of \$110 million. No inconsistencies: nothing misleading. The honourable member has clearly confused the figure for schools and preschools with that for the Education portfolio as a whole, which of course included TAFE capital works.

Question 3: why did the Minister issue a media statement last week claiming that this year's (1999-2000) \$79 million capital budget was \$14.7 million greater than last year's? The honourable member is obviously not on top of the changes occurring in her shadow portfolio. If she were, she would understand that since 1998-99 the capital works budget is now categorised as investment and operating. For the benefit of the honourable member, in lay terms, investing activities are those that raise the value of the asset stock, and operating activities are those that maintain the value of the stock. My media release stated that the Government had increased investment by \$14.7 million from last year, 1998-99. This is accurate. The 1998-99 estimated result for investment was \$64.729 million; the budgeted amount for 1999-2000 is \$79.418 million, an increase of \$14.7 million for this year over last.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

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

Ms RANKINE (Wright): There is little doubt that the events of the past few weeks have sent shock waves across our nation and our State; they have had a profound effect on all South Australians. The events of the past few weeks have been particularly difficult and stressful for the residents of Snowtown and Salisbury. Through no fault of their own, these communities have been drawn into Australia's biggest ever serial killing. This is particularly unjust and does not reflect the community that I love and know so well. I came into the Salisbury area in 1986, having moved from a country

region with my family. I was struck very much by the sense of community that was ever present in the Salisbury district.

I was struck by the sense of value of the people—the value that they place on their region, the value that they place on their environment and, most importantly, the value that the people of Salisbury place on one another. If one of their community is in trouble, they are there to help out, time and again. They are there to offer whatever support they can. The Salisbury community is one of compassion, of caring and of tolerance. The people of Salisbury have opened their hearts time and again to migrants who have come to this country to make new lives for themselves and their families.

First of all it was the British migrants who came here to work in the defence industries and in GM-H. We have had Greek and Italian migrants come into the community, Polish migrants and the latest wave of people from Asian countries. The people of Salisbury have recognised the difficulties that these people face, and they have reached out to make their difficult transition as easy as possible.

Salisbury also has a large population of Aboriginal people. The Salisbury Council, in particular, is doing what it can to enhance the status of Aboriginal people within their community. The community rejects racism and it turns its back on those who espouse those values, and much of this is led by the vibrant and progressive Salisbury Council. Salisbury is a community of strength. Over the years, it has faced many difficulties and it has got through them. It has a great and proud history and in this trying time I urge the people to stand proud and stand together.

I also pay a tribute to the police officers who have been involved in this dreadful set of circumstances. We all know that police do not have an easy job, and this has been a particularly difficult task.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: That is a question that nobody has been asking, I have to say. Other community services have been involved and there is no doubt that an incident such as this has a profound effect on those involved and on their families. I know very well the impact that these sorts of circumstances have on the officers involved and on their families. Policing is not just a job for one member of the family: it is a lifestyle that involves the entire family.

It has been particularly heartening to see the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Neil McKenzie, and his senior officers supporting the community and the officers under their control. As the full extent of these horrendous crimes has become apparent, Neil McKenzie has been there, reassuring the people of this State. It is nice to see a senior officer who has come through the ranks of the South Australia Police, who has a real understanding of the people of this State and the people who work under his control, standing up and being counted when needed. I was disappointed that I could not attend the service that was held at St Augustine's Catholic parish the other night but, again, the police, led by Assistant Commissioner Graham Brown, provided a strong presence. I understand that detectives and victim support officers were also present. We are seeing officers of the South Australia Police standing by the community they serve.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I rise to bring to the attention of the House two gross cases of misrepresentation of the facts by Ministers of the Government. One can only wonder why Ministers continue to want to sacrifice the truth, but presumably it is because they put self-promotion ahead of all else.

The two concerned are the Attorney-General and the Minister for Environment and Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs. The two matters are the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Compensation Fund and the container deposit legislation. First, I refer to the Attorney-General, who put out—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will give some quick advice to the honourable member. This issue involves Standing Orders whereby the member may be dealing with a matter that should be moved by substantive motion if it is to be a substantial allegation against a Minister. I caution the honourable member about his presentation, which must not stray into the area that I have just specified.

Mr McEWEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will simply quote from the record and leave it to others to decide whether or not the matters are of a substantial nature. The record in the first instance is a press release from the Hon. Trevor Griffin, MLC, with the heading, 'New laws to tighten vehicle compensation'. You, Sir, like me will well remember that saga. The second paragraph says:

The new laws introduced into State Parliament last year by the Minister for Consumer Affairs, Trevor Griffin, are now in operation.

A private member's Bill that I introduced achieved that objective. I claim that as a total misrepresentation of the facts. The second matter concerns the container deposit legislation, and again I will quote from the record. As reported in *Hansard*, Minister Kotz said yesterday that a matter had been brought to her attention over 'recent weeks', which is important, and that she 'reacted quickly' by redefining the matter. Let me now refer to the record in relation to both 'recent weeks' and 'reacted quickly'.

I first brought this matter to the Minister's attention on 18 January this year. Did this happen in recent weeks? It was 18 January. On that day, Ian Webber, the principal of Green Triangle Recycling, contacted me after he had discussions with Steve Smith from Environment and Heritage. On that day and over the next three weeks on three occasions I spoke to Bob Jackson from the Minister's office in relation to this issue. There was no reaction. On 2 February, I sent a memo to Parliamentary Counsel and immediately had drafted the Environment Protection (Container Deposit) Amendment Bill. I wrote to the Minister on 15 February, and said:

Dear Minister, I first brought to your officers' attention an anomaly in the container deposit legislation early in January and, to date, have not received advice as to your intended response. I have had an amendment to the Act drafted and will move this myself if I cannot get a timely response to the issue. I am aware the loopholes have the potential to break the deposit fund and so to my mind should be corrected by now. Your earliest advice on how you intend to respond would be appreciated.

On 1 March, I received a response to that letter, in which the Minister says in closing, 'I will advise you of the outcomes as soon as possible.' I heard no more until yesterday when the Minister stood in this place and made two comments: first, it was brought to her attention over 'recent weeks'; and, secondly, she had 'reacted quickly'. I will leave the House to judge.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I rise today to bring a matter of interest to the House. It is not a matter that has an immediate impact on my constituents but it should be of interest to us all here in the Chamber and in South Australia. I refer to the South African elections which were held yesterday, going into last night, the counting for which is proceeding today. It appears that the African National Congress will be returned with a comfortable majority. The first figures showed that the

ANC would achieve just over 50 per cent of the vote and the seats in the national Parliament in South Africa but, as counting progresses, that percentage is steadily being revised upwards. That stands to reason, as most of the early counting would have taken place from urban booths and, generally speaking, as you move out of the urban centres, the ANC vote increases. In that respect it is a bit like South Australia: the further you get away from the coastline, the social democratic spirit tends to diminish.

One of the interesting features of the election has been the relatively peaceful and proper conduct of the elections. Of course, an independent Electoral Commission is in place, and I am pleased to report that Lord Steele, who is head of the Commonwealth group of observers, has described it as a normal election that might take place in any democratic country. That is something for South Africans to be proud of, but it is also something that is of potential advantage to South Australia because there are huge commercial opportunities in South Africa which this Government should be pursuing.

Over the last five years, the ANC has been pursuing a policy of reconstruction in that country so that literally millions of citizens have received additional housing, water supply and electricity. There is undoubtedly scope for South Australian companies to have a piece of that action if only they can make the necessary contact, and that would require some Government assistance.

One of the other interesting aspects in the South African election results as they come through is that the Democratic Party, which is one of the smaller more white-oriented Parties, is about to become the official Opposition in South Africa, superseding the National Party which renamed itself the New National Party. It seems that the former National Party supporters, those who would have been fully behind the apartheid regime of the 1950s to the early 1990s, are splitting somewhat between the more openly racist political Parties in South Africa and on the other hand more Liberal progressive and yet still middle class Parties, such as the Democratic Party. So, the New National Party seems to be in third place and will eventually decline into irrelevance, I suppose.

I wanted to place on record that the results are pleasing in two respects. First, the elections have been conducted in an atmosphere of stability and safety, and secondly, as a social democratic Party here in South Australia, the Labor Party I am sure would join me in being very pleased at the success of the ANC.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): First, I would like to address the issue of what was historically known as Minda Farm, at Flagstaff Hill and Blackwood. Members may recall that originally Minda Incorporated owned land on both sides of the Sturt River. They sold off the southern portion, ostensibly to get money for their own projects. I understand they made little or nothing out of that. Since that time development has been taking place on the northern side.

My concern is that the State Government provided \$3 million for open space on the northern side, and that, in effect, has gone largely towards the purchase of billy goat-type steep SAS training country in the Sturt Gorge. That in itself is not a bad thing, except that that money was meant, as I understood it, to provide a buffer zone for the new housing development on the northern side.

I was very concerned today to hear that some of the land that has been purchased by the State Government is likely to go under water as part of the wetlands proposal for the Sturt Gorge. Once again, I want to make it clear that I am not

against a wetlands development, but I believe that some answers need to be provided in terms of whether the State Government really got any value for the \$3 million it expended as part of what was a commitment to save some of the open space on the northern side of the Sturt Gorge. The member for Davenport's electorate basically takes in that northern side, but it does impact on my electorate of Fisher because of the shared boundary of the Sturt River and what is taking place there.

I believe that the behaviour of Minda Incorporated does them no credit. As an organisation which largely depends upon Government funding for the caring of people, I believe that Minda has not gained any glory as a result of what has taken place on either side in terms of that development. I have written to the relevant Minister to find out what happened to that open space money, how the process was handled, and why it was that the Sturt Gorge was the area allocated as that open space provision, where no housing could occur. I am keen to receive answers. I have no problem with the wetlands scheme in the Sturt Gorge itself but, as I indicated earlier, I am concerned to hear today that the land on which that money was spent is now, in effect, to be flooded.

Another area of concern relates to the looming shortage of technical teachers for our secondary schools. Up until recently the University of South Australia trained technical teachers in a four year program, and these are the teachers who would teach what members would understand as the woodwork, metalwork, plastics, electronics-type programs. The university, for reasons best known to itself, is discontinuing that program, this being the last year of the four year trained technical teachers, and replacing it with an end-on program where people can do any other degree basically and then do a shortened version of technical training which, I believe, is nowhere near as good as that which it replaces.

The real problem for us is that, this being the last of that four year program, the 30 graduates are likely to be snapped up by interstate departments or by the New Zealand Government which is offering a spotters fee of approximately \$1 300 if you can nominate one of these young people to go there. I have written to the Minister about this, but we need to move quickly to secure those graduating technical teachers, because the average age of the current technical teachers is close to 50 or above. We will have a looming shortage at a time when we are committed to increasing the number of traineeships.

I know that the Minister is very receptive and responsive to these sorts of matters, but I urge the Minister to move quickly to ensure that we secure many of those young people graduating this year from the old program at the University of South Australia, and I look forward to the university's reconsidering its attitude to its approach to the training of technical teachers. It is critical to our future and we need some action now.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I rise to speak about the union movement, employment and the biggest political sting I have witnessed since beginning my term in this place, the Industrial and Employee Relations (Workplace Relations) Amendment Bill. Today, as a person who has always been proud to be a unionist, I joined many hundreds of people on the steps of Parliament House to blow the whistle on the proposed insidious changes to industrial relations in this State, changes which are apparently nothing more than anti-union legislation dressed up as reform—reform that will not foster the strength of unity: rather it will encourage division via the tactics of coercion.

The union movement has a long and proud history which is continually celebrated at every May Day march and every Labour Day rally, a movement which exercises its collective democracy at every stop work meeting and every peaceful assembly—and here on the steps of Parliament House today. Unionists have fought hard over many years to achieve rights for working men and women, and they will continue the struggle against this unscrupulous Government attack and will fight to save those hard won rights.

