

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 1 March 2001

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

AUSTRALIAN ROAD RULES (SPEED LIMITS IN BUILT-UP AREAS) VARIATION BILL

The **Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher)** obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to vary the Australian Road Rules. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Members would be aware that, towards the end of last year, I introduced the Road Traffic (Speed Limits In Built-Up Areas) Amendment Bill, which was related to the likely introduction of a 50 km/h limit in residential streets. I indicated at the time that if an alternative option was preferred by local government, the RAA and other interested parties I would withdraw that bill, and I will do so at the appropriate time. The reason for introducing the Australian Road Rules (Speed Limits In Built-Up Areas) Variation Bill in preference to the alternative bill is that, under this proposal, streets do not have to be signposted where the 50 km/h limit applies.

Members can appreciate that this saves an enormous amount of money and resourcing because if no speed limit sign is displayed the limit is 50 km/h. As we know, major arterial roads carry signage indicating the limit. Limits apply to school zones, and councils may apply a special speed zone, but this bill states quite clearly that if no sign is displayed in a residential street the limit is 50 km/h. I have been in consultation with the RAA and it supports this proposal, which is sometimes called the default option, meaning that if no sign limit is posted the limit is 50 km/h.

I have had support from many of the councils. For example, the Adelaide City Council supports this option, as does Marion and Norwood, Payneham & St Peters. The LGA has indicated that a very significant meeting of its executive will be held next week, after which it will be in a position to indicate its response to this issue. The LGA indicated in a letter to me that it is mindful of the time constraints of parliament but, in fairness to the LGA, because its comments are very important, its position will be taken into account. A letter that I received on 27 February, which was signed by John Comrie, Executive Director, states:

The LGA intends to provide information to both the Metropolitan Local Government Group at its meeting dated 14 March and the LGA State Executive Committee at its meeting dated Thursday 15 March 2001.

The LGA wants to consider some issues, and one is whether the variation to Australian road rules which imposes a 50 km/h residential speed limit should apply to country towns as well as to the metropolitan area. At this stage my bill does not seek to introduce the default option or that variation to country towns. I have spoken with some country members, and they feel it might not be appropriate in some towns, for example, those in the Riverland, because the streets are quite wide.

However, some country members believe that, once their councils and the LGA have had a chance to look at that issue, they will be in a position to respond accordingly. It may well be that country towns are considered in terms of an optional

coverage or a blanket coverage. I am not seeking to impose my will or the will of the parliament on country people, but we will have time during the passage of this bill to provide that option if that is what country members wish, whether it be an opt-in provision or a blanket provision.

Members would be aware that in January, Victoria introduced a blanket 50 km/h speed limit in residential streets. Indeed, it became law in Victoria from 22 January this year and, as I indicated earlier, its advertising campaign was, 'If there is no sign, it is 50 km/h'. Queensland has adopted the same policy and, around the world, 50 km/h is the accepted appropriate limit for residential streets. Last year I surveyed my electorate and there is majority support for a 50 km/h limit in residential streets, not 40 km/h.

My bill would not prevent a council from continuing with a 40 km/h limit, and I know that the City of Unley has a 40 km/h provision. The bill provides that, if there is no sign, it is 50 km/h. If the council has gone through the proper process and designated a residential street at 40 km/h, my provision would not automatically override that decision. However, it is important that we move quickly to clarify the situation. Only a week or two ago the City of Mitcham, in response to requests from a group of residents at Blackwood, moved to introduce a 40 km/h zone in part of Blackwood.

If we are not careful, a situation will develop in the metropolitan area where there are different limits in residential streets, and I do not think that is in the interests of the community, motorists, pedestrians and residents. A speed limit of 50 km/h, slightly down from 60 km/h, is the appropriate limit. People will realise that, when they turn into a side street, they ease off on the accelerator and slow down. All the expert evidence is that 50 km/h is the most appropriate speed limit.

One issue is very important and I trust that, if this measure is passed by parliament, councils will move quickly to ensure that they designate appropriately roads that they do not want to be 50 km/h. Many of these are called collector roads, which are not the major arterials such as Anzac Highway but the less busy but still significant transport corridors. We could have a situation that occurred in Victoria where the law was changed but the councils did not move quickly enough to designate the collector roads, which they may wish to keep at 60 km/h. If they wish to keep them at 60 km/h they have to signpost them. They are the feeder roads, which are the next stage up from the residential streets that feed into arterial roads.

I do not need to canvass the issues at great length. It is fairly self explanatory. The bill is very straightforward. The key issue that has been deliberately omitted is whether or not it should apply to country towns, and that matter can be addressed in the near future following responses from country members, the LGA and country councils.

I commend the bill to the House. I believe it has merit. I want to bring the issue to a resolution. I appreciate the work being done by the parliamentary committee looking at road safety, chaired by Angus Redford. That committee has put in a lot of time and effort. I am not trying to gazump that committee, but I want to bring this matter to a head and get it in place before we see a plethora of various speed limits applying in residential streets around Adelaide. The public want it and it has strong support from the RAA and councils and it is up to us to move on this issue and ensure that we come up with a sensible proposal. The default option, the variation to the Australian road rules, is the way to go. It is

inexpensive and can be implemented quickly if it passes through the parliament. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms STEVENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOSPITALS, PUBLIC

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That a select committee be established to consider and report on the following matters relating to the funding of our public hospital system, including medical, dental and aged care services and to matters relating to medical staff (including doctors nurses and allied professionals) employed under public health services in South Australia—

- (a) whether the system an adequately and appropriately funded;
- (b) its interface with the private hospital system;
- (c) whether funding levels and current staffing regimes (including staff numbers and hours of duty) are resulting in a negative impact on patient needs and care in both metropolitan and country hospitals;
- (d) whether funding levels and current staffing arrangements are resulting in a negative impact on staff, acceptable occupational health and safety standards and the cost of medical litigation;
- (e) the relationship between state and federal funding and any difficulties which arise therefrom; and
- (f) any other related matter.

This motion proposes a select committee to consider matters of vital importance for the people who staff our public hospitals and to the people who use them. We are all aware that, over recent years, since the early 1990s, cut upon cut has occurred to our public health system, and hospitals in particular have borne the brunt of this. However, it has been the more recent events that have led to this motion.

Members will be aware of the serious problems that have besieged metropolitan hospitals since July 1999 when ambulances on bypass from both public and private hospitals were forced to queue at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Public hospitals were full. They could not cope with what should have been predictable demands, and the Premier admitted that the public health system had been at 'breaking point for some time'. Even after this admission by the Premier in 1999, and contrary to the Premier's announcement on 9 March 2000 that the main thrust of the 2000 budget would be on social areas such as health, further cuts were in the pipeline.

The 2000 budget actually targeted cutting services at both metropolitan and country public hospitals. The government targeted reducing by 4 000 the number of people to be admitted to metropolitan hospitals; it targeted reducing by 10 000 the number of people to be treated at emergency services at metropolitan hospitals; it targeted reducing by a staggering 93 000 the number of outpatients to be treated at metropolitan hospitals; and, in a figure found in the glossy publication about the government's regional package, it targeted reducing by 10 000 the number of outpatients at country hospitals.

In an extraordinary contradiction of the Premier's promises, not only did the government plan to cut the number of patients but also it targeted a reduction in the quality of services. The 72 per cent of emergency patients who were treated this year within the required time of 10 minutes was targeted to fall to 70 per cent; and the 65 per cent of urgent cases that were treated this year within the required time of 30 minutes was targeted to fall to 60 per cent. Major metropolitan public hospitals which were already running multi-million dollar deficits faced further cuts in real terms while trying to meet costs of maintaining basic services. Clearly, the only possible outcome would be over-stressed staff and falling standards of service, and that is exactly what has happened.

In his annual report dated November 2000, the Chairman of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Medical Staff Society, Professor Horowitz, said the society became aware in April 2000 that there were no plans to open winter beds at the QEH and expressed concerns about the impact that this would have on efficiency at the hospital. Nothing was done. When the Queen Elizabeth Hospital went into gridlock again in July 2000, the medical staff society says the government reaction was to deny that a problem existed and an attempt to suppress public comment by staff.

The closure of 500 beds had finally reduced the capacity of our public hospitals to a point where they were in gridlock and again had to turn away people in ambulances and cancel elective surgery. Bed shortages resulted in emergency departments becoming so overcrowded that Dr Dunn, the head of the emergency department at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, told the select committee inquiring into the future of that hospital that occupancy rates in the emergency department reached as high as 200 per cent.

The Opposition was given a copy of a memo written by Dr Dunn, the Director of the emergency department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, on 21 September 2000. I will quote from the memo that he wrote to staff in the North-West Adelaide Health Service at that time in relation to how bad things had become in his department. The memo states:

Over the last 18 months I have been steadily reporting deterioration in emergency department performance to Executive with requests that this is passed on to the board and a strategy to address this situation is devised. To date, no strategies have been employed that have reversed the continued trend of deteriorating conditions in the emergency department.

In the last two and a half weeks the emergency department has been required to go on by-pass on six separate occasions. Conditions have been so overcrowded with patients awaiting beds that the safety of additional patients could not be guaranteed. In addition, patients have been herded together in overcrowded cubicles and staff subject to frequent threats and abuse. Patients detained under the Mental Health Act have had to share cubicles with other non-detained patients whilst being guarded, with some staying in the department for two days before a bed is found.

He goes on to say:

Waiting time performance has decreased 22 per cent in one year (80 per cent of all patients seen within time versus 58 per cent of all patients seen within time) and we recently had one patient who, immediately before a period of by-pass, waited 10 hours before being seen. Waiting times in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital emergency department for less urgent cases are now amongst the worst in the country.

He went on to say:

Staff morale is low and falling fast, rates of sick leave have markedly increased and junior doctors are increasingly reticent to work in the emergency department. The conditions for patients and staff have never been as bad—even in the dark days of 1996.

In September 2000, Dr Dunn also wrote to the Minister for Human Services and said:

I cannot put it more plainly—the emergency department is under extreme pressure and every measurable parameter is deteriorating at an ever increasing rate. Staff are barely managing this degree of stress and I do not believe this level of activity can be maintained without a major adverse effect on them. It is also inevitable that a major adverse patient outcome will occur in the near future—minor incidents are already occurring frequently.

As with Dr Dunn, Professor Horowitz warned of 'a number of near disastrous consequences as a result of severe overcrowding' at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and said that it is now frequent for patients to have to wait longer than 12 hours to get a bed. Yet in the middle of last year, the minister said that he had solved the problems of emergency patients from

private hospitals being sent into the public system. Clearly, he has not. Then on 6 November last year we were told that 65 extra beds would solve the problems: clearly they have not. We have a health system that can no longer cope with predictable demands in winter or summer. We have a system that has not been able to adjust for an ageing population—a development everyone except John Olsen has foreseen—and, because 3.6 per cent of patients who have clean surgery where they have no infection become infected as a direct result of their hospital stay, we have a system that records the worst rate of hospital acquired infection across all categories in Australia.

Against this background there is little wonder that medical staff, doctors, nurses and allied professionals have all been warning of the consequences of patient safety and health services in South Australia if this appalling situation is allowed to continue. In the second half of 2000, the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association presented a substantial body of evidence to the government that the working conditions for many doctors in the public health system are inherently unsafe. The medical officers claim that there is a substantial body of evidence that long working hours and increased pressure combine to overload staff and create fundamentally unsafe conditions for both patients and staff, but until now staff have been reluctant to take these issues into the public arena.

According to evidence given to the select committee inquiring into the future of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital by Professor John Horowitz, doctors who speak out against the run-down in our hospital system have been bullied by the state government and are worried about being sacked. The Salaried Medical Officers Association representing doctors working in our public hospitals believes four key issues underpin the current unsatisfactory situation. First, they say that in some areas traditional employment patterns are no longer sustainable. The officers claim that new work patterns based on different shift arrangements are needed to ensure that demands of the job are matched with reasonable working hours and time free of duty.

Secondly, they refer to the dichotomy that often arises between service delivery and doctors' training requirements; thirdly, to deep seated expectations about the level of dedication and the need to be exposed to a range of presentations which expects that many doctors, and in particular junior doctors, will work very long hours almost as a right of passage; and, fourthly, to the issue involving the amount of non-medical work now undertaken by doctors and in particular junior doctors. The officers claim that in many cases better medical service delivery could be achieved by the provision of additional administrative support to enable doctors to concentrate on their prime functions.

Employees seeking change in a system under extreme pressure feel obligated to put a good face on the situation, whatever their work patterns. This applies to a doctor working 80 hours or more in a system that has traditionally demanded and operated in a paradigm where such hours are commonplace and where everybody does it. It also applies to our nurses who are working under extreme pressure and are being required to look after ten to 12 patients a shift. The Nurses Federation says that nurses are working under conditions that are not only a crisis for nurses but also a crisis for people who need access to the public hospital system. What is needed is a proper forum to enable the facts to be ascertained and allow the community to assess what changes are needed to meet realistic modern standards and ensure the

safety of all concerned. What is needed is a vehicle that reports to this parliament without fear or favour and makes recommendations to allow us to move forward in addressing these critical issues.

I can understand the minister's opposition to a select committee to investigate these matters, opposition which he voiced earlier during the week. The minister has said that cabinet has refused his requests for additional funding for our health services, and he is now forced to defend what is happening in our hospitals. I am sympathetic to the position the minister finds himself in. In fact, earlier this week, the minister wrote to the independent members of this House claiming that an internal inquiry would be a more appropriate way to address these concerns. This view is not shared by the medical officers and is certainly not shared by the opposition. It is also not shared by other staff who have lost confidence in the minister and his department, and staff who claim to have been threatened for speaking out.

In conclusion, the opposition has moved this motion in an attempt to have these issues out on the table in an attempt to have in this state a forum at the highest level in which issues can be presented and recommendations made with the hope that we can move forward and fix the situation in which we find ourselves.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Minerals and Energy): I think I am regarded by my colleagues as being a fairly charitable fellow, and I usually give the mover of a motion in this parliament the benefit of the doubt. I have sat back and listened with interest to the motion moved by the honourable member. But she disappointed me. She disappointed me from the outset because, when a motion of such a serious nature is moved, one would expect that, if a member is wishing to establish a select committee in this parliament on a matter that they regard as serious, particularly on a matter pertaining to health, they would move such a motion with regret because something is not occurring in a way in which they would wish. However, that is not what we heard from the shadow minister. No, it was 'with pleasure' that she moved her motion today; those were her opening words.

Within this parliament unfortunately over the more than 11 years I have been here occasionally I have seen some things that are base and crass political, and this falls into that category at a whole new low level. This is not a motion that is moved out of any genuine concern or compassion for South Australians and our health system. This is a motion that is moved for crass, base political purposes—a motion that the honourable member moved 'with pleasure'. Those were her words. It was not with regret but 'with pleasure'. That is how the motion was moved.

Her whole speech was littered with selected information, and I will go through that information with interest, and compare it with the documented facts in relation to the health system. The honourable member was not part of the Labor government that was so unceremoniously dumped before the State Bank saga. That saga was not the only reason it was dumped. One of its many areas of maladministration was the health system. The honourable member believes there are problems with the health system now. However, they pale into insignificance against the system that operated before.

An honourable member: Rubbish!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Well, the honourable member interjects 'Rubbish', so I will share with the parliament some documented facts relating to the health

system that was there under the last Labor government up until now, facts that will be put on the record.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The honourable member has moved her select committee motion and read her stilted speech, which was probably put together by some of Labor's union mates. She has read her diatribe into the record; now, she can sit back and listen to the facts. She might not like them, but the facts will go onto the record.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Well, the facts will go onto the record whether she likes it or not. When this government came into office, the 1992-93 total admissions to South Australian public hospitals was 275 000. By 1999-2000, admissions had gone up to 339 377—an increase of 64 318 admissions. I regard that as a pretty significant achievement: to see our public hospitals under a Liberal government (after Labor's maladministration) now putting through that extra number of people getting access to health services.

Much has been made of the emergency departments by the honourable member. Well, I have some information in relation to those as well. In 1992-93, in the dying days of Labor's maladministration, 371 048 people received attention. In 1999-2000, that figure rose to 463 044—an increase of 91 998 people who received attention in emergency departments in our hospitals. Again, I regard that greater throughput as a pretty significant achievement—a slightly different picture from the one which the member tries to paint in this parliament.

The honourable member also made much about outpatient attendances, and I also have some information in relation to those. In 1992-93—again, in the dying days of Labor's maladministration—outpatient attendances totalled 1 299 362. In 1999-2000, that figure increased to 1 483 803—an increase of 184 441. Again, that is a very different picture from that which the member who has moved this motion today would have us believe. One must ask what the reason is for her motion. She has moved it with pleasure, not with regret. She is hurling unsubstantiated information at the parliament, and for one reason only: to try to score political points in the most crass manner possible.

I have some other interesting statistics that are worth sharing with the parliament in order to gain an appreciation of what happens in our hospitals on a weekly basis. In South Australia each week 6 509 people are admitted to public hospitals; 8 880 people are treated in emergency departments; 28 456 services are provided to outpatient clinics; 351 babies are born; 1 252 women are screened for breast cancer; and nearly 700 people undergo elective surgery. That is a magnificent effort by the men and women who work in our public hospitals: full credit to them for being able to manage this sort of a workload.

The figures relating to elective surgery do not include what has happened in recent days, because we all know that Labor's union mates are doing their best to try to disrupt elective surgery in our hospitals. I encourage the shadow minister to try to exert some influence over that, because I suspect that she does have some influence over the crass union activity involving our hospitals, which is ensuring that people who are waiting for elective surgery cannot have it. I refer, again, to the lack of compassion that we have seen during her stilted pre-written address today. It was probably written by her union mates, and it demonstrates that she has no compassion or feeling on this issue. This is simply a crass

attempt to score political points—and a pretty poor one at that.

The honourable member may well get a select committee. I actually think that there could be an advantage in it, because I would like to see a few facts put before such a committee. It may well be that the honourable member has pulled the pin out of a hand grenade and it will explode before she gets a chance to drop it. It could be very interesting to see what comes out of it, because it will expose the crass nature of this little exercise. It is a shame that the TV cameras were not on the honourable member when she presented her address. I look forward to the time when internet television is available in the parliament, because it will encourage a few members on the other side perhaps to think twice about the way in which they present themselves.

The public could then see her lack of genuine compassion and concern on this issue, see how stilted was the address delivered to the Parliament (pre-prepared by her union mates) and see exactly what lies beyond this. If this select committee becomes a reality—and I suspect that it probably will—the advantage for the people in this state will be to see just how members of the opposition are acting in this Parliament. It will give them an opportunity to see the facts presented before the Parliament.

At the end of the day, what can be shown in undisputed fashion through this committee is that, while the health system is a difficult system to administer and none of us will stand here and say that it is perfect—no system can be—compared to that which was in operation under the maladministering Labor government, it is a heck of a lot better than it was.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I rise not with regret but with hardly contained anger to second the motion, because the diatribe that we just heard from the Minister is evidence pure and simple—and very poorly put, I might add—of exactly the attitude that this government has towards the plight of South Australians when it comes to our health system. This Minister, representing the government—he is the duty Minister in the House at this time—basically told us that there was not a problem in our health system.

The people of South Australia are hurting; constituents such as mine and those of every member of this House, who come in time and again telling of the falling standards in our health systems; telling their individual stories of when they cannot get a hospital bed; telling of their anger when they see billions of dollars of state assets sold, yet money being cut from our hospitals, just as it is being cut from our schools and as it has been cut from our police. As with all aspects of this government's attitude, it is one of denial.

It is the same in my own portfolio when it comes to one of the most pressing problems in education, the appalling drop-out rate. What is the government's response? It quibbles with the figures; quibbles with the facts; and does not even admit that there is a problem. That is exactly what the minister said to us in this place: 'There is not a problem.' His argument was that there are more admissions into hospitals than there used to be 10 years or however long ago. Of course there are: we have an ageing population.

The demand has grown out of all proportion, but the real question of this government should be: is that demand being met? And the answer is no. The test is not how many are going through your hospital doors; rather, the question is whether the demand is being met. And what are the priorities of this government if it is spending money on consultants; on

icons; on buildings; on blow-outs in contracts; on bad deals and deals with mates, often; on corporate welfare that is not well targeted, when they cannot deliver hospital beds to people in need?

That is one of the most fundamental jobs a government has to do, and all that this government can say is: 'There is no problem.' Well, there is a problem: all of South Australia knows that there is a problem, and I am disappointed that the Minister for Health did not even have the decency to come into this chamber to deliver the government's response but left it for another minister. That is an appalling situation, but it is not unique, because it happens on many motions all the time.

Are we meeting demand? No. Our ambulances are bypassing emergency departments, and our hospitals are full so much of the time. I recently spent a week in hospital. I do not want to talk about my own experience, because it is not relevant in this context, because it was quite a happy experience; it was the birth of my baby son. However, that week in hospital gave me pause to think about what doctors and nurses have to do and the pressures placed on them. It was a worthwhile experience to me, and I think many would benefit by thinking from a patient's point of view. I got to know a doctor's point of view; over a period of time I got to understand the work load and the hours put in by the obstetrician who was treating me, as well as being aware of the pressures on his personal life. We developed quite a rapport, because we have some similarities in that regard.

My greatest respect has to go to the nurses who work in our hospitals. While I had a good experience in hospital, I had a complication, which was picked up by a midwife, not a doctor. The nurses are overworked and not only do what they are required to do by the job description set out on a piece of paper but they give of themselves and are patching up a failing health system. The system is in crisis but is being ignored by a government and minister who are quite happy to continue blaming the federal government. The federal government blames the state government, and what is the result? The state government says there is not even a problem as far as it is concerned; because it might be spending more in absolute dollar figures than a few years previously, then it is doing its job. It is not doing its job, because it is not meeting demand.

This select committee is exactly what parliament must do. This select committee gives a platform to identify exactly what the problems are. That platform has been missing. We have seen medical professionals and others in the industry whistleblowing on what is happening in the system, and we have seen attempts by the government to hobble that criticism. This platform will give the opportunity for problems to come out in a protected and bipartisan way, where all levels of the health system can give evidence so that we can acknowledge as a parliament that there is a problem. The opposition knows well that there is a problem and has raised it, but somehow this is falling on deaf government ears.

This is a necessary move, and one which the public of South Australia wholeheartedly support and want, because their bottom line is that they want the problem fixed. In order to fix the problem you must first identify it, admit there is a problem and resolve to do something about it. Despite the sale of all the assets, all the increases in taxes and revenue coming in the door, this government has cut hospital and human services spending. That is an appalling situation to put South Australians in. It is not only with regret that I find this

motion before the House necessary: it is also with anger, reflecting the pure anger out there among the South Australian public.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I have been listening with much interest to the member for Taylor's contribution in support of the motion. The discussion about anger and regret is interesting. I certainly believe that the health system should be a top priority of any government. I have continually voiced the concerns of my constituents to the government and to the minister when problems have arisen. I must say that I have been answered promptly and that the government has addressed the problems in relation to health which I have raised and which concern the public. If we follow the opposition's demands for committees, I fear that we will have more committees than we have members of parliament to sit on those committees.

Ms White: That is because we have more problems than members of parliament.

Mr SCALZI: The opposition appears to be committed to committees and not committed to dealing with the problems they raise.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Of course, that is no different from what is happening in Victoria. The Bracks government has established more committees than there were in the years of the Kennett government. There is committee after committee. The public of South Australia does not want committees. It does not want the government and the opposition squabbling over health. It just wants the job to be done. That is what it wants. I speak with a bit of experience in the hospital system. I spent 15 years in and out of hospital from 17 years of age until 30 years of age. I was an orderly at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for six months. I am privileged to be a member of the Public Works Committee that has looked into the increasing public works at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Lyell McEwin Hospital (in the honourable member's electorate) and I was at the opening of the upgrade of the theatres at Modbury Hospital.

I take a particular interest in health and I know that there has been an increase in demand. There is no question that there has been an increase in demand for services. But, as the minister outlined yesterday, there has been an increased response from this government to the increase in demand. The figures show that not only in the public works programs that this government has put forward but also in the treatment. As the minister outlined yesterday, in 1992-93, 275 000 patients were admitted to hospital and in 1999-2000, 339 377 people were admitted to hospital—an increase of over 64 000.

Which other government has had to deal with that increase in demand? I agree that we should have an adequately and appropriately funded health system. This government agrees with that. Why have a select committee to see whether or not it should or should not? In relation to interface with the private hospital system, this government is committed to having greater cooperation between the public and private systems. This government and the federal government have done something about it. The federal government has given rebates to stem the flow of people going into the public system. It has given greater access to the private system which enables those needy members of the public who cannot afford it access to the public system.

This government has done something about it, and I am sure some members opposite have taken advantage of joining the private health system since the incentives have been

given. There needs to be cooperation between the private and public systems. It is no use grandstanding and saying, 'We need select committees.' We need to get the job done. This minister is working hard to ensure that in difficult times funds are available for health—as the government has given priority to education as well.

What happens when this government realises that we should put more money into health and other services? Members opposite, when we give up a race, squabble about why we have given up a race. They cannot have their cake and eat it too. On the one hand, they make such an issue of it, and what do they want? Another committee—'Let us have committees.' Members of the public do not want committees. They are sick and tired of governments and oppositions squabbling. They want to get the job done. This government is committed to getting the job done: it is committed to health and education as a priority.

As I have said, as a member of the Public Works Committee, I have seen first-hand the increase in capital works, which will address a lot of those issues. Were funds put aside when members opposite were in power? Where were the funds? They knew that there would be an increase in population, and they knew that there would be increased demands.

At the same time, let us be realistic. If one looks at the health standards of South Australians, one will see that we have a lot to be proud of—for example, look at the rate of success with respect to breast cancer and other areas in South Australia. We are leading the nation. Another example is life expectancy. Members opposite do not tell us about that. Of course, more needs to be done, and this government is committed to doing more. The Minister for Human Services often has been seen lobbying the federal government to make sure that the funds are available for aged care.

Ms White: But what has happened?

Mr SCALZI: Do you think that a select committee, amongst all the other committees that you are committed to, will deal with that problem? Let us get on with the job and do something.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: We are doing that. The minister is now working on the current staffing levels. We have offers on the table for the nurses. I have great respect for the nursing profession, but let us get on with it. Let us not just play politics with the health of South Australians.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Yes—and we are directing more funds and resources into health and education and, as soon as we do that, we hear cries from the opposition, which is more concerned about the race. Members of the opposition have to be careful: they might not only miss the race, they will miss the bus.

Mr Hanna: Isn't there a problem in hospitals?

Mr SCALZI: Of course there is a problem. Has the member not been listening? We are dealing with it. There is a problem, and there always has been a problem. It is how one responds to the problems. Committees will not solve the problems: you have to have the funds available to deal with the situation. This government has got the economy right: it understands the difficulties and the increasing demand for health services, and it is addressing that. It is continuously negotiating with the federal government to make sure that funds are available.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SCALZI: Members opposite might wish to go to the major hospitals from time to time—apart from the headlines—and go to see the people who are there.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I have, when I have gone to see some friends and patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I know the hospital inside out, and I have walked around, not on a tour—

Ms Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SCALZI: When was the last time I spoke to a nurse?

Ms Rankine: In a public hospital.

Mr SCALZI: Not that long ago. And I can tell the member that I have seen patients who have come out of hospital within the past 10 days. Let us deal with the problem. This government is aware that there are problems, and we are addressing them. This government is aware, now that we have the economics right, that we must address those issues—not only with respect to health and education but also with respect to other social infrastructure—

Time expired.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I think that people are getting a bit excited about this select committee. In one way, that is good, but it would be even better if we could solve some of the issues that confront our hospitals. The terms of reference focus on some of the key factors at the moment, including the federal-state funding arrangements, and I think that is where a lot of the current difficulties stem from. As members know, the federal system has some advantages, but it also has a lot of disadvantages, as can be seen in relation to the Murray River and hospital funding: the commonwealth collects most of the money and then generously dispenses some of it out to the states for hospitals.

The problem of waiting lists and the demand on hospitals is not new. I was looking at some figures from 1992, when Labor was in government, and there were huge waiting lists at the Flinders Medical Centre (I can make those lists available if members want to have a look at them). So, it is not a new issue. There have been some seasonal factors recently: the heatwave and, prior to that, an epidemic of the 'flu in the middle of last year, and that is likely to continue.

So, there will be episodic situations where the hospitals are under great pressure and the hospital staff do an excellent job. However, there seems to be a problem in relation to funding for some of the services, and I commend the government for providing money for capital works. I also commend the present minister, who has been an outstanding Minister for Health; when I realise that he has responsibility for Family and Youth Services and the Housing Trust (which is about 43 per cent of the total budget), I think he does an excellent job.

However, something needs to be addressed in relation to the funding. I am not an expert to know whether the hospitals use their money efficiently and effectively, but there seems to be difficulty in getting adequate funding for our public hospitals, and I know this from the people who come into my office. For instance, an 83 year old lady who needs a hip replacement had to wait 10 months to see a specialist and then another two years on top of that to receive the replacement; a senior student with chronic tonsillitis had to wait nearly a year to have her tonsils removed; a young adult with impacted wisdom teeth will have to wait four years to have those wisdom teeth removed. So, there is a problem. Some people would say, 'Well, take out private health cover.'

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Mines and Energy has had his opportunity to speak and the member for Wright will have an opportunity to speak, if she wants it.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: People say, 'Why don't they take out private health insurance?' That is a very expensive option for a lot of people, and many people have taken out the minimal commitment in order to get the tax benefit, knowing full well that they will never go into a private hospital because they will end up with a big bill at the end of the day. I have the top table for hospital cover, but for being prudent in that respect you get penalised when you go into a public hospital, and you receive a bill at the end of the day: in effect, you are paying three ways. So, there are a lot of problems in the system.

I am not naive enough to think that this select committee will solve all those problems but it will, I hope, if people go about it the right way and not just use it as a political point scoring exercise, provide some possible strategies. The key strategy, of course, is that cabinet has to provide extra money and the federal government has to ensure that it provides sufficient funds. I forget the exact percentage, but I think that at present something between 10 and 20 per cent of our hospital beds in the metropolitan area are taken up by people waiting to go into nursing home accommodation. Nursing home accommodation is the responsibility of the federal government but the state government is now carrying those people in our public hospitals, taking up beds that could be available for other people. That is just one example of a situation that is unacceptable.

If members look closely at the terms of reference, they will see that this select committee will provide the opportunity to generate some sensible and constructive outcomes. We should approach it in that way. I have been very impressed with the President of the AMA, Dr Michael Rice. He calls a spade a spade and does not hold back. I think that is important. We know that various groups will play politics with this emotive issue but I would urge members to look at this as an opportunity to get to some of the core issues, and hopefully get them addressed. That will mean support from both the state government, in terms of cabinet support for funding, and the federal government, in terms of its contribution to our important public hospital system.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I support this motion. My electorate has three public hospitals. Country hospitals do experience all the problems of city hospitals, but also they experience other problems that are quite unique to country hospitals. My electorate includes the Coober Pedy Hospital, which is a relatively new hospital and one which is working very well. I have the Roxby Downs Hospital, which is almost a state-of-the-art hospital, and I have the Whyalla Hospital. I was very interested to hear the member for Taylor talk about her recent stay in hospital for the birth of her young son.

I visited Roxby Downs before Christmas and some 176 women in that town were pregnant. I believe that Roxby Downs has the highest birthrate in Australia. The problem is that Roxby Downs does not have a resident obstetrician who can work with the women, so all those women must leave their town and go elsewhere to have their babies.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Ms BREUER: Sounds like it. This is one problem which is quite unique and which does happen in country hospitals. I know that the hospital at Ceduna is in a similar situation.

That hospital also affects my area because anything west of Ceduna is part of my electorate. Women in that area also must travel elsewhere to have their babies. It is a very difficult situation. I am sure that the member for Taylor would appreciate that it is very difficult for women at the time of the birth of a child not to have friends and family around. I am very proud that SACRRAH (South Australian Centre for Rural and Remote Area Health) is located in my region at the Whyalla University campus.

SACRRAH has contributed greatly to improving health services in our region. The centre undertakes a total look at health services in regional areas. It has carried out considerable research in the area and I would request that, if it is established, the centre be consulted by this committee because serious problems exist with respect to staffing country hospitals with professionals. The centre has done a lot of work on this issue. SACRRAH is headed by Professor David Wilkinson. I was very pleased recently to hear that the centre has been chosen as one of the regional clinical schools. Hopefully, as a result of that selection and as a result of staff being trained, including doctors, in country regions we may be able to keep some of those medical practitioners, including nursing staff.

Figures have been released by SACRRAH with respect to its research which indicate this incredible proportional gap between GPs who practise in country regions versus GPs who practise in city regions. A country GP cares for 2 000 or 3 000 patients whereas a city GP may care for 500 or 600 patients. The figures are amazing and I certainly hope that the committee consults with the centre. I would like to have been appointed to the committee because of SACRRAH; however, I will ensure that the country perspective is given to the committee. Whyalla Hospital certainly has experienced staffing problems over the years and it still is experiencing problems.

Staff in that hospital are working under incredible pressure. One reason for the problems experienced in the Whyalla Hospital relates to the maintenance of the hospital. There have been some major problems this week, particularly with the hot water system. I do admit that money has been allocated to that problem. I spoke to the minister about the problem this week and some \$700 000 has been allocated towards maintenance of the hot water system. Unfortunately, the system spat this week and it has been necessary to relocate patients to other areas which has caused problems. Also, unless they are very urgent cases, patients have not been able to be admitted.

Three or four weeks ago I toured the hospital to look at some of the work that was occurring and to talk to staff in the hospital. That visit occurred during that extremely hot weather and I was very disturbed to hear about, realise and experience the lack of airconditioning in the hospital. The airconditioning unit is very old, it is run down and, in some parts of the hospital during that very hot spell (the hottest that we recall in Whyalla), fans were installed in the corridors of the surgical and intensive care areas in an attempt to keep patients cool. For staff who are already over-worked and over-stressed this situation was very difficult.

My office received a number of complaints about this and, as I said, I was also able to experience it first-hand. I want to remind the minister on the record today that he gave me an undertaking on ABC Radio, and he personally gave me an undertaking this week, that the money will be allocated. The problem has been given priority one but, in the past two years, the money still has not come through. However, the

minister has given me an assurance that that airconditioning unit will be repaired by next summer. In Whyalla, we do not have any choice, it is the only hospital we can go to, so we must make sure that conditions are maximised for our patients. I thank the minister for his assurance and I will keep him to his word.

I support the establishment of this important committee. We cannot bury our head in the sand. There is a problem in our hospitals and we are all aware of that. It is interesting, as mentioned by members opposite, that there is increased demand on our hospitals, given that patient stays are so much shorter these days. A young woman I know in Whyalla was admitted yesterday morning and had her appendix removed. I rang today to have some flowers delivered to her and was told that she would be out after lunch. I remember the days when patients stayed in hospital for 10 days when they had their appendix out. However, there is increased demand despite the fact that patient stays are much shorter.

We have to support the establishment of this committee. We must have this inquiry and we must look at conditions in our hospitals. Contrary to the member opposite, who said that this motion was ridiculous and that we did not need to waste our time, I believe that, as members of parliament, it is our responsibility to make sure that our health service is up to date and adequate, and this committee will address a lot of those problems.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): In my opinion, this motion to establish a select committee is highly irregular and sets a dangerous precedent, but not because it seeks to set up a select committee, because that has been put before this House on many occasions. What is highly irregular and what worries me is that there is a determination to have this voted on today without our side of politics having any chance to go away and think about it for the next few days.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I am surprised to hear interjections from opposition members because, if we try to bring in a bill with less than a week or so for consideration, there is a huge uproar and outcry from them that they have not had a chance to look at it. Now they are saying that we should consider this motion in a matter of minutes. Surely this type of motion needs to be looked at carefully, and I would have thought that there are definite possibilities for amendments to it to make sure that we are not wasting our time, but I can see from the reaction opposite that this is a political stunt. That disappoints me greatly, because it will not prove anything. The opposition seeks to set up a committee, and we have heard the arguments from both sides.

We know what is happening in Victoria. There was a change of government in that state just over a year ago and since then 360 new committees have been set up. There might be more than that. If you want to put off until tomorrow what is supposed to be done today, set up a committee. That is the best way of putting something off. We saw what happened in Victoria when Labor was in power. It bankrupted Victoria, it brought it to the lowest level, even lower than South Australia for a while. The Liberals brought it back up to a solid position and now the Bracks government does not know how to handle it, so everything is being thrown to a committee. Over 360 new committees in a year!

I shudder to think what would happen if this opposition ever got into government here. We would go back to a stage of committees, and that is being highlighted today with this motion to establish a select committee. Opposition members

are prefacing what would happen if they got into power. I would weep for South Australia if, in the foreseeable future, Labor got back in because all the good work in the state would be undone in the first four years, and I can guarantee that to the people of South Australia.

The subject of health services is interesting. At the end of last year I was given some statistics from a survey that was done around Australia on what people thought of our public hospital system.

Ms Rankine: You are well prepared. You were doing it last year.

Mr MEIER: Just listen. For those who had been in a hospital in recent times, 96 per cent said that they felt the hospital system was very good to excellent. For those who had never been in a hospital in recent years, how many said that it was very good to excellent? Not 96 per cent but only 26 per cent said the hospital system was very good. It was interesting that the member for Taylor said that her experience in hospital was very good. So many people who have not used the hospital system are misled into thinking, because of what they read in the paper, that it is no good, but of those who have been in hospital 96 per cent Australia-wide say that it is very good to excellent.

A survey was also conducted on people who apparently do not listen to the news or read newspapers (and apparently shift workers come into that category); these people were targeted and asked how they thought the hospital system was going. The result was roughly 50-50, with 50 per cent saying that it was not very good and 50 per cent saying that it was very good to excellent. So, you can use statistics and figures to show what you want.

Therefore, this committee will do nothing, in my opinion, to improve the current health system. There is no question. The Premier admitted yesterday that we have problems in the health system: we always have and always will. It will never change because additional resources could always be brought in.

Let us consider our hospital and health system in comparison with that of any other country in the world. We rate up with the best in probably every category. In fact, our quality of care is recognised as being better than any other country. Our cancer cure rate is 16 per cent better than that in any other European country, and we have the best survival rate for breast cancer out of the 12 countries surveyed. So, we have an excellent report card in that respect.

People in this chamber know that the increase in cost of health care is going up at a rapid rate, and the amount of money we are putting in is not able to keep up with that rapid rate. If the opposition says, 'Increase taxes', fine, I am happy to listen to its policy. I was amused at the time of the change of government in New South Wales when Mr Fahey was ousted and Mr Carr came in. During that election campaign the Labor Party, then in opposition, said that the streets of Sydney were unsafe. It was a scary situation: law and order was a big issue, as crime was rampant in Sydney, and apparently the Liberals were the cause of it. A change of government occurred. A few months later, the then minister responsible for the Olympics, Michael Knight, was being interviewed on the radio. The interviewer said, 'Look minister, you will be bringing hundreds of thousands of people to Sydney: what will you do about law and order and the crime on our streets?' This was a few months after Labor had got in, having said that it was the most unsafe place in the world. What did Michael Knight say? He said, 'What, the

streets of Sydney for overseas visitors? These would be the safest streets in the world—we have no problem at all.'

Ms Rankine: What's this got to do with the health system?

Mr MEIER: This whole health issue here is a political stunt. You are seeking to create scare tactics and a scare environment when in fact you know full well that when your government was in power the health situation was in a far worse situation than it is today.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I do not believe there is any greater issue of concern in the minds of South Australians at present than the state of our public hospital system. I commend the member for Elizabeth for taking this important initiative, which everyone in this parliament should support. It is an initiative that I believe all South Australians will welcome. They have suffered long enough. They are sick and tired of witnessing the decimation of what was once one of the best public health systems in the world. They are sick and tired of seeing their loved ones suffer from a lack of appropriate care and a lack of quality treatment. That is not in any way an indictment on our doctors and nurses who are stretched to the absolute limit in our hospitals: it is a direct result of a lack of funds and a lack of staff. Our doctors and nurses in South Australia are some of the best trained and most sought after in the world. It does not matter where they go: they are employed with glee. We know what this government wanted to do with our public health system. We know it does not have a commitment to a public health system. It wanted to—

Members interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: Your agenda was to privatise the public health system—first, the water supply; then ETSA; and our public hospital system was fair and square within your target until the Modbury Hospital situation arose. Modbury Hospital was going to be the great flagship of health privatisation in this state. Instead of that, your ship sank. You were not prepared to go any further because it has been such an abject disaster. It has been an abject failure in all aspects. Not one undertaking that the government gave in relation to that privatisation proposal has happened—not one! What happened to the private hospital that was going to be built on the Modbury Hospital site? It reached the stage of becoming just one floor in the hospital and then it was closed down. I have spoken on the issue of Modbury Hospital on a number of occasions in this House, in relation both to personal experiences and to those of residents in my electorate and, let me tell the House, their concerns continue. The confidence in the public health system in this state continues to deteriorate.

My concern about this matter, involving our major public hospital servicing the north-eastern suburbs, was such that I put a motion to the House in the last session seeking an investigation into patient care at that hospital. This government shows so little regard for the care of patients and staff at that hospital that not one member spoke on that motion. They allowed it to lapse. That is an indication of their contempt. I look forward to debating the member for Elizabeth's bill on the establishment of a health ombudsman because, clearly, when things go wrong in the public hospital system in this state people have no confidence and nowhere to go to have issues resolved. We clearly need someone who is independent, has a knowledge of the hospital system and can fairly arbitrate in relation to these matters.

We heard the minister yesterday tell us about the very generous offer that he has put to the nurses in relation to the current dispute.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: They were the minister's words, not mine. Nurses are probably one of the most dedicated and most responsible group of workers in this state. They are now making a desperate stand—and not about things that benefit them: their stand is about—

Mr Williams interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: Their pay claim has been met. You may well laugh. The member for MacKillop has previously made statements in this House about our health system. He thinks it is a big joke. He thinks it is a joke that people are left on trolleys; he thinks it is a joke that old ladies cannot get their hips replaced; he thinks it is a joke that patients are left to die on mattresses on the floor. Well, let me tell him that the people of South Australia do not think it is a joke, and he will find out about that at the next election when he is no longer the member for MacKillop. He can sit with that smug look on his face then and we will see who has the last laugh.

Nurses in South Australia are fighting for appropriate care for their patients. Yesterday, the minister quoted figures involving the number of people treated in public hospitals, and we were subjected to that again this morning. What he does not tell us about is the number of people who are readmitted: readmitted because they were pushed out of hospital before they should have been, because they are not getting the care they should get, because there is no longer preventative programs in place—they are no longer funded—and because they no longer get the home support they need. Let us not kid ourselves: the Minister for Health is no lady with the lamp; he is not out there to fix the hospital system and nor is this government.

Today this government will be shamed into action. It is gagging medical staff, it will not allow them to speak out about it. I know that, for example, in the oncology ward at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital where people are being treated for cancer, when we have had heavy storms, the rain runs down the inside walls of those wards and the staff are not game to speak up because they know they will lose their jobs. You will should be ashamed of yourself—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: You should not be able to hold your head up in this place; you are a disgrace.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not shout the chair down or he will be in real strife.

Ms RANKINE: This government continually shows how out of touch it is. It continually wants to give up its basic responsibilities as a government. It continually shows how little it knows about the needs of the people of this state. It has a lack of credibility. Again it has the wrong priorities. It is so way out of touch, it is on the way out.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I have just discovered from listening to that diatribe from across the chamber and a couple of the other contributions from members opposite exactly why the Labor Party is seeking to have a select committee; that is, it is bereft of knowledge of exactly what is happening in our hospitals. Members opposite are bereft of all the information that is in the public sphere. They are bereft of the good work that has been done in the public hospital system in South Australia; for instance that nonsense

a moment ago about this government's creating a situation where we have roofs leaking in public hospitals.

The reality is—and the minister spoke about this when answering a question yesterday—that the previous Labor government not only caused massive debt in this state, and ran a budget deficit on an annual basis of \$300 million, but it allowed the infrastructure of this state to wind down to an abysmal level. It did it to the schools, the hospitals and the roads, and that is why we have hospitals that are substandard now. The legacy that was left to this state after 20 years of almost continuous Labor government is absolutely appalling and it is an absolute disgrace for members opposite to suggest that it is as a result of this government that we have some problems in our hospital system.

We are not denying that there are problems in the hospital system. We are acknowledging that, but I am urging the House not to support this motion to set up a select committee because this is a politically motivated stunt. Members opposite are already shamelessly prepared to cause great angst and anxiety to people in our communities, particularly the elderly and infirmed. They are putting about a perception that our hospitals and our public health system is in failure mode, when it definitely is not. The public hospital system in this state is under pressure, we acknowledge that. We also understand the reasons and we are addressing the problems.

As other members on this side know and the member for Hartley rightly pointed out—and I sit with him on the Public Works Committee, as does the shadow minister; and she knows exactly what has been happening with regard to capital works in public hospitals in South Australia—we have spent \$500 million in the last seven years. As the minister said in his answer yesterday, in 1985 the then Labor government promised to spend \$10 million a year on the QEH until the turn of the century. Not one dollar spent—and they have the temerity to suggest that this government has been the cause of the problems in the public health sector.

The temerity of them is absolutely outstanding. Given the ignorance that has been displayed from members on the opposite side of the chamber, I can understand why they would want to have a select committee. They do not even have regard for the information given in this House or that which is available in the public arena through the popular press. They do not make use of the information they can access through their work on standing committees of the parliament. Rather, they wish to pursue this political stunt.

Mr Scalzi: Like Victoria.

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes. They take no action and have no ideas. They simply decide to set up a committee. It has absolutely fascinated me that, in the 3½ years that I have been a member of this parliament, a lot of talk and nonsense has come from members opposite about the problems we have in the health system and other areas of government responsibility. Not once has the shadow minister or the Leader of the Opposition suggested a policy, and not once have they suggested an initiative.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Eighty-five clauses! Smoke and mirrors! We are addressing real problems in a real way. The figures that the minister brought to the attention of the House yesterday in answer to a question indicate that total admissions to our public hospitals since this government has been in power over the past seven years have increased by 25 per cent. I heard the following quip from across the Chamber early in the debate, 'Yes, but we have an ageing population.' We have an ageing population, but it is not ageing at quite

that rate, and we know that we have a virtually static population in South Australia.

In the past seven years the total population in South Australia has hardly changed at all. In fact, when we took over government the population was declining; people were leaving South Australia in droves. That is one thing that we have arrested and been able to manage to turn around because we have the fundamentals right. We have the fundamentals of the economy right, and now we can work at a greater rate—and we have been working at this the whole way through—on getting some of these major social issues under control. We are concentrating on health, education and law and order. They are the areas in which we are doing things. We have already committed \$500 million to capital works and the health system. We have negotiated a good deal with the nurses. In spite of the nurses wishing to—

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I'll tell you exactly why they are staying out. It is because a few nurses see the political advantage for their mates in prolonging this dispute and trying to sheet home the blame to the Government. Last week in my electorate I had a meeting with some people involved in the health sector. At the end of the meeting, after we had talked about some important issues and initiatives that we were promulgating in our area, I asked some of the people who are professionals in the health field and who work on a daily basis, 'Is this 1:4 ratio necessary? What is the real situation?' The answer was, 'Certainly in hospitals, in acute care wards, in post operative care wards and where it is necessary we have a high staffing ratio'—as the minister said yesterday—'quite often of 2:1.' That is, two staff per patient, on three shifts, 24 hours a day. We have those high staffing ratios in the areas they are needed.

The Nurses Federation is calling for a ratio of 1:4 right across the board, in every ward and in every hospital right across the state. I asked these health professionals in my electorate and they said that, in some of the major teaching hospitals in the city, staffing ratios approaching that may be appropriate in particular areas. However, when you get out into major regional hospitals, a staffing ratio somewhat below that would be appropriate and, as you moved out into the small country hospitals, a staffing ratio considerably below that would be appropriate.

The ridiculous thing is that the Nurses Federation has called for a staffing ratio based on what it is telling the community has happened in Victoria, yet it just has not happened in Victoria. Indeed, it cannot happen in Victoria because, even if the government of Victoria said, 'Tomorrow we will introduce these staffing ratios,' the staff are just not on the ground; they are just not available. So it will not happen. The Nurses Federation knows that.

I conclude my remarks by saying that, unfortunately, it is my understanding that the House will probably support the motion, despite the fact that I think it is a political stunt and a nonsense and will be a waste of time for everyone other than those members opposite who are having great difficulty getting their mind around the truth of exactly what is happening in our hospitals.

The member for Wright asked what happened to the private hospital that was to be built at Modbury Hospital. She might be interested to know that, today—and at that time—there is a 45 per cent over-supply of beds in the public hospital sector. This is one of the problems, and we know it.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: But you want a select committee to tell you what we already know. Together with many of my colleagues, I believe that the government is getting on with producing, and in fact has produced, a health system in South Australia which would be unmatched anywhere in the world.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Reynell, could I ask that the conference be conducted off the floor of the chamber. The member for Reynell.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): It is important to vote on this matter today, so I want to emphasise and support everything that has been said by members on this side and contribute briefly to the debate. I am particularly pleased to see that this motion contains a term of reference relating to the interface with the private hospital system. We have heard some rhetoric and abuse across the chamber today about what the government's role has been in relation to the private health system and whether or not it has changed, which I think is one of the issues that needs to be considered.

However, I want to go back to May 1998 when I was fairly new to my work on the Public Works Committee and when I received the submission for the Modbury Hospital redevelopment project. I could not understand why one of the government's objectives in relation to this work was to commission a private hospital to improve access to private facilities for residents of the north-eastern suburbs.

At that stage it was beyond my understanding—and it still is—as to why the government believed that it had a responsibility to provide private health care for the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. It is the government's responsibility to provide public health care. The market system will provide private health care, if that is appropriate.

This is just a small indication of this government's confusion in relation to its approach to health care. Several members on this side have noted the fact that it is very difficult to understand exactly all the implications of what is happening in our hospitals, because staff who know what is happening have been coerced into silence. One of the areas in which I keep on hearing little pieces of information, both from people working in the health system and from those who have been using it, is in relation to the arrangements about the use of the private health system.

Constituents who have gone to Flinders Medical Centre as public patients, expecting to be treated in the public hospital system, have come back to tell me that they have ended up in the private system. They quite like the carpet, but they are worried about how much money is being spent from the public system to support the private system and whether the public system is getting a fair deal in the arrangements that have been made with the private system. Staff members keep on suggesting to me that this is not the case. It is very important that this term of reference be explored comprehensively.

We have heard from members opposite about the increased attendances in public hospitals. We have heard from members on this side that one of the reasons for this is that people are discharged too early and, therefore, are readmitted. Every time I hear this, I deplore the way the system is being managed and staff are being forced to do things that they know, in the best interests of the patient, should not be done. Another issue is the way in which the statistics are kept. Again, through the Public Works Committee, there has been an indication that there is a change in the way in which the statistics are being kept.

Our own private experiences are worthwhile here. Some time ago my partner was taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital in a life-threatening emergency. The treatment, accordingly, was absolutely superb. He was seen immediately, and I cannot praise too highly the ambulance officers who attended to him. It was with some amazement that, some six months later when he went for a checkup, he discovered that he was having an inpatient band attached to his wrist because he was considered to be an admission.

As far as he was concerned, he was just going down there for an hour or so to find out whether everything was okay. He was treated as an inpatient and, between the time that he was told to sit in the waiting room while some tests were processed and when he was seen some time later, he in fact went back to his workplace—with the badge saying that he was an inpatient. He should never have been treated as an admission: he was simply an outpatient going for a checkup. I have confirmed through the Public Works Committee that he should not have been treated as an inpatient.

So, we also need to look at these things. It is not really important to find out whether the statistics are being fudged: what is really important to find out is that services are being delivered and people are getting the services they need. I have also taken offence at the implications from several members opposite that the action of our nurses at the moment, in not lifting industrial bans, is for political reasons. I find this a gross insult to 700 nurses who attended the meeting and who are perfectly capable of making decisions for themselves.

These are the people who run our hospital system: who every day make decisions about the good treatment of patients. The suggestion from members opposite is that these same people are incapable of making decisions for themselves about the best way to manage an industrial situation relating to the health of our hospitals. Of course they are able to do this for themselves: they are good, honest-thinking people.

I want to conclude by giving one example of the sorts of problems that come out of this mismanagement of the health system. This relates to a constituent whom I doorknocked the other day. She had not bothered to come and see me as she did not think it was worthwhile, but when I knocked on her door she was certainly going to tell me her story.

Just before Christmas she was taken to the emergency services at Noarlunga Hospital—and I am very pleased to see those services upgraded. They provide a much better working environment and a much better environment for patients. She had dislocated her shoulder; she had done this many times before. This time she was advised that it was up to the stage where reconstructive surgery was required. She was referred to Flinders Medical Centre to get an appointment. The first appointment she could get was 27 July. She was also advised that, if surgery was required—and it was certainly the opinion of the doctor attending her at Noarlunga that it would be required—it would probably be a 24-month wait before she could have surgery.

This woman has a husband on a disability pension and two young children. The fact that her shoulder is dislocating constantly means that she is not able to do things like hanging the washing on the line; neither can her children or her husband. This family is expected to manage for about two years with this absolute insult to the way people can handle their domestic arrangements. It is just intolerable; and somehow they are expected to manage it for two years. I contacted the Flinders Medical Centre to see whether these details were correct. Indeed, they are pretty well correct; the

only difference was that the wait for surgery might be only 18 months. That is what the list is at the moment, but there was no indication of what the list might be by the time my constituent gets to see the upper limb clinic in July.

This is what the mismanagement of our health system means to individual people. This constituent has family, relatives and neighbours, many of whom will have to help out in the two years before this surgery is undertaken. Of course they know there is a problem in the health system. Of course they know the opposition is not exaggerating it, and of course they know the mismanagement of the health system by the government members opposite is just an indication of how they mismanage everything.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I do not intend to speak for very long; I think the case has been adequately put by my colleagues on this side. I know that this is a very important issue for my electorate, so I wanted to get on my feet and support it. I will read one letter that I received recently about health. I could read hundreds of letters in here, because I recently surveyed my constituents about health and got hundreds of replies. I know that all of us on this side receive phone call after phone call about people who are on waiting lists and who have been in the same sorts of circumstances as the member for Reynell has just described. The letter that I am about to read describes what is going wrong with our health system and why we need an inquiry. What has happened is that the hospitals have been so badly squeezed that the care has been left out of health care in many cases.

I received this letter from a gentleman who lives next to a woman of 77 years of age. On 23 January that woman broke her arm in three places and was sent by ambulance to Flinders Medical Centre, where she received an X-ray and was then sent home in a taxi with her arm in a sling. She was told she could not stay overnight, because there were no beds. The woman lives alone—remember, she is 77—she is independent, so she would not ring other pensioners for help, and that night she had to get into bed with her clothes on because she could not undress herself because of the breakage and the pain. Fortunately on the morning of 24 January, Flinders apparently relented and sent a taxi to take her to Blackwood Hospital, where she remained until 31 January. She was then transferred to one of the rehabilitation wards in the Repatriation Hospital, where she remains to this day.

I guess this woman is lucky that she had to spend only one night in agony, but there must be many more who are not made that offer. It is disgraceful that that 77 year old woman with her arm broken in three places was sent home with a sling and that was about it; no care, no after care, no bed and no other help at all. If the members on the other side think there are no problems in the health system they really need their heads read. There are great problems in our health system, and I hope this committee will help solve them.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I was amazed by the speeches of the Minister for Minerals and Energy and those of members on the other side and the attitude of government members in respect of this issue, particularly in relation to the criticism levelled at the shadow minister for daring to move this motion to establish a select committee. I remind members that every member of this parliament is entitled to move a motion, introduce a private member's bill, or seek to set up a select committee to look at any matter. That is their democratic right and that is what the institution of parliament is about. It is unfair that any member should be criticised for doing

their job and for supporting something in which they believe strongly.

I cannot understand the government's attitude in opposing this motion. If, as the government says, there are no problems with the health system, it should be only too happy to have an inquiry to vindicate that view. If the health system is in good shape, when the evidence is taken and the findings of the select committee come down, the report of the select committee will reflect that. The fact that the government is opposing the setting up of a select committee indicates to me that it is frightened of what evidence will be given and that it is trying to cover up an inadequate health system.