Should this Bill become law, it will render unions and their members, the working men and women of this State, powerless to defend themselves. It will assist in the creation and entrenchment of an army of working poor, and is based on the flawed logic that making it easier to sack workers and reducing wages and conditions will create more jobs.

The Hon. Dr Armitage has proposed that these amendments will increase employment, especially among our young people. This implies that there is a relationship between employment growth and changes to the regulation of industrial relations. There is in fact little evidence that a shift to individual employment contracts, the removal of recourse to unfair dismissal provisions for many, and the extension of junior rates for young people and other related measures, will affect aggregate employment levels. This case is simply not established.

Reliance upon changes in labour market regulation to achieve employment growth is unreliable and an unproven remedy. Such changes often have the opposite effect to that which is intended. For example, a fall in wages for young workers relative to other workers is more likely to result in labour market substitution of the young for the old, rather than net job creation. Such outcomes are both inefficient and inequitable. Similarly, there is no evidence that making unfair dismissal possible in smaller companies will create employment. Indeed, evidence from the Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey suggests that unfair dismissal regulations are a low order of concern to small business in relation to hiring decisions.

Changing the regulatory regime of industrial life in our State is likely to have many effects, but they are unlikely to include a significant boost to employment. Indeed, one consequence of the proposed amendments is likely to be a decline in demand for labour over the medium term. The Federal system now covers large employers in major industries—approximately 60 per cent of the South Australian work force—where there are historically high levels of unionism and enterprise bargaining.

The State jurisdiction covers employees who require greater protection. They have little bargaining power, are in smaller businesses or scattered occupations, many are not in unions and, with many more casuals and part-time employees, are women, young and non-English speaking background employees in service sector occupations such as clerical, cleaning, child care, hospitality and non-Government teaching sectors.

It is no mistake that the Olsen Liberal Government has targeted these employees. However, today we saw many hundreds of workers under Federal awards come to the steps of Parliament House to defend the rights of all workers. They stopped work and marched to Parliament House in solidarity with their comrades because they know that Peter Reith has his eye on this Bill and how it fares. They know that this piece of State legislation fits neatly within the Federal industrial relations agenda that Reith has been pushing and they know that they will be next. Liberal Governments in this

State and federally treat workers with contempt. For example, take the speech by the Minister for Transport against the PTU delivered in another place.

The workers united will not be held to ransom by this Government's amendments, which will leave employees no option other than to 'take it or leave it' when their wages and conditions are reviewed. The conservative agenda driven by the Liberals in this State is a model from years gone by and is against the best interests of workers and therefore, ultimately, the economy. Instead of investing money in public education and training to develop the skills of our work force, or in raising investments in infrastructure, the Government believes that, by making workers insecure, it can inculcate the fear needed to make our economy more competitive.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. R.B. Such): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): There are several matters I wish to address today, the first of which is in keeping with World Environment Week, or whatever it is, by drawing attention to a practice which will make sheep farming and the use of insecticides on sheep a sustainable activity in perpetuity. Again, this also illustrates the brilliance of South Australians when they are not given even half an opportunity to have a go. A couple of blokes, Professor Dudley Pinnock, for whom I have a great deal of respect, and Dr David Cooper, were reported last year in the *Stock Journal* as being close to releasing what I guess you would call a pesticide that will kill sheep lice and sheep blowfly, which is not a chemical—not in the sense that we know it. It is not a manufactured material. Indeed, it is an extract taken from a bacterium, *Bacillus thuringiensis*, which kills the pests.

It works by simply extracting from the sheep's fleece a deadly strain of *Bacillus thuringiensis* and reproducing that strain in pure form. You mix it with water and spray the sheep with the bacteria, which then grow in the fleece, living in the lanoline there and, whenever a louse or a maggot comes along, the bacteria produces a toxin: when the louse or the maggot comes in contact and ingests it, they die. The length of time over which it will work in the fleece is as good as the strongest chemicals that farmers have been allowed to use. Those chemicals have a long withholding period and leave residues in the fleece. The control of sheep lice and blowfly, or the failure to control, costs sheep farmers \$24 million a year. The total market is probably worth more than that for this bacterial pesticide, this non-chemical material. Professor Pinnock and Dr David Cooper have been able to determine that the residues in our sheep's wool and meat cost this country an income loss of \$197 million a year. It is brilliant that they have been able to put all this together and that it is now virtually ready to go to market for sheep farmers around this country and around the world. It will mean that in future people can eat their loin chops and their mutton stews with a great deal more confidence than they could ever have done in the past with respect to chemical residues, because it leaves no toxic residue. It is already endemic in the natural environment anyway.

I congratulate them and trust that all of us do likewise. It is a pity that the University of Adelaide simply acted on invalid information and destroyed Professor Pinnock's academic career as an outstanding, internationally recognised entomologist: he was recognised around the world by his peers as being outstanding.

Another matter to which I wish to draw attention is the need for us to take more care about whom we allow to

become the adults looking after the children in our society tomorrow. If you want to adopt a child, you have to go through the most rigorous scrutiny by officers of Government agencies to prove that you not only hold no prejudice against anyone else's sexual proclivities but that your own are considered to be appropriate and normal and that your home behaviour is acceptable to these people who do the reviews, and that you have everything in place and are a moral, upright citizen in good financial standing.

Yet all you have to do, if you want to get a supporting parent's benefit, if you are a young woman, is simply to work on your back for five minutes. It does nothing for the life of the child, for whom you will be given total responsibility regardless of how dopey (I mean that in every sense) or addicted you may be to any substances or how inappropriate or weird your behaviour may be in detachment from the norm. How sad.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WATER ALLOCATION IN THE SOUTH-EAST

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I move:

That the select committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the House today.

Motion carried.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin), the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) and the Minister for Disability Services (Hon. R.D. Lawson), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

FINANCIAL SECTOR REFORM (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 2 June. Page 1599.)

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): The Opposition supports the Bill. The Opposition recognises the need for the Bill to be passed before 1 July and the Attorney in another place has clearly outlined the reasons for the legislation. Essentially, they represent a transfer of the various organisations regulating non-bank financial institutions to the Federal sphere, whereas we have had for some time our own State agencies to look after those institutions. It is a comprehensive Bill and it is, of course, mirrored in the legislation passed or to be passed by other Parliaments around Australia. There is some cause for concern about the short amount of time the Opposition has had to reflect on the Bill.

The Opposition has really had no proper time to go through the detail of the Bill and make criticism, should it be warranted. However, I note that the Attorney yesterday in another place did outline the reasons why the Bill came to the

South Australian Opposition very late. In fact, the Bill seems to have come in its current form to the South Australian Government very late and the Opposition acknowledges that and simply suggests that there is room for improvement from both the Commonwealth Government and also from the promoters of this type of legislation. Clearly, it does take some time to bring about agreement amongst all the States, but this is not the first time that the Opposition has been confronted with a Bill and expected to pass it within a week or so when, in fact, it is of such a comprehensive nature that it would repay more careful study.

Having said that, I can say that the Opposition supports the principle of the Bill. In fact, the Opposition is probably less worried by the transfer to a Commonwealth regulatory system than our own Attorney-General, who is known for his preference for State involvement as much as possible.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): This is yet more national uniform legislation in which the State Parliament has, effectively, no say. The Opposition has studied the legislation—both Bills—in the short time available to it. From our soundings of stakeholder opinion, we have no basis on which to criticise the legislation. However, I must say Parliament is more often facing this kind of legislation, and there is really no scope for this House to do anything but rubber stamp legislation that is agreed in another place and, accordingly, we acquiesce in the rubber stamping.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Industry and Trade): I thank members for their comments.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10.

Mr HANNA: One of the features of the Bill is the transfer of staff from a State level to a Federal level. In other words, the same people will be here in Adelaide doing the job, we hope for the foreseeable future, but they will be working as part of a Federal agency, not a State agency. Will the provision for those staff in terms of their entitlements being preserved be the same or worse than any employees who might be transferred from the various ETSA corporations to any private sector electricity generator or distributor and, if so, why?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am advised that AFIC is a Queensland body established under Queensland legislation. I would have to take advice on that and come back to the honourable member, and I am pleased to do that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 20 passed.

Clause 21.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I move:

Page 9, after line 1—Insert new clause 21 as follows:
Supervision Fund

1.(1) Despite the repeal of the Financial Institutions (Application of Laws) Act 1992, the Supervision Fund continues in existence until SAOFS has fulfilled its obligations under this section.

(2) SAOFS must pay out of the Supervision Fund at such time or times as SAOFS determines—

(a) to APRA—

(i) such amount in respect of liabilities relating to leave or other entitlements of employees of SAOFS who become employees of APRA, being liabilities existing immediately before the date on which the relevant employees become employees of APRA, as is determined by SAOFS; and

- (ii) such amount in respect of any other liabilities of SAOFS that, by reason of this Act, become liabilities of APRA, as is determined by SAOFS; and
 - (b) to ASIC—
 - (i) such amount in respect of liabilities relating to leave or other entitlements of employees of SAOFS who become employees of ASIC, being liabilities existing immediately before the date on which the relevant employees become employees of ASIC, as is determined by SAOFS; and
 - (ii) such amount in respect of any other liabilities of SAOFS that, by reason of this Act, become liabilities of ASIC, as is determined by SAOFS.
 - (3) SAOFS must also pay out of the Supervision Fund—
 - (a) any expenses incurred by SAOFS before the transfer date (see section 94(3) of the repealed Financial Institutions Code); and
 - (b) any other expenses incurred by SAOFS before it is wound up under Part 5 of the South Australian Office of Financial Supervision Act 1992.
 - (4) SAOFS must pay into the Supervision Fund all amounts that would be payable into the Fund were it not for the repeal of the Financial Institutions (Application of Laws) Act 1992.¹
 - (5) The amount remaining (if any) in the Supervision Fund after compliance with subsections (2) and (3) must be distributed by SAOFS to each building society, credit union and friendly society that is a transferring financial institution under the Corporations Law, in such proportions as the Minister considers fair.
- ¹ Proceeds from the realisation of surplus SAOFS assets are also to be paid into the Supervision Fund: see Part 5 of the South Australian Office of Financial Supervision Act 1992.

Clause 21 is a money clause which the Government feels necessary for the Bill. Clause 21 provides for the use of the supervision fund during the winding up of SAOFS. It authorises payments out to APRA and AFIC with respect to transferred liabilities. It also authorises the winding up and other expenses of SAOFS to be paid out of the fund. Any surplus in the fund is to be distributed amongst the building societies, credit unions and friendly societies in proportions considered by the Minister to be fair.

Amendment carried; new clause inserted.

Clauses 22 to 37 passed.

Clause 38.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I move:

Page 22, after line 10—Insert new clause 38 as follows:

Exemption from State taxes

2.(1) No stamp duty or other duty or tax is chargeable under any Act in respect of anything effected by or done under a transfer agreement given effect to by this Act.

(2) No obligation arises under an Act for the assessment or imposition of any such duty or tax—

(a) to lodge a statement or return relating to the vesting of an asset under such a transfer agreement; or

(b) to include information about such vesting in a statement or return.

This clause, again, is a money clause. It exempts all transfers of assets from AFIC or SAOFS to APRA or ASIC, under the measure, from the State duties and taxes.

Amendment carried; new clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (39 and 40), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FINANCIAL SECTOR (TRANSFER OF BUSINESS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 June. Page 1600.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): The Opposition has looked at this subsidiary Bill and finds no fault with it. Again, it is national uniform legislation. We are not in a position to have a Committee stage and to amend it or we will be out of line

with all the other jurisdictions and the Commonwealth. The Opposition acquiesces in the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I move:

Page 3, after line 30—Insert new clause 8.