The minister also criticised, very unfairly, the nurses' recent industrial action. Nurses are wonderful people. They are long suffering, responsible people who do not take industrial action lightly. The fact that they have been forced into this position means that the health system is in crisis and that they have taken this step as a last resort.

The minister asserted that under Labor the health system was in a bad state. I point out to the House that about four years ago, along with other members of parliament who have constituencies in the western suburbs, I was invited to a Queen Elizabeth Hospital board meeting. At that board meeting it was pointed out that the cuts that this government was imposing on the QEH, in particular, were starting to bite and were hurting the hospital. I remember at the time that the then member for Peake, Heini Becker, objected to this and said that there had been cuts under the previous Labor government. He was told by members of the board that there had been cuts under the previous government because there was fat to be cut; but he was also told that there was no longer any fat to be cut and they were cutting into the bone. That situation has continued. The health system is in crisis. I support fully the shadow minister's call for the establishment of a select committee.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I will speak briefly in support of this motion by the shadow minister for health which seeks to set up a select committee to consider various matters concerning the public hospital system. Without exaggeration, every week I hear stories from people about their disappointment at the disaster in the hospital system. One area of concern relates to waiting times when people actually arrive at hospital. Many cases have been reported to me of people who have waited for perhaps 12 hours in pain and agony in the casualty area. Another area of concern involves those people who wait, literally for years, for surgery which might be considered elective in a technical sense but which will have a dramatic impact on their quality of life. For example, knee surgery which will enable a person to walk again or eye surgery which will enable them to drive a car again. They are fundamental matters.

I am pleased also that the proposed select committee will look at the interface between the public and private health systems. This is of particular relevance to the Flinders Medical Centre and the private hospital next to it. Many patients have told me that they have gone into the public hospital only to wake up in the private hospital. I have also heard of patients who do not want to pay the private hospital gap, even if they are insured. There are a number of problems around private health insurance and the gap payments that must be made.

A number of constituents in Mitchell Park, for example, live there specifically because they are close to Flinders Medical Centre if something goes wrong. In emergency cases

a number of these residents have been taken in an ambulance not to Flinders Medical Centre or Daw Park General Hospital but, rather, to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which is the very thing they wanted to avoid by moving close to Flinders Medical Centre.

I am really shocked at the response of government members to the motion. To suggest that there is nothing wrong with the health system is really putting their head in the sand. It is completely ignoring the disappointment and concern that is widespread in the community—certainly in my area. The government should be ashamed of its record on health care and funding for hospitals.

I support the motion, and I believe that the first step towards solving the problem is a thorough and open public analysis of what is wrong—whether funding is the answer; to what extent funding is the answer; and to what extent reversing privatisation is the answer. This select committee will need to address a number of issues, and I believe that it is the first step to getting our health care system back on track.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): In closing the debate on the motion, I would like to thank the members for their comments, particularly members on this side of the House and also the member for Fisher, who supported the motion and who acknowledged the importance of proceeding with such an initiative.

I would like to make a few comments in relation to the contributions of various members during the debate. First, I would like to respond to a few points made by the Minister for Mines and Energy. He, interestingly, resorted to personal abuse, and I guess we all know that when people have no argument to put forward—no strong argument, no facts on which to base a proper response—they resort to personal abuse and, of course, we saw that again. We have seen it before from this minister and, no doubt, we will see it again. We had it again today.

I moved this motion with pleasure, not because I am pleased with what is happening in our health system and not because I am pleased with the suffering that has been so evident over recent years amongst our constituents across this state. Rather, I did move an initiative where we, as parliamentarians, will have an opportunity to do our job: to sit down, to work through the issues and to come up with some constructive solutions.

It is interesting that the Minister for Mines and Energy thought that I should have talked about regret. I do not regret being able to do my job: I look forward to it. I welcome the opportunity, and I will be rolling up my sleeves and getting down to working out some constructive solutions to fixing the problem.

I also was accused by the minister of being factually wrong. I invite the minister to look at the budget papers for the last year and the press clippings and the statements that were made. Everything in my speech was absolutely backed up factually. People will know that I do not get up and talk off the top of my head—as the minister did today and as he does so often.

The member for Hartley said that we did not need a committee; that we needed action. I agree that we need action but, unfortunately, we on this side of the House are not yet in a position to deliver the action. We soon will be. I am very pleased to have this committee, because I know that, in about eight or nine months' time, it will be my job, and I want to get a head start on this, because I am not prepared to sit on

my hands and make out that it is not happening, and no-one on this side is prepared for that to occur. It will be a different style of government altogether, with different priorities.

The member for Goyder said that there always have been problems, and there always will be. What a defeatist attitude! We are not prepared to have that sort of attitude. We are prepared, on this side of the House, to say that health is a priority for our government to be, and that we are prepared to get in early and start looking at the situation.

The minister, to a degree, even though he said at the beginning of the week that he did not support a select committee and that it was not necessary, acknowledged that there were problems. He said that his solution was to set up a 15 person committee from within his department and they would deal with the issues. The problem is that the time line for this committee is September 2002: it is a bit late. The fact is that it is all happening now. The government will be gone in 2002. We need action and we need it now and this is the committee that can do it.

Finally, it is quite clear from comments from the members opposite that they are in a complete state of denial, and this point has been made by a number of my colleagues on this side of the House. I find it really sad that members opposite have got to the point of accusing us of a political stunt and accusing the doctors and the nurses of a political stunt. I wonder if they actually think that the people contacting their offices—they must be contacting members opposite as well, because they are contacting us—are also engaging in a political stunt. The fact is that they are not. Take your blinkers off, be honest with yourselves: there are lots of problems. It is not a matter of our pointing the finger at each other and talking about 10 years ago, yesterday and now: let us get on with a committee and find some solutions, look at the future and work out how we can get out of this mess.

Motion carried.

The House appointed a select committee consisting of Ms Bedford, the Hon. Dean Brown, Mr McEwen, Ms Stevens and the Hon. D. C. Wotton; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Wednesday 30 May.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That Standing Order 339 be and remain so far suspended as to enable the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the House.

Motion carried.

SWAN REACH WATER SUPPLY

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That this House calls on the government to direct SA Water to provide, within the next 12 months, all residents, businesses, institutions and allotments in Swan Reach with a potable, filtered water supply at appropriate pressure, regardless of elevation above the level of the Murray River, at no direct additional expense to the ratepayers.

I wonder how many members in this place have to put up with a water supply that will not run through a shower rose; a water supply to the school which their children, or grandchildren in some instances, or nephews and nieces if they do not have any children, or the children of their friends, go where there is no pressurised water supply available for firefighting—leave alone for the school's domestic needs—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, I well understand what the member for Stuart is telling me. In a good part of the township, in fact, there is an inadequate water supply, by the standards of the 21st century. Even a place such as Yunta has a reticulated water supply from a dam that has been there for many years, yet what I am talking about is not a figment of my imagination; it is a fact of life for the people of Swan Reach. That is in spite of the fact that it is on the Murray River and it is in spite of the fact that the Swan Reach Pumping Station delivers not just a pressurised supply of water to the Mid North and Yorke Peninsula through the Stockwell Pipeline, but also, and more importantly, it is a filtered pressurised supply. Towns such as Clare get their water from Swan Reach, even though it is miles away.

Towns such as Maitland are included in that reticulated supply of potable filtered water that is metered, yet in Swan Reach, on what is called the upper level, not all the residents in that town can have a pressurised supply of potable water, leave alone the fact that absolutely every resident, including the school, has no filtered water. Why is it that the government cannot find the funds to take the pipeline from the filtration plant seven kilometres to Swan Reach? It is not a big town and it is not a big ask. If it cannot, in its opinion, supply the pipes to get the water from the existing facility of the pump house and the filtration unit, surely to God, surely for our sakes, as a civilised state, we as a parliament can direct the government to install a small filtration unit and an adequate supply of pressurised water to enable all those homes and the school to be supplied with such water.

It is, indeed, the reason why the township cannot and does not expand, and it is a chicken and egg problem. Whenever people have wanted more power to be reliably supplied any time over the past 40 years the argument has been, 'Well, your town's not big enough.' Whenever the local member has argued for a better water supply the response has been, 'The town is not big enough', yet when you go to prospective investors to establish industries there that would—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: We are debating Notices of Motion/Other Motions No. 1 on page 6, which states:

That this House calls on the government to direct SA Water to provide, within the next 12 months, all residents, businesses, institutions and allotments in Swan Reach with a potable, filtered water supply at appropriate pressure, regardless of elevation above the level of the Murray River, at no direct additional expense to the ratepayers.

All members in this place pretty well take that for granted, but the people of Swan Reach cannot, and I have been drawing attention to that fact ever since I have been here. Successive ministers have always used this chicken and egg approach which says that, if you do not have a big enough population, you will never get one. No business will go there because it does not have any water. I encouraged one business, Oakdale Potatoes, to go there. That business is investing millions upon millions of dollars in the development of irrigation properties well back from the river using state-of-the-art technology.

That industry will expand the number of permanent jobs in Swan Reach and it will also provide a quantum leap in the demand for power. It will justify, on that ground, the investment of the additional capital necessary to give a reliable power supply to the town. That will make it feasible to hook up three phase power to the pumps that are there at present to lift the water from the river to the tanks where it is chlorinated at such high levels (because the water is not

filtered) that it produces trihalomethanes and other carcinogens—which most members in this House know are a consequence of these high levels of chlorination required to make the dirty water safe—thus putting the health of those people at risk.

We have removed that risk by filtering all of Adelaide's supply, but we still say it is okay for the folk in Swan Reach. I do not think it is. I do not think it is reasonable; I do not think it is fair. I think it is about time they were given the same consideration as everyone else on the Swan Reach through Stockwell pipeline that supplies the Barossa, the Lower North, the Mid North and Yorke Peninsula. If we can build a pipeline for 200 kilometres to deliver potable filtered water to all those other communities so far away, why cannot we build it just eight kilometres to the people in Swan Reach? Why cannot we make it safe for the kids at the school to have clean, properly filtered, low chlorinated water available to drink? Why cannot we have adequate supplies to fight fires on hot days? On the upper level, there is no pressure.

Something has to be done. The piecemeal improvements that have been undertaken to date are unreasonably inadequate and totally unfair. The Premier and the member for Schubert are extending the pipeline on a non-viable basis into the northern Adelaide Hills. It is going into the northern end of the Premier's electorate and into the member for Schubert's electorate through the communities of Eden Valley and others that are outside the Barossa Valley. If it is good enough to do it for them, why is it not good enough to do it for the folk in Swan Reach and other similar communities that have been ignored and left out?

I draw attention to this more especially because there are so many indirect supplies in the town, and this is the crunch point for me in the argument. The supply of water as an indirect supply simply means that, if you want water and SA Water's pipe does not go past the front of your property, you have to buy some polythene hose pipe, usually high density, and connect it to a meter that will be put on someone else's land several hundred metres away. You roll out your own pipe at your own risk, after you have permission from the council to do so, along the roadside.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: It is called an indirect service.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, that is what I am talking about. It is an indirect service and it has to be installed. What the minister does not seem to understand, and what no other minister has ever bothered to do anything about, is that these indirect supplies are within the limits of the town. It is not as if they are in rural areas. All the other indirect supplies around South Australia are outside surveyed, proclaimed township areas.

One of my constituents, Mr Simmons, a pensioner, has had to install his own. When one of the neighbours between his home and his meter, several hundred metres away, decides to clean up the weeds along the roadside and drive along with a rotary slasher, and if the sand drift has shifted and exposed his pipe close to the surface, the slasher blade goes through the loose sand on the surface and cuts his water supply, so the poor bugger has to pay excess water. If it is not that, it is the neighbours cleaning up the rubbish. They pile it up in heaps and, when they have a good day to burn it, they set it alight and cook his bloody pipe. He has to pay for the excess water and replace the pipe at its own expense, and he lives in the town!

Do members think that is fair, civilised or reasonable? Well, I do not. If he was outside the town I could understand it. That is the system we have. But he is not outside the town,

and there are many others like him. If the government of the day thinks it is fair to renege on the promise that was given to Tom Stott by Steele Hall to provide a reticulated supply of safe potable water to all the residents in the township of Swan Reach—and subsequent ministers have ignored that promise ever since that day—and if the government thinks in the 21st century that it is fair and reasonable to do it, it has another think coming.

I doubt that the Liberal Party will get more than a handful of votes on polling day when it is next held in Swan Reach unless it does something about this, and anybody who votes for the Liberal Party in Swan Reach will be someone who has visited there to take an absent vote from somewhere else. The folk in Swan Reach are ropeable about this. If a minister went up there now, after this last summer with the way the heat and water supply have been, I would not be held responsible for his safety. Those people are normally placid, reasonable folk. But, by hell, they are angry—and for good reason. I call on the minister and the government to get off their backside and give the people of Swan Reach a fair go and a decent water supply before the year is out.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I can understand the feelings of the honourable member in relation to the provision of adequate water supplies because, as someone who comes from a part of South Australia with limited supplies of water and who has had to supply his own, as have my neighbours, I know the costs involved. I have been involved in running water in excess of 19 kilometres, so I understand clearly what the honourable member is saying. I have in my constituency places like Hawker which have shocking quality water. Places like Stirling North have a proliferation of indirect services. One of the things that concerns me greatly is that I just wonder what is the charter of SA Water. It does appear to me that it seems rather reluctant, to put it kindly, to want to connect more clients to the system.

I have in my constituency other areas that are suffering badly, and I am aware that around South Australia there are places like Streaky Bay where the only solution to the problem is desalination. That is the only solution to the problem at Hawker, but I do not know who will pay. When we have a huge quantity of money going to the arts and other things, I wonder what are the priorities. I am one of those who strongly believe that we will have to give serious consideration—and time is running out—to the quantity and quality of water available in South Australia. Unfortunately, too few people understand that we have a potential crisis in this state, and it is not only the quantity but the quality. If people think that we can just ad infinitum go on sinking bores into aquifers and pumping out water without any regard to the future, they are not facing reality. It is a very serious matter.

Constituencies such as mine which have reticulation systems looking after small towns are under tremendous pressure. Not only is the system overloaded, but to find adequate sources to supply that system is a grave difficulty. It is something to which we have to give serious consideration. SA Water has gone from being a fairly intransigent bureaucracy to a government corporation: one which was losing money to one which is now putting money into the general revenue of the state. My point is that we should be reinvesting a considerable amount of that surplus on operations back into upgrading and improving systems.

Mr Lewis: Like Telstra's social obligations.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is right. I understand that SA Water is making in excess of \$40 million to \$50 million

profit and I am pleased about that but I want to see some of that money reinvested in these small communities so that they have the opportunity of being connected. We have a system in place where most meters are limited to five litres a minute, wherever you are. Therefore, I know that at places like Eyre Peninsula there are very grave concerns about availability of water.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, I have very grave concerns. There are difficulties on the outskirts of Port Augusta where there are five acre, I think it is, blocks of land where it is terribly difficult to get a connection. You would think you were trying to gain access to the Crown jewels, such is the difficulty of getting people hooked up. I have had some most interesting debates with our friends at SA Water about why they cannot hook up some poor fellow to water. It should be a condition of sale of such land to tell people what the availability of water is. People should not be able to buy land and be of the view that they are going to be automatically hooked up, because after they buy they suddenly say, 'No-one told us.' So it should be a condition of sale so that they are fully aware. Obviously, it is going to affect the value, but it is not fair to let people buy land when there is no water available. They should be fully aware of it and what steps can be taken to get it connected and what the cost will be, because a lot of people do not understand. As the honourable member pointed out, if you have to run polythene pipe, you have to put it in properly or you will be like my poor constituent who did not realise it was leaking and he received a tremendously high account for excess water because he did not know it was running onto the ground.

So, I understand completely what the honourable member is talking about. For years, I was involved in making representations to get water extended west from Ceduna to Penong. We got it to within about 8 kilometres: we have not quite got there yet but I intend to continue to pursue the matter. The council has managed excellently a very good scheme at Ceduna in cooperation with the communities at Denial Bay and at Koonibba. It was a very sensible operation, although there are some problems. But that is taking place elsewhere. I think that we have spent enough down here and that it is time to spend more money to connect these people to what is a basic necessity of life.

So I understand and appreciate what the honourable member is talking about. The area he is talking about is not far from my constituency anyway, and I have had dealings there with people on other matters. So I say to the honourable member that I think this matter needs to be addressed and I will talk to my colleagues in relation to this and a number of other matters as they affect my constituency. A number of areas need additional investment to ensure that people can be connected and that existing schemes can be expanded.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

OLYMPIC FOOTBALL MATCHES

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this House congratulates the government and all those who contributed in making Adelaide's Olympic football matches at Hindmarsh Stadium such a resounding success and, in particular, the players, volunteers, officials and spectators whose enthusiasm contributed to securing our Olympic history and putting Adelaide on show to the world.

In moving the motion which stands in my name I rise to point out to the House, and I am sure everyone would agree, that

the Sydney Olympic Games were a staggering success, surpassing even the loftiest expectations of the nation and the world, and that Adelaide played an important part in those games. Indeed, some international journalists have gone as far as to suggest that Australia should become a permanent home for the games. I am not sure that I would go so far, but it was certainly a resounding success.

In the interests of brevity and in order to get this motion agreed to by the House, I will contain my remarks to a few minutes, because I am sure that there will be general agreement that the part played by Adelaide in hosting the soccer events during the games was a fine achievement by Adelaide, by South Australia and by all concerned. I feel very proud of that significant role and the community should be congratulated for the amazing support that it provided for the Adelaide based Olympic events.

Through the staging of six preliminary football matches and one brilliant quarterfinal over a 10 day period at Hindmarsh Stadium, our purpose-built home of Olympic football in Adelaide, we again showed the rest of Australia that, when it comes to staging a major event, you cannot beat South Australia. We even beat Sydney to opening the games with our first football match and own spectacular gala opening staged two days before Australia's golden girl, Cathy Freeman, lit the Olympic cauldron at Homebush. The sight of the best footballers in the world racing out onto Hindmarsh Stadium in their bid for Olympic glory was among the first images from the Games to be beamed around the globe.

The Premier (Hon. John Olsen) and the Minister for Tourism (Hon. Joan Hall) are to be congratulated on the outstanding success of the Olympic football project, flawlessly managed by Peter Lang, in conjunction with SOCOG Adelaide and the tournament director, Sam Ciccarello. It is my aim today to pay special thanks not only to those who have worked for more than two years to ensure the success of our event but also to the countless number of volunteers who gave up their time for no pay to play their part in Olympic history.

The television footage of football teams from such great sporting nations as Chile, Nigeria, Korea, Honduras, Spain, Morocco, Japan, Italy and the United States and their arrival in Adelaide was such a fantastic site, with fans turning out in their droves to welcome their heroes to our great state. Only in Adelaide could fans so easily meet the teams, grab an autograph or pose for photographs with their heroes, and there is no doubt that such a warm welcome will be long remembered by those athletes. In fact, young Italian football superstar Andrea Pirlo said that the support of fans would provide a fantastic boost to his team, with Adelaide's strong Italian community providing 'a piece of Italy that will give us strength'—as he put it.

Adelaide, of course, was already a favourite city for the Korean Olympic Football Team. It was at Hindmarsh Stadium in January where it went on to blitz Nigeria, Egypt and Australia to win the coveted four nations tournament. Just as she welcomed all the teams to Adelaide, the tourism minister was on hand to welcome the 55 strong entourage of Korean players, officials and media at a special function at the Adelaide Hilton International on 7 September. Her commitment and support for the entire event is a credit to her, the government and the whole state.

Those warm welcomes were just a taste of our renowned South Australian hospitality. Thanks to the hundreds of paid staff—everyone from police and ambulance workers, caterers and cleaners to drivers and doormen—and the boundless

enthusiasm of our volunteers, the athletes were greeted at every turn with efficient, professional help and a warm, friendly smile.

South Australia has a strong and proud tradition of the community coming out and volunteering their time to help with the success of major events; and our former Formula One Grand Prix and the Masters Games are prime examples of that. It was not just the athletes, dignitaries and team officials who benefited from our volunteer effort, although they were full of praise for our volunteer drivers, interpreters, medical teams, competition managers and accreditation venue logistics and protocol staff. More than 111 000 fans crowded into Hindmarsh Stadium for the seven matches—on three occasions the crowd passed 18 000. Volunteers were on every corner, guiding spectators to their seats or offering advice and warm greetings.

Adelaide's wonderfully diverse multicultural community ensured that all teams had the home support that they deserved—the fantastic range of colours, flags and banners throughout the event clearly proved that. Although Aussie Rules has always reigned supreme on the football fields of South Australia, for those 10 days (13 to 23 September) football truly captured our hearts. And did we not see some fantastic performances at Hindmarsh? Our stadium has won praise from players and team officials, fans and the world governing body FIFA and is recognised around the world.

The quarter-final capped off the spectacular Olympic event in Adelaide, with the United States beating Japan in a nail-biting finish, winning a shoot-out penalty 5:4. An amazing 1 200 Japanese fans had flown to Adelaide for the event. Off the field in Adelaide, the work of so many in running the Olympic football project is clearly paying dividends. No-one summed it up better than Signor Vincenzo Marinelli, the Acting President of the Italian soccer federation, who said of Adelaide:

Life here is so easy going and the people are so friendly and courteous, nothing seems to be too much trouble for them.

Thanks to the fantastic organisational skills of the Olympic football project and SOCOG Adelaide, the cooperation and devotion of Adelaide's work force, and the brilliant volunteer effort by the South Australian community, we all proved ourselves winners, and we showed to the world what a fabulous soccer stadium we have here, and what a fabulous soccer tradition we have. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): The opposition is pleased to support a motion of this nature. I note that in his motion the member for Waite has identified a range of key people. Following the Olympic Games, it is appropriate to have in the parliament a motion of this nature. Principally, we should never forget that the Olympic Games are put on for the athletes. Certainly, we would want to pay a tribute to all those other groups that have been recognised in this motion. However, let us put the emphasis where it should be, that is, fairly and squarely on the athletes. When the Olympic Games were first staged, it was intended that they were for the athletes. Unfortunately, far too often through history and the various Olympiads in other countries, the games have drifted away from the athletes.

At the Sydney Olympics, and also here in the small part we played in staging the soccer as a part of the games, we can be extremely proud of the fact that the games were put on for the athletes, who were the focal point, just as they should be.

I would like to recognise two other groups involved in the Olympics, one of which was the vast number of volunteers, who played such an important part. In neither Adelaide nor Sydney—and I saw them operate at both venues—have we seen volunteers carry out their quality work with such enthusiasm. The second group I would like to recognise is the public. At the end of the day, it was the public which ensured that good crowds turned up to all the games; and those crowds became involved in the atmosphere. The volunteers ensured that, irrespective of who was playing, the feeling was one of great excitement—and I went to three or four different matches during the tournament—and the public really got involved in it.

Because of the lack of time at my disposal, I will not extend my comments, because we would like to vote on this motion today. It is important that we do not let this motion drift too much further down the track. It has been on the Notice Paper for some time.

Mr Lewis: I have some amendments on file.

Mr WRIGHT: I might as well keep talking if that is the case.

An honourable member: Yes, you might as well, if that is the case.

Mr WRIGHT: Yes. Will the honourable member definitely move an amendment?

Mr Lewis: Of course.

Mr WRIGHT: Okay. In that case—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Scalzi): Order! The member for Lee.

Mr WRIGHT: In that case, there is no need for me to finish my comments today, because unfortunately we will not be in a position to vote on this matter today. It is something of which we should be very mindful: that, whether people agree or disagree with motions of this nature, they are, in part, time relevant. Let us not hide behind the truth. There has been great controversy about the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium, and that controversy continues. However, this is not the time to debate that. This motion has been moved in good faith in this House, and it relates to the athletes, the volunteers, the coaches, the medical staff and the public.

Debate adjourned.

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

FIREWORKS

Petitions signed by 6 697 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ban the personal use of fireworks with the exception of authorised public displays, were presented by Mrs Geraghty and Mr Hanna.

Petitions received.

ALDINGA POLICE STATION

A petition signed by 69 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ensure that the Aldinga Police Station is open 24 hours a day, was presented by Mr Hill.

Petition received.

DENTAL SERVICES

A petition signed by 58 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the government to fund dental

services to ensure the timely treatment of patients, was presented by Mr Hill.

Petition received.

NOARLUNGA THEATRE

A petition signed by 81 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ensure the continued access by the community to the Noarlunga Theatre, was presented by Mr Hill.

Petition received.

SCHOOL PARKING

A petition signed by 153 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the government to review student drop off and pick up parking at State schools, was presented by Ms Thompson.

Petition received.

WATER CONTRACT

In reply to **Mr CONLON** (8 November 2000).

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Mr Nuriaman is a highly respected businessman in his own right. He has extensive business and government networks and a wealth of business experience.

His knowledge, expertise and the respect he carries were established long before his brother Nuriana became governor of West Java.

Mr Nuriaman was engaged by the SA Water manager in Indonesia after a search for an appropriate person to assist with the SA Water international business. His appointment was fully in accordance with Indonesian Law.

Mr Nuriaman's assistance and dedication have proved to be invaluable. He is a key member of the team.

Mr Nuriaman's background is industry and economics. In addition to his work in Indonesia, he has trained and worked internationally. Whilst he is now retired, he is actively engaged as President, Chairman or Board Member of land, mining and computer businesses in Jakarta. He also has extensive experience as:

- Member of West Java Chamber of Commerce and Industry Board
- Vice Chairman West Java Promotion and Business Linkage Board
- Vice Chairman West Java Agribusiness Development Board
- Chairman of the West Java/South Australia business Council

Mr Nuriaman is paid approximately \$A1 200 per month. This is for an average of 15 days per month, and equals approximately half of what would be paid in Australia for one day of an equally qualified consultant.

It is worth stating that the value obtained from Mr Nuriaman's assistance is very high and his appointment has proved to be very valuable indeed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

- ElectraNet Transmission—Lease and Report
- ETSA Utilities Distribution—Lease and Report
- Flinders Power Northern Power Station—Lease and Report
- Optima Energy—Lease and Report
- Synergen—Lease and Report.

MOTOROLA

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yesterday in the House issues were raised in relation to the Cramond and subsequent Prudential Management inquiries. These documents were not in my office for four months, and I reject the inference from

members opposite that my office withheld them. I have also previously informed the House that I have ordered an immediate inquiry as to why these documents were not produced at the time of the original Cramond inquiry and why it is only now that they have come to light. The way in which these documents have come to light is of great concern to me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As to the question of whether or not these documents would have had any implications on Mr Cramond's findings is a matter that only Mr Cramond can answer. In view of that, I have today asked the Crown Solicitor to refer the documents to Mr Cramond to obtain his view as to their material relevance.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: Yesterday the member for Stuart asked me to rule on a matter of privilege, alleging that the member for Ross Smith had been prevented from properly discharging his duties as a member of parliament by the state ALP Secretary and the ALP Caucus. The member for Ross Smith has since communicated with me and advised me that he is unable to provide me with any information to substantiate the matters raised by the member for Stuart for to do so would be in breach of the rules of the ALP and of the resolution—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come back to order and remain silent. These are serious allegations and this is a serious reply. I will read that paragraph again. The member for Ross Smith has since communicated with me and advised me that he is unable to provide me with any information to substantiate the matters raised by the member for Stuart for to do so would be in breach of the rules of the ALP and of the resolution carried out by the SPLP last Tuesday and would result in his expulsion from the party. In the absence of this supporting material from the member for Ross Smith to the matters raised by the member for Stuart (other than press speculation), I am unable to rule that a prima facie breach of privilege has been established.

LE MANS RACE

The SPEAKER: The member for Hart has asked me to rule on whether the Minister for Tourism may have misled the House when she made the statement:

The fact is that I informed the race organisers on Friday that I could not deliver a race this year.

I note in the statement by Mr Panoz dated 26 February that he is quoted as saying that the minister informed his people on the Thursday 'that she was having difficulty in obtaining sign-off on the agreement and that she was suggesting the investigation of a combined event.' Also in his statement, Mr Panoz refers to the 55 minute conference call on the Friday between himself, the minister and Mr Rainsford in which they all discussed the combined race. That raises the question as to why they would be discussing a combined event if the single event was not under threat.

In another statement by Mr Panoz on 27 February, he stated that he was not aware of the Premier's decision to cancel negotiations for future events. The emphasis here is on the words 'future events', not the 2001 event.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members might be interested in the sequence of events. I note that the Premier's speech notes

(when he made the announcement) referred only to not picking up the option for the Le Mans race this year, which raises the continuing confusion over the company's reaction to cancellation of a single race or the whole series. Mr Rainsford, in a statement dated 26 February, stated that neither he nor Mr Panoz was informed of the Premier's decision.

However, when asked on 5AA on Tuesday 27 February whether he knew of the possibility of the race falling over, Mr Rainsford replied: 'Yes, I was involved in the conversation with the minister'—and they then went on to discuss the races being merged. I also note that, on 5AN on Monday 26 February, Mr Rainsford stated that the minister called him into her office to tell him that there were difficulties and that the circumstances had changed. This led to the telephone hook-up with Mr Panoz on the next day.

The nub of the issue is that there is nothing in the statements attributed to Mr Panoz and Mr Rainsford which have been tendered so far which contradicts the actual terminology used by the minister in the House when she claimed that 'she could not deliver a race this year', which is the form of the words which are being called into question. As a result, I do not give precedence to a motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. I remind members of my ruling yesterday on automatic calling and naming.

QUESTION TIME

MOTOROLA

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier name all those people who had access to the Motorola files that have been called in from all government agencies and who were responsible for ensuring that all documents would be given to Mr Cramond in accordance with the Premier's undertaking to this House in December 1998 that 'all documents, all documents will be made available'?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): That is almost an impossible task. How would I know which public servants in which government agencies responded to the call from the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to source the documents from dozens of agencies? That is an almost impossible task. I advised the House yesterday that I sought (on I think it was at least two occasions) advice as to whether all documentation had been sourced and, as I informed the House yesterday, I was advised verbally that, in fact—

An honourable member: By whom?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: By the then chief executive—that they had in fact been sourced. I also draw the attention of the House to the issue related to Marineland. The House will recall that a select committee was established in relation to Marineland and that on, I think, two occasions after a call for documentation, further documentation arrived. In fact, a whole filing cabinet was identified much later—and the member for Hart would know about this because he was an

adviser to the then minister (Hon. Lynn Arnold). I would give credit to this extent: I would expect that, when they did the trawl for documents, in all good will they would have attempted to do so; and, in fact, a whole filing cabinet was found after the inquiry had anticipated that all documentation had been received. So, let the opposition be a little more precise and accurate with the innuendos and allegations that it puts before this House.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, it is wishful thinking, because members opposite have to reflect back only a very short period of time.

POLICE CALL CENTRE

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I was taught as a teacher to wait until the kids are quiet.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Hart to order. The member for Hartley will get on with his question.

Mr SCALZI: Now that the pilot police call centre has been operating for just over a month, will the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services outline to the House any preliminary information that demonstrates the effectiveness of a separate dedicated facility for 11 444 calls?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I often discuss with the member for Hartley his interest in policing and the protection of the community. In September last year, or earlier than that, I acknowledged that I had some concerns about the technology with respect to 11 444. My main concern—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I will also talk later about the importance of remaining cool, calm and collected when you make phone calls.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: As I said, I acknowledge that there were problems, and the problems in South Australia with 11 444 are the same problems that all jurisdictions have been experiencing, primarily because of the enormous amount of increased reporting of incidents via mobile telephones. As we all know, one in every two people in Australia now has a mobile phone. What we did last year, with some financial input, was work on the re-engineering of the whole of the 11 444 area.

However, it was still evident to me that more had to be done so that we could get a better response structure for the community of South Australia and an improved customer focus when members of the community ring 11 444. Four weeks ago we implemented a pilot call centre project for 11 444, which we are running at this stage from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. with some flexibility, starting at 8 a.m. and going to 11 p.m., Monday to Friday. So, we are taking a snapshot with this pilot of what we could do with 11 444 if a call centre were set up for a 24 hour, seven day a week service.

In that four weeks, 10 500 calls came in to the 11 444 call centre. Those 10 500 calls, I am pleased to say, were answered in an average of 17 seconds, which is a fantastic result. I will not be too pre-emptive in saying that that is the

way that we will be able to do it for ever in future. We will wait for the rest of this pilot project, which is not expected to be completed until the end of July, and then we will look at a full evaluation to see what we can do to improve customer service with SAPOL and 11 444.

Another important fact to consider is that, with 40 000 calls in total coming into SAPOL over that period, we have seen 25 per cent of the calls going into 11 444 and being handled there. That indicates that, if the pilot program became a full, 24 hour, seven day a week program, we would see a reduction in the workload of the life threatening 000 communication centre of about 50 per cent. That is an enormous reduction and would allow those police officers to focus more on life threatening issues. We will continue to monitor and evaluate this pilot project, and I will be happy to report to the House.

I would also like to report to the House on some of the concerns about the 11 444 number that have been raised by the member for Napier. I received a copy of a press release from the member for Napier—although I would not have known she was the member for Napier, given that press release. One would have to wonder what a red ribbon seat Labor voter would think about the sort of service they were getting from someone who seems to spend all their time everywhere else but the seat of Napier. But, of course, that is just an example of what a Labor member would do if they were ever put into government. The member for Napier put out a press release on 11 444, and it is the biggest dog's breakfast of a press release that I have ever seen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: This press release came out on Wednesday 31 January this year—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, sir. Standing Order 98 provides that the minister cannot debate an answer. He is clearly doing that.

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

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The bottom line is that this was in January. I announced in September that we would re-engineer and do more with this issue. We have delivered on this, and here we have the member for Napier calling for an overhaul, days after we have actually developed the pilot project.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. He is clearly now flouting your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that, when rising on points of order, members at least wait until the chair acknowledges them. In the honourable member's enthusiasm to get to his feet, his whole point of order was lost, because he was not being listened to.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: In answer to the points raised by the member for Hartley and the point about 11 444, we acknowledged the position with 11 444 in September. The Labor Party was asleep for four months on an extended holiday. We have delivered and are improving a service.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that, consistent with your previous ruling, the honourable member is clearly flouting Standing Order 98, and I would ask that you rule.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that last sentence was an infringement of standing orders. It might have been getting close, but it was not there.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Not only will we continue to develop and evaluate this 11 444 project but this

year we will spend about \$40 million on capital works for police, 113 additional police officers and 245 going through the academy this year. We will continue with the radio network, which is vital for police. The police commander I went out with in the Tour Down Under said that the best piece of technology SAPOL had had for as long as he could remember was the new radio network. We are looking at a call centre project and are committed to making sure that the right resources go to SAPOL to deliver services to the South Australian community that the Labor Party is not interested in delivering. It is not even interested in finding out what we are doing as a government to help the community of South Australia.

MOTOROLA

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I direct my question to the Premier. What was the location of the missing Motorola documents withheld from—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Not all your back bench thinks it is funny.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will start again. I direct my question to the Premier. What was the location of the missing Motorola documents withheld from the Cramond inquiry for the five years prior to 8 December last year, when they were sent to your office? I ask this particularly after the Premier's answer to my first question. All documents carry a file number, a bar code and movement control, revealing who had them and when. This will reveal the paper trail and who had possession, control and access to the so-called missing documents.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): That is exactly what I want to find out. Why do you think we are going to do this inquiry? I want to know where they have been, and I want to know who has been sitting on these documents. As I said to the House yesterday, I do not know, but I want to know.

BERRINGER WOLF BLASS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Premier advise the House of the expected effect of the commissioning today of the new \$30 million Wolf Blass winery at Nuriootpa; and what was the production of wine grapes in the South Australian 2000 season?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I am delighted to have this question from the member for Schubert. Along with the Leader, the member and other members, I was at the opening of the first stage—a \$30 million investment by Berringer Wolf Blass at Nuriootpa. It is the first of some \$120 million worth of investment. The majority of the infrastructure—the steel vats and the other equipment that has been installed—has been purchased from South Australian companies. It was indicated to me during a tour through the factory that a deliberate decision was made to attempt to source a whole raft of manufactured goods from within South Australia because in fact their durability was higher than sourcing out of Europe various wine infrastructure to go into the production and manufacturing of wine.

The facility is certainly first-class. It is a company where the Wolf Blass Yellow Label premium wine is now the top selling red wine in Canada. I was advised that exports have increased by, I think, 32 per cent in a six month period. That

indicates the sort of investment that is taking place through viticulture in the Riverland, McLaren Vale, the Barossa, Coonawarra and the Adelaide Hills where our wine industry is gathering significant momentum. That is actually passing back into local country towns, communities and districts a vibrancy and a spend, for example, in transport, wine labels and wine bottling. And of course we have secured AMCOR to invest in a very substantial new wine bottle manufacturing facility, as the member for Light knows, just outside Gawler.

Part of the reason for that is to put more competition into input costs for the wine industry, that is, wine bottles. In the past we have had only ACI but, by AMCOR's being attracted to South Australia and establishing a facility at Gawler, it will put a competitive base in wine bottles so that particularly small wineries that do not have the same purchasing power will have competition in the marketplace to reduce their input—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes; because there is competition their input cost of wine bottles will be reduced. It also involves the jobs that are generated from it. The direct economic activity at this particular facility is about \$385 million. That translates to an expansion in the community of something like \$500 million. So, the impact of investment is very substantial.

As a result of that, we can be pleased to see our wine exports expanding substantially. One has only to look at the recent statistics out of the United Kingdom: exports from Australia into the United Kingdom have increased by 5 per cent, whereas French exports into the United Kingdom have reduced by 4 per cent. Effectively, by the end of this year there will be a 2 per cent margin between our exports into the United Kingdom and France's exports into the United Kingdom.

So, it is anticipated that next year we will, in effect, beat France in exports to the United Kingdom. That is not bad, from the southern hemisphere, the other side of the world, compared to a country that is virtually a neighbour of the United Kingdom. With companies such as this now investing here to go into the Americas to expand that market, this is an industry that will continue to grow, continue to invest, have benefits for small-medium business and underpin our export market increase that we have seen in recent times.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Does the Premier still insist that his former adviser, Ms Alex Kennedy, had no role whatsoever in preparing or handling any documents for the Cramond inquiry, and will he table a statutory declaration in which Ms Kennedy states that she had no involvement with the Motorola documents? It has been reported that, for two days in late 1998, Ms Kennedy was locked in the cabinet room where all the Motorola documents were being held. The Premier has told this House that Ms Kennedy was simply checking his travel records to answer an FOI request, even though she was not the FOI officer for the Premier's department.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I think Mr Cramond makes reference to that on page 7, 8 or 9 of his report.

NURSES

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Flinders has the call. Please let us have some courtesy.

Mrs PENFOLD: Can the Minister for Human Services inform the House of the outcome of the meeting with the nurses union held earlier today?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I met at 1 o'clock today with Lee Thomas and Rob Bonner of the Nurses Federation. We have had, I guess you would say, constructive and useful discussions. Those discussions are due to continue later today when I am able to get away from the parliament.

I do not wish to comment further than that, although I would bring to the attention of the House that, as of today, 663 admissions to public hospitals have had to be cancelled because of the industrial bans imposed for the metropolitan area. If one includes the country figure in that, the number of admissions is now up over something like 800, and most of those would be for elective procedures that have had to be cancelled. So, the human cost of those industrial bans is now very high indeed. My concern is for those people, because the longer the bans continue and the longer the cancellation of elective procedures continues, the longer those people will have to wait for their procedures once the bans are lifted.

I am hopeful that we can continue to work through the issues in a constructive way. I stress the fact that, obviously, the union representatives will have to go away after today and consider the issues, but I have been at least encouraged by the positive way in which they have sat down and had the discussions with me.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Can the Premier guarantee to this House that neither his Chief of Staff, Ms Vicki Thompson, nor his close associate, Ms Alex Kennedy, nor any other member of his staff culled, shredded, altered or tampered with any of the Motorola documents which should have gone to the Cramond inquiry?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CONLON: A number of Liberal sources have alleged—

Members interjecting:

Mr CONLON:—you make me, and I will—to the opposition that, at a luncheon held in the Alphutte restaurant in early 1999, the Premier's Chief of Staff, Ms Thompson, stated that she and Alex Kennedy had previously shredded documents that would have been material to the Cramond inquiry. The opposition has been informed that former and present Olsen staff attending that luncheon included Christopher Argent, John Deller, Jen Eddy, Christian Kerr, Nick Papps and Robert Underdown. So, be careful in case one of them tells the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is now commenting.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): The fact is that from his last statement the member for Elder does not have anything substantive to back up what he has just said. He has nothing to back up what he has just said.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Certainly to my knowledge no-one has done what the member for Elder has alleged in this House. The member for Elder stands up in this House and makes these broad allegations without any substantive background information or evidence. He has no substantive

base and he stands up and makes these broad and outrageous allegations. This is an opposition that wants government for the sake of government; this is an opposition that does not have a policy direction, and the member for Elder—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let me refer to the member for Elder's grievance yesterday, because this is a material point. In his grievance yesterday, the member for Elder—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the leader to order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In his grievance yesterday, the member for Elder said that these documents that he now has in fact destroys my case—or whatever the point was that he was making. He went on to say that in April 1994 they were forwarded to the Office of Information Technology. The member for Elder's grievance yesterday was based on a false premise. The documents referred to them going two years later, that is, 1996 and not 1994. The member for Elder—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No. Perhaps the member for Elder—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Minister for Police and the member for Stuart.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Perhaps the member for Elder might have the good grace to now apologise for what he said in his grievance yesterday.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr Conlon: This is outrageous.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Go back and check the record. The member for Elder's grievance yesterday was based on a totally false premise on dates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Hartley.

WORKCOVER

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Can the Minister for Government Enterprises advise the House what the government is doing to raise community awareness of workplace injury?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I thank the member for Colton for an important question about an important topic which affects everyone and every worker in South Australia. It is fortunate for all South Australians that, after what was a real mess left by the Labor Party when we came into government, we were able to rescue the WorkCover Corporation from decay. When we came into government, the WorkCover Corporation was unfunded to the tune of \$276 million. Whilst that rolls off the tongue easily, it means that the representatives of the workers, so-called, were subjecting every potentially injured worker in South Australia to a deficit-funded organisation; and, hence, their benefits were at risk.

We now have a fully funded WorkCover thanks to the government making a number of very difficult and tough decisions. A fully funded WorkCover is excellent for all workers in South Australia because it allows WorkCover to concentrate on its core business, which is the prevention of workplace injury. Research by WorkCover shows that with its Work to Live campaign the message is getting through, because workplace injury rates are being reduced. Current statistics indicate that there are more than 45 000 workers with reported injuries, and it is thought that there may be up

to another 50 per cent that are unreported. This is still an unsatisfactory number for me and for the government and certainly for everyone who is in the workplace.

It was with great pleasure this morning that I launched WorkCover's new extension, the next step in this campaign, and the television advertisement which forms the centrepiece of the campaign and which is called 'Figures'. Again, the campaign features nakedness as the previous advertisements did. This advertisement uses the nakedness of people who collectively form a giant body to indicate the vulnerability both of the individual worker and of the company in the instance of workplace injuries. The Figures campaign will premier this Sunday on television and I would fully recommend every member of parliament to leave their work for a couple of minutes—because I know that is what we will all be doing an Sunday night—to watch this advertisement, because it is quite spectacular.

The previous campaign won a number of awards for its focus and I am confident that this campaign will carry on that good work. Public awareness campaigns, though, are nothing without best practice to back them up. WorkCover is doing an excellent job with this and it is developing its own corporate knowledge to support the objective of preventing further workplace injury, and it is doing this on a global scale. It is doing it so well that I am pleased to remind the House that, in association with the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority, WorkCover will be staging the Fifth International Congress on Work Injuries Prevention, Rehabilitation and Compensation at the Convention Centre between 18 and 21 March this year. The second national workers' compensation symposium will be held concurrently.

The program is of an extraordinarily high standard because WorkCover now has an international reputation for doing its job so well. More than 150 presenters from 20 countries will attend, including some of the world's foremost experts in the field of work injury prevention, rehabilitation and compensation. I would hope that WorkCover's work will be further stimulated by the outcomes of the congress. The congress is terrific news for South Australia: not only does it allow us to strut our stuff with respect to how good we are at the moment and intending to be even better in preventing workplace injury, but there will be an immediate economic benefit from this congress.

I am told that about 700 delegates will attend the congress from Australia and 25 overseas countries. They will obviously support—as we have heard from the Minister for Tourism frequently—local businesses through accommodation, buying meals, going on tours, both before and after and, indeed, perhaps with some delegates during the congress, shopping through the three day event, and so on. It is estimated that this congress may, in fact, generate income of \$2.5 million to South Australia, which is clearly an immense benefit to the small businesses which will be, in their own way, hosting the delegates.

As I indicated, WorkCover is producing the goods. The new Figures campaign is excellent and I would hope that all members of parliament will extol the virtues of the Work to Live campaign. I am confident that in making the workplace a safer place to be we will make for a more productive and a better South Australia.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Given the Premier's ostensible anger that documents crucial to the Cramond inquiry had not

been supplied to Mr Cramond, what action will the Premier now take against the Minister for Industry and Trade (Hon. Rob Lucas) given the minister's failure to advise the Premier of these documents during the past 10 weeks? In a ministerial statement last night, the Premier advised the House that his chief of staff became aware of these documents and forwarded them to the Minister for Industry and Trade last December. The Premier's statement did not indicate what the minister has been doing with these documents since then, despite the fact that the Premier met with the minister before last night's ministerial statement.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): As I indicated—

Mr Conlon: Did anyone read them?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Pardon?

Mr Conlon: Did anyone at all in the government read them?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am sure they have.

Mr Conlon: Years ago.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, that is where you are wrong. As to the copies that were referred to, as I said, the chief of staff was at a meeting other than in the office at North Terrace. Some papers were handed over. It related to the Chief Executive Officer of DIT wanting a public apology. Members will have noticed that the Chief Executive of the Department of Industry and Trade has been in some difficulty with public utterances, and he was told that he had to clear all such matters through his minister. Therefore, on the basis that he wanted a public position put down to correct his 'gung ho' attitude, I think it was, it was referred to the minister to look at.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the honourable member for Heysen!

Mr Conlon interjecting:

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

ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage advise the House on what action the government is taking to give South Australians greater access to important environmental information?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I thank the honourable member for his question. We all understand his personal interest in matters relating to the environment. As the House would be well aware, the government collects environmental information from all sorts of sources on different environmental issues, whether it be air quality, water quality, waste management issues or biodiversity issues. That information can be distributed and reported in a number of ways to the broader community, and it is usually in a printed format, which is all right for those of us who are academically inclined but more awkward for those who do not have the background to understand exactly what the reports are saying.

As a result, the department has done some work on how it can present environmental information in a more user friendly and informative format for the broader community. A new web site, which was launched in the last three or four weeks, is designed specifically to try to educate the community about environmental reporting. Slowly but surely, as the department does more environmental reporting, it will be able to put that information onto the web site with

explanations about exactly what the environmental reporting means.

The web site provides far more flexibility in the way information is presented and it is far more user friendly. We have been able to divide the web site into different levels of information, so there are levels that are user friendly for schoolchildren; other levels provide more information for secondary students; and there is also quite detailed information for tertiary students and academics who are doing detailed research papers.

There will be a long-term benefit from this process because the broader community faces very complex environmental issues on a regular basis. There is no doubt that, through community education programs and general community awareness, the community is becoming more interested in and educated about environmental issues. They want to know what is happening around them and how we deal with it. Through the web site, not only will we be able to provide monitoring and the base data but we will also be able to take the opportunity, if appropriate, to explain exactly what the monitoring means.

We will be able to explain what Murray River water quality issues, River Torrens issues and biodiversity issues mean. We will be able to put into layman's terms what the monitoring is and exactly what that means for our community. Through that, our community will be better educated about what is happening in their environment.

Some issues take years to show trends, and water quality is a bit like that. Water quality data take a number of years to develop some form of trend that can be measured and commented on. However, with other issues such as waste management, a response can be obtained far more quickly, but it takes a longer time to develop a trend about biodiversity. Importantly, the web site will also allow the government of the day to put down its policy response to an issue. We will be able to show the monitoring data, explain what it means for the community and set out the government's policy response, highlighting what action we are taking to address the issue. We think that is important because we as politicians all know that some of these environmental issues are long term, and a good example is the Murray River. We all acknowledge that it will be a significant issue for some time to come.

By putting down long-term action plans on this website it brings the community with us about where we want to go in respect of environmental solutions. That empowers the community with information and we think gives the community a far better understanding of some of the environmental issues we face and where that might be heading policy-wise in future. Long term, for governments and parliaments, that means that it will make the community more open to change. It will make the community more educated about the need for behavioural change. The whole concept behind putting monitoring on the website is the fact that we think we will be able to use it as a tool to educate the public about the very important need for them to consider that their individual actions will have a beneficial or negative effect on our environment, and through looking at what is available on the website we think we will ultimately be able to convince the community to be involved in long-term behavioural change.

We have started it with some base data. We accept that more data will go on in due course, and it will slowly build as the monitoring becomes available. Environmental monitoring is an important tool and in the long term will

greatly benefit the broader community. I recommend that members take the opportunity to visit the website, look at what is available and refer their constituents to it.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Will the Premier tell the House who it was during question time yesterday that told him that the missing documents had not been held with all the other Motorola documents in the Premier's office and just how they knew so quickly?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Because a member of my staff telephoned the author of the letter. The member for Elder did not release the letters of the Chief Executive of the Department of Industry and Trade enclosing the documentation to the Ombudsman. Also he sent it to the Prudential Management Group.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I think you have been a little selective again, Patrick. I think you have been a little selective about documentation.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Oh, did you?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, I didn't. When you raised the question we inquired with the Chief Executive of the Department of Industry and Trade as to what this was about. He then said that these matters had gone to the Ombudsman. That is the reply.

PHOTOVOLTAIC REBATE PROGRAM

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Minerals and Energy advise the House of the rebates available through the photovoltaic rebate program and indicate the benefits this program can provide to both rural and metropolitan South Australians?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Minerals and Energy): I thank the honourable member for his most unexpected question. I always know that the member is particularly interested in opportunities in our state. I am well aware that he has a keen interest in energy efficiency and that he is particularly an advocate of renewable and sustainable energies in our state. I am also well aware that the honourable member has been encouraging people in his electorate to take advantage of opportunities relating to the state's photovoltaic rebate program.

This government has been very pleased to partner with the federal government in a venture that has the opportunity to deliver particular energy efficiencies to South Australians, not only in metropolitan Adelaide but also within rural regions. Those who live within rural regions of our state have the opportunity to make even greater gains than those in metropolitan Adelaide, particularly if they are presently generating their power needs from diesel generators or the like, which are particularly expensive. A \$31 million scheme over four years has been announced by the federal government to allow South Australians, be they community groups or individual property owners, the opportunity to access funds to assist with the installation of photovoltaic systems within their property.

It is important that members understand that with photovoltaic systems I am talking of something that is distinctly different from solar systems such as solar hot water services, because photovoltaic systems utilise a solar cell which is

placed in a position where it attracts sunlight, much the same as cells on an office or school calculator. Light energy is converted to electricity, whereas, in a solar system, heat from the sun is converted into energy.

The rebates that are available and administered by the state government—which, as I indicated, are in partnership with the federal government—are up to \$10 000 for a community group and up to \$7 500 for a household. Many South Australians are now taking up the opportunity to apply for such grants—individuals, rural property owners, and also a number of community groups (including schools and local government bodies) are taking advantage of this program.

It needs to be remembered that, while the program is generous—a maximum of \$10 000 for a community group and \$7 500 for a household—these systems are not without expense. To install a system that is grid connected in an area already connected—for example, in the township of Millicent in the honourable member's electorate—would cost in the vicinity of \$20 000, for a system which attracts a \$7 500 rebate. For a slightly larger system connected to a community connected scheme it may cost about \$25 000 with a \$10 000 grant. So there is a payback time, obviously, of some duration before it becomes a fully economical viable proposition. However, where there is a diesel generator involved—and I know the honourable member has a number of constituents on rural properties who rely on diesel power—the payback period is obviously much shorter and can be as few as three to five years to cover the cost of expensive diesel to generate power. I know the honourable member and, indeed, many of my colleagues are encouraging particularly rural property owners to take advantage of this scheme.

I am optimistic that South Australia has the opportunity to become an Australian and, indeed, a world leader in the provision of power through alternative sources. This particular program for households offers considerable opportunity. The honourable member, of course, is in the fortunate position of having an electorate which is suitable for other forms of power generation as well. I know that he is a strong advocate of encouraging people in his electorate to look very seriously also at wind power generation. The honourable member's electorate and, indeed, that of my colleague the member for Flinders are two fabulous places for wind power generation and, in the very near future, in the electorate of the member for MacKillop we are going to see the state's first wind farm, which will be a significant facility, and I also very much look forward to seeing that occur.

So there are considerable changes occurring within our state at this time for alternative power generation and that, of course, has been made possible not only through partnerships such as this one with the federal government, but also due to the fact that Australia is a signatory to the Kyoto Protocol to commit ourselves to a reduction in CO₂ emissions. This has resulted in a myriad of opportunities for funding assistance for alternative power generation schemes and the one about which the honourable member asks me, the photovoltaic rebate program, is indeed one that I commend to members of the House to ensure that their constituents are aware of these exciting energy opportunities and the rebate opportunities that are available.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Who informed the Premier that there had been a breakdown in communications between government agencies over the Motorola contract and did the

Premier mislead this parliament when he first revealed this alleged communication breakdown on 26 November 1998? The Premier first claimed that there had been a communication breakdown between government agencies on 26 November 1988. The Premier's office had been holding all government agency files on Motorola for three months by the time the Premier offered this information in his defence.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): No, I did not. The member for Elder ought to go back and look at the documentation and the dates on it. The assertion contained in his grievance debate yesterday is on a totally erroneous base.

TAFE ENROLMENTS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise the House on the record numbers of students currently enrolled in TAFE courses around the state?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): This is an important question because we can be justifiably proud of our TAFE institutes in South Australia, as they have built an excellent reputation of quality training and supplying quality courses to our young people and those who wish to retrain in South Australia. The reason why that has happened is that they have very direct links between industry and TAFE institutes to ensure that the training they provide to young people, or to others in the community, is directly relevant to the jobs they will undertake when they join the work force. It is the very reason why TAFE institutes stand at number one in Australia in terms of delivering outcomes and jobs for young people in South Australia.

Through these courses they attain the skills that they need for their chosen field, and we are certain then that they are very attractive to industry in terms of picking up employment. However, let us look at some facts regarding TAFE enrolments, particularly over the period from 1996 to last year. In 1996, 90 000 students were enrolled in TAFE. Last year, it had risen to 98 500. That is an increase of 8 500 students over four years. Members have to remember that this was a time when user choice came into the marketplace as well. Therefore, for TAFE to pick up that level of increased enrolments is nothing short of outstanding.

The other thing that has happened is that TAFE is now liaising with the universities and our schools to ensure that we have a seamless progression for young people between school and TAFE; that is, they get accreditation for subjects they have studied in TAFE and accreditation for TAFE learning when they go to university. This ensures a smooth transition when students move between the various levels of education.

Let us look at some of the areas in which there has been increased enrolment. Enrolments in textile courses are up by a staggering 475 per cent; manufacturing and processing courses by 166 per cent; community services courses by 105 per cent; and marine construction courses by 103 per cent, just to name a few. It continues with aquaculture, recreation and food processing courses.

A survey undertaken by the National Centre for Vocational Education Research—and I mentioned these figures earlier—indicated that a total of 91.4 per cent of students in South Australia obtained jobs or went on to further study after graduating from TAFE, which is quite incredible. Nine out of 10 students who attended TAFE achieved that. I think that is an excellent commendation for the staff and lecturers

at our TAFE institutes, and they are to be congratulated for the outstanding results that they are achieving, and I certainly do so.