State duties and taxes

8. (1) No stamp duty or other duty or tax is chargeable under any Act in respect of anything effected by or done under this Act.

(2) No obligation arises under an Act for the assessment or imposition of any such duty or tax—

(a) to lodge a statement or return relating to the transfer of an asset under this Act; or

(b) to include information about such a transfer in a statement or return.

(3) However, a receiving body in a voluntary transfer of business must pay to the Treasurer an amount determined by the treasurer on the basis of an estimate of the duties and taxes that would, but for this section, be payable under the law of this State in respect of the relevant transfer of assets.

(4) The Treasurer must give the receiving body written notice of the determination.

(5) The amount must be paid as required by the Treasurer in the notice of determination.

This is a money clause, which exempts transfers of business under the measure of State duties and taxes. However, in the case of a voluntary transfer of business, the Treasurer may require a payment to be made based on an estimate of the duties and taxes that would otherwise have been payable by a receiving body. This reflects the approach taken in the Bank Mergers (South Australia) Act 1997.

Amendment carried; new clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (9 and 10) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.

(Continued from 2 June. Page 1597.)

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): It is with disappointment that I must again raise the matter of the soccer stadium at Hindmarsh. Members may be aware that the Public Works Committee met yesterday and further information was brought before it in respect of this most unsavoury event. The Opposition, of course, has raised this matter on many occasions and it has received little sense from the Government in response to our questions. The Public Works Committee was informed yesterday of some information which is most disheartening to the whole process and probity of this situation.

This Government allocated \$30 million to the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium primarily, as I understand it, to have it in suitable condition and standard for the Olympic soccer games that will be coming to South Australia next year as part of the Olympic Games. South Australia will be getting seven matches. Like other States around Australia, whoever has bid will get soccer matches. South Australia will be one of several States that will host matches during the Olympic Games. As part of that process we have tossed in \$30 million to enable an upgrade of the soccer stadium.

The architects of this from the Government are, of course, as is well known, the former sacked Deputy Premier and the ambassador for soccer, Joan Hall. They are the architects of this whole deal to fulfil promises that have been made. The Government committed \$30 million to the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. If that is not bad enough, we learned yesterday in

the Public Works Committee that, in relation to money that has been loaned by the Government to the Soccer Federation, some \$6.1 million, taxpayers are now being forced into a situation of having to bail out the South Australian Soccer Federation to the tune of \$521 000, in respect of its loan repayments on the \$6.1 million for the redevelopment of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium.

Again, we have further questions being put on the public record. We have grave doubts about what is going on and we have another situation where there seems to be little organisation and little management with regard to this situation. Questions have previously been raised with regard to the suitability and probity of the \$30 million that has been allocated to the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium but, of course, the next stage of that debate is occurring. Some time ago the Opposition put into the public domain, as is rightly the case, what was happening with regard to the loan repayments.

The Soccer Federation informed the Government that it was not able to meet these repayments because crowd numbers were low and, as a result, the Federation was not getting the subsidies that are due to be repaid. Further, believe it or not, as a result of questions asked yesterday by the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, Mr Peter Lewis, the Soccer Federation cannot even provide attendance figures. No attendance figures have been recorded over the past three months. I find this completely astounding. I am somewhat stunned by this information.

After all of the debate and conjecture that has occurred in the public domain about what has taken place in respect of \$30 million being handed out to upgrade the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium, we now have a situation in which, apparently, the Soccer Federation is unable to supply, because it does not know, attendance figures to the Public Works Committee. It has no idea what the attendance figures were for the past three months. I do not know what is going on but it sounds awful to me. It sounds very amateurish and, if I were the Government, I would be particularly concerned. I would want to know and I would be asking questions directly of the Soccer Federation and Tony Farrugia.

Mr Farrugia appeared before the Public Works Committee and said that he was not aware of the attendance figures. What sort of show are they running down there? This is a very serious public issue and, if I were the Government, I would want to know what is going on. I would be asking some very pertinent questions to get on top of this matter and to get on top of it quick smart. It is one thing for the Soccer Federation's being unable to repay the loans that have been made by the Government, but it cannot even tell us the attendance figures for people going through the gates.

Public money has been made available to soccer. A lot of criticism has been made about it; a lot of speculation has been made about it; there has been a lot of public debate about it; and a lot of other sporting organisations have questioned very strongly why \$30 million was made available to soccer and not to other sports. A lot of debate has occurred in the community about that. The Government has made its decision. It chose to throw \$30 million into soccer to rebuild and redevelop the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium and I would expect, at the very least, that some questions and answers be delivered to the public about what is going on.

It is simply not good enough. We now have the situation where, as recent as yesterday, further information was put before the Public Works Committee that is just not acceptable. One of the architects of this project is the Minister for Tourism, whom I genuinely praised about the tourism budget

either yesterday or the day before. Today, I must unfortunately draw to the attention of the House that the Minister for Tourism and the former sacked Deputy Premier—because make no mistake, every member in this Chamber and people in the soccer world, the sporting world and the broad community know—were the architects for making available the \$30 million to the soccer stadium.

No procedure was put in place, there was no proper accounting, and here we have a complete and utter shemozzle. It is just not acceptable, and they have to get on top of this very quickly, before it gets worse than it is already.

I would like to finish by drawing to the attention of the House that, despite the fact that Parliament has been chugging on through its processes, believe it or not we have a situation whereby the Minister for Environment and Heritage has still not called together the Aboriginal Lands Trust Parliamentary Committee. I know that you, Sir, will be somewhat astounded at that, because the Minister has been given chance after chance. This has been brought to the attention of the House on a number of occasions. The Minister has had every opportunity to call together the Aboriginal Lands Trust Parliamentary Committee and, despite numerous debates in this House, despite being questioned and probed by the Opposition (especially by the member for Giles) over the past 18 months, still the Minister has failed to comply with her ministerial duty of calling the committee together.

One would think that after the debate occurred some six to eight weeks ago in this very Chamber the Minister would have taken that golden opportunity. She had six to eight weeks when the Parliament was not sitting. She could have taken a golden opportunity to send out a notice to members and say, 'Right-oh, troops, here we go. I'm going to call you together. I know I've failed in my ministerial duties. I know I've broken the law. I know I haven't served the Parliament with the committee reports as is my statutory requirement, but here we go; let's have a meeting. Let's put all that behind us. Let's have a little bit of discussion and see what the priorities will be.' Many Government members have come to me and said that this is an utter disgrace. And so it is.

As the member for Giles and I have said before, the Minister stands condemned. The Minister is meant to be a law maker, not a law breaker. The Minister is a law breaker and she stands condemned. She has had numerous opportunities. Time and again privately and in this Chamber I have raised the question, and still she has not called the committee together.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): In supporting this Bill, one must say that no doubt it was a tough budget but, I think, also a responsible one in addressing the huge debt of the State. I can understand constituents right across the State feeling very angry in that they have been called upon to repay the debt created by the mistakes of politicians from the previous (Labor) Government. In any company situation the shareholders would act responsibly by sacking the board of directors had they created a mess of this magnitude. But in politics some of those people who created the mess are still here today, able to continue.

To take some of the positives in my electorate of Colton, I must say that in the 5½ years for which I have been the local member I have been very proud of some of the achievements in the electorate, reached by sensible budgeting and by looking at the responsibilities of meeting the demands of the community. When I became the member 5½ years ago, Colton had a very ageing population, but there have been

dramatic changes down there, I think because the Government has responded to my requests for things to be done to make the electorate more viable and a more decent community. I will deal first with the area of education.

Only four months after I was elected, in April 1994 I was called by the Principal of Henley High School. He told me that the students at the school, in trying to get from the yard into the school itself on a wet winter's day, were having to go through a shower, because the gutters were rusted right through and the water was just pouring down in a continuous stream. When I had a close look at the school I was ashamed that I was taking over. There was only one secondary school in the entire electorate and I was ashamed to think that here was a school that was providing possibly one of the best secondary educations in the State, because of the high quality of the Principal and the teaching staff, yet the previous Government had allowed it to run down.

Thankfully, owing to a quick response by the then Minister for Education, the gutters were replaced within 72 hours and, since then, record amounts of money have been put into Henley High School so that today it is probably one of the best kept and best presented secondary schools in South Australia. That also led to its being selected among some 12 high schools in the western suburbs to conduct the Institute of Sport specialised sporting school in the western suburbs to meet the demands from Glenelg to Port Adelaide and from West Terrace in the city right through to Henley Beach. The school today is going ahead in leaps and bounds.

I am also very proud that not only is my high school still there but my six primary schools are also still there. Seaton Primary School, which was an absolute disgrace, has been through a refurbishment program of more than \$500 000, as have some of the other schools in the area. The wonderful thing about it is that, because the area is progressing, the registration of students in every one of the six primary schools is up in numbers. Continually over the last five years the intakes have been increasing. Henley High School has a surplus of some 300 students on the waiting list—waiting to get in—and we can see that education is in a healthy state. The two kindergartens in the area are both filled to capacity with a waiting list, because there has been a change in the area.

As the older people are going in, the message that we have been putting out is: move to Henley, to Grange, to West Beach, because you are close to the West Lakes Shopping Centre; you are close to Glenelg; you have the beach right there; you are 15 minutes from the city; and you have all the facilities that you want. That has resulted in the real estate values in Colton going up some 12 per cent in the past year. In fact, the increase in real estate values in my electorate as released by the Real Estate Institute of South Australia is second only to that in North Adelaide. That is an indication of how well the area is going.

We have also been able to convince the former Minister for Sport and the Minister for Education to create an international class gymnasium. The old gym, a prefabricated hut on the land of the old Grange Primary School, was insufficient, and we are now in the process of developing that. We have also been able to convince the West Torrens District Cricket Club to shift from Thebarton Oval next to the Brickworks Market down to the Henley Beach Memorial Oval. Since it moved there, some 350 young boys who would never have taken up cricket because Thebarton Oval was too far to go have now registered, and the club is flourishing. The great thing about it is that we are giving 300 young South

Australian boys in the western suburbs the opportunity to play at Sheffield Shield level from district, and even to go onto Test cricket.

The announcement this week of the airport's being upgraded is one of the great pluses for my electorate. It is always an embarrassment for me to pick up international visitors from an airport that is third grade. Some regional areas of Australia, such as the Gold Coast, have a better airport than Adelaide's. Now we are to have the international and domestic terminals combined in one instead of having to travel between the two. It will be a magnificent facility and it will send a clear message to every visitor to South Australia that South Australia is serious about its tourism and about its business development.

The other good thing is that, within the next 12 months, when people come out of the airport they will drive to the city along Burbridge Road, which has been totally refurbished and which is a credit to the joint venture of the State Government, the West Torrens Council and the Adelaide City Council. More importantly, its name will change in about 15 months to Sir Donald Bradman Boulevard, and it is only appropriate that international visitors from all over the world should enter a boulevard that is named after one of the greatest cricketers who has been produced in this country and possibly the world. They are the changes that are being made.

While the budget has been tough, and it has been felt by a lot of people in my electorate, I hope that later on today decisions made in the Upper House will relieve the pressure on a lot of my constituents. However, the people who live in the electorate of Colton are enjoying the very best quality of life and at the same time they are assured that their homes are increasing in value, simply because there is a demand for housing in that area, and it is a wonderful thing to have such an investment. That has occurred because of the facilities, because of the way marketing has been undertaken and because of the beautiful beaches and wonderful lifestyle.