This government has strongly supported our TAFE students, because since 1998 we have committed some \$700 million towards TAFE students. Under this government, TAFE has emerged as a key player in economic growth in South Australia. We have only to look at the Murray Institute of TAFE, for instance, which covers part of my electorate, the member for Chaffey's and others. In 1998, it was supplying some 465 000 hours of tuition. Last year, it topped one million hours of tuition delivered to students across South Australia. That is not isolated, because I know that in the member for Gordon's electorate at Mount Gambier it is also close to one million hours of delivery.

It really shows that our TAFE system is competitive, is providing the sorts of courses that students want and that industry is recognised as being important and relevant in terms of employment. It shows how ridiculous the opposition's claims are of TAFE's ability and its claims that there have been massive cutbacks. Given the information from the teachers' union, they are not accurate, because our TAFE system is continuing its success. It is making great contributions towards this economy in South Australia, and it is doing an excellent job for our students in South Australia.

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Has the Premier disciplined the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for failing to advise him of the discovery of the missing Motorola documents when the Premier has advised the House today that the Chief Executive Officer of his department received copies of these documents in December? The Premier has just told the House that not only did Mr Cambridge send the documents to his minister Mr Rob Lucas in another place and to his chief of staff Vicki Thomson but also to the prudential management group, of which the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is a member. The Premier would meet weekly with the CEO of his department. Do you want us to believe that he would not have raised this matter with you over 10 weeks?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Once again, you have got it wrong. The fact is that, as you would know and as the Ombudsman would indicate, the documents were referred to him only Thursday last week. My understanding is that it was referred to the prudential management group for consideration yesterday, because the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet told me yesterday afternoon that the matter had been referred to it yesterday morning.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): When did the Minister for Emergency Services first receive a report for the year 1999-2000 from the Chairman of the CFS board, and why did he not table that report in the parliament? Why did he not table the report now tabled on time?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I do not have answers to those questions. I will take them on notice and report back to the House.

WANGANEEN, Mr G.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Will the Minister for Police and Emergency Services advise the House of the exact nature of the fatal wounds sustained by Mr Grant Wanganeen on Monday and how police procedures and training might be improved so that police officers are no longer placed at risk and alleged offenders are safely apprehended?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): As there is a commissioner's inquiry into this matter, it would not be appropriate whatsoever for me to comment at all. We need to wait for the commissioner's inquiry. As I have said very often, a police officer's job is a very difficult one. Given the amount of domestic violence and the number of mental health issues the police have to encounter on a daily basis, my heart goes out to those police officers who never know what they may have to encounter. It also goes out to their families—their wives, children and husbands. I am committed to—and we saw it last year—significant and ongoing increases in the training of police officers. I certainly stand by police officers in the difficult work they have to do. The one thing I am always worried about is their safety and that of the community when they are put into extremely difficult circumstances.

ABORIGINAL REUNION PROGRAM

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Mr—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You might hear a little more about it before we have finished.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You might be right in it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Will the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs advise the House of any action that has been taken to reunite Aboriginal people with those who have been separated from their families and children?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs): I certainly thank the member for Stuart for what is a very substantial question involving a very emotive and sensitive issue. There is in fact a program that does what the member has asked, that is, reunite those people who as children have been separated from their parents and other extended family members. This is a program called South Australian Link-up which is located at and hosted by Nunkuwarrin Yunti in Wakefield Street.

The program started in February last year and a number of very successful reunions have been coordinated, including five last year and four this year to date. Another one is organised for this month. I am told that currently the program has 66 active clients (as referred to by the team), and a further 10 are awaiting assessment to go into that program. The South Australian Link-up program first initiates family tracing and reunion services which include, as one can imagine, some very extensive research leading to initial family contact. There is also ongoing support for family members following reunion.

Because of the very emotional and sensitive nature of these matters, provisions are made for referral to specialist counselling, as well as referral to other appropriate agencies that may provide additional services according to the circumstances in each individual case. The time that is taken

with each client, as members can also imagine, is quite considerable, and it certainly requires a very large degree of patience and certainly an understanding of and respect for Aboriginal culture.

I must acknowledge the efforts of the case workers and the coordinator of the program, Mrs Kay Goodman-Dodd. They are certainly to be commended for their very professional and committed efforts to the people whom this program has already assisted. I had the opportunity to meet with Mrs Goodman-Dodd and the case workers last year, and was taken through the process that they undertake to make sure that these reunions occur not only in the best of situations and circumstances but also certainly with the best of professional intent.

Both ATSIC and the state government, through the Department of Human Services, have provided funding to the link-up program for the employment of the coordinator and the three case workers. The reunions I have talked about have taken place as far away as Oodnadatta; some have taken place in Darwin; and others, of course, have occurred here in Adelaide. It is also important that the awareness of this program actually reaches Aboriginal people and communities across the state. The South Australian Link-up team has conducted a number of community visits, particularly to the rural and regional areas of the state, to raise the public awareness of the program so that Aboriginal people do know that this service is available to them.

In addition, a number of workshops and training programs have been conducted by the team which have complemented the range of community initiatives that have already been undertaken, including participation in the information stall conducted by the Department of Human Services at the Royal Adelaide Show last year.

The work of the South Australian Link-up program is certainly welcomed and endorsed by this state government, and I take this opportunity to sincerely congratulate all involved in what have been outstanding results to date. The practical application of programs such as link-up are the key elements in moving the reconciliation process forward. This government will continue to actively take the steps necessary to support the reconciliation process across this state.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources): I rise on a matter of privilege. Mr Speaker, I ask that, prima facie, you examine this matter and rule that a breach of privilege has occurred in this House and establish a Privileges Committee accordingly. In your ruling today, you said:

[The member for Ross Smith] advised me that he is unable to provide me with any information to substantiate the matters raised by the member for Stuart for to do so would be in breach of the rules of the ALP and the resolution carried by the State Parliamentary Labor Party last Tuesday and would result in his expulsion from the party.

The *Advertiser* (page 14) seems to support the member for Ross Smith's assertion because it purportedly quotes a motion of the State Parliamentary Labor Party, as follows:

Except by way of a collective decision of the State Parliamentary Labor Party, no matter of privilege be raised that would suggest the ALP's state executive may be in breach of parliamentary privilege.

This is a grave matter which directly impinges on the most precious of all our privileges: freedom of speech. On page 84—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —of the 22nd edition of Erskine May we find that the House ruled:

... it is inconsistent with the dignity of the House, with the duty of a member to his constituents, and with the maintenance of the privilege of freedom of speech—

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is the honourable member reflecting on your ruling and, if so, is this the appropriate manner in which to do so?

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair is not taking it that the minister is actually reflecting on my ruling; rather, he is trying to establish a basis on which he may reopen this matter.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Erskine May states:

... it is inconsistent with the dignity of the House, with the duty of a member to his constituents, and with the maintenance of the privilege of freedom of speech, for any member of this House to enter into any contractual agreement with an outside body, controlling or limiting the member's complete independence and freedom of action in parliament or stipulating that he shall act in any way as the representative of such outside body in regard to any matters to be transacted in parliament; the duty—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair has a viable interest in hearing what the minister has to say. I ask for some cooperation.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I will continue:

the duty of a member being to his constituents and to the country as a whole, rather than to any particular section thereof.

On page 112 we find:

The acceptance by a member of either House of a bribe to influence him in his conduct as a member, or of any fee, compensation or reward in connection with the promotion of or opposition to any bill, resolution, matter or thing—

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. If the minister is attempting to raise a new matter of privilege, should he not establish a prima facie case rather than argue the merits of his entire argument at this point?

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is still using Erskine May to establish a legal basis for the request, as I interpret it.

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

The acceptance by a member of either House of a bribe to influence him—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —in his conduct as a member, or of any fee, compensation or reward in connection with the promotion of or opposition to any bill, resolution, matter or thing submitted or intended to be submitted to either House, or to a committee, is a contempt.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Well, if the honourable member wrote Erskine May, let him quote it. I will continue:

Any person who is found to have offered such a corrupt consideration is also in contempt. A transaction of this character is both a gross affront to the dignity of the House concerned and an attempt to pervert the parliamentary process implicit in members' free discharge of their duties to the House. . .

Finally, on page 124 there is a direct reference to 'improper influence'. I apologise to the House that in one hour I have

only found those few references, but I am quite sure that Erskine May throughout supports the notion of freedom of speech in this House and that that freedom of speech can be neither limited by an outside body nor coerced by other members of this place. Mr Speaker, I ask you to examine this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair paid careful regard to that extract from Erskine May over the last evening, and spent a considerable amount of time going through it. I noted also that the honourable member referred to the article in the *Advertiser* as purporting to represent a situation. The reality is that I took advice and spoke to, I think it was, the member for Stuart and the member for Ross Smith.

It is all very well to make allegations, but when I confront the honourable member affected by them and that honourable member says, 'I am not able to give you any evidence that says that my duties as an MP are being curtailed,' then the chair has considerable difficulty. While I acknowledge everything that the honourable member has said about the rights of members to have the freedom of parliamentary privilege to go about their business, the chair is not in the business of being involved in any games or any other resolving of people's issues.

The honourable member has had ample opportunity in approaching the chair to say that he does have a difficulty out there, but he chose not to. As long as he chose not to, it puts the chair in this difficult position of having to say that at this stage, whilst matters were raised by the member for Stuart, in fact the honourable member who was affected by them has been to the chair and said that he is not able to provide any evidence to the chair.

The honourable minister and anyone else in this House has the opportunity to move a motion, and the motion then could be worded in such a way that the House will make a decision if it wants to set up a privileges committee. I also pick up another point that the honourable member made, that is, that the chair does not set up privileges committees. All that I would have done is set aside time for a debate to take place and the House would then take that course. The House has the option of taking the course anyway, if it wishes to give notice and set up a motion.

Under the circumstances of the agenda being played here today and the fact that I interviewed the honourable member and he could not provide me with any information in the way of minutes or factual evidence that he was in fact aggrieved, I took the course of action that I did. If any new evidence comes forward, I will be perfectly happy to re-examine the issue.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: On a point of order, Sir, I merely seek clarification in that the member for Ross Smith's justification for not providing you with that evidence was that he had 'a contractual agreement with an outside body.' Can I ask—

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

Mr CONLON: Not only is the minister now reflecting on your ruling, but he is debating it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will allow the minister to speak as long as he keeps purely to the Erskine May aspects of this question.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I merely seek clarification. As the member for Ross Smith's justification for not providing you with further evidence was that he was relying on the fact that he had a contractual agreement with an outside body, can I then seek advice from you as to how we

may get that contractual agreement considered as a matter of privilege?

The SPEAKER: Order! the chair spent a considerable amount of time last evening and again today considering this matter. There is an agenda being played here. The chair made a ruling today based on the fact that members were given an opportunity to say that they were being aggrieved but chose not to take that opportunity. If they want to take that opportunity and say that this is happening, that is fine, but while they keep coming back to me and saying, 'I am not prepared to say that I am being aggrieved and provide you with the evidence,' I am not varying my ruling.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! the member for Elder has the call.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move forthwith a motion without notice regarding the establishment of an inquiry into matters surrounding the Cramond inquiry.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (25)

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

NOES (21)

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

Majority of 4 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Mr CONLON: I move:

That this House calls on the Premier to establish an inquiry headed by an independent senior counsel and assisted by an ex-public servant of high standing to inquire and report into the following matters associated with the inquiry of Mr J.M.A. Cramond into allegations concerning the now Premier in regard to Motorola:

- determine whether material evidence, written or oral, was not supplied to Mr Cramond and the reasons it was not supplied;
- determine whether any oral evidence given to the Cramond inquiry was misleading, inaccurate or dishonest in any material particulars; and
- determine whether any person or persons did or failed to do anything which caused relevant evidence not to be presented to

the Cramond inquiry or caused inaccurate, misleading or dishonest evidence to be given to the Cramond inquiry.

The House calls upon the Premier to ensure that the inquiry has the powers to subpoena documents and witnesses and to take evidence under oath and calls on the Premier to report to the House on 13 March 2001 regarding the names of the persons to be appointed and the commencement date of the inquiry.

The motion will come as no surprise to the House given that I grieved on this matter yesterday. As I said at that time, the House is dealing with an extremely serious matter. It appears to the opposition that there has been a cover-up in regard to a very serious matter and that there has been a failure to provide to a judicial inquiry duly set up by this parliament all the evidence and all the relevant documents that would have allowed that inquiry to do its job properly.

As a result of that failure, it is plain that key findings in the Cramond inquiry are wrong; that verbal evidence given to the Cramond inquiry was, at best, misleading and potentially dishonest; and that, as a result of those matters, the Cramond inquiry was fatally flawed, and the subsequent report of the Prudential Management Group turned upon equally flawed assumptions and, as a result, was also fatally flawed.

The opposition discovered in this process documents which the Cramond inquiry, on 10 different occasions, said did not exist and the absence of which was a basis for its key findings. The documents also made it very difficult to sustain the defence of the Premier in regard to the Cramond allegations, that is, that there was a mix-up between departments and that the relevant department which gave preference to Motorola was never provided with a copy of the contract and, if they had had it, the defence is that they would not have extended that preference.

With regard to the comments of the Premier today, I make clear what I made clear in my grievance yesterday (and which the Premier seems to believe is not correctly reported in Hansard), namely, that the documents which have been revealed and which were said not to exist show that in April 1996, just in case—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: That is what I said yesterday, and I say again today, because that is what the documents say. In April 1996, the 1994 contract was sent to OIT by the Economic Development Authority. In July, it acknowledged its receipt. It called for a legal audit of it; it acknowledged that that would occur. Other documents acknowledge discussions by officers of the department in regard to those contracts and, months subsequent to that, the contract was signed to give preferential treatment to Motorola. The Premier's defence lays in tatters.

Our main concern is that (and we note the response of the Premier in this regard) these missing documents, it appears, came to the surface again in December last year. They went to the Premier's office but his Chief of Staff apparently did not think that they were important and sent them somewhere else. They went to the Treasurer's office. We learnt from the Premier that they went to the Ombudsman, and apparently they went to the Prudential Management Group.

What we find here today was no acknowledgment of the existence of these documents from the government until a question was raised by the opposition, at best, 10 weeks after senior members of this government were put in possession of them and, if the Premier is to be believed, should have been alerted that serious material documents did not go to the Cramond inquiry. I put to this House that, if we had not asked

questions, we would never have heard about the missing documents.

My concern is this: on this side of the House over the past year we have had repeated leaks from Liberal sources saying that documents had been removed, that Cramond had not heard the whole story and that evidence was not true, and we dealt with those responsibly. There appeared to be no substantial evidence that we could put forward. We now have the evidence. We now want to know whether all these allegations that have been made by other members—other Liberal people—are true. We want to know whether it was just these documents that went missing or whether other documents went missing. We want to know just what evidence to the Cramond inquiry was not truthful or was misleading, and we want to know what evidence should have been given. Most of all, we want to know how it could occur that, from three different government agencies, documents on exactly the same matter, documents damaging—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I will explain to the Premier, if he does not understand. I am glad that he gives me the opportunity to explain this. The documents from the Economic Development Authority sending the contract to OIT went missing. The documents at the Office of Information Technology acknowledging receipt went missing.

Since the Premier has not been following this, I refer to the third document that has never appeared. It is obvious from the documents that OIT sought an audit from Crown Law on the contract. That audit also never went to Mr Cramond. That audit would have been very interesting reading because it occurred before preference was given to Motorola pursuant to the contract late in 1996. Three agencies, Mr Premier—three.

The Premier would have us believe that it all happened by accident and that, somehow by some extraordinary confluence of celestial circumstances and coincidence, documents concerning the transfer of a contract to the Office of Information Technology went missing from their files. At the same time they accidentally went missing from the files of the Economic Development Agency, and at the same time they accidentally went missing from the files of the Crown Solicitor—all documents about exactly the same matter and all about a matter that went to the heart of the Premier's defence and destroyed it.

We believe that this inquiry is necessary not only to determine why these documents did not go but what else did not go, and not only just what evidence was dishonest but what other evidence was dishonest. We want to know the truth. This is the most serious matter on which I have risen in this House. It is a matter of a cover-up that goes to the heart of the government. The Premier has a large number of questions to answer. We are not satisfied that the Premier's office should be investigated by the Premier's office: we want a full independent inquiry, and we would like truthful answers.

The SPEAKER: Will the member for Elder please bring up a copy of the motion to the chair so that it can be distributed to other members?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I am happy to accept the motion moved by the member for Elder, and I do so for a couple of reasons.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, we would have agreed to the suspension after one or two people called for it.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, we would have. Anyway, you please yourself.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Just to attest to that, the member for Elder and some other people knew that prior to the suspension I would agree to this. Anyway, be that as it may, I am happy to agree to this motion, happy to come back on 13 March because, as I said yesterday, I am sick and tired of the web of intrigue with which the member for Elder seeks to, with half-truths, build a scenario. This matter has to be cauterised and cauterised once and for all.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Hart.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There is too much valuable time of this parliament and myself being spent on this issue that is not relevant to the interests of South Australians and their future.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: That is why this matter has to be cauterised. The member for Elder is talking about an incident of seven years ago—seven years. Seven years ago this issue was raised by the member for Elder. What I want to do is get this matter cleared. That is why at the start of Question Time today I came in and said quite clearly I was happy for Mr Cramond to go back and revisit the components, but if you want to do it another way, that is fine by me. As I said in my answer to the Leader—I think it was his second question—I also want some answers on this, because it is not about asking me questions, it is about my asking some questions also as to the advice that was given to me, in terms of all that was previously made available. And so this side of the House supports the motion.

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): I will speak just briefly to this motion. I rise to support it. I support the motion because at this stage in this parliament we have a crisis of confidence in the processes behind government. I think it is vitally important for confidence within the community that this matter be dealt with.

I commend the Premier for supporting this motion. It is not an easy thing for the Premier to do, but there are difficulties behind the scenes that need to be dealt with within the departments. The Premier and the opposition have agreed that this is the appropriate course of action to take, and I commend both sides of the House. The report that will be subsequent to this inquiry, I am sure, will make interesting reading. A number of questions will need to be answered to gain the confidence of the South Australian public in this parliament and in the processes behind government, and that is why I support this motion.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I still do not have an answer to the question I asked of the Premier during question time on Tuesday about the code of conduct for ministers. It goes to the very heart of this matter. That is something which I do not think ministers in this government generally understand, and the answer given by the Minister for Emergency Services today further illustrates that point. Let me remind all members of the House of what I have been saying for years and what I have been saying in more recent times, that is, that all ministers will recognise that full and true disclosure and accountability to the parliament are the cornerstones of the Westminster system, which is the basis for government in South Australia today.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: You will get your turn, sunshine. The Westminster system requires the Executive Government of the state to be answerable to parliament and through the parliament to the people. Ministers will recognise that they have an obligation to account to the parliament fully and effectively for all moneys they authorise to be spent, invested or borrowed. Ministers need to be reminded, I guess, that they ought to pay particular regard to sections 251 and 253 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. In this state, had we established when it was fashionable to do so, though I am not sure that it was necessarily sensible, an independent commission against corruption or a criminal justice commission, a handful of ministers in the Liberal government since it took office in 1993 would now be behind bars. That is not drawing a very long bow.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: In fact, it is not drawing a bow at all.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair has a real concern with the direction the honourable member is taking. He must be very careful not to reflect on members.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I am not sure what you are telling me.

The SPEAKER: I am telling the honourable member not to reflect on members.

Mr LEWIS: I believe that you, Sir, are getting a lot of assistance from the member for Bragg. If he thinks that he knows your job better than you do, maybe he would like to take it on. The member for Elder said, 'We want to know.' Well, I do not care what the Labor Party wants to know. Frankly, I want the public to know. All members in this place have a delegated authority that we get from the people in our electorates at the time of the election, and that is a delegated authority and a trust. It is not about our feelings about ourselves or each other; it is about the interests of the public and not what is of interest to the public; and it is what is in the public interest.

It may be of interest and it may cause excitement but it is not about that: it is about what is in the public interest in the way that ministers conduct themselves and the way in which they relate to parliament and their responsibilities in the parliament. Of this inquiry let me say that I am less than satisfied. It does not go as far as it needs to. Sufficient power is not being provided through the proposition as it sits before us this afternoon to get to the nub of the matter.

Nothing short of the powers of a royal commission will enable that to be discovered as it relates to this matter. Such power, once properly exercised as it would be, would for all time exonerate the Premier and/or any other minister who has had any hand in this matter and the staff of ministers in their respective offices, or otherwise condemn them and let them take their chances with respect to the way the law would then deal with them, according to whatever it is they may have done that would cause the inquirer to report the matter unfavourably against them to the parliament.

Let me say to the Premier through you, Mr Speaker, that it does not matter how long ago it was. It is a heinous crime, if you are a minister in the parliament, to mislead parliament, to know that you are misleading parliament and to state falsehood. It is as much a crime as it is to commit felonies against the person in the wider community, because you abuse the institution that all of us rely upon to give us our rights as citizens, and you abuse the trust that all of us have

in the ability of the institution to perform in that way in the public interest.

I have been saying this since before I became a member of parliament, I have been saying it since I have been a member of parliament, and at all times until more recent years most people in the parliament thought I was simply playing politics. Well I am not and I never have been, because I have been in countries that do not have a Westminster democracy. I have been in countries where they do not have any democracy, and I know what it feels like to be pursued by people who have untrammelled power to do what they will with you when they catch you, and that is not nice. Yet those of us who take this institution for granted and laugh about the consequences one way or the other as though it is here for our entertainment are very much mistaken and are abusing the trust the public has given us when they have given us that delegated authority.

I say now to the Premier that, when the information provided to retired Chief Magistrate Cramond was found by him to be deficient in both the number of documents and the substance of the verbal evidence, he should have required that to be reopened. He should have reported that to the parliament. Indeed—

Mr McEwen: But he didn't know.

Mr LEWIS: He says he didn't know. How could he have not known, because he knew of the existence of the documents and could have easily discovered that during the course of his own inquiries into the matter, which I am sure he would have made. Why otherwise would he have invited me to consider the Cramond report before it was tabled in parliament and what I might do about it? I honestly told him then as I have told him ever since and as I tell him more firmly now: he should resign.

Mr Foley: Who should?

Mr LEWIS: The Premier. I do not tell him that in malice. I tell him that out of the respect I have for this institution and what it means for the safety of all of us.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I hope that I eventually get an answer to the question that I put to the Premier about the code of conduct which we all adopted in 1993 and which I have quoted from during the course of this week and again today. The habit, as though it were an entertainment and a sport, that ministers have to dodge questions that they should be able to answer directly is not in any sense in compliance with that code of conduct, nor is it in the spirit of Westminster parliaments, conventions and traditions.

Altogether, it saddens me that the government, knowing that it has not got the numbers, is drawn screaming and kicking to yet another inadequate inquiry. I wonder whether this inquiry, once established, will have the power to subpoena ministers to appear before it and give answers under oath. If it does not, it is a gross waste of time, not just a waste of time. It must be able to do that and it must be able to do likewise with any and every other citizen, including all public servants who may have information relevant to this.

I said 'citizens' deliberately because I have been told by people who were involved in this business relating to Motorola and the government radio network who have either since left the Public Service or had nothing further to do with it that there was corrupt dealing and that all of that was done before the formal process of the contracts was commenced so that it fell outside the terms of reference of the people who were charged with auditing that process. It happened ahead of time. The cake, its ingredients and what it would look like,

was cooked before the formal processes were begun. I have not been able to get material evidence of that, but why would men and women of standing in the community, men and women who were trusted and who were known to have told the truth all their lives, otherwise come to me and say those things and lie in the process? Why would they do so? It is entirely inconsistent behaviour for any and all of them to behave in that way. I do hope, although I am not confident, that such an inquiry will produce the result that it seems the majority of members of this House expect.

Mr McEwen (Gordon): I am somewhat disturbed by the member for Hammond. It is important that we all understand what we are dealing with here at the moment and that we set aside two fundamentally different issues. We are not discussing here today whether the findings of Cramond are in any way flawed. We are not today pausing even to reflect on those findings, which we dealt with at another time. What has shocked South Australians today is to learn that the process was flawed. What we are looking into today is a matter that ought to be of concern to all of politics because, as much as we expect robust debate in this place and we understand the cut and thrust of the political process, we have learnt today that there is a flaw in the judicial process. That is something that we must all take very seriously because that is a crisis of confidence in all of us.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr McEwen: Well, it was an inquiry by a retired judge.

Members interjecting:

Mr McEwen: The point I am trying to make is that we have learnt today that the discovery process leading up to the determination of a matter was flawed. We have to establish whether that happened by accident or by design. That is the important issue here, so all of us should focus on what went wrong in that process and ensure that that never occurs again, and please allow that process to run its course before we ask ourselves another question.

At the end of this process we will ask, 'Why weren't these documents discovered and are there yet other documents that were not discovered?' At the end of that process, rightly we can ask another question: 'Have these extra documents (and perhaps documents yet to be discovered) in any way changed materially what was considered in Cramond's making his determination?' But, please, do not jump too quickly to that matter. That is totally inappropriate at this time. Please, all of us, reflect at the moment on the matter before us, which is simply the matter of asking why the discovery process was flawed: was it by accident or was it by design and, if it was by design, who was responsible?

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): During the course of the last week we have seen a number of ministers made very uncomfortable by questions that have been legitimately asked of them as to why they behaved in the way that they did or failed to behave in the way that they should have; and as to why they had information which they should have provided publicly but did not do so. The most recent illustration of that, of course, was when the Minister for Emergency Services, clearly, had a report provided to him by the Country Fire Service Board, yet did not table it in this House and sought another report. At least, that is what the evidence suggests to me. I have a copy of two reports, after having written to the

person who was the chairman of that board and demanded from him, under threat that I would take out a writ of mandamus in the Supreme Court requiring that he deliver to me (as he did) a copy of the report that he ostensibly provided to the minister in June.

That person, Mr Michael Pengelly, I suppose did not welcome the strength of my demand. It was an inquiry and it was put politely, but it was put very firmly. Having written to him in those terms, I sent a copy of my letter to the minister. The minister, on the first day of sitting, tabled that report. However, when I came to look at it, I discovered that the report that was tabled was not the report written by Mr Pengelly but the report written by Mr Kim McHugh, who had been a member of that committee for only five months during the year 1999-2000 and who, following his membership of five months, became chairman of the CFS board when the government—acting on the minister's recommendation, I guess—chose not to reappoint Mr Pengelly as chairman but to appoint Mr McHugh. How Mr McHugh could know the full gamut of business conducted by the board prior to that time is beyond me. I do not reflect on Mr McHugh because I know him to be a decent, honest and honourable man of integrity. He is Mayor of the District Council of Alexandrina. I am talking about the ineptitude of the process that was involved.

Secondly, at the beginning of the week the Minister for Tourism found it difficult to answer questions about whether or not she had told Mr Panoz before the announcement was made by the Premier that the Le Mans car race series was over. Mr Panoz claims, and so do other people involved in that enterprise who are not part of government, that no such advice was given to them at any time. Whom do you believe? I note that the minister said nothing to that effect outside this chamber, and I wonder whether that enables any of us to come to a likely conclusion against the minister's version. I leave that question in the air, but the fact remains that what was said by the minister outside this place and what was said by the Premier outside this place are pretty much at odds: it did not go to the heart of the matter, and it is pretty much at odds with what was said inside this place.

Equally, there is the ministerial statement made by the Premier yesterday concerning the matters which we have been considering during question time today and which have become the subject of the proposition adopted by the House a few minutes ago: I wonder about the credibility of that, too.

Time expired.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I rise today to discuss a couple of issues in my electorate that have been of outstanding success in recent times; and given the resumption of parliament only this week I have not had a chance to put this on the record. First of all, I would like to speak again about the success of Taste of the Race Tour, the success of the Tour Down Under and the way in which it was supported by our local community in the Willunga Basin, and indeed the whole of the Fleurieu Peninsula. As members would know, this is the third Tour Down Under and, on each occasion, we have seen even a further commitment by a large group of volunteers, together with the City of Onkaparinga and, importantly, the business and resident associations, to ensure that we get an even greater opportunity to display what the McLaren Vale wine region, indeed the Fleurieu Peninsula, has to offer the world.

This year I accompanied the Police Regional Commander in the command vehicle which led the race not only to see how the new radio communications network was working but also to see first-hand the preparation and commitment of thousands of people from my own electorate, and indeed neighbouring electorates in the region. On this occasion I particularly congratulate Willunga for its excellent effort and commitment to this event for which it received an important award. Importantly and in conjunction with this, I had the opportunity to be involved in the opening of a new section of the bike, walking and jogging track from Seaford to McLaren Vale. This project has been a joint effort by a number of us. I was fortunate enough to be on the working party. The Minister for Transport (Hon. Di Laidlaw) supported financially and in kind some of the development of this track and the City of Onkaparinga also put in an enormous effort both in kind and financially.

When this whole track is finished we will have over 30 kilometres of excellent track from Willunga to Hallett Cove allowing people to connect with all the other bike tracks and to go either to our beautiful beaches along the coast or into the wine region to do some tasting. The other important thing about this is the health and fitness of our community. Not only does it provide families with the opportunity of being able to use this track—something which I see regularly—and to enjoy the opportunity of spending time together but also it enables them to keep their families fit.

The other point I raise relates to the Noarlunga Theatre Company. The Noarlunga Theatre Company is a fantastic theatre company, which during the year provides thousands of people with the opportunity of being able to watch the local talent. I was privileged to be able to go—unfortunately not for the whole event due to workload—to part of the performance of *Cosi*, an Australian comedy that was written by Louis Nowra. Talking to a number of people that night, they said how important local theatre productions are not only for providing the opportunity for locals to develop their drama and theatre experiences but also in providing the opportunity for local people to attend an enjoyable fun night at a reasonable cost and not having to travel to Adelaide.

I know the state government puts some funding into the arts in our area, as indeed does the local council, and I am sure that that is money well spent. The reason why the Noarlunga Theatre Company is such a successful theatre company is due to the commitment of all the people who head up the board and do all the work behind the scenes in organising the plays, promoting them, looking after all the staging and so on. What has happened as a result of the Noarlunga Theatre Company is that a lot of young people have been given the opportunity to develop their creative talents together, which, hopefully, will further their opportunities to advance into full-time work in the arts and theatre. I believe that this theatre company has a big future. It already has a lot of scores on the board in our region. I am sure that if it continues to keep focused and it continues to get some support from the state government and the City of Onkaparinga it will do well in the future. Arts, tourism, the wine industry, the Tour Down Under and those sorts of events are all helping to develop our region both culturally and economically.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. When the five minute grievances were introduced into sessional orders and then into standing orders, they were regarded as classical grievances, namely, an opportunity for opposition members and backbenchers to state their griev-

ances before the grant of supply to the Crown by the parliament. Now we have the unusual situation in which a minister of the Crown grieves notionally against the government of which he is a part. Could I ask you, sir, whether the notion of grievances embraces ministers of the Crown?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Spence would be aware that, for as long as the chair can recall, the opportunity has been provided for ministers to participate in the grievance debate procedures and have talked about various issues.

Mr Atkinson: Such as?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not appropriate to have a debate about this; the member for Spence knows that. I am quite happy to talk to him about that privately. It is appropriate that the information the minister has brought to the House be raised through the grievance debate.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no reason why he should not.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Over the past few months, the issue of fireworks has been of major concern within the community. Quite frankly, it has created a great deal of misery for many thousands of people who live in either the metropolitan or rural areas of South Australia. It is true to say that we in the community have been driven to the point of despair over fireworks being let off at all hours of the day and night. My Torrens electorate office has been inundated with calls from hundreds of families who have just had enough of what has become a menace in our society. I know that the councils, the CFS and animal welfare organisations have also received hundreds of complaints from the public who have been protesting about the dangers of fire and the loss of their quality of life because of the improper and illegal use of fireworks that has kept them awake at night, driven their pets mad and also caused property damage.

Today, I presented a petition to the House signed by some 5 924 people, and many more are yet to be returned, because our community is sick and tired of the irresponsible use of fireworks. My colleague the member for Mitchell also presented a petition asking for a ban on the public use of fireworks, because he, too, no doubt like other members' offices in this place, has received numerous complaints. Clearly, the public is saying that enough is enough. It was reported that 23 bushfires were started by fireworks on New Year's Eve and that over 500 dogs around Adelaide suburbs fled in terror. Some pets were seriously injured, and some tragically killed, leaving their owners devastated; for example, Bronwyn and Steve Sinclair, whose pet Sabby was killed on the road because he was terrified and terrorised by fireworks.

During the Christmas period we heard that police seized three tonnes of illegal fireworks from shipping containers at Port Adelaide and that the number of illegal fireworks had mushroomed in Adelaide since 1995-96. It is clear that our community is genuinely concerned and it wants a ban on the public use of fireworks. Like others, I am very happy to support organised public displays put on by accredited pyrotechnicians and also those who are authorised to do so for cultural and religious purposes, because in general these events do not terrorise our community and are under pretty decent control.

Our problems have stemmed not just from the use of illegal fireworks but through the use of legally bought fireworks which have been used outside their permit hours.

Complaints from the public to the police and the council are ineffective, because we have insufficient resources to chase up the complaints and, as a result of this, many South Australians, particularly where it is happening consistently in their areas, are suffering a nightmare existence. This whole sorry saga has greatly eroded the quality of life for families. They often have to cancel social engagements because they have to stay home and look after their pets or they are concerned about property damage. People are starting to feel that they are losing their right to live freely and enjoy their quality of life.

Minister Lawson has said that the government would consider prohibiting the use of fireworks during the fire season. If that is the government's only position, it is clearly ignoring the wishes of the majority of the public who have been subjected to noisy and dangerous backyard displays. The fact is that a ban during the fire season will not resolve the noise pollution outside that time, and I do not think it will resolve it during the summer season, either.

The cost to our community is just too great when we add up the loss of quality of life, the property damage, the vet bills and the fines incurred when dogs escape their yards—costs that many people just cannot afford. Why should we have to bear those costs just to pay for somebody else's so-called pleasure? So, we are asking the minister to listen to the call. There will be many more petitions coming in. Listen and get rid of this menace within our community. As I have said, enough is enough.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I raise the matter of telecommunications facilities in residential areas. I draw to the attention of the House the fact that the local council in my constituency, the Mitcham council, is about to find itself embroiled in a very serious court dispute with Telstra over the issue of Telstra's insistence that it erect large transmitting stations and towers within my local community. That is simply not good enough.

On 30 June 2000, the Full Court ruled in the City of Marion v. Network Design Construction that a telecommunications facility was a transmitting station. This decision had wide-ranging implications on the telecommunications industry because most council development plans have listed transmitting stations as non-complying in residential zones and some non-residential areas. By reason of such a designation, most metropolitan councils have had the ability to properly control and manage such facilities in residential zones.

The City of Mitcham recently classified a telecommunications facility at 501 Goodwood Road, Colonel Light Gardens, as a transmitting station being non-complying based on the Full Court decision in the Marion case. Telstra then appealed the City of Mitcham's classification and the ERD Court recently dismissed the appeal and upheld the decision of the council in properly treating the application as non-complying. However, Telstra is to make a further appeal to the Full Court, with statewide implications. Telstra has put the council on notice that, should it lose the Full Court appeal, it is likely to appeal further to the High Court.

The Full Court decision that has been made is a common-sense and logical decision and provides planning authorities with appropriate control mechanisms to deal with mobile phone towers in residential areas. Members would be aware that, if a facility has special merit, it can still be approved as non-complying. Telstra seeks to challenge the Marion council Full Court decision and, if successful, it will substantially

erode a planning authority's ability to properly control such facilities, particularly in sensitive residential zones.

As the member for Waite, I want to make it clear to the House that my local community is very concerned about this issue of transmitting stations, and I am sure I am not alone in that. I am sure that many members here share both my concerns and those of my local community. Those concerns are many, but they focus on two key areas: first, the issue of safety and, secondly, that of amenity. In respect of safety, most sensible people and I acknowledge that the facts and the science of transmitting towers and the possible health implications are a little uncertain. Experts around the world have been working on this, and reports have been made. There is, however, sufficient doubt about the safety of these towers to be causing considerable stress and discomfort out in the community.

I hope that we do not find in 20 or 30 years class actions being taken against telecommunications companies (as we have seen in the case of smoking) on the basis of injuries occurring to people as a consequence of the erection of these towers in communities and general residential zones. I hope that we do not face a huge debacle in the years ahead when we suddenly discover that these towers are a serious problem.

I say to Telstra: these towers are not wanted in residential zones. The design of these towers can be adjusted to make them more pleasing to the eye, less of an obstruction and less objectionable. Some telcos are doing that. I suggest that they should have a market advantage, and that we should be saying to telcos: if you design these things sensitively, customers should support you.

Telstra risks community outrage and the community abandoning its products and services if its competitors can erect more amenable towers and facilities around the city and avoid residential zones. I say to Telstra: negotiate with councils (in particular, the Mitcham council) and listen to the people. I appeal to all members of the House to consult with their communities and to come together to try to seek an amicable resolution to this vexed problem.

Time expired.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I often speak in this House about the lack of response, or inappropriate response, of this government to the real problems facing South Australians, particularly in my constituency. I often refer to the funding crisis in our public schools, and this morning my focus was on arguing for the setting up of a select committee into the funding of our public hospital system.

However, this afternoon I want to draw attention to two other issues that are of concern to my constituency and the whole of the public of South Australia. I refer to the problems that we are having with our electricity system and police response times. I do this today because an event, which took place in my electorate quite recently in January, was a good illustration of the link between the problems that we are having in my electorate with the electricity supply and police response times. I am prompted to do so because of the comment in the House today of the Minister for Police when he referred to the 11 444 call centre and the way in which calls to the police for emergency assistance are handled.

On Saturday 13 January—I do not have the exact figure—I am told that more than 2 000 people attended a national race meeting at the Virginia speedway. At about 10 o'clock, just after one of the heats had been completed, there was a power blackout. Power blackouts are not new to my electorate. Since 1995, when I was newly elected, I have raised with the

government the severe problems that we have been having in the electorate of Taylor. In fact, I have lobbied hard for a more reliable power supply and, indeed, there have been upgrades to the power system. However, they have not been enough. In a way, members of my electorate have been quite smug about the rest of South Australia having to endure what they have had to deal with for quite some time, such as poor, unreliable feeders.

On this day, the blackout at this event lasted for 40 minutes. What happened was quite disturbing. An attempt was made to ring the emergency police number (000), because a large number of people were in darkness for 40 minutes; the situation involved high speed cars; people were trying to get out of the venue; and a number of children were running all over the place.

It was potentially a very threatening situation, so there was an attempt to call the police on the 000 number. The operator there tried seven times to call the 11 444 number. It was twice engaged, and it rang out completely on the following five attempts. The people at the track tried to call the 11 444 number. They were pressured because there were confused people in darkness. They had to hang up, and I understand that one of the organisers ended up ringing her son, who is an SES member, and he came out to erect emergency lighting.

Eventually, they got the police by ringing the Two Wells police station, which contacted the Elizabeth police, and they were the ones who attended. In darkness there were people on the gates with money, there were children, there were confused people, and it was just lucky that there were not speeding cars at the moment when the blackout struck, because that would have led to real disaster. The spokesperson for the police at Elizabeth said that there was a real possibility that the police attendance number could ring out after hours at peak times.

That is not news to many South Australians who have been in life-threatening situations and had these problems with the phone system, but that is an admission of a real problem, an urgent problem that must be addressed. This example is just one of the potentially life-threatening situations that can arise if both these issues are not handled quickly.

Time expired.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I wish to discuss two matters this afternoon. A few weeks ago I had the pleasure of attending the Cadell Prison to participate in a graduation ceremony, and I wanted to bring to the House the excellent way in which the management and staff are conducting rehabilitation courses at that prison. They have a system whereby a number of young offenders are given a 17 week course that provides them with social skills and skills necessary to participate in and become worthwhile citizens of the community.

I thought it was a very well-run program, well thought out, being implemented by staff who were enthusiastic, considerate and obviously had the interests and welfare of those people in the institution at heart. I would very much like to commend and congratulate them for the manner in which they conducted that program, which is ongoing. I was very pleased to have the opportunity to attend and observe the graduation, because I believe that the institution plays an important role in South Australia. It is also very important in that local community, and I believe that the people administering the prison set a fine example in prison administration,

and South Australia can be very pleased with the way in which they are carrying out their duties.

The other matter that I would like to discuss is my continuing concern about the attitude of certain unruly elements within society who have no regard for other people's property or persons and who have taken it upon themselves to disrupt elderly people's lives and generally to act in a thoroughly outrageous way towards sections of the community that have paid their taxes, have lived their lives and clearly, at this stage of their lives, want to be left in peace and quiet to get on with their lives with some dignity.

What concerns me is that with policing there appears to be an absolute obsession with traffic. On Monday in Port Augusta I observed two speed cops at one service station. What were they there for? Were they there to patrol the streets of Port Augusta in the evening after dark, to get after these villains, these gangs that are roaming the streets harassing and annoying decent people, or were they there to go out on the road to try to catch some unsuspecting motorist who may be doing 125 kilometres an hour on some of the best roads in South Australia?

Was that their purpose? Or was it to check their number-plates or some other trifling and nonsensical thing? I want to know. I will give another example. On Australia Day I attended a number of functions, and I had to go to Cockburn. I went into Yunta. There was one police car at a service station there, and one of these fellows with jodhpur sort of clothes on got out looking very unfriendly towards the community. He was generally observing people. To my surprise, just as we left, another police car arrived. There were two police cars in Yunta, yet only a very short time before that an elderly woman in Port Augusta was murdered in her home. If someone is doing 125 km/h on the Barrier Highway, what harm are they doing? They are doing no harm; it is a damn nonsense. It is an insult to people's intelligence that police are out there trying to book them. I do not care what anyone says; they will get public criticism while they are obsessed with writing out these damned tickets. In my view, there has been an abuse of the on-the-spot fine system, and my constituents have had enough of bloody villains and hobos running wild. They should be kicked up the backside.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You are a weak, vacillating fool, that's what you are. You haven't got the political courage to stand up to anything, and so we don't take any notice of you.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, sir. The member for Stuart has referred to me as a 'weak, vacillating fool,' which is unparliamentary. I take umbrage and I invite him to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The chair asks the member for Stuart to withdraw.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am quite happy to withdraw, Sir. I am surprised the honourable member would draw attention to it to have it recorded twice in *Hansard*.

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I bring up the 148th report of the committee, on the Women's and Children's Hospital Day Surgery Unit Redevelopment—Final Report, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

That the report be published.

Motion carried.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Police Superannuation Act 1990 and to make a related amendment to the Superannuation Act 1988. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This bill seeks to amend the *Police Superannuation Act 1990* by consolidating the superannuation arrangements for members of the schemes established under that Act, and the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme. The bill also seeks to make a number of minor technical amendments to the *Police Superannuation Act*, as well as to bring the structure of the invalidity provisions under the police pension scheme into conformity with the provisions applying to public servants under the *Superannuation Act 1988*.

Currently, police officers who are members of one of the two defined benefit schemes established under the *Police Superannuation Act*, are also members of the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme. The Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme was established in 1988 to provide a 3% of salary "productivity benefit" in the form of a superannuation benefit to police officers. The requirement for police officers to be members of two schemes creates unnecessary and additional administrative work, and confusion amongst members. This bill therefore seeks to merge the benefits of the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme into the two defined benefit schemes under the *Police Superannuation Act*. The amalgamation will simplify the superannuation arrangements for police officers, whilst at the same time maintaining the existing overall level of superannuation entitlements. For police pension scheme members, the amalgamation will not result in increased pension entitlements as the merged benefit will be maintained as a lump sum. The amalgamation will also result in no change in the current costs to Government.

This bill will also have no impact on those police officers who are members of the Triple S Scheme.

The *Police Superannuation Act* currently provides that all terminations of service after age 55 are taken to be retirements on account of age. This means that where a member terminates service on the grounds of invalidity after age 55, an age pension rather than an invalidity pension is payable. The current provisions disadvantage those officers who are forced to retire after age 55 due to an unexpected and serious deterioration in health. There is also evidence that some officers are bringing forward their invalidity retirement to gain the higher invalidity pension benefit payable before age 55. The bill therefore seeks to amend the Act to restructure the invalidity provisions in the police pension scheme so that officers can retire on the grounds of invalidity at any age up to age 60. The proposed amendment will make the invalidity provisions of the scheme consistent with the main State Pension Scheme for public servants.

An amendment is also proposed that will introduce a facility to enable members to make additional voluntary contributions. The facility will provide an option under which members may invest money in order to accumulate an additional superannuation benefit. The additional voluntary contributions made by members will not attract any matching employer money or benefit. Such a facility is already available in the main State Scheme for public servants, and the balance of the accumulated contributions and interest will only be available to members on the termination of service.

The other amendments being proposed in the bill deal with technical issues of the same kind recently addressed by amendments to the *Superannuation Act 1988*, in respect of the main State Scheme. For example, the amendments being made to Sections 14 and 15 of the Act relate to the proportions of benefits that the Fund can support. As these proportions are actuarially determined, the

Government believes the proportions should be based on the latest actuarial report and set by the Board rather than the Minister. The amendment to Section 40 is of a technical nature and will bring the original intention of the income assessment provision into conformity with actual Board practice. The amendment will enable the Board to assume a person's income from remunerative activities is received over a full financial year, thus providing an incentive for persons in receipt of an invalidity or retrenchment pension to seek part time or short term work. Section 43 is also being amended to provide that where a person becomes entitled to a pension on account of being at least 55 years of age, or a spouse becomes entitled to a pension on account of the death of the member, a guaranteed minimum amount will be paid as a benefit from the scheme. This amendment is the same as a recent amendment made to the *Superannuation Act*, and will provide for the minimum benefit to be equivalent to 4.5 years of pension less the value of any commutation paid as a lump sum. This "term certain" arrangement will enable simplification of the accounting arrangements, and provide greater certainty of entitlements to members, without any cost impact on the Government. The bill also contains a technical amendment to the *Superannuation Act* in relation to this same term certain provision, in order to maintain conformity between the provisions in the two Acts.

The Police Superannuation Board, the Police Association, and the Police Department have been fully consulted in relation to these amendments. All these bodies have indicated their support for the proposed amendments.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts new subsection (7a) into section 4 of the principal Act. The new subsection provides that a person whose employment terminates on invalidity in the circumstances referred to in the subsection will only be taken to have retired if he or she had reached the age of 60 years.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 10—The Fund

This clause makes amendments to section 10 of the principal Act that are consequential on the insertion of new Part 5A by clause 19.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 14—Payment of benefits

This clause amends section 14 of the principal Act so that a proportion (fixed by the Board) of a pension or lump sum payable under the Act will be charged against the contributor's contribution account. These provisions are similar to section 43A of the *Superannuation Act 1988*.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 15—Reports

This clause replaces subsection (4)(b) of section 15 of the principal Act. A similar amendment was made to the *Superannuation Act 1988* earlier this year.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 21—Retirement

This clause amends the formulas in section 21 of the principal Act to take account of the closure of the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme by new section 46A inserted by clause 23.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 22—Resignation and preservation

This clause amends the benefits provided on resignation by section 22 of the principal Act to compensate for the closure of the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 23—Retrenchment

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 25—Termination of Employment on invalidity

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 26—Death of contributor

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 28—Retirement

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 29—Retrenchment

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 31—Invalidity pension

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 32—Benefits payable on contributor's death

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 33—Benefits payable to contributor's estate

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 34—Resignation and preservation of benefits

These clauses amend the benefits provided by sections 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33 and 34 of the principal Act to compensate for the closure of the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme.

Clause 18: Insertion of s. 38A

This clause inserts new section 38A into the principal Act. This provision enables the saving of administrative costs by the closure of contribution accounts that do not need to be kept open. A similar provision (section 43AA) was inserted in the *Superannuation Act 1988* earlier this year.

Clause 19: Insertion of Part 5A

This clause inserts new Part 5A of the principal Act. This Part will enable an active contributor to the Scheme to invest additional money in superannuation benefits on terms and conditions determined by the Board. New section 38D provides for the keeping of accounts in the names of investors. Section 38E provides for the payment of benefits.

Clause 20: Amendment of s. 40—Effect of workers compensation, etc., on pensions

This clause amends section 40 of the principal Act to streamline the reduction or suspension of pensions because of the impact of workers compensation payments or income from remunerative activities.

Clause 21: Insertion of ss. 42A and 42B

This clause inserts two new sections that are similar to section 47A and 47B of the *Superannuation Act 1988*.

Clause 22: Amendment of s. 43—Repayment of balance in contribution account

This clause amends section 43 of the principal Act. Subsection (2) is replaced with a provision that guarantees the equivalent of at least 4.5 years of pension payments.

Clause 23: Insertion of s. 46A

This clause inserts new section 46A which terminates the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme. Where a contributor is entitled to preserved benefits under that Scheme when it is terminated by subsection (1), he or she will be entitled to an amount under subsection (2) in place of those benefits.

Clause 24: Insertion of s. 47A

This clause inserts new section 47A which provides for post retirement investment. The section is similar to section 47B of the *Southern State Superannuation Act 1994*.

Clause 25: Amendment of Superannuation Act 1988

This clause amends section 48(2) of the *Superannuation Act 1988*. This subsection and section 43(2) of the principal Act (replaced by clause 22) are similar. Improvements to the subsection in both Acts have been made by this Act.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

HAIRDRESSERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 November. Page 713.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Under the current Hairdressing Act, hairdressing means 'the washing, cutting, colouring, setting, permanent waving or other treatment of a person's hair or the massaging or other treatment of a person's scalp'. The bill amends the definition of hairdressing so that anyone can wash hair or massage scalps. This will enable massage practitioners or nurses to do these things without being in breach of the Hairdressing Act. To achieve this, the final portion of the definition I read is deleted.

The contentious part of the bill is that which establishes a scheme whereby people can apply to the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs to have their qualifications recognised even though they have not done the standard course in hairdressing by either studying at TAFE and doing work experience or by completing an apprenticeship together with lessons in hairdressing. Currently, there are reasonably stringent requirements in respect of the recognition of qualifications. It is what the Attorney-General would call 'negative licensing', namely, one cannot carry on the trade of hairdressing in South Australia unless one holds certain qualifications that are recognised in regulations. People who do not satisfy the regulations but who are otherwise competent can now apply to be a hairdresser if their qualifications are recognised by the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Affairs.

No cases under the act have been reported in the Law Society Judgment Scheme or the South Australian State Reports, so we are not quite sure what it is we are replacing

because that has not been judicially considered. The bill is said to be part of the government's 'comprehensive micro reform program to ensure competitive market outcomes for both consumers and business'. Not much has emerged from the reference group on the hairdressing trade. This is quite a small outcome to its deliberations. Nevertheless, the opposition would prefer apprenticeship to be the principal means of becoming a hairdresser. It regrets that now there are a lot of private colleges which qualify people to become hairdressers without going through the apprenticeship system or by attending TAFE, but the opposition concedes that that is an argument it lost some time ago. The opposition is now willing to acquiesce in the bill.

I should disclose that before I entered parliament I was Secretary of the Australian Hairdressers and Wigmakers Employees Association, and I am a member of the union which currently covers hairdressers, namely, the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association, and that will be apparent from the declaration in the register of pecuniary interests of the parliament, but I mention this in the debate.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, the Minister for Water Resources is right to say that I am concerned about this bill. I have looked into it quite diligently and consulted the relevant trade union, which I note the Attorney-General in another place confessed he did not do before bringing in these provisions.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister for Water Resources is out of his seat.

Mr ATKINSON: The Attorney makes the point that this discretion in the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is necessary because there cannot be mutual recognition of hairdressing qualifications in South Australia as some Australian states do not require qualifications for hairdressers. I say nothing about wigmakers on this occasion: I am addressing my remarks to only hairdressing. The Attorney points out that in the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory, Queensland and Victoria there is not regulation of the trade, whereas there is licensing or regulation in New South Wales, Western Australia and Tasmania. So, the Attorney says that, if a hairdresser comes from Victoria to South Australia, he or she will not have qualifications to be mutually recognised and, therefore, it is appropriate for the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Affairs to look at that hairdresser's background and to determine whether he or she should be certified as suitable to practise in South Australia. The opposition appreciates that argument.

Having said that, however, I point out that the opposition thinks that the review panel set up by the Office of Consumer Affairs laboured mightily to bring forth this mouse. The idea that, if the parliament of South Australia set up a scheme different from that proposed by the government, if we accepted the amendments of the Hon. Ian Gilfillan in another place that would have required regulations specifying what qualifications were necessary in order to be cleared to be a hairdresser in South Australia, we would somehow have competition payments withheld from the state of South Australia is, I think, drawing a long bow.

I would have thought that hairdressers would have some reservations about people who are not properly qualified being allowed to hold themselves out as hairdressers. It devalues the concept; it devalues the vocation of hairdressing. On the other hand, the market for hairdressing is consumer driven, and people who do not know what they are doing will

not be around for very long. With those remarks, the opposition reluctantly acquiesces in the second part of the bill.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I thank the member for Spence for his contribution.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr CLARKE: My question to the minister is prefaced somewhat along the lines of some of the concerns that the member for Spence has raised in terms of unqualified people acting as hairdressers. The member for Spence says that market forces might sort that out, simply because if they are a bad hairdresser no-one will go back to them. I do not have to particularly worry about a bad hairdresser. The difference between a good and a bad haircut to me is about three weeks, if that.

Mr Atkinson: You don't have a bad hair day.

Mr CLARKE: Exactly, as the member for Spence correctly points out. Of course, hairdressers do not simply cut a person's hair. The definition talks about cutting, colouring, setting, permanent waving—

Mr Atkinson: Shaving.

Mr CLARKE: Shaving, yes. The point is that a poorly qualified person, or a non-qualified person, attempting this work can create havoc with a client's hair. They handle chemicals for colour treatments of a person's hair, and so on. Treatments can affect the client's skin if it is not properly applied, or aggravate a condition that that person has.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I will just ensure that I never have the member for Spence as my hairdresser and let him practise with the scalpel as a hairdresser. Of course, another point about the consumer is that whereas it might cost me \$15 (which seems a bit redundant to give me a quick shear), for many women hairdressing costs are \$60 or \$70-plus (which is a considerable percentage of their earnings) and, if one fouls up their hairdo, they may not be able to afford to have it rectified for some weeks, or whatever, or they might be forced to have it rectified because they will suffer humiliation, or whatever, because of work or social obligations.

So I am concerned about this liberalisation of who can and cannot be a hairdresser. I am a bit of an old-fashioned type of person in the sense that, as a union representative of the old Apprenticeship Commission or the Industrial Commercial and Training Commission (as it then was), I prefer hairdressers to have gone through a formalised system of training before they are let loose on consumers.

My question to the Minister comes down to what qualifications the commissioner has for consumer affairs and what expertise do officers in his department have to be able to appropriately classify whether an unqualified person ought to be given approval by that department to act as a hairdresser? What yardstick will the commissioner use to say he believes that a person has appropriate qualifications or past experience to allow that person to work on somebody's head, or something of that nature? There are potential dangers in terms of health and safety; likewise, significant costs to consumers who do not want a botched up job through people being inappropriately qualified.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The commissioner already has a similar power in relation to a number of other professions.

The member for Ross Smith may not be aware, but the advice to me is that the commissioner already has similar powers in relation to the building contractors; land agents; conveyancers; and plumbers, gasfitters and electricians legislation. Like hairdressing, all of those are very important professions—

Mr Atkinson: And trades.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: And trades; professional trades in some cases, and others trade as professionals. The commissioner already has that discretion in relation to those areas, and under the act the commissioner has the opportunity to seek advice and do any research that he or she may wish to undertake to check the bona fides and experience—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That as well.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Well, we will see. It might be another reform. So, they can check and research in relation to the qualification, bona fides, experience, etc. National benchmarks are also in place for qualifications against which the commissioner can compare. This procedure is already used in at least five other areas of employment. It has worked quite well and we see it as a logical step in relation to the hairdressing trade. Of course, many other states do not necessarily have a qualification system, as the member for Spence has already pointed out in his contribution on behalf of the opposition. This allows people coming into a state, if they can convince the commissioner that they have the right skills and experience, to proceed to be a hairdresser.