The development in the last 5½ years of Henley Square with its restaurants and ambience has been a great plus. All I say is let us not keep on knocking; let us be positive about what is happening in South Australia. When I talk to people, I say that 91.5 per cent of the community are now working, instead of turning it around and quoting the number of unemployed. I look forward to the next couple of years with great enthusiasm because I believe that the Government has got it going right and on track.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I wish to continue my remarks on the budget and I will focus on the harsh realities facing most members of the South Australian community, particularly in the area of human services. I will raise about five or six issues, beginning with the capital works budget. As well as highlighting the harsh realities, it points out the Government's dishonesty in the way it has presented and worked through its capital works program over recent years.

On Monday prior to the budget's being delivered, the media reported a budget boost for spending on hospitals. That statement was completely inaccurate and was a very thin smokescreen for capital works that have been delayed, recycled and reannounced year after year, and I will give two examples, although there are more than that in the budget. The first very prominent example is the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is clear that the Olsen Government intends to break its promise to spend \$43 million over three years upgrading the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Last year the Health Minister, Dean Brown, said that \$43 million would be spent

on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital over three years and, in Budget Paper 2, he detailed \$14 million to be allocated in 1999-2000—this year. This year's budget papers show that, instead of \$14 million, only \$4 million will be added to that project. It will not happen over the three years as was originally stated. Why not just reannounce it and make out we are having a budget boost? This is actually a budget cut.

The same thing applies to the Lyell McEwin Hospital in my own area, and we have just about given up on this hospital. It has been in every budget since 1996. It started off at \$28.5 million in 1996, it went up to \$48.5 million at one stage in the intervening years, and it is now down to \$40 million. Last year Dean Brown said that \$40 million would be spent over a four year period. Last year's budget paper detailed \$6 million to be spent in 1999-2000. This year's budget papers show that it is now \$2.3 million. Rather than a budget boost to capital works funding for our hospitals, there has actually been a budget cut. It is a pity our journalists do not read more than just one Minister's media release when they report to the public.

I move now to community based services, particularly those funded under the Home and Community Care agreement. This is a Commonwealth-State agreement and, a month or so ago, the Commonwealth and State Governments announced that they had reached a new agreement. The problem is that the new agreement did not involve any new growth funds. The 3.3 per cent increase in funding that has been approved this year will simply cater for salary increases and cost of living adjustments. There is no new funding in that area from the State or the Commonwealth Government, and this is an area of overwhelming need.

For example, the Home and Community Care program funds domiciliary care and the Royal District Nursing Service. Every member in this House must be aware of the fact that domiciliary care services in our State are overwhelmed by the demand that they face. No-one could have escaped noticing that fact. In my area in particular, people have given up ringing for services from the Northern Domiciliary Care Service, and I understand that the southern and western services are in similar dire straits. Quite frankly, instead of providing the services to keep frail, aged people in their homes, we are forcing them into acute care and into nursing homes in direct contravention of our policy. This is a State and Commonwealth issue, and an agreement needs to be reached between both Governments for some way to catch up on the backlog. I know that previous Labor Governments also ignored this issue in terms of State funding, but what I am saying is that we have to face the fact that the need exists and we have to deal with it.

I also note that one way of handling this problem is to do what the Royal District Nursing Service is about to do and that is impose fees on people requiring Home and Community Care services. As of 1 July, people wanting the services of the Royal District Nursing Service will have to pay a fee. It will be \$20 a month, or every four weeks, for people who hold a Health Care Card, and \$40 a month if they do not. People might say that that is not much. It is not much if it is on its own, perhaps, but for people on a fixed income who have dearer water bills, dearer electricity bills, who pay an emergency services tax and who pay a GST, the \$20 a month that they will have to pay for their shower or for whatever service they require from the Royal District Nursing Service, will be just one more cost. It is just one thing after another. People on fixed or low incomes, which is the majority of people in our State, just cannot cope.

With respect to dental services, the waiting lists for public dental service now total 86 000 in South Australia. People have to wait at least five years for dental treatment. I hope everybody is listening to that. It is a national disgrace. It is a particular disgrace in this State where, since the Federal Liberal Government reneged on the Commonwealth Dental Scheme, this State Government has failed in any way to address this appalling situation. Some 86 000 people are waiting for dental treatment. Some will wait five years; some will be dead before they are due to actually receive that treatment. It is a disgrace.

As to disability services, I spoke in this House a week or so ago about the unmet need, and explained that both the Commonwealth and State Ministers had agreed that \$300 million across Australia was a reasonable estimate and that they would address it. I noted that the Federal Government had declined to actually put any dollars in its budget, and I inform the House that the State Government has done the same. It has talked about a 3.3 per cent increase in funds to disability services to allow current services to be maintained. There is absolutely no indication that this Government has any commitment to actually address the unmet need. So much for their commitment to the thousands of people suffering in relation to that in our community.

Mental health continues to be one area in our community where services are simply inadequate. One year after the end of the Minister's summit, one year after he promised \$3 million a year for four years of new money, the Minister has finally announced, one year late, the spending of \$3 million. This is welcome, but unfortunately it will not go far enough. The struggle, the hardship and the suffering of people (and their families) with a mental illness, continues, and this is another area from which we just cannot turn away. We need to address it, and we need to have a plan. We need to have that plan public and we need to stick to our commitments.

I will finish by saying that when a government increases its overall outlays by almost \$450 million, but continues to cut the grossly under-resourced areas such as the vital area of social infrastructure, it stands condemned.

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I am delighted to be participating in the grievance debate today as it relates to the budget because, as the Tourism Minister, I am very confident about many of the opportunities we are pursuing in this particularly important area of economic development for our State. As a general view, as we put the State finances back on track, despite what is being said opposite, and leave behind the debt that we inherited from the previous Government, more opportunities will develop over the coming years.

I would like to place on the record my appreciation to the Premier and to the Treasurer, along with my ministerial colleagues, for their support and the increased investment in the tourism industry. I am sure that their investment will pay dividends in the future through economic growth and through the generation and creation of more jobs and the increasing confidence of South Australians. As we know, increasing employment opportunities is the top priority of this Government.

The extent of South Australia's debt and the comparative disadvantage we have in relation to other States presented the Treasurer and the Premier with an enormous challenge in producing the 1999-2000 budget. I congratulate them on taking the highly principled road in this very difficult task.

The Government could have simply reduced Government spending further. It could have reduced investment in our State's future and its key industries, and it could have reduced key social services, or it could have simply borrowed. It could have borrowed more and added to the burden of debt that we inherited from the previous Government. These paths are unacceptable to this Government and I am very proud to be a member of a Government which has confronted the challenges left to it, which is conscious of the social responsibilities that it has and which is meeting these social responsibilities with what I believe to be a dynamic plan for the future.

I draw attention to some of the key features of the budget, where it says that it is balanced, it injects more funding into employment programs (which I would have thought would have been welcomed), it spends more than \$1 billion on capital works, and it continues to decrease net debt as a percentage of gross State product. This is in stark contrast, I would say, to the Labor Opposition, because there have been no cost blowouts. Public sector wage increases during 1998 are below levels in the private sector and, while Labor's mathematicians claim unsubstantiated blowouts, other Opposition members approach each portfolio area with the basic complaint that we are not spending enough.

Here we are discussing a debt that is costing us \$735 million interest per year. Opposition members must mean that what they really want is real cuts that hurt people, when they say that they can reduce the debt burden by reducing expenditure. But will members of the Labor Party front up and tell the House which big ticket items they wish to reduce from the Government expenditure? Will it be Public Service salaries? Is it education or the number of teachers? Do they want to reduce the numbers of police salaries?

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. HALL: Do they want to reduce primary industry research? Do they want to take off from the transport infrastructure in many of the regions? On top of all this, Labor members say that taxes should not go up and that ETSA should not be sold. They just simply cannot have it both ways.

Unlike the Opposition, this Government does work and operate in the real world. I applaud the continued support in this budget of programs, services, infrastructure and facilities that are so important to the general community. As a Government, we have confronted the challenges put before us, and we are investing in a dynamic future for this State.

High among those areas of Government investment, I am very pleased to say, is the future that exists in the travel, hospitality and tourism industry sector. As I said before, it is one of the fastest growing industry sectors in the world and it is a major employer across all countries. Fortunately in South Australia at the moment it is at an all time high. As I said earlier today, Malaysia and Singapore Airlines have just increased their international capacity by 30 000 seats into Adelaide over the next 12 months. Ansett has increased its capacity from the key Sydney market by 21 per cent since July. The December quarter has shown occupancy levels of five star hotels in Adelaide enjoying 83 per cent. These figures are fantastic for this State and they ought to be recognised as such.

I would say that the Government's investment so far is clearly paying off, and the further investment we have committed for the next 12 months will bring more benefits for all South Australians outside of the city and across all

regions. I believe we have set ourselves some ambitious tourism projects and targets, and through innovative marketing and ongoing major developments, we do aim to increase international tourism by 8 per cent and our domestic market by a further 3 per cent. We have set ourselves a goal of 55 000 additional visitors to South Australia over the next 12 months.

To assist us in achieving that goal, we will have the further release of the Secrets campaign. There is another 200 000 copies of the *Shorts* booklet to be distributed across the country. One of the major features we will pursue with great vigour is a very concentrated \$5.6 million campaign on international marketing. This is a particularly important aspect of our future activities because, along with New Zealand, the Secrets campaign will focus on three individual books covering our nine regions and we will be very specific with our targeting of advertising in both cinema and print advertising.

As I mentioned earlier, we will print this book in four languages—three plus English: Italian, French and German—and the figures certainly indicate that that investment will be very important to us. In addition to that, this year we have budgeted to produce for the first time a travel trade planner, which is unique for us because it will show our beautiful and very special tourism product. It is to be available for international wholesalers and travel agents. It is very important to those who bring people to our State.

In addition, the tourism budget this year has increased the media and trade familiarisations program to enable us to take absolute advantage of the opportunities that will come with the Olympics next year, and we are putting down a particular priority and focus on developing the expanding and opening markets of China and India. I know they will be very important for us in the future. As I mentioned earlier today, major events will take centre stage and I will not go into and repeat the details that I gave earlier today, but we know that that is a huge component of attracting visitors to South Australia so that they can plan and package their holidays and spend their money around the events situated outside Adelaide, through the Adelaide Hills, down the Fleurieu, on Kangaroo Island, up through the Riverland, particularly into the Barossa and the wine regions, into the outback and on the west coast. It is particularly important for us to understand and take advantage of all those opportunities.

We only need to drive down North Terrace, for example, to see the importance of the investment into tourism and associated activities over the past few years, and I cite the Radisson Playford Hotel. We can see, on the corner of Dequetteville Terrace and North Terrace, the new wine centre and international rose garden moving along well. They will be great assets when they are complete. In addition, we have the \$17 investment in the Aboriginal Cultures Gallery, which is to provide a fabulous facility to show off the world's largest collection of Aboriginal art and artefacts.

This is all in addition to the activity that is to take place at the Convention Centre with a multi million dollar expansion and development with the Riverbank precinct, which is hugely important. The conference and convention market, as we know, is so important to the State. We have one of the top 10 convention centres with our magnificent city and lifestyle, which enables conference delegates to spend so much money when they come to visit South Australia. Outside our city area we have other developments taking place. We have the new Woolshed development at West Beach, we have Holdfast Shores, we have the All Seasons resort at Tanunda,

which is opening soon, and excitingly we have airstrips at Hawker and Balcanoona, which are already operational.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): A few weeks ago I highlighted to the House the enormous success of this year's Cornish festival, the Kernewek Lowender. I was unable to do full justice to it in the brief time allowed me. In fact, I did not even touch on the Monday's activities at Moonta, let alone make a brief comment about the Sunday activities. However, I certainly congratulated everyone who was involved and it was great to have such a successful festival in the Goyder electorate. It seems that success breeds success, and over the past weekend of 28 to 30 May another wonderful festival was held at Port Victoria. The festival commemorates 50 years since the last windjammer left Port Victoria.

'Windjammer' is the name given to the boats that came into Port Victoria and many other South Australian ports to load grain in the early years. In fact, it is almost exactly 100 years since the first windjammer came into Port Victoria and 50 years since the last one left.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Yes. As the Minister interjects, there are quite a few wrecks around Wardang Island. The reasons for the wrecks is not hard to understand in the context of the weekend. While Port Victoria is a wonderful place to live and visit, it gets its fair share of wind, as does much of Yorke Peninsula. The weekend of 28 to 30 May was no exception. I was pleased to be present on the Friday and the Saturday, which were two great days, and I was disappointed that I could not be there for the Sunday as well.

I compliment everyone involved, including the Chairman, Mr Clive Kelly, and the Secretary, Mrs Wilhelmina Dutschke. Mrs Dutschke—'Willie' as she prefers to be known—has done a wonderful job in promoting Port Victoria, Yorke Peninsula and particularly central Yorke Peninsula. She really went out of her way to organise the Windjammer 50 festival.

While I was at the festival I thought, 'The big industry for Yorke Peninsula that can still be promoted enormously is tourism, because we have the important grain industry and other industries such as hay processing, Prices pasties and pies and many small businesses but, if we want another big business, we will not get a General Motors, a Mitsubishi or another major manufacturer in our area in the foreseeable future, but certainly we can bring tourism on in a much more expansive way than we have done so far.' The Windjammer 50 festival was a classic case of a program being organised that gave the opportunity for many people to visit the area.

It was wonderful, too, that the Cape Horners took the opportunity to visit for the weekend. The Cape Horners are a group of people who have all sailed round Cape Horn in a sailing ship. I believe the other criteria is that the vessel was not mechanised by power in association with sailing round Cape Horn. Apparently there are strong winds at Cape Horn most of the time and the seas are very rough: it is quite an experience to get around Cape Horn, let alone to make it safely. As the Minister indicated, there are many wrecks around Wardang Island: there are many wrecks around Cape Horn.

On Friday we had the formal welcome by Mayor Malcolm Thomson and then the opening of the schools' art exhibition and the art gallery by the Hon. Neil Andrew, Speaker of the House of Representatives. I was privileged to be present

along with many other distinguished guests. In opening the Windjammer 50 art exhibition, Mr Andrew drew attention to many of the aspects associated with Port Victoria. On Saturday the parade was held in the morning, and Port Victoria certainly got its share of rain early on: when I arrived soon after 9 o'clock it was pouring. The procession was due to start at 9.30. I think at 9.29 it was still raining and, literally, at about 9.30 or 9.33, the rain eased and the procession was able to proceed. It was wonderful to see how all the locals had got together, made up different floats and provided a huge amount of entertainment for everyone. It was wonderful also that the Scotch College band joined in, along with several other outside groups, to make it well worthwhile for all those who came to visit and who were part and parcel of the day's activities.

Whilst there were many other events on both Friday and Saturday, Sunday saw something special. Many members would have heard on the radio a gentleman called Macca—

The Hon. M.K. Brindal: Macca on the radio.

Mr MEIER: Macca on the radio. Macca (whose real name is Ian McRae) was at Port Victoria on Sunday broadcasting from 5AN. I had to smile when he said on several occasions that it was 'Windy, windy, windy'. Apparently they started the broadcast in the hotel, because they thought it was just too windy, but Macca then came out onto the median strip in Port Victoria. Certainly, everyone who was there was delighted to have Macca on board at Port Victoria. He interviewed many interesting people there, some from the Cape Horners, and also Max Fatchen. Max wrote a special poem for the Port Victoria weekend and he certainly told some stories that were very humorous and amusing.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The Minister said he would have thought that everyone would be at church in the morning. There was a church service from 10 a.m. on the foreshore with the Yorke Choir singing hymns of praise. Also featured on Macca's program was the combined Yorke Peninsula Schools Band, which really performed very well. Again, my compliments to them.

It was a wonderful weekend throughout, and it helped put not only Port Victoria on the map but also central Yorke Peninsula. I continue to reflect on the fact that so many people have not been to Yorke Peninsula, and yet literally everyone who visits and has a look around says what a magnificent place it is. I am very privileged to be the local member. It has been my aim for some years, and it will certainly continue to be my aim in an even stronger sense, to make sure that Yorke Peninsula is fully promoted and fully developed, and we are well on the way to doing that. I would like to thank the Government for all that it has done in assisting in a variety of ways in this respect. We will see real results in future years.

To Willie Dutschke, the Secretary; to Clive Kelly, the President; and to the CYP National Trust (the President, Nelda Gerschwitz), I say thank you for everything that you did for the weekend. I hope that there will be some follow-up type festivals associated with Port Victoria in future years. It was a great way to go, and something that I am sure everyone who was in attendance greatly appreciated. Sincere thanks to all concerned.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): There are many important issues facing South Australia at the moment—issues which have been debated in this place many times and which keep coming back. No issue is more important than employment,

which is the key element to reinvigoration of South Australia. Small business is this State's greatest employer, and the issue that, arguably, will have the greatest impact on small business is the deregulation of shopping hours. In the argument for deregulation, we should not be surprised to see that flexibility is part of the equation.

In the name of flexibility (and we are continually being told that flexibility means that we should be able to shop whenever we want), we are at risk of losing the livelihoods of the very businesses that provide the greatest number of employment opportunities in this State. And what for? Will prices fall as a result of deregulated trading? Will deregulation mean more jobs? Will the jobs be full-time and secure? Is the current push on industrial relations laws really about cutting wages or about lowering costs so that traders might be able to survive—for I am told that it is not the allegedly unfair dismissal laws but deregulation that is preventing employment in the retail sector and the growth of small businesses.

Shopkeepers and businesses who rent in the large shopping complexes continue to be worried about open slather on trading hours. They are concerned about being required to open seven days a week, in competition with the giants of the retail world—the Targets and K-Marts—that sell almost everything with purchasing power advantages that small businesses can only dream about.

Again, another feature that has become part of the introduction of unpalatable measures for no apparent gain, the no compulsion option, is part of the sales pitch. Traders in the big shopping centres are told that they will not be forced to open, and yet they know that this will only be the case while core hours remain unchanged in their leases. The definition of 'core hours' is the key to the 'no compulsion' clause. Shopkeepers are rightly wary in the current climate, as there is no guarantee that the next lease they sign will contain the core hours they currently honour. I am told that any addition to core hours will impact gravely on traders.

Faced with these circumstances, a group of traders has recently experienced the meaning of solidarity. They have learnt that coming together to discuss shared concerns and map out a plan of action has given their single voice, or vote, great strength: for in unity is strength. Traders cannot work harder or longer than they already do and this has forced them to take action. It is not only in the really big centres where traders are working longer and harder to retain their market share—because this is the nub of the problem: market share. People only have a set amount to spend, the population is not growing and things are not booming. We see small businesses competing against each other in strip shops, the smaller suburban centres and against each other and the big retailers in the large regional centres.

The push for deregulation in retail trade will impact on employment. As we are now seeing, there is a growing trend to casualisation and under-employment of the work force. These trends on employment are factors that contribute to the physical and social problems being experienced by our communities. Employment impacts on health outcomes, and the health budget is a major budget outlay. For with employment comes self-esteem, acceptance and the ability to participate in society. Without it, there is a demise in confidence and a lack of ability to turn things around. Much work is being done on the reasons for, and results of, poorer health on the unemployed and those in lower socioeconomic groups. Therefore, employment must be part of our preventative health measures plan.

Along with its impact on the health budget, law and order issues can also be addressed by a commitment to full employment. As is often said, the idle mind is the devil's tool, and so those unable to secure employment are trapped in a poverty cycle making them look for ways to augment income and give them the means to provide for their families. The scourge of mental illness and suicide will also see improvement when people are valued enough for employment to be recognised as a necessity and a right that must be available to all. Society's problems with drugs must be addressed on many levels, and I have no doubt that employment can play a key role in reducing drug dependency. If we are unable to increase revenue, we must look to the concept of prevention as a way to reduce spending. Rather than limiting ourselves to solely cutting expenditure, resulting in people missing out on much needed services, we must be smarter.

We must invest in our people. We live in a community, not only in an economy. People count and communities count. Would it not be better to invest in people so that they can be productive members of society, paying tax and stimulating the economy with their spending power, rather than having to allocate funds to pick them up when they are broken in spirit and can no longer contribute in any meaningful way? There are alternatives; there can be a better way. We must all survive this 'hanging on' budget and work for better times ahead.

Perhaps the single thing that is most insulting to residents of this State—the members of the public who are our constituents—is not being told the truth about the situation or, rather, being told only part of the truth, or the bit of the truth that it is thought they can tolerate and understand. People do not appreciate being treated like mushrooms. They know when they are being fed a line and they do not respond well to being kept in the dark. We should not underestimate the ability of people to understand the situation we face, nor their ability to respond in a magnificent way.

South Australians have done it before and they will do it again. I hope that the echoes of the sounds and the whistles blowing on the steps today outside of this place will ring in the consciousness of the members opposite when they consider the Industrial and Employee (Workplace Relations) Bill and cast their votes. This Bill will not create employment or save jobs. Be assured that nothing will save your jobs if you make this piece of legislation law. I have said it before and I will say it again: voters can outsource politicians, and believe me they will.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I wish to contribute briefly to this debate, conscious that it will probably be the least listened to debate in the history of this Parliament. People appear to be more pre-occupied with events in other places in this building. Nevertheless, I commend the last speaker for what she said. I know that she has a genuine commitment to employment because I can remember her attending the employment workshops in her area and listening and, in fact, making a contribution. This budget commits, as did the last budget, \$100 million towards employment outcomes in this State.

Not only does it do that, it takes another \$28.5 million over the next three years and makes an extra commitment, as the member said, to the people, to our community and to employment in South Australia. That is something that really needs to be fully acknowledged as a strategy in this budget. Is it enough? Would we like to provide more? I think the undoubted answer of every member in this House, I would

hope, on both sides is 'Yes.' I just take issue with the honourable member's comment about trends towards casualisation and say that, while I believe casualisation, and under-employment especially, was a trend in the retail sector, there appear to be (and I feel that members would be interested in this) indications now of a counter-trend; that some of these employers have suddenly discovered that whole heaps of casual people, who do not know how long they will be working at any time, tend to look for more stable employment opportunities.

Some of the retail sector I believe is now actually reversing that trend and looking towards permanent employment and a more stable work force. Hopefully, that trend, which I think all of us would believe creates a degree of uncertainty and provides lack of fulfilment for people because they never know how long they will last in the job, is a trend that we will not see continuing. I acknowledge, as the last member said, that employment is not an issue on its own: that it touches on law and order; that it certainly touches on health; and that the vast amounts of money poured into those sectors to rightly redress people who are then in need—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Peake comes into the Chamber and, without even listening, says 'rubbish'. I suggest that the member for Peake read *Hansard* because he might be embarrassed that he said 'rubbish' at the point he did, because his electors will judge him as they judge me on his contributions. The fact is that law and order and health, into which we put a lot of money—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning): The member for Peake is out of order, and he is out of his seat.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The honourable member also touched on drugs and suicide which are, in fact, symptomatic of the problems of unemployment. It is therefore problematic: if we invest more money into employment and if we create a more stable and happy work force, how much we can expect to save in those important budgetary areas?