Of course, there is another safety check. If someone seeks employment to work as a hairdresser with someone operating a hairdressing business, that employer would also do the checks, balances and look at the experience and qualifications of the person. So, there is a dual check in that circumstance. I make the point to the committee that at least another four or five areas are involved. Plumbing, building and conveyancing are all examples where one can go to the commissioner and, based on your experience, pick up a licence if the commissioner is convinced.

Mr CLARKE: With respect to those trades to which the minister refers, I can see that the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs could look at the type of work that a builder, for example, has done and say, 'Yes, that matches all the safety standards; that meets the quality of work that builders meet.' In terms of an electrician, or things of this nature, if a person has played around with power points for the past 25 years and has not electrocuted himself, herself, or anyone else, it is probably not a bad record with respect to being able to be licensed, even if a restricted licence is issued in those areas. Likewise with plumbing, and so on, there are identifiable yardsticks to be able to say, 'Yes, that person has the level of competence to be able to do the work.'

Hairdressing is a bit like viewing art, to a certain degree, because beauty is in the eye of the beholder. A particular person's hairstyle meets one person's criteria as being fine and acceptable but others might say, 'That's a very botched job', or whatever else it might be. What is the objective criteria upon which the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs will be able to rely to say, 'This hairdresser, although he or she has not gone through the apprenticeship system, is competent to be able to perform the range of tasks of a hairdresser and able to satisfy the consumer in terms of their getting value for their money'?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The commissioner will have the opportunity to contact previous employers. As an example,

if a hairdresser comes from interstate or from another country the commissioner could go to the previous employers and seek performance records. The commissioner is essentially checking on occupational health and safety issues, not necessarily whether a style is to his or her liking. The artistic quality is always in the eye of the beholder. The issue of occupational health and safety is the primary reason, I am advised. There is also the opportunity to contact complaint mechanisms in other jurisdictions. If there are industry bodies to which people can complain those records can be accessed. There is enough of a safety net within the system to provide adequate protection in this particular circumstance.

Mr CLARKE: My last point concerns the adequacy of the staffing levels within the consumer affairs department to be able to monitor and deal with consumer complaints. Within the past 12 months, I have had problems with respect to a building dispute that involved a constituent of mine. It concerned a repair job on a veranda that was knocked down in a car accident, and there was a dispute as to the appropriate price that should be paid by the person who damaged it in the first place, with the insurance company arguing for X dollars and the consumer saying it should be less.

When I approached the consumer affairs department to see whether it employed a builder or a person with building experience who could appraise the situation and give a fair summary as to the amount of time that would be required to effect the repairs, the type of material that was purchased and the like, the department's response was that it no longer employed people with such skills. I was told that my constituent would have to purchase some advice from another builder if he wanted to compare costs, like with like. My constituent receives a sole supporting parent benefit, and it cost in excess of \$200 to get another builder out to make an assessment as to whether or not the job done by the first builder with respect to the hours he alleged he spent doing the work was fair and reasonable.

In terms of consumers who have problems with a hairstyle and believe that the work that has been carried out on them is less than satisfactory and below the standard of what one could have expected from a qualified person approved by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, will the commissioner have on staff qualified people who are able to make an assessment as to whether or not the professional competence of the person in question is up to scratch? Alternatively, will it be left to the consumer, such as my constituent in the building instance I gave, to go to another registered hairdresser, get an appraisal as to whether or not the job was done professionally, pay for that service and then try to recover the moneys from the person who was approved by the Consumer for Commissioner Affairs for a price of \$60 or \$70?

It becomes an issue where the consumer gives up, saying that it is not worth trying to enforce their rights because it is just too costly and too time consuming. These are the things that the department should have on tap to be able to resolve these issues appropriately and quickly.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am advised that two industry bodies are available to try to resolve complaints.

Mr Clarke: And they will do it for free, will they?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am unclear as to whether there is a cost for that service. I am advised that, between 1 January 1996 and 1 March 2001, there have been only 39 complaints. So, over a four-year period there have been fewer than 10 complaints a year. Staffing is a matter for the commissioner but I doubt whether the commissioner would take on a full-time staff member on the basis that there are only

10 complaints per year in the industry. The commissioner always has the power to seek advice if that is the commissioner's wish. There is an industry complaint mechanism and then there is the commissioner to fall back on after that.

Mr ATKINSON: Under the national competition principles, there was a possibility that the state government could have deregulated hairdressing altogether. I must say that I was pleased that the government was willing to maintain a negative licensing regime because there was a requirement for some regulation to minimise the risks to public health and the risk of substandard work.

I take the point of the member for Ross Smith that there is a very high cost to consumers in this area in enforcing their legal rights. If a perm or colouring goes wrong, the cost of that is comparatively small and therefore the consumer will be unlikely to get any satisfactory remedy, so it was important to maintain some kind of regulation instead of going to a completely deregulated market like we have in four of the Australian jurisdictions now. So the opposition is thankful for small mercies in this area.

Could the minister, who mentioned in response to a question from the member for Ross Smith that there were two industry bodies that could resolve complaints in this area, advise the committee what is the coverage of hairdressers by those industry organisations? What percentage of hairdressers are covered by those industry associations and what are the names of those two industry associations? Is he including the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association? What is the cost of a consumer making a complaint about a particular hairdressing service to either or both of those organisations?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I thank the member for Spence for his question. I am advised that the two associations are the Men's Hairdressing Association and the Hair and Beauty Industry Employers Association.

Mr Atkinson: Much the bigger, I believe.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Much the bigger, the member for Spence believes. I do not have before me numbers involved in those associations, so I will ascertain that number and advise the member for Spence in due course. It should be noted that, because of the negative licensing system, as I am sure the member for Spence understands, there is less organisation in negative licence industries, because there tends to be not a lot of membership lists and so on as it is a negative licensing system rather than a proactive licensing system, and that is why the industry tends to be more fractured than other industries and not have one central group. I hope that is of some benefit to the member for Spence.

Mr Atkinson: The cost?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I will establish whether there is a cost to go to either of those associations and will bring back a reply.

Clause passed.

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

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

Motion carried.

Clause 4.

Mr CLARKE: I have some questions under the heading 'Appeals' in new section 4B, which reads:

An applicant for a determination may appeal to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court against a determination of the commissioner refusing the application.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: It is an interesting point that the member for Spence makes. I am interested to know whether the District Court is the appropriate place for an appeal to be heard. I assume it is before a judge of the District Court.

An honourable member: You would be right.

Mr CLARKE: Therefore, some significant costs would be involved in an applicant making an appeal, and there would also be the risk of having the Crown's costs awarded against that person in the event that they were unsuccessful. It seems to me that perhaps the District Court is too high a court to hear such an appeal and that it might be more appropriately dealt with in the Magistrates Court or some other jurisdiction where an applicant can represent themselves without the need for lawyers and where, indeed, the Crown would not need practising lawyers to represent it. It seems to me that it ought to be a reasonably simple process of appeal whereby an independent person can ensure that the commissioner has accorded natural justice to the applicant and has used a proper range of objective tests to establish whether the applicant meets the criteria involved. An applicant should not be fearful of making an appeal against the commissioner's decision because of costs.

Therefore, I ask why the District Court has been chosen as the appeal forum and whether the government considered a less formal jurisdiction, perhaps such as the Magistrates Court or, indeed, maybe an arm of the Industrial Relations Commission in South Australia which deals with similar things on a regular basis, in order to prevent legal technicalities getting in the way of natural justice and the merits of the case.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The reason the government chose the District Court is that it has the Administrative and Disciplinary Division which is specifically set up to deal with occupational licensing appeal matters and disciplinary matters. Therefore, for consistency, because of the court's experience in that field, that is where appeals will go.

Mr CLARKE: Are lawyers excluded from representing parties in that division, or are they allowed to be there? Also, are costs awarded, and are they awarded according to the normal schedule under the Supreme Court rules?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The advice given to me is that lawyers are able to represent parties. On the matter of allocation of costs, I would have to have that clarified and forward it on.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WATER RESOURCES (RESERVATION OF WATER) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Water Resources Act 1997. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Water Resources (Reservation of Water) Amendment Bill 2001* addresses a very significant reform for water resources

management in South Australia. At the heart of the reform is the capacity for the Government to reserve an amount of water in those prescribed areas where it is thought appropriate to do so for strategically important economic development or environmental purposes.

It will do so in a framework established through the proposed amendments that ensures the integrity of sustainable levels of resource allocation and protection of existing users' rights.

It is intended that the Government will release water held in reserve under limited circumstances, the requirements for which will be set out in a notice published in the *Gazette* by the Governor. It is intended that the guiding principle for any water released by the Government from the reserve is that it will be leased at prevailing market rates.

Each quarter, a notice in the *Gazette* will be published to detail any allocations made from the reserve. This, together with the publication in the notice of the requirements for access to an allocation from the reserve and the lease of that water at prevailing market rates, will ensure maximum transparency and accountability for the allocation process without affecting the water trading market.

The proposed amendments will enable the Government to reserve water, if it is considered appropriate to do so, in any of the State's prescribed water resources. However, most of the currently prescribed resources are already either fully allocated or are close to fully allocated and the opportunity to reserve water in those resources either does not exist or is limited.

The prescribed water resources of the South East are an exception and it is intended to immediately apply the provisions of this amendment to hold in reserve the remaining unallocated water of those management zones in the five prescribed wells areas in the South East where less than 20 per cent of the available water remains unallocated.

This will assist in meeting several objectives at the same time.

Firstly, the proposed amendments are significant in their own right, in that they enable the Government to exercise strategic control over the appropriate use of a proportion of the State's water resources that are available for use on a sustainable basis.

At the same time, it establishes an opportunity for a prudent and precautionary approach to resolving some of the outstanding and very complex water allocation issues currently being faced in the South East without exacerbating the potential problem through the further allocation of the remaining unallocated water under the terms of the water allocation plan.

In particular it will allow further time to address the complex matter of the impact of land use change on recharge and water availability.

Members will be aware that this is a critical issue in the South East.

On 30 November last year I foreshadowed legislation to address this issue. I informed the House that I would firstly consult with the community in the South East and other stakeholders. I did this. During January I held consultations with the various industry groups, local government and the general community in Mount Gambier, Penola and here in Adelaide. This exhaustive consultation built upon discussions I had already held with groups and local Members of Parliament from the South East.

On 27 February this year I provided the House with a report on the outcomes of those discussions. I indicated then that there are some further issues that need to be looked into, in response to the stakeholder and community concerns. In particular the forestry industry will be confirming its strategic plans for development in the South East and some further scientific investigation and technical work will be undertaken.

To better understand both this Bill and future Government strategy it is worthwhile recording some further remarks concerning the consultation process.

While, as has previously been said, there remains some areas of disagreement, areas of consensus are no less important.

There was unanimous agreement that water should be managed in a sustainable way recognising that there are a range of bona fide interests in water including urban use, environment flows, and agricultural and industry use.

A number of other points were also generally agreed:

- (a) that the rights of existing users should be preserved so long as they are accountable for the use in volumetric terms and that 'best practice' is being progressively adopted;
- (b) that it is desirable to stimulate economic development by encouraging efficient water use and making available

unallocated water as either share entitlements or extraction entitlements based on an approved development plan;

- (c) that the Government should ensure that the cost of holding unused water allocations is significant enough to encourage use. On this matter various views were put and, while there was consensus that there should be a level of payment, the appropriate level is disputed;
- (d) that as a matter of urgency all scientific data as it relates to local ground water systems needs review, an identification made and an investigation undertaken of all data gaps. The Government has acted on this view and on the 27th of February 2001 the commitment of \$300 000 was announced to ensure that this matter is brought to a satisfactory conclusion;
- (e) that a forestry strategy must be developed as a matter of highest priority so that the change of land use issues as they impact on the water cycle might then be brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

Water resources available for allocation in many of the at-risk management areas in the South East have not yet been fully allocated. It is therefore prudent to reserve the remaining unallocated water to assist in any subsequent adjustment to the volume of water available for use from the aquifer, should that become necessary as a result of land use change, in particular forestry. This would minimise the likelihood of further land use changes affecting existing users.

At the same time it would be imprudent not to provide the Government with some flexibility to allocate this water to bona fide purposes where the consequence of not providing access to water might jeopardise the government's economic development objectives for regional South Australia.

Importantly too, reservation of water by the Government will stimulate the market for water in the South East. By holding water in reserve the water available for allocation will have been effectively allocated, either to existing licensees or to the Government through the reserve.

Whereas currently, proponents seeking access to water can be granted an allocation free of charge provided that the requirements of the water allocation plan are met, where a hundred, through the proposed mechanism, now becomes fully allocated, they would now be required to either obtain an allocation through the market from existing licensees or from the government's reserve. In either case, the proponents would be paying the appropriate market rate.

It is intended that the strategic water reserve would be available for allocation to proponents only after they have first made serious efforts to obtain their required allocation through the market and can demonstrate that the market has failed to meet their needs.

In presenting this Bill, I provide the opportunity for members to debate and move such changes as they see fit.

I acknowledge that the Government's position, as currently represented in the Bill, may not present a final solution to the two difficulties as identified by the conference of Houses last year. The Government has been unable to come up with a solution as quickly as previously expected, however the Government will continue to work as expeditiously as possible for a legislative solution to those two problems.

This Bill, as presented however is important in that it ensures that the resource is not allowed to decline further while additional refinements are suggested to the legislation now before the Parliament.

The proposed amendments are therefore significant and timely. I commend the bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Insertion of Part 5A

This clause inserts new Part 5A into the principal Act. If the excess water in a water resource is 20 per cent or less of the water available for allocation, new section 44B will enable the Minister to reserve the excess water in a water resource from further allocation either at all or subject to restrictions. The restrictions will be set out in a notice by the Governor published in the *Gazette* and further restrictions can be included by the Minister in the notice reserving the water (*see* section 44B(2)(c)). Section 44C sets out provisions that apply to the allocation of reserved water that do not apply to the allocation of water generally. Section 44D provides that restrictions on the allocation of water will be set out in a notice published in the *Gazette* by the Governor. Section 44E requires the Minister to keep

the public informed of allocations of reserved water by quarterly notices published in the *Gazette*.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 142—Right of appeal

This clause amends section 142 of the principal Act. The new paragraph inserted by this clause specifically provides for an appeal to the Environment, Resources and Development Court where the Minister refuses an application for a water allocation. However an appeal in respect of the refusal of an allocation of reserved water is excluded.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.07 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 13 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27 February 2001

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SCHOOL CARD

3. **Ms KEY:** What number and proportion of students at each of the following schools received School Cards during 2000—Black Forest Primary, Cowandilla Primary, Goodwood Primary, Heathfield High, Linden Park Primary, Marryatville High, Mitcham Primary, Nuriootpa High, Plympton Primary, Richmond Primary, Rose Park Primary, Stirling East Primary, Warriappendi, William Light R-12 and Yankalilla Area?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Further to my response printed in *Hansard* on 8 December 2000 I now provide the 2000 School Card figures for the requested schools.

School	No. of students (Feb. 2000 census)	No. of approved School Card students 2000	Proportion of School Card students
Black Forest Primary	524	122	23.3%
Cowandilla Primary	162	121	74.7%
Goodwood Primary	186	53	28.5%
Heathfield High	718	144	20.1%
Linden Park Primary	542	80	14.8%

Marryatville High	1 074.4	170	15.8%
Mitcham Primary	430	66	15.3%
Nuriootpa High	923.3	192	20.8%
Plympton Primary	287	101	35.2%
Richmond Primary	153	65	42.5%
Rose Park Primary	414	71	17.1%
Stirling East Primary	362	45	12.4%
Warriappendi	40	20	50.0%
William Light R-12	671.6	255	38.0%
Yankalilla Area	366.5	32	8.7%

GOVERNMENT CREDIT CARDS

5. **Ms WHITE:**

1. What are the names and positions of all staff in the Department of Education, Training and Employment who have access to and use of government credit cards, what was the total spent on each card in 1999-2000 and how much related to travel, accommodation and entertainment?

2. What are the names, positions and salaries of all staff engaged in the head office Partnerships 21 implementation team and what are the details of all interstate and overseas travel undertaken by team officers during 1999-2000 including the date, destinations, cost and purpose of travel?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. Departmental systems do not record the title of each cardholder. To compile a list of all cardholders and their titles would require significant additional administrative effort.

2. The attached table lists the names, positions and salaries of all staff of the Partnerships 21 implementation team, along with any interstate and overseas travel undertaken by any of these staff members.

Partnerships 21 Taskforce—Interstate and Overseas Travel (July 1999-June 2000)

Name	Position	Salary	Destination	Date	Purpose	Cost (Travel and Accommodation)
Paul Kilvert	Director	\$104 000	Alice Springs	27/3/00 – 28/3/00	To conduct P21 workshops for all Anangu Schools	\$913
			Edmonton, Canada	23/5/99 – 3/6/99	As leader of an 8 person study group of principals and superintendents to investigate the system of local management in the Edmonton Public Schools system.	\$3 426 (meals paid for privately)
Terry Sizer	Superintendent	\$81 526	Alice Springs	26/3/00 – 29/3/00	To conduct P21 workshops for all Anangu Schools	\$1083
			Edmonton, Canada	23/5/99 – 3/6/99	As a member of an 8 person study group of principals and superintendents to investigate the system of local management in the Edmonton Public Schools system.	\$3 426 (meals paid for privately)
Bronte Stuart	Superintendent	\$81 526	Alice Springs	27/3/00 – 29/3/00	To conduct P21 workshops for all Anangu Schools	\$998
Helen Tunbridge	Superintendent	\$81 526	Brisbane	26/9/99 – 29/9/99	To attend the Australasian Association of Senior Educational Administrators Conference	This trip was not funded from the Partnerships 21 budget
Debbie Graham	Superintendent	\$81 526	New Zealand	23/6/00 – 30/6/00	Annual Australian Primary Principals Association Conference.	During this period, Ms Graham was released from duty from Partnerships 21 to attend the conference but the travel and accommodation was not funded by P21.

The following officers did not undertake any travel:

Name	Position	Salary
Christopher Charlesworth	Executive Officer	\$81 526
James Davies	Superintendent	\$81 526
Robert Heath	Superintendent	\$81 526
Ruth Jones	Superintendent	\$81 526
Nicholas Williams	Superintendent	\$81 526
Michael Sinkunas	Manager	\$70 103
Wendy Benton	Project Officer	\$58 144
Robin Soyland	AS03	\$38 551
Jacqui Wathen	AS02	\$33 462
Natasha Burton	AS01	\$25 128

KOALAS

7. **Mr HILL:** How many koalas on Kangaroo Island have been sterilised under the government's sterilisation scheme, what is the island's current koala population and what was it prior to the scheme, how much has the scheme cost and how much additional funding will be required to make the population sustainable?

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

As at the end of June 2000, a total of 3437 koalas had been sterilised.

In 1994, the koala population was estimated at 3 000-5 000. More recent information suggests this was underestimated and the Kangaroo Island koala population is more likely to be higher than the earlier estimate.

The management program, known as *Koala Rescue*, began in January 1997. An initial budget of \$635 000 was provided from the state and commonwealth governments for the period January 1997 to June 1998. A further \$600 000 has been provided by the state government to June 2001.

PESTICIDES

11. **Mr CLARKE:**

1. What pesticides were the EPA – Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed Protection office referring to in their October 2000 background information brief as being detected in the Happy Valley, Millbrook, Warren South Para and Barossa Reservoirs in the past 12 months and have other reservoirs been tested for pesticide contamination and if so, what are the results?

2. With respect to inappropriate pesticide application; as referred to in page 2 of the background document:

- what was the quantity and concentration of pesticides used;
- what was the level of use which was not compliant with registration and instructions on the pesticide label; and
- was there a failure of government employees or spraying contractors to follow industry best practice and the national code of best practice?

3. What initiatives are currently being planned and implemented to strengthen and improve coordination between government departments and stakeholders; as referred to in page 3 of the same background document?

4. What are the details of the range of initiatives for 'Industry Systems' the government is undertaking; as referred to in page 7 of the background document under 'Use of Pesticides'?

5. What is the precise methodology and frequency of the current water quality testing program with particular regard to pesticides, which pesticides are tested for and what common agricultural, commercial and domestic pesticides, if any, are not tested?

6. Which pesticides are tested for under the Adelaide Hills Catchment Testing Program?

7. With respect to the Mt. Bold Reservoir Weed Management Program, what are the:

- main pesticides and combinations of pesticides used;
- quantity of pesticides used in each of the past three financial years;
- frequency of spraying and any other form of application; and
- success or otherwise of the program?

8. What measures, if any, are taken by government agencies and their spraying contractors to avoid water contamination by pesticides when weeds covering the banks of the Onkaparinga River and River Torrens and tributaries are subject to spraying?

9. What are the government's current and proposed initiatives to educate, regulate, control and monitor pesticide use by government and local government bodies?

10. Has the minister sought and received assurances from the Department of Primary Industries and Resources that they will

ensure rigorous, impartial and objective surveillance and control of pesticides in the Adelaide Hills catchment area and elsewhere in South Australia and if not, why not?

11. Will the Minister ensure that a fully researched and documented bottom line data base is established that will accurately describe:

- volume, type, frequency of use and method of application of pesticides used in the Adelaide Hills catchment area; and
- volume and types of pesticides used by the full range of users in the catchment area?

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

1. The October 2000 background information brief issued by the EPA Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed Protection Office referred to the detection of the pesticides Atrazine, Simazine and Hexazinone. Testing of reservoir waters is the responsibility of SA Water; that agency has advised that all water supply reservoirs in the Mount Lofty Ranges are regularly analysed for herbicides. This monitoring has not found any other pesticide contamination during 1999 or 2000.

2. A wide variety of pesticides are used across rural industry, and domestically, within the Mount Lofty watershed. The quantities or concentrations of pesticides used and information regarding the manner of use is not available.

Where reservoir contamination of particular significance has occurred, such as that detected in the Warren, South Para and Barossa reservoirs in 1998, investigations can lead to discovery of a potential source for the contamination. Investigations at that time found the source to be a granular forestry herbicide applied by Forestry SA to new pine trees during their establishment phase in the Mt Crawford Forest area in May 1998. The method, timing and rate of herbicide application by Forestry SA contractors was in accordance with the label instructions as approved by the National Registration Authority.

3. A number of state government agencies, local government and statutory authorities are actively involved in programs in the Mount Lofty Ranges, contributing to integrated environmental management objectives. These include the Department for Environment and Heritage (DEH) through the EPA, Primary Industries and Resources SA (PIRSA), Planning SA, the Department of Human Services, the Department of Water Resources, SA Water, local councils, catchment water management boards (CWMBs), soils boards, the Mount Lofty Ranges Catchment Program Board and animal and plant control boards (APCBs), and the Australian Water Quality Centre (AWQC). These bodies liaise closely with one another on a wide variety of issues and collaborate on a number of specific programs and projects, contributing specialist expertise, and human and financial resources.

4. The Industry systems initiatives referred to in the background document are indicators of initial key focus areas for the Watershed Protection Office.

5. SA Water tests for pesticides in its water supply systems as part of a comprehensive water quality monitoring program. Pesticide monitoring is based on a risk-based approach. A routine program of monthly frequency at key SA Water locations is supplemented by an event-based program which can be triggered by significant rain events in catchments, by detections of pesticides or by knowledge of an incident that may represent a risk of contamination. If significant risks are indicated, the frequency of routine monitoring may be increased commensurate with those risks.

In the event that pesticides are detected, SA Water looks to the EPA to lead an investigation to determine the cause of contamination and oversee remediation of the cause. SA Water supports the collection of targeted event-based samples in upper catchments as a tool to identify the specific causes of water quality problems.

Pesticide monitoring is based on information available on usage in the catchments and taking into consideration the potential health and environmental impacts.

The pesticides monitored by SA Water are categorised as organochlorine pesticides and organophosphorus & triazine pesticides.

6. The Torrens Catchment Water Management Board has an ambient monitoring program that includes testing for total insecticides (specifically Dieldrin) and total herbicides (including Atrazine, Simazine and Dacthal).

The Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board conducts a similar program.

7. The following information has been provided by SA Water with respect to the Mount Bold Reservoir weed management program:

- (a) the main pesticides used in 1999-2000 are Glyphosate, Trounce, Biactive, and Brush off
- (b) the quantity of pesticides used in each of the past three financial years are:

	1999-2000	1998-99	1997-98
Glyphosate (litres)	80	28	200
Trounce (173g packs)	556	272	4430
Biactive (litres)	157	100	40
Brush off (grams)	1558	335	920
Simazine (litres)	0	0	20
Garlon (litres)	0	6	0

It is of note that no Simazine has been used in the catchment since the Environment Protection Authority direction in February 1999.

- (c) Spraying is generally carried out annually.
- (d) The Animal and Pest Plant Board has acknowledged the success of the program.

8. The current policy and practice of Government agencies and their spraying contractors to avoid water contamination by pesticides during spraying of weeds on the banks of rivers is that only 'Roundup Bioactive' (Glyphosate 360) is used in such circumstances. Glyphosate 360 is recognised as the lowest risk herbicide available for broad application.

9. State and local government agencies are subject to the same regulatory requirements as all other pesticide users and are involved in educational and monitoring programs. These agencies are frequently leaders in the application of new and improved application technology and appropriate choice of pesticide.

10. The Department of Primary Industries and Resources SA (PIRSA) is cooperating with the Department for Environment and Heritage and other partnership bodies in a variety of programs and special projects focussing on improved land management, integrated natural resource management and improved management of pesticides in the Mount Lofty Ranges, including the Mount Lofty Ranges Catchment Program and the Pesticide Use in the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed project.

PIRSA Farm Chemicals Branch is presently working with the EPA and local government to address specific chemical trespass matters and it is anticipated that PIRSA will be a partner in developing measures to address these issues in the future.

11. The diverse range of users and purposes for which pesticides are used make it impracticable to establish a database of pesticide use such as is proposed in the question.

Rather, the government is developing a strategic approach including education and awareness raising programs and the application of auditing processes for chemical spray contractors.

Work undertaken as part of the Pesticide Use in the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed project aims to identify the different user groups and outline the major chemicals that are being used by these groups.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION CONCESSIONS

17. **Mr HILL:**

1. Does the government intend extending motor vehicle registration concessions to the long term unemployed and if not, why not?

2. What would be the total value of these concessions to all persons unemployed for 12 or more months?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. A pensioner concession benefit was first introduced into the Motor Vehicles Act in 1970. Entitlement to the benefit is dependent on the owner of the vehicle being the holder of a pensioner concession card issued under the law of the commonwealth, or a State Concession Card issued by the Department of Human Services that entitles the holder to reduced fares on public transport.

The pensioner concession benefit (age, disability support, sole parent and carer pensions) was provided in the expectation that the long term status of the owner was not likely to change during the currency of the vehicle's registration. This may not be the case for some other owners, for example people receiving a Newstart or Youthstart allowance, which is the reason why successive governments have never extended the concession to people who are unemployed.

As the member would be aware, there are currently a range of concessions available on the registration of motor vehicles and on drivers' licences. The revenue forgone from the Highways Fund as a result of pension related concessions is approximately \$8 million per annum.

The pensioner concession benefit also provides owners with an exemption from stamp duty on the renewal certificate for Compulsory Third Party (CTP) insurance, which would otherwise be paid into the Hospitals Fund. The revenue forgone from the Hospitals Fund, as a result of the exemption from the payment of stamp duty on CTP renewal certificates, is in the region of \$5 million per year.

The introduction of additional registration concessions would represent a further reduction in revenue to the Highways Fund (which is used in the construction and maintenance of roads)—or would need to be recovered through an increase in the registration charge and the CTP stamp duty from all other vehicle owners.

2. Information provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) indicates that there are some 35 000 people currently receiving the Newstart or Youthstart allowance in South Australia. However, from the information held by the ABS, Centrelink and State agencies, it has not been possible to identify the people who have been receiving the Newstart or Youthstart allowance for 12 months or more and hold a driver's licence or own a motor vehicle.

VEGETATION CLEARANCE

18. **Mr HILL:** What action has the Minister or the Native Vegetation Council taken in relation to illegal clearance of vegetation associated with the construction of a drainage scheme at Bonney's Camp and will prosecutions be pursued and if not, why not?

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

The Native Vegetation Council approved a management plan for the clearance of the proposed drain route through Bonney's Camp on the understanding that this was the only logical route available within the time span of the Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Mitigation Scheme. The plan approved the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board, or its agent, clearing the route. Conditions on rehabilitation and management of the vegetation associated with the proposed drain were placed upon the plan. The placement of a drain through Bonney's Camp has consent of the owners, Wetlands and Wildlife.