So what the Government is forced to do is to invest heavily in law and order and health. While acknowledging what the member said, perhaps these things are better addressed by looking at the employment problem. I would like to finish in deference to the member for Elizabeth—and if the member for Peake keeps doing that the member for Elizabeth might just reach out and touch him. The point is that we would seek, in the context of this budget, to do much more. I remind this House that there are two million reasons each and every day why we cannot invest more in the very things that the members opposite have spoken passionately about the need to invest in. That is the amount. The Premier and many of his Ministers have come in here day after day and said, 'We are losing because of the interest paid on past debt.'

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Peake says, 'What is the excuse after we sell it?' If we are allowed to sell an asset and if we are to realise the asset, the member for Peake will be a hypocrite to ask what the excuse is, because the member for Peake has been absolutely passionate in his opposition to the sale. For the member for Peake to say, 'Now that you might sell it what will your excuse then be?' shows the rank hypocrisy of which only he is capable in this House.' A previous member said that we must be smarter; we must invest in the future. I acknowledge that, and our investment

in the future is best realised by a sale and by a capitalisation of our assets.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: We must be smarter and we must invest in the future. That is a message coming from every member of the Labor Opposition. They say that we must have a commitment not to ideology and not to economy but to people and to the future. I agree with that. I do not think that many members on this side of the House, in fact any members on this side of the House, would not agree that our commitment must be to our people and to our future. That is exactly why we have presented this budget, as difficult as it is. We have sat around and we have made some stark choices. We have made those choices in the interests of all South Australians and in the interests of our children.

We do not, like others who have gone before us, shirk the hard decision or the difficult road. We have taken tough decisions and you, Sir, would know some of those decisions are not proving all that easy to explain to our electors. It is not a matter of choosing the easy road: it is rather, I believe, a matter of choosing the right road. The true test of this Government will not only be in the next election, as undoubtedly it will, but it will be in the future. I believe that people in the future will look back and say that this Government might not have made the easy choice, it might not have made the popular choice but undoubtedly it made the right choice.

Populism in politics is a very dangerous animal, indeed. There are trends and swings in politics and in popular opinion that we have all seen. Sometimes popular opinion simply is not right. Sometimes good leadership in Government demands that the elected Government of the day turns and says, 'In spite of popular opinion, this is the right direction to take; this is the right thing to do; this is why you elected us to office.'

It must then take the responsibility of facing the electors at the next election and explaining its decision. It is called representative democracy: that is what this budget is about; and that is why I am quite proud to stand here and say that, whatever else is said of this budget, I believe we have made the right decision, difficult though it might be, and I believe that it will lead to a safer, better and more prosperous South Australia in the years ahead.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I want to make a very brief comment tonight, possibly the briefest I have made in nine years but probably one of the most important, in relation to the budget. I have a concern in relation to the impact of the emergency services levy. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Minister involved (Hon. Robert Brokenshire) and also of the Premier, and I appreciate their patience and having their ear. But I put on record that I am very concerned at the impact of this levy. I do not believe that the testing of it was done fully. I think the impact will be higher and harder than we thought it would be, and some of the anomalies have occurred because of the definitions of the different classes of land and land use.

I particularly have a concern regarding the Barossa Valley, which is adjudged the same as the metropolitan area and different from the Clare Valley. I believe that all the wine

areas should be the same. When you apply the formula to actual constituents' figures and work out the impacts, the actual modelling, we are finding some rather severe impacts that I am rather concerned about. I put on the record that I have appreciated the cooperation I have had from the Minister, from the Premier and from the Deputy Premier in working through this. I just hope that in the weeks ahead we will be able to fine tune this. We were led to believe that what was originally planned was to pick up the 30 per cent of people who were not contributing to our emergency services via the current fire insurance levy, and that the impact to those currently insured would be basically neutral.

Certainly, there were to be some losers and there were to be winners but, from the testing that I have been able to do, actually looking at the figures for my constituency, it looks as though there are far more losers than there are winners. I again stress that I appreciate the cooperation that I am having from the Minister and put on the record at this time my concern about the impact of this new levy.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I would like to elaborate on the remarks I was making during the grievance debate earlier this afternoon, when I drew attention to the fact that people who seek to adopt children must go through a procedure that is, to say the least, very demeaning. Not only are they examined for reasons of determining their personal physical health—that they are sound of wind and limb and free of any disease—but they are also examined to determine whether they are free of any taint in conduct of any kind whatsoever. Further, they have to show all the relevant details of financial transactions in which they have engaged in the past several years, demonstrate that they are solvent and show that they have a capacity to manage their finances in a prudential manner. They also need to illustrate that they are strongly committed to each other and to the welfare of a child, regardless of what may happen.

I made the point then that, on the other hand, someone who wishes to be a biological parent has only to spend a few minutes prostrate—or, indeed, in any other of the *Kamasutra's* many positions—to ensure that in consequence they become one of two parents. If they agree as parents—that is, the man and the woman—they automatically are accorded status. Whether or not in any sense they are fit to look after that human life is beyond me and not important to them. Certainly, the law is entirely silent on the matter of their fitness. They are not required to give any commitment to anyone, not even to their partner in the act of procreation. That strikes me as stupid.

Indeed, we give licences through law to people who wish to marry, and that costs money. It is not necessary for them to have a licence to cohabit: we have passed laws to provide for that. If they have cohabited for some time, their status is identical to that of someone who has become legally married. The point I am making there is that as biological parents they need not have any responsible attitude whatever to the fact that they are parents; and the child suffers in consequence. They need a licence to be married but not a licence to be parents, and I think it ought to be the other way around.

I have seen too many children suffer in consequence of having parents that I would wish on nobody; parents who neither care nor understand parenting responsibilities; parents who have probably acquired their own indifferent attitudes from their parents; parents who do not care for those children at all and, indeed, abuse them; parents who have themselves been brought up badly by their parents before them. How do

you break the cycle if you do not require people to demonstrate that they are worthy, capable and competent to be parents in the first place?

The member for Schubert, without interjecting by so much as saying anything, illustrates to me that the mechanism he has in mind is a vasectomy. That is all very well: that may stop the male from becoming a father but it does not stop the woman from becoming a mother. If sterilisation were to be a choice, that would demonstrate a measure of responsibility on the part of the woman—a great deal more responsibility than I have seen demonstrated by some of the women who have had successful pregnancies and been given the custody of the children who result. That is the tragedy to which I draw attention. It is not fair to those kids to allow the situation to go on in the way it is at present. If, in my judgment, from this point forward they wish to be mothers, allowed in law to retain the custody of the child and the responsibility for its care and upbringing, then I believe that, if they want welfare assistance, they have to demonstrate in future that they are capable of understanding their responsibilities.

I do not think it is appropriate any longer for us to wait until a child has been so abused and so scarred in psychological development that we then take action. It is better to act ahead of time. We do so in the case of adoptions and, if it is good enough to do it there, it is good enough to do it in the case of natural procreation of families, and I do not see any difficulty with that. If anyone argues that it is in some way not fair, I would tell them, 'Yes, I agree. It is not fair to the kids.' We have to break the cycle. There are some subcultures within our multicultural society that are less competent in consequence of the way they set about living, I guess, to be parents than other subcultures.

I turn from that matter to another problem that I see bedevilling us, and I have my suspicions that it has happened already. I refer to the lands title system, the Torrens title system as it was known, which was required in law. A portrait of Torrens used to hang in this Chamber, but I think that was taken down at the time we hung the two tapestries, quite appropriately, during 1994 to celebrate the centenary of women's suffrage universally in South Australia, and a very good thing it was, too. We gave women not only the right to vote but also the right to stand for Parliament, because they were no different from any other citizen in society, namely, the men.

Torrens devised the system and it immediately reduced the amount of disputation and so on in the wider community about who owned what in the way of land. By law there was a requirement to keep a record of who owned every piece of land that had ever been surveyed and allotted throughout South Australia. We changed that a few years ago and I sought assurances from the Minister at the time that the changes to keep the record in an electronic form would not mean that it could be tampered with, and I suspected that it could be. I believe now that it has been. I believe that we need to return to the set of circumstances where we keep an original piece of paper on which all entries are made of encumbrances on that piece of land and owners of that piece of land.

That piece of paper and the printer through which it is put from time to time can vary, but it ought to be kept in a form that enables forgeries to be detected. As it stands, I allege that forgeries are already occurring and that is to cover up botches that have been made in the process of issuing the title, transferring the title from one person to another, or changing the records of who previous owners may have been and what

the mortgages may have been. It is not only a matter of who owns it but who has owned it and what the history of the encumbrances on it may have been. With an electronic record, there is no way that we can trace whether or not it has been interfered with by miscreants.

Motion carried.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Local Government): I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by 6 July 1999, in accordance with the timetables as follows:

Estimates Committee A

Tuesday 22 June 1999 at 11.00 a.m.

Premier, Minister for State Development, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Year 2000 Compliance

Legislative Council

House of Assembly

Joint Parliamentary Services

Department of the Premier and Cabinet

Auditor-General's Department

State Governor's Establishment

Administered Items for Department of the Premier and Cabinet

South Australian Tourism Commission

Minister for Tourism—Other Items

Wednesday 23 June 1999 at 11.00 a.m.

Treasurer

Department of Treasury and Finance

Administered Items for Department of Treasury and Finance

Thursday 24 June 1999 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Minister for Local Government

Department of Industry and Trade

Administered Items for Department of Industry and Trade

Minister for Local Government—Other Items

Tuesday 29 June 1999 at 11.00 a.m.

Deputy Premier, Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development

Department of Primary Industries and Resources

Administered Items for Department of Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development

Wednesday 30 June 1999 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Environment, Heritage, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs

Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs

Administered Items for Department for Environment, Heritage and Aboriginal Affairs

Minister for Environment and Heritage—Other Items

Estimates Committee B

Tuesday 22 June 1999 at 11.00 a.m.

Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services

Department of Justice

Attorney-General's Department

Courts Administration Authority

Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department

South Australian Police Department

Department of Correctional Services

Administered Items for Police Department

Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services—Other Items

Wednesday 23 June 1999 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training, Minister for Employment, Minister for Youth

Department of Education, Training and Employment

Administered Items for Department of Education, Training and Employment

Thursday 24 June 1999 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, Minister for the Arts and Minister for the Status of Women

Department for Transport, Urban Planning and the Arts

TransAdelaide

Administered Items for Transport, Urban Planning and the Arts

Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, Minister for the Arts and Minister for the Status of Women—Other Items

Tuesday 29 June 1999 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Human Services, Minister for Disability Services and Minister for the Ageing

Department of Human Services

Department of Human Services—Other Items

Wednesday 30 June 1999 at 11.00 a.m.

Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Information Economy, Minister for Administrative Services, Minister for Information Services

Minister for Government Enterprises and Minister for Information Economy—Other Items

Department of Administrative and Information Services

Motion carried.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed and consist of Messrs Clarke and Conlon, Ms Key and Messrs Ingerson, Rann, Scalzi and Wotton.

Motion carried.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed and consist of Messrs Atkinson, Hamilton-Smith, Hanna, McEwen, Meier, Snelling and Venning.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 5.16 to 6.5 p.m.]

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday 10 June at 10.30 a.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: For the sake of members of the House, I will quickly explain the situation. We are adjourning until next Thursday. There was not much point in our sitting on Tuesday or Wednesday if the Upper House had not completed the Bill. We will come back on Thursday in the hope that we might be able to get it out of the way. We will start at 10.30 a.m., and will undertake Government business on Thursday morning. Accordingly, I move:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 79, Government business take precedence over all other business between 10.30 a.m. and 1 p.m. next Thursday.

Motion carried.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council intimated that it had given leave to the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin), the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) and the Minister for Disability Services (Hon. R.D. Lawson) to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

FINANCIAL SECTOR REFORM (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**FINANCIAL SECTOR (TRANSFER OF BUSINESS)
BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 10 June at 10.30 a.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 June 1999

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WEST BEACH STORMWATER DRAIN

26. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:**

1. With respect to the proposed storm water drain at West Beach, what is the length of the drain, the budgeted cost, the construction timetable and anticipated maintenance costs?

2. Will this project have any adverse effect on property values, the local environment and the public who frequent this beach?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The proposed stormwater outlet at the northern end of the Patawalonga Lake has, over the past several months, been the subject of concept development work. This work has, by necessity, been integrated with the developments in the upstream catchment, including the recent completion of the Warriparinga Wetland. This wetland is adjacent to Science Park and is the result of a partnership between the Patawalonga Catchment Board, City of Marion and the Government. Integrated catchment management is a task the Government takes very seriously. We intend that the work we carry out on behalf of the community gets the best overall result possible.

The proposed stormwater outlet will be south of Barcoo Road and run under the sand hills and under the beach, just south of the new West Beach Boat Launching facility, another initiative of the Government.

The Barcoo Outlet will provide the means by which the Patawalonga will become a stable marine ecosystem, as it will provide the outlet for sea water taken in through the existing gate structure at the southern end. This will be a sustainable, tidally driven system, providing almost continuous sea water circulation, with the lake's entire water volume being exchanged every few days. The Patawalonga will become a high quality, marine water body abundant with marine life including sought after estuarine fish. The Barcoo Outlet will enable a significant, positive change in the environmental, social and economic value of the Patawalonga and Glenelg-West Beach region to occur.

The Barcoo Outlet will also allow much of the stormwater flows that presently enter the Patawalonga to be released directly to the sea. This will reduce the concentration of stormwater in the Patawalonga Basin, and the black anaerobic discharges to the sea which have occurred in the past. It will act like all the other stormwater outlets along the coast, except it will go under the beach, via a submerged pipe.

The Government remains committed to improved regional water quality outcomes in the Glenelg-West Beach area. Scientific and engineering work for the project is progressing, with design details being refined to achieve the best environmental and technical outcomes for the project. At this stage I can advise that the design will include an underwater pipeline, which extends 200 metres out to sea. Cost, construction and maintenance costs will be confirmed in coming months as the design work is completed and the project delivery method is confirmed.

This leads to the second part of the question. The likely outcome for the regional, and indeed the South Australian community, will be a greatly improved local environment. The market will determine property values and any improvement. I do not propose to speculate on this, however, what is certain is that the overall result will be a vast improvement on the present situation for the benefit of locals and visitors alike.

OLYMPIC GAMES

46. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** How many Sydney Olympic visitors are predicted to visit South Australia and what will the financial benefit be to this State?

The Hon. J. HALL: The Sydney 2000 Games is expected to bring long-term promotional benefits for the whole of Australia and a significant increase in international tourist arrivals.

To assess the likely tourism spin-off from the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games, the Tourism Forecasting Council commissioned a study into 'The Olympic Effect'. Three scenarios for the potential

tourism impacts of the 2000 Games were developed for the international market and two for domestic market. In developing the scenarios the tourism impacts of past Olympic Games were considered.

Based on the most likely scenario of tourism impacts, the forecasts of visitor arrivals and visitor dispersal for Australian according to the Study are as follows:

- Between 1997 and 2004 an extra 1.6 million international visitors are expected to come to Australia as a result of the Games.
- Generating an additional \$6.1 billion in tourism earnings and creating 150,000 new jobs.
- The Study indicates that the impact of the Olympics will have started in 1998.

New South Wales will be the main beneficiary of the boom in international tourist arrivals but the spin-off will also be significant for the rest of Australia.

The Games will produce long-term promotional benefits to Australia as a whole over the period 1998 to 2004. These promotional impacts are assumed to be distributed across all States and Territories, with 7% of all extra tourists expected to visit South Australia.

The forecast number of additional international visitors to South Australia over the period 1998 to 2004 is 99,000. This takes into account, that in the year of the Games, there is expected to be a small number of international visitors who will switch their travel from other destinations to New South Wales.

The maximum impact for South Australia is expected to be two years after the Games with the number of additional visitors peaking at 25,000 in 2002.

'The Olympic Effect' report does not estimate State financial impacts. However, based on the methodology used in the study and using an average length of stay of 14 nights, additional spending in South Australia associated with the forecast extra visitors to the State is estimated to be \$114 million. This does not include package tours and prepaid international airfares.

The Government is not assuming that South Australia will automatically benefit from the Games. The Government is actively pursuing initiatives to ensure South Australia maximises opportunities associated with the Games by:

- Providing the international media with stories, images and footage of South Australia.
- Inviting the international media to South Australia as special guests to showcase South Australia's tourism offerings.
- Working with industry to develop Olympics tour packages to South Australia.
- Working with The Prepared To Win Campaign to promote South Australia as the ideal place for athletes, officials and family members to train and holiday.
- Working with the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority to secure businesses wanting to conduct conventions around the time of the Olympics.
- Providing positive public relations for the Torch Relay and Olympics Football.
- Working with community groups to ensure there is plenty of opportunity for public participation in South Australian Olympics celebrations.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

53. **Ms KEY:** What are the names of the private and public sector agencies which were granted exempt employer status under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 in 1997-98, and if any of these agencies have outsourced their claim management function, what are the details and who is performing this function?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: During the 1997-98 financial year the WorkCover Corporation approved four new applications for exempt employer status (or self insurance) from private sector bodies. The following three were granted exempt employer status with effect from 1 July 1998:

- Britax Rainsfords Pty Ltd;
- Kimberly Clark Australia Pty Ltd; and
- Resthaven Inc.

The fourth, from Western Mining Corporation Resources Ltd, was granted exempt employer status with effect from 1 January 1999.

WorkCover Corporation also granted private exempt employer status to the following two organisations, formerly deemed to be Crown Exempt employers:

- Healthscope Ltd;

United Water International Pty Ltd.
 WorkCover Corporation does not have any decision-making powers in relation to the granting of exempt employer status to public sector bodies. Under section 61 of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986, any agency or instrumentality of the Crown is deemed to be registered as an exempt employer.

I am advised there have been some extensions or variations of registration of existing exempt employers to cover additional newly acquired or created operations.

In relation to the issue of outsourcing of claims management, the WorkCover Corporation has been advised by the above employers that they have not outsourced that function and, accordingly, they each retain full responsibility for all delegated powers.

68. **Ms KEY:** What is the number and average time delay for workers' compensation claims forwarded by non-exempt employers in excess of the five business day requirement under section 52(5) of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 during each of the past four financial years and have there been any prosecutions for breaching section 52(5) and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The requirement under section 52(5) of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 is that the employer must, within five business days after receipt of a claim, forward to WorkCover Corporation a copy of the claim and a statement in the form of the Employer Report Form.

For the purposes of this response, seven calendar days have been used in lieu of the five business days as stated in the Act.

Using the 'date notice received' section of the Worker Report Form and the date the claim was received by the Claims Agent, the following data has been extracted by WorkCover Corporation:

Year	No. of claims	Percentage of all claims	Average Time in excess of seven calendar days
1995-96	10,553	37%	22 days
1996-97	9,645	39%	27 days
1997-98	10,157	41%	36 days

There have been no prosecutions for breach of section 52(5) since the scheme began in 1987. In fact, a review of the same data for earlier years shows similar results.

The WorkCover Corporation has, in the past, concentrated its prosecution efforts on matters of dishonesty and like offences.

However, the WorkCover Corporation has been concerned for some time about the delays, and is currently addressing the issue of late lodgement. The Corporation has recently provided claims agents with a list of employers who appear to have repeatedly failed to comply with section 52. Agents are required to advise these employers of their apparent failure to meet their obligations under section 52(5) and the consequences of continued breaches. Should there be no improvement, prosecutions will be considered in appropriate cases.

LOTTERIES COMMISSION

94. **Mr ATKINSON:**

1. What are the respective odds of winning first prize and any prize for each game offered by the South Australian Lotteries Commission?

2. Are first prizes paid as lump sums or annuities?

3. What proportion of the pool in each game is allocated to prizes, consolidated revenue, commissions, administration and advertising?

4. How much has both the commission and the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board spent on advertising for each year since 1989?

5. Are the activities of the commission and the board subject to all State and Commonwealth fair trading laws?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:

1.

Game	Division/Prize	Odds
Saturday Lotto	Division 1	1: 8,145,060
	Division 2	1: 678,755
	Division 3	1: 36,689
	Division 4	1: 732
	Division 5	1: 297
Monday Lotto	Division 1	1: 8,145,060
	Division 2	1: 678,755
	Division 3	1: 36,689
	Division 4	1: 7,240
	Division 5	1: 815

Oz Lotto	Division 6	1: 297	
	Division 1	1: 8,145,060	
	Division 2	1: 678,755	
	Division 3	1: 36,689	
	Division 4	1: 732	
Powerball	Division 5	1: 297	
	Division 1	1: 54,979,155	
	Division 2	1: 1,249,527	
	Division 3	1: 274,896	
	Division 4	1: 7,049	
	Division 5	1: 6,248	
	Division 6	1: 557	
The Pools	Division 7	1: 161	
	Division 1	1: 2,760,681	
	Division 2	1: 460,113	
	Division 3	1: 14,842	
	Division 4	1: 371	
	Division 5	1: 297	
	Division 6	1: 1,000,000	
Super 66	Division 1	1: 52,631	
	Division 2	1: 5,555	
	Division 3	1: 555	
	Division 4	1: 55	
	Division 5	1: 55	
Game	Division/Prize	Odds	
\$1 Instant Scratchies	\$ 1,000	1:33,333	
	Common Low tier structure	\$ 100	1:10,000
	\$ 50	1: 5,000	
	\$ 25	1: 556	
	\$ 10	1: 175	
	\$ 5	1: 40	
	\$ 2	1: 10	
	\$ 1	1: 9	
	Average	1: 4	
	\$1 Instant Scratchies	\$ 25,000	1:1,500,000
	Common High tier structure	\$ 2,500	1:1,500,000
	\$ 250	1: 150,000	
	\$ 100	1:15,000	
\$ 20	1: 1,500		
\$ 25	1: 250		
\$ 10	1: 155		
\$ 5	1: 300		
\$ 4	1: 150		
\$ 2	1: 0		
\$ 1	1: 8		
Average	1: 4		
\$2 Instant Scratchies	Common Structure	\$100,000	1: 500,000
	\$ 10,000	1: 500,000	
	\$ 1,000	1: 500,000	
	\$ 500	1:62,500	
	\$ 100	1:50,000	
	\$ 50	1:20,000	
	\$ 30	1: 6,250	
	\$ 25	1: 4,545	
	\$ 20	1: 1,667	
	\$ 15	1: 1,667	
	\$10 (5+5)	1: 333	
	\$ 10	1: 294	
	\$ 6	1: 55	
\$ 5	1: 23		
\$ 3	1: 6		
Average	1: 4		
Game	Division/Prize	Odds	
\$5 Instant Scratchies	Common Structure	\$250,000	1: 600,000
	\$ 25,000	1: 600,000	
	\$ 10,000	1: 600,000	
	\$ 2,500	1: 300,000	
	\$ 1,000	1: 60,000	
	\$ 250	1: 6,000	
	\$ 100	1: 1,200	
	\$ 75	1: 1,200	
	\$ 50	1: 1,200	
	\$ 40	1: 750	
	\$ 25	1: 75	
	\$ 20	1: 67	
	\$ 15	1: 60	
\$ 10	1: 17		
\$ 5	1: 7		
Average	1: 4		

Keno Prize Structure			8 SPOT	
1 SPOT	1	Odds 4	4	12
	Average	4	5	55
2 SPOT	2	17	6	423
	Average	17	7	6,232
3 SPOT	2	7	8	230,115
	Average	7	Average	10
4 SPOT	3	72	9 SPOT	4
	Average	7		5
5 SPOT	3	23		6
	Average	326		7
	22			8
	3	12		9
	4	83		Average
	5	1,551	10 SPOT	0
	Average	10		5
6 SPOT	3	8		6
	4	35		7
	5	323		8
	6	7,753		9
	Average	6		10
7 SPOT	4	19		Average
	5	116		9
	6	1,366		
	7	40,979		
	Average	16		

2. All prizemoney is paid as a lump sum.
3. For the 1997-98 financial year, the proportion of gross sales was split as follows:

Product	Prizes	Surplus	Commission	Administration	Advertising
Sat Lotto	56.2%	32.8%	6.3%	3.8%	0.9%
Mon Lotto	55.6%	32.4%	7.4%	3.8%	0.9%
Oz Lotto	56.5%	32.2%	5.9%	3.5%	2.0%
Powerball	55.9%	30.9%	6.9%	3.8%	2.5%
The Pools	47.2%	40.4%	5.6%	6.8%	0.02%
Super 66	57.1%	33.3%	4.8%	4.6%	0.2%
Instants	61.4%	20.3%	7.7%	6.7%	3.9%
Keno	72.8%	12.9%	9.0%	4.3%	1.1%

Year	SA Lotteries (\$'000)	SA TAB (\$'000)
1988-89	1,649	527
1989-90	2,216	658
1990-91	2,800	660
1991-92	2,968	750
1992-93	3,328	751
1993-94	3,705	712
1994-95	3,314	600
1995-96	4,402	649
1996-97	3,612	1,830
1997-98	3,896	2,100

4. I am advised that both Lotteries Commission of SA and SA TAB activities are subject to all State and Commonwealth fair trading laws.

ABORIGINAL LIAISON OFFICER

119. **Mr ATKINSON:** Why has the position of Aboriginal Liaison Officer with the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs in Port Augusta been made redundant?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: In mid 1995 a particular problem was highlighted in the far north areas of the State where Aboriginal people were disadvantaged by the sale of second-hand motor vehicles. It had been confirmed that some sales were conducted by unlicensed dealers and purchasers were completely unaware of their rights relating to the purchase and warranty obligations of the vendor.

Due to limited resources and the geographical vastness of the affected area, monitoring and enforcement provided only limited results and it was decided that an ongoing educational program would be the most efficient and cost effective method to address this problem.

Extensive consultation with a number of local groups including: Aboriginal Legal Rights and the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Council resulted in agreement to establish the position of Aboriginal Liaison

Officer, on a trial basis, to develop and implement a program to assist the indigenous people of these areas.

The organisations involved agreed that Bungala Aboriginal Corporation Community Development Employment Program (CDEP) would be responsible for recruiting candidates for the position. A representative from OCBA participated on the interview panel and on the day of the interviews 2 of the 3 applicants withdrew. On 4 October 1995 the appointment of an Aboriginal Liaison Officer was made under a 12 month contract and the position was to be jointly funded by CDEP, the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) and OCBA. The position was not a State Government employee position and OCBA was not responsible for, nor had control of its future. There was no FTE allocated to the position and no additional funding was received from Treasury. Funding from OCBA was provided by reallocation of existing budgets and from temporary savings arising from vacancies in the Consumer Affairs and Customer and Education Services Branches.

In October 1996 an evaluation of the program outcomes was made and it was agreed that the program be extended for an additional 12 months and it be expanded to include other Aboriginal communities in the South East, Riverland and Murray Mallee areas.

At this time changes occurred in the funding arrangements resulting in CDEP funding the majority of salary costs and OCBA contributing the remainder of the salary plus operational costs.

In October 1997, this funding arrangement from CDEP ceased. Other avenues for funding were explored without success and OCBA agreed to continue part funding of the position until 31 March 1998.

To assist with a short staffing situation in the Northern Regional area at this time, OCBA undertook to employ the incumbent of the Aboriginal Liaison Officer position as an Administrative Services Officer, on a monthly casual contract basis, based in the Port Augusta regional office. In October 1998 this short staffing situation ceased with the appointment of an officer in the Whyalla office and, in December 1998, all funding avenues were exhausted and a reluctant decision was made to cease further extension of the contract.

The OCBA Compliance Unit, which was re-established early in 1998, has commenced an intense compliance and monitor-

ing/inspection program across the State. Inclusion of remote areas in this program is now considered to be the most effective and resourceful way of reaching all people in these remote areas of the State.

OCBA's Customer and Education Services Branch will be involved in the compliance activities in these areas to ensure that there is a strong consumer education component to the program. In addition, assistance and cooperation will be sought from Aboriginal community leaders, ATSI members and officers from the Division of State Aboriginal Affairs (DOSAA) to ensure that the program is delivered in the most effective way possible.

Disseminating the responsibility for ensuring consumer protection and education in remote communities across different branches of OCBA will broaden the expertise and skills of staff. This, in turn, will ensure that all of the kinds of problems experienced by these communities can be handled by the most appropriate officers. This approach will also enhance the level of service delivered by OCBA and establish a broader range of contacts for members of Aboriginal communities.

BENLATE

134. **Ms WHITE:**

1. What action has the Government taken following the Legislative Council's call on 30 November 1995 for: 'an immediate halt to the sale of Benlate in South Australia; and an urgent investigation by the Department of Primary Industries into the detrimental effects of Benlate on crops and human health; and the State Government to support affected growers in their legal action against the manufacturers of Benlate should the investigation confirm detrimental effects.?'

2. Have any of the affected growers since been declared bankrupt?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN:

1. The sale of Benlate can be considered in at least two forms in South Australia:

- the material which was causing concern, the fungicide Benlate 50 DF (the 'DF' referring to its formulation as a 'Dry Flowable' material), was withdrawn from the market by the manufacturer (Du Pont) in 1991;

- the Benlate 50 WP (standing for 'Wettable Powder') formulation has not been implicated in causing crop or health damage since it was first registered in South Australia in October 1969. It is still freely available and in wide and effective use in Australia and overseas;

- exhaustive testing done by the (then) Department of Agriculture and others, both in Australia and overseas, between the years 1990 and 1995 did not conclusively link Benlate 50 DF and the crop damage that growers observed.

Further investigation of Benlate 50 DF was not undertaken after 1995 because :

- commercial supplies of Benlate 50 DF had been exhausted years before, and it was not possible to obtain enough for further experimentation (remaining small samples were being held by potential litigants);

- large amounts of investigation had been done in South Australia, in other states and overseas prior to November 1995, and no new information would have been likely to emerge on either crop or health effects even had it been practically possible.

The State Government has supported allegedly affected growers with a large amount of free access to information that it holds about the Benlate 50 DF issue. This information may be of considerable use to growers who launch actions against Du Pont. The State Government does not consider that it has a responsibility to provide financial support to individuals engaging in civil litigation.

2. To the knowledge of the Department of Primary Industries and Resources, only one of the allegedly affected growers has been declared bankrupt. Whether Benlate 50 DF use was a contributory factor is under current scrutiny in an action before the Supreme Court of New South Wales.

SALISBURY HIGHWAY

141. **Ms WHITE:**

1. How much revenue was collected from speed cameras along Salisbury Highway in each year since 1994?

2. For the last year, what proportion of Salisbury Highway speeding fines were for speeds at or under 70 km per hour?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has been advised by the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services of the following—

Speed Camera Offences Issued/Expiated during 1994 to 1998
Camera Location – Salisbury Highway

Year	Issued		Expiated		Vehicle Speed <=70 km/h			
	Number	Amt \$	Number	Amt \$	Issued		Expiated	
					Number	Amt \$	Number	Amt \$
1998	2,785	387,835	2,260	305,305	667	79,956	577	68,901
1997	4,735	652,674	2,898	390,394	1,055	124,119	668	78,533
1996	6,446	896,231	4,738	649,895	981	110,521	728	81,807
1995	1,842	211,517	1,247	139,221	420	40,721	289	27,642
1994	3,026	329,638	2,395	255,706	659	61,230	559	51,872

EDUCATION, SPORTS FUNDING

146. **Ms WHITE:** How much did the State Government spend on sport in public schools in 1997-98, what is the budgeted expenditure for 1998-99 and in what ways is the money being spent?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: It is difficult at present to accurately quantify the total spent by the State Government on sport in public schools, as most of the resources provided to schools are applied at the school's discretion and therefore, not measured in the Department of Education, Training and Employment's accounting system. For example, all schools are provided with a staffing allocation based on enrolment numbers. It is up to the Principal of the school to

determine how many hours will be allocated from within that allocation to sporting activities. Similarly, schools decide how much they will spend on sporting equipment in any given year from within their Support Grants as provided by the department and from other revenue sources such as student fees. Officers of the department are currently implementing the EDSAS administration system across the department's operations that may enable such a question to be answered more comprehensively in future. Nevertheless, information has been obtained from a sample of schools and has been extrapolated to provide an estimate of staffing and equipment costs across the system.

In summary, estimated costs are as follows:

Description	Estimated Actual 1997-98 \$'000	Budget 1998-99 \$'000	How is the funding being spent?
8.0 Full Time Staff—Sports Coordinators 1.0 at Brighton, Marryatville, Blackwood, Heathfield, Seaton, Seaview High Schools and 2.0 at Henley High School.	422	434	Salary costs for officers to facilitate an organisational infrastructure supporting sports programs at a statewide and regional level.
Junior Sports Policy (Project 098)	472	442	Funding provided to supplement individual school sports budgets, support a year 7 sports camp, provide programs for students not catered for in mainstream program and provide professional development for teachers and other related costs.
Aussie Sports (Project 485)	1	67	Funding provided to support the Active Australia Sports Network.
Capital Payments Capital Works Assistance Scheme—	3,937	3,424	Expenditure on repayment of principal and interest on existing loans for construction of activity halls and gymnasiums, and construction of new halls and gymnasiums.
Estimated staff costs in schools	24,940	24,940	Physical Education programs in schools
Expenditure on equipment	1,000	1,000	Cost of new or replacement equipment purchased from school funds
Total	29,877	29,364	

In addition, the School Sports Association generates an estimated \$0.5 million in additional funding through school affiliation, entry fees and sponsorship which is invested back into school sporting activities.

HARRIS, Mr R.

153. **Mr CLARKE:** Will the Minister release publicly or through the Parliament a report prepared by Mr Jim Gaetjens for WorkCover Corporation into allegations made by Mr Robert Harris concerning the handling of his WorkCover claim by H.I.H. Winterthur's and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The report referred to by the honourable member contains confidential information relating to Mr Harris' workers compensation claim and is already in Mr Harris' possession.

In view of this, I have decided not to release the report.

SOUTHERN RACING FESTIVAL

160. **Mr WRIGHT:** How much did the Racing Industry Development Authority spend on the launch of the Southern Racing Festival on 16 March 1999?

The Hon I.F. EVANS: I have been advised as follows:

The Racing Industry Development Authority spent \$16,324 on the launch of the Southern Racing Festival on 16 March 1999.

NIPPY'S FACTORY

173. **Ms STEVENS:** On what dates since 1995 was the Nippy's Regent Park factory inspected by officers authorised under the Food Act, what food product tests were conducted and what were the results?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Nippy's Regency Park is in the jurisdiction of the Council of Port Adelaide/Enfield. The Council has advised that, since 1995 and prior to the recent salmonella outbreak, inspections of the premises took place on:

- 22 May 1995
- 9 August 1995
- 6 June 1996
- 22 July 1996
- 4 February 1997
- 14 December 1998

No food analyses were conducted however this is not surprising as orange juice is generally regarded as a low risk food and there are no microbiological standards for orange juice in the Australian Food Standards Code. The latter issue will be raised with the Australian New Zealand Food Authority.