The Department for Environment and Heritage has investigated concerns of illegal clearance. Although the clearance on the ground did not entirely match the plan alignment, the overall clearance was not significantly greater than was specified in the plan. Approval for the use of the Bonney's Camp route was given by Wetlands and Wildlife. Moreover, the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board has responsibility for management of the drain construction, including rehabilitation works, to minimise impacts on biodiversity.

29. **Mr HILL:**

1. How many applications were made to the Native Vegetation Council in 1999-2000 for permission to clear land of native vegetation?

2. What was the outcome of these applications, how much land was approved to be cleared and how many trees were removed?

3. How many of the applications involved vineyard development?

4. How many allegations of illegal clearance were received reported to the Council in 1999-2000, how many were investigated and how many prosecutions were made?

5. What auditing of heritage agreement land is made by the Council to ensure compliance with the agreements?

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

1. 183 applications were assessed during 1999-2000.

2. Of the 183 applications assessed, 136 applications were determined with a further seven deferred for further information. Forty applications were either withdrawn by the landowner or considered to be exempt following assessment by the Department for Environment and Heritage.

Consent was granted to six applications for brush and wood-cutting over 719.5 hectares. It is anticipated that these areas will regenerate over time. Fifteen hectares were refused clearance consent over these same six applications.

130 applications were determined allowing the clearance of 5 949 scattered trees over 4 350 hectares and 845 hectares of scrubland.

3. Twenty-nine applications for vineyard development.

4. 141 reports of illegal clearance were received and investigated with prosecution proceeding with 13 of these cases.

5. The Department for Environment and Heritage has in conjunction with the Natural Heritage Trust employed a number of Bush Management Advisers now located in regional centres. One of their main responsibilities is establishing and maintaining contact with

Heritage Agreement landowners to discuss management of these important areas.

Within this framework the Council has over the last few years established an annual call to Heritage Agreement landowners for grants to assist in the management of these blocks.

Currently, regional staff are as part of their work requirements asked to contact all Heritage Agreement landholders within their regions at least once a year, and visit a third of those same Heritage Agreement areas personally with the landowner and/or manager.

NATIONAL PARKS, MANAGEMENT PLANS

32. Mr HILL:

1. How many national parks, conservation parks and reserves have completed management plans, how many have draft plans and how many parks are without?

2. How long will it take to complete management plans for all parks and what is the estimated cost of achieving this?

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

1. Currently the Department for Environment and Heritage administers 316 reserves proclaimed under one of either the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, the Wilderness Protection Act 1992, or the Crown Lands Act 1929. Of that total, 119 reserves have gazetted management plans. There is one reserve for which a draft management plan is currently on public exhibition and an additional 14 reserves whose management plans have been through public exhibition and are being processed to finality. There are a further 22 reserves with management plans in the early stages of preparation. The remaining 160 reserves do not have management plans in any of these categories.

2. The current annual budget allocated to the management planning program is \$160 000. If every reserve required a reasonably detailed management plan, it is estimated that, based on a production rate of around 16 gazetted management plans each year, it would take approximately 10 years to achieve a situation where all reserves have formally gazetted management plans. Ignoring inflation, the estimated cost to achieve that end point would be approximately \$1.6 million. However, the department recognises that individual reserves have variable need for management plans. The remaining reserves without management plans are being examined as to their need for attention and planning work will continue to be undertaken on a priority basis.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

37. **Mr ATKINSON:** Which Adelaide suburbs and other areas of the state were blacked out:

(a) on the evening of 1 November, on what criteria were they chosen and by whom; and

(b) during this year owing to interruptions of full electricity supplies from interstate?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

(a) The South Australian transmission entity, ElectraNet SA, has advised that the following areas were affected by the rotational load shedding requested by the National Electricity Market Management Company (NEMMCO) on 2 November 2000 in response to generation shortfalls brought about by industrial activity in Victoria: Cheltenham, Croydon Park, Kilburn, Kilkenny, Port Adelaide North, Kilburn South, Prospect, New Richmond, Thebarton, Tonsley Park, Playford and Brinkworth.

When required to be undertaken under the rules of the National Electricity Market (embodied in the National Electricity Code) in response to a major electricity system disturbance, load shedding is managed in South Australia by the local transmission entity, ElectraNet SA, acting as agent of the market operator, NEMMCO. Load shedding is conducted in accordance with an established schedule of load shedding priorities, approved by the State's electricity planning body, the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council.

Load shedding is generally undertaken so as to avoid significant impacts on industry and essential services. Furthermore, on each occasion, standard practice is to avoid individual suburbs being impacted by load shedding for more than an hour at a time. Load shedding events are also rotated over time so as to avoid multiple impacts on the same areas on consecutive occasions. Whilst there may have been local

network difficulties in some areas, load shedding was rotated on 2 November 2000 in accordance with this practice, with individual substations affected by load shedding for periods of no longer than approximately half an hour.

(b) The only other instance of widespread load shedding resulting from interruptions of the Victorian interconnect during 2000 occurred on 3 February as a result of extreme demand conditions and industrial activity affecting generation in Victoria. I am advised by ElectraNet SA that the following areas were impacted, for periods ranging up to 45 minutes: Campbelltown, Cudmore Park, Kent Town, Kingswood, Lower Mitcham, North Unley, Panorama, Seacombe, Harrow, Linden Park, Magill, Northfield, Ascot Park, Clarence Gardens, Happy Valley, Morphett Vale East, Norwood, Sheidow, Glenelg North, Keswick, Morphettville, Oaklands, Plympton, Athol Park, Findon, Flinders Park, Fulham Gardens, Henley South, Keith, Kingcraig, Mount Barker, Blackpool, Croydon, Glanville, Largs North, Port Adelaide, Queenstown and Woodville.

BEECHWOOD BOTANIC GARDENS

39. **Mr HILL:** Is the Beechwood Botanic Gardens available for private hire and if so, what are the charges and were they let out for private use during 1998-99 and 1999-2000 and if so, when and for what purpose?

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

Beechwood Heritage Garden is available for private hire. Currently, the cost is \$750 for 3 hours for a wedding or \$600 for 3 hours for wedding photographs.

The garden was hired out for a total of seven times in 1998, eight times in 1999 and seven times in 2000.

As provided for by the indenture agreement between the Board of the Botanic Gardens and the house owner, the garden has also been used for private functions.

HMAS HOBART REEF

40. **Mr HILL:** What effect will the proposed HMAS *Hobart* Reef have on fish population and behaviour in the area, will the reef make it easier for recreational fishers and will the minister designate the area as a marine park?

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

Artificial reefs do not necessarily increase the total number of fish available, despite providing shelter and food. Studies of artificial reefs worldwide have found that they act more as fish aggregators—in other words, fish tend to congregate around them. It should be noted that many species of commercially and recreationally important fish tend to use seagrasses, mangroves and salt marsh habitats for breeding, rather than reefs. A proposal for a marine protected area will be considered as part of a whole of government strategy in this area.

PHYTOPHTHORA CINNAMOMI

41. **Mr HILL:** How widespread is *Phytophthora Cinnamomi* in South Australia and what programs and budgets are in place to deal with this problem?

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

Our current understanding of the distribution of *Phytophthora cinnamomi* is incomplete. In the Mount Lofty Ranges, we have recently confirmed its presence near Para Wirra Recreation Park. This is the northernmost known location. It occurs throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges south of this site and on Kangaroo Island. Although other species of *Phytophthora* have been located in the South East of South Australia, *Phytophthora cinnamomi* has not yet been confirmed.

National Parks and Wildlife SA has been investing in programs to mitigate the risk of the spread of this disease during the past four years. A three year strategic plan for the management of *Phytophthora* species was developed in early 1998 and has been coordinated by National Parks and Wildlife SA's *Phytophthora* Species Working Group. A *Phytophthora* education and management position was recently created with Natural Heritage Trust state matching funds to enhance National Parks and Wildlife SA's capacity to investigate, develop and implement *Phytophthora* threat mitigation and education programs across South Australia.

New initiatives to be supported by this officer include:

- systematic survey and testing to map the current distribution of *Phytophthora* species;

- the identification and mapping of areas of high conservation significance potentially impacted by Phytophthora;
- implementation of an action plan to ensure significant biodiversity sites are protected;
- development of policy and hygiene protocols for National Parks and Wildlife SA; and
- development and implementation of an education and training program to provide knowledge and advice to National Parks and Wildlife SA staff, institutions, groups and individuals on appropriate hygiene to ameliorate the impacts of Phytophthora.

The outcomes of these actions aim to provide a skilled group of people in South Australia, who will have the necessary skills to carry on with the process of effective management of the Phytophthora threat to native vegetation.

LAND PURCHASES

42. **Mr HILL:** Has any local government authority sold any land purchased through MOSS or ROSES funds and if so, what provisions exist for the return of the proceeds to the government?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has provided the following information:

Planning SA has no record of any land purchased through MOSS or ROSES (P & D Fund subsidies) being subsequently sold by a Council, other than for some road realignments.

This government has introduced tighter conditions which make it more difficult for open space purchased with P & D Fund assistance to be sold. When land is purchased with P & D Fund assistance, a requirement is that title to the land be cancelled and that Council then holds the land as a reserve under the Crown Lands Act. A council cannot then deal with the land without prior written approval being obtained from the minister responsible for the P & D Fund.

Should land become surplus to open space requirements and is proposed for sale by a council, then the P & D Fund would need to be reimbursed from the sale proceeds, at current market values, and in proportion to the original financial assistance provided.

HOSPITALS, EMERGENCIES

46. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** During 1998-99 and 1999-2000:
- (a) how many emergencies were diverted away from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Royal Adelaide Hospital, respectively, and sent to private hospitals; and
 - (b) how many emergency procedures were carried out at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:

(a) Public hospitals only divert to other public hospitals, except in cases where the patient specifically requests a private hospital. In times of need hospitals make the decision to divert and subsequently follow the agreed diversion policy which was implemented in August 2000 as a working draft. The hospitals are not able to provide numbers of where emergencies are taken, as once the decision to divert is made, the hospital on diversion is unaware of the volume of traffic or numbers of cases transported by the Ambulance Service.

Under the diversion policy, there are specific categories that are not to be diverted:

- patients classified by SA Ambulance as priority one;
- patients with myocardial infarction;
- patients with life or limb threatening conditions;
- patients who have been treated by SA Ambulance Service as major trauma (these patients will be transported to a designated Major Trauma Centre); and
- patients accepted for admission to a critical care service.

(b) In 1998-99, 3 532 emergency procedures were performed in the Emergency Surgical Suite at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. In 1999-00 there were 3 765 which is an increase of 7 per cent. This does not include some emergency surgical cases done in the general operating theatres.

The following figures give an approximate indication of the procedures performed in the Emergency Department each year. The figure is based on one procedure per presentation although many patients have more than one procedure carried out.

1998-99	47 641	Priority 1	1 554
1999-00	47 731	Priority 1	1 712

ACCESS CABS

47. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:**

1. What contractual performance criteria must be met by Yellow Cabs in relation to the operations of Access Cabs and how often is this reviewed?

2. What is the average waiting time for an Access Cab between the weekday hours of 6.00 am and 6.00 pm and how often is this monitored by the Passenger Transport Board?

The Hon DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has provided the following information:

1. Contractual performance criteria to be met by the Yellow Cab Group relate to service standards for the Access Cabs Central Booking Service (CBS), as specified by the Passenger Transport Board (PTB). Details associated with CBS requirements are provided under Section 29 of the Passenger Transport Act 1994, Regulations 12 and 13 of the Passenger Transport (General) Regulations 1994, and Schedule 10 of the Passenger Transport (General) Regulations 1994. The performance of the Yellow Cab Group is reviewed quarterly as part of CBS accreditation requirements. In addition, as part of the Access Cabs contract, key performance indicators are the basis for regular monthly reporting by the Yellow Cab Group to the PTB. These include waiting times, number of complaints, number of commendations and number of jobs cancelled by customers.

2. The average waiting time for an Access Cab during the weekday hours of 6.00am to 6.00pm, as reported by the Yellow Cab group in September 2000, was 8 minutes. This is one of the key performance areas that is monitored monthly by the PTB based on analysis of transmission data between the CBS and all vehicles.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COUNCIL

50. **Mr HILL:** What is the state of the National Environment Protection Council—National Pollutant Inventory Measure funding, what is state government's contribution for 2000-01 and what are its future commitments?

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

In South Australia, the National Pollutant Inventory (NPI) is being implemented under the Environment Protection Act 1993 by the Department for Environment and Heritage.

Funding for implementation was subject to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the commonwealth and each of the states and territories. The three year MOU was for the period 1997 to 30 June 2000.

During this three year period, South Australia was allocated \$640 000 by the commonwealth to implement the NPI.

This funding was provided by the commonwealth as the NPI is an initiative of the commonwealth, with the individual jurisdictions providing an in-kind contribution by absorbing non salary on-costs.

For 2000-01, the commonwealth is entering into one year MOUs with each state or territory separately as the initial stage of a proposal to enter into a long-term cost sharing arrangement between the commonwealth and the states and territories. The commonwealth is proposing to provide \$176 000 to South Australia to continue the NPI for 2000-01.

Under a previous MOU, an additional \$100 000 funding was provided to carry out aggregate emissions work. In fact, a comprehensive aggregate emission inventory for Adelaide and 16 regional airsheds was undertaken. In detail these were for Adelaide and 5 other major airsheds (Barossa, Port Lincoln, Riverland, Spencer Gulf and South East) and 11 minor airsheds (Lyndoch, Nuriootpa, Barmera, Berri, Loxton, Renmark, Millicent, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Whyalla). Motor vehicle studies were completed for Adelaide and 16 regional airsheds.

Similar aggregate emissions work was undertaken for two major water catchments, Adelaide-Mount Lofty and the Barossa Catchments.

PACKAGE LABELLING

51. **Mr HILL:** What would be the likely effects on the health of consumers should a leading breakfast cereal producer remove the labelling on the packaging depicting the amount and percentage of sugar content and what action can and will the minister take to prevent this action?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The effect of sugar in the diet is not a simple matter, however, it is possible that the impact of removing sugar from food labels could encourage some consumers to make

inappropriate food choices and also lead to an increase in the amount of dental caries in the community.

At a recent national meeting of the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Council I spoke strongly in favour of the right of consumers to know what is in the food they are eating and argued for the labelling of sugar and saturated fat. I am pleased to advise that I received strong support for this view and Ministers agreed that the Australia New Zealand Food Standard Code will be drafted to require mandatory inclusion of sugar and saturated fats on food labels.

WATER QUALITY

59. **Ms THOMPSON:** What monitoring of water quality of the Christie Creek is currently occurring and what information on the quality is available?

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

The Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board monitors water quality at two sites in Christies Creek.

Samples are collected monthly for chemical analysis including nutrients, salinity, heavy metals and dissolved oxygen. Surveys for macroinvertebrates are undertaken twice yearly in spring and autumn. Results are available from the Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board.

In addition, the community based Waterwatch program has 10 monitoring sites at various points along Christies Creek.

Preliminary assessment of the data indicates that the water in Christies Creek is of poor microbiological quality. Other data has not been assessed to date.

SCHOOL CARD

60. **Ms THOMPSON:** For each of the following schools—Christies Downs R-7 & Special, Lonsdale Heights CPC-7, Flaxmill CPC & Primary, Hackham West, Morphett Vale West, Reynella Primary, Reynella South CPC & Primary, John Morphett Primary, Pimpala Primary, Morphett Vale East, Coorara Primary, Christies Beach High, Morphett Vale High and Wirreanda High:

- what number and proportion of students are Schoolcard recipients; and
- how many students have a negotiated curriculum and how many teachers with specific special needs training are available?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

- The number and proportion of school card recipients in the identified schools is as follows:

School Name	FTE enrolment (as at 4 August 2000)	School Card Students (as at 13 December 2000)	Per- centage School Card students
Christie Downs Primary	163	122	74.8%
Christie Downs Special	48	21	43.8%
Christies Beach HS & Sth Voc College	1077	391	36.3%
Coorara Primary	462	183	39.6%
Flaxmill Junior Primary	185	90	48.6%
Flaxmill Primary	254	117	46.1%
Hackham West Junior Primary	186	119	64.0%
Hackham West Primary	291	170	58.4%
John Morphett Primary	220	84	38.2%
Lonsdale Heights Primary	212	127	60.0%
Morphett Vale East Junior Primary	212	111	52.4%
Morphett Vale East Primary	349	154	44.1%
Morphett Vale High	654	288	44.0%
Morphett Vale West Primary	274	151	55.1%
Pimpala Primary	265	83	31.3%
Reynella Primary	590	133	22.5%
Reynella South Primary	230	111	48.3%
Wirreanda High	993	353	35.5%

- The number of students who have a negotiated curriculum plan in the identified schools during 2000 is as follows:

	Students with negotiated curriculum plans FTE Enrolments
Christie Downs Primary School	28.0
Christie Downs Special School	48.0

Christies Beach HS & Sth Voc College	145.7
Coorara Primary School	40.0
Flaxmill Junior Primary School	13.0
Flaxmill Primary School	24.0
Hackham West Junior Primary School	25.0
Hackham West Primary School	43.0
John Morphett Primary School	37.0
Lonsdale Heights Primary School	30.0
Morphett Vale East JPS	25.0
Morphett Vale East Primary School	25.0
Morphett Vale High School	69.8
Morphett Vale West Primary School	48.0
Pimpala Primary School	27.0
Reynella Primary School	25.0
Reynella South Primary School	16.2
Wirreanda High School	70.9

The vast majority of teachers in schools have undertaken some form of ongoing training to support students with specific special needs. Given the wide range of student special needs and the variety of training experiences undertaken by teachers, comprehensive records of staff participation in ongoing programs or specific pre-service course content are not held centrally. Records are kept by individual teachers who maintain their own personal portfolios for use when applying for new teaching positions.

Many pre-service teacher training courses include components of special education. In addition, universities, the department and other organisations such as the Down Syndrome Association offer a range of training and professional development programs for staff each year. These programs range from half-day courses on a specific subject through to accredited modules leading a teacher to a graduate certificate, bachelor of education or masters degree.

Teachers chose to participate in these programs to ensure they are skilled to provide an appropriate curriculum for their students. The flexibility for staff to participate in programs throughout their career ensures that teaching practices continue to be responsive to the needs of their students.

HOUSING TRUST

62. **Ms THOMPSON:** What is the location and number at each location of South Australian Housing Trust maintenance staff, what has been the average waiting time in each maintenance category for the Noarlunga region during 2000 and what were the comparable details during 1996?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: A total of 45 full time equivalents Housing Trust staff provide maintenance services in the field at the following locations:

Modbury:	1 x Area Maintenance Manager; 1 x Field Manager; 4 x Maintenance Coordinators; 5 x Clerks;
Marion:	1 x Field Manager; 4 x Maintenance Coordinators; 1 x Clerk;
Port Adelaide:	4 x Maintenance Coordinators; 1 x Clerk;
Salisbury:	2 x Maintenance Coordinators;
Riverside:	1 x Maintenance Coordinator; 5 x Clerks;
Elizabeth:	4 x Maintenance Coordinators; 1 x Clerk;
Port Augusta:	1 x Maintenance Coordinator; 1 x .2 Clerk;
Whyalla:	2 x Maintenance Coordinators; 3 x .2 Clerks; 1 x Vacant Position;
Noarlunga:	2 x Maintenance Coordinators;
South East:	1 x Maintenance Coordinator; 1 x .2 Clerk;
Port Lincoln:	1 x Maintenance Coordinator; and Relieving: 1 x Maintenance Coordinator.

In addition to these field staff, outsourced managers from John Hindmarsh (metropolitan area) and Property Management Services (country area) provide programmed maintenance and some responsive work such as disabled modifications and half cost fencing.

The service standards for the 3 categories of maintenance work are as follows:

Priority 1—	urgent repairs that immediately affect health, safety or security—within 4 hours.
Priority 2—	urgent repairs that do not immediately affect health, safety or security—within 24 hours.

Priority 3— non-urgent maintenance—the Trust will assess if the work needs to be done.

There is no detailed monitoring against these standards. Rather the approach is to monitor customer callbacks in which tenants advise the maintenance centre of work not completed in a timely manner or to expected levels of quality.

The National Customer Satisfaction Survey is conducted independently each year. This measures overall levels of satisfaction with emergency and non-emergency maintenance, as distinct from the specific service standards listed above.

NOARLUNGA HEALTH SERVICE

63. **Ms THOMPSON:** What are the current staffing levels of each entity comprising the Noarlunga Health Service and in each case, what are their designations and employment status?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Noarlunga Health Service comprises of four sections, which are all managed by a single administration. These sections are:

- Public hospital patients, employing 262.94 staff;
- Private hospital patients, employing 41.14 staff;
- Community Health, employing 73.46 staff; and
- Community Mental Health, employing 29.63 staff (staff numbers are full time equivalents (FTEs)).

The following are actual staffing numbers and not FTEs.

1. Public hospital patients section

Designation	Employment Status	
	Permanent	Casual
Nursing	123	45
Medical	12	13
Ancillary (domestics, cleaners, maintenance)	54	20
Administrative	42	18
Professional	12	8
Technical	3	0
Total	246	104

2. Private hospital patients section

Designation	Employment Status	
	Permanent	Casual
Nursing	17	5
Medical	1	
Ancillary (domestics, cleaners, maintenance)	7	
Administrative	21	
Professional	3	
Technical	2	
Total	51	5

3. Community Health

Designation	Employment Status	
	Permanent	Casual
Nursing	13	1
Medical		
Ancillary (domestics, cleaners, maintenance)	3	1
Administrative	36	6
Professional	24	10
Technical	2	0
Total	78	18

4. Community Mental Health

Designation	Employment Status	
	Permanent	Casual
Nursing	9	2
Medical	2	1
Ancillary (domestics, cleaners, maintenance)	3	0
Administrative	6	1
Professional	11	1
Technical	3	0
Total	34	5

MORPHETT VALE TRAFFIC

64. **Ms THOMPSON:**

1. How many motor vehicle accidents and injuries occurred at both the eastern and western intersections of Emmerson Road and Bains Road, Morphett Vale?

2. How many expiation notices for speeding have been issued to Morphett Vale residents since 1999 and what proportion of all notices issued does this represent?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has provided the following information:

In responding to the Member for Reynell's question, the following clarifications are made:

- Examination of individual road crash reports could not ascertain whether the crashes had occurred at the eastern or western intersection of Emmerson Road. Consequently, the following information is grouped together as intersection crashes at Emmerson and Bains Roads.
- The information is provided by calendar year.

Intersection	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Road crashes						(to August)
Total Crashes						
Reported	1	3	2	1	0	1
Total Number of Injuries	0	2	0	0	0	0

Of the total of 8 crashes reported between January 1995 and August 2000, 4 were 'rear-end' crashes on Bains Road and 4 were 'right-angle' crashes involving vehicles leaving Emmerson Road.

2. Advice is being sought from the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services in relation to this matter and a response will be provided in due course.

TAX EXEMPTIONS

71. **Mr FOLEY:** What are the names of all omissions, reductions and concessions from State taxes, fees, fines and charges for 2000-01 and in each case, what is the Budget revenue forgone by its application?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

The budgeted cost of relief from State taxes and charges in 2000-01 is as follows:

Item	2000-2001 Budget \$m
Tax Relief	
Stamp Duties	
First home concession	9.0
Inner city area rebate for new home units	0.2
Provision for <i>ex gratia</i> relief	19.2
Payroll tax	
Exporters rebate	3.5
Trainee rebate	16.4
Young persons employment rebate	0.4 (a)
Industry specific payroll tax relief (administered by DIT)	5.3
Emergency Services Levy	-
Remissions	45.5
Pensioner concessions	6.6
Subsidies	
Petrol and on-road diesel	18.9 (b)
Liquor	12.3
Concessions for government charges	
Water and sewerage rates	22.5
Electricity charges	12.7
Transport concessions	14.6
Local government rates	24.7

(a) Although this scheme was closed at the end of 1999, some rebate claims will carry over into 2000-01 since claims are submitted six monthly in arrears.

(b) Comprises \$16 million for ongoing petrol and on-road diesel subsidies and \$2.9 million being the final instalment of off-road diesel subsidies payable in respect of 1999-2000 activity.

There is of course a wide range of exemptions from taxes and charges which reduce the revenue base. The benefit to taxpayers from these exemptions is not explicitly costed in the Budget.

The Budget reports on actual revenue collected and those concessions and other forms of relief, whether provided by way of refund, rebate, subsidy or as part of an explicit concession scheme, which result in a Budget expenditure.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 1 March 2001

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

AUSTRALIAN ROAD RULES (SPEED LIMITS IN BUILT-UP AREAS) VARIATION BILL

The **Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher)** obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to vary the Australian Road Rules. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Members would be aware that, towards the end of last year, I introduced the Road Traffic (Speed Limits In Built-Up Areas) Amendment Bill, which was related to the likely introduction of a 50 km/h limit in residential streets. I indicated at the time that if an alternative option was preferred by local government, the RAA and other interested parties I would withdraw that bill, and I will do so at the appropriate time. The reason for introducing the Australian Road Rules (Speed Limits In Built-Up Areas) Variation Bill in preference to the alternative bill is that, under this proposal, streets do not have to be signposted where the 50 km/h limit applies.

Members can appreciate that this saves an enormous amount of money and resourcing because if no speed limit sign is displayed the limit is 50 km/h. As we know, major arterial roads carry signage indicating the limit. Limits apply to school zones, and councils may apply a special speed zone, but this bill states quite clearly that if no sign is displayed in a residential street the limit is 50 km/h. I have been in consultation with the RAA and it supports this proposal, which is sometimes called the default option, meaning that if no sign limit is posted the limit is 50 km/h.

I have had support from many of the councils. For example, the Adelaide City Council supports this option, as does Marion and Norwood, Payneham & St Peters. The LGA has indicated that a very significant meeting of its executive will be held next week, after which it will be in a position to indicate its response to this issue. The LGA indicated in a letter to me that it is mindful of the time constraints of parliament but, in fairness to the LGA, because its comments are very important, its position will be taken into account. A letter that I received on 27 February, which was signed by John Comrie, Executive Director, states:

The LGA intends to provide information to both the Metropolitan Local Government Group at its meeting dated 14 March and the LGA State Executive Committee at its meeting dated Thursday 15 March 2001.

The LGA wants to consider some issues, and one is whether the variation to Australian road rules which imposes a 50 km/h residential speed limit should apply to country towns as well as to the metropolitan area. At this stage my bill does not seek to introduce the default option or that variation to country towns. I have spoken with some country members, and they feel it might not be appropriate in some towns, for example, those in the Riverland, because the streets are quite wide.

However, some country members believe that, once their councils and the LGA have had a chance to look at that issue, they will be in a position to respond accordingly. It may well be that country towns are considered in terms of an optional

coverage or a blanket coverage. I am not seeking to impose my will or the will of the parliament on country people, but we will have time during the passage of this bill to provide that option if that is what country members wish, whether it be an opt-in provision or a blanket provision.

Members would be aware that in January, Victoria introduced a blanket 50 km/h speed limit in residential streets. Indeed, it became law in Victoria from 22 January this year and, as I indicated earlier, its advertising campaign was, 'If there is no sign, it is 50 km/h'. Queensland has adopted the same policy and, around the world, 50 km/h is the accepted appropriate limit for residential streets. Last year I surveyed my electorate and there is majority support for a 50 km/h limit in residential streets, not 40 km/h.

My bill would not prevent a council from continuing with a 40 km/h limit, and I know that the City of Unley has a 40 km/h provision. The bill provides that, if there is no sign, it is 50 km/h. If the council has gone through the proper process and designated a residential street at 40 km/h, my provision would not automatically override that decision. However, it is important that we move quickly to clarify the situation. Only a week or two ago the City of Mitcham, in response to requests from a group of residents at Blackwood, moved to introduce a 40 km/h zone in part of Blackwood.

If we are not careful, a situation will develop in the metropolitan area where there are different limits in residential streets, and I do not think that is in the interests of the community, motorists, pedestrians and residents. A speed limit of 50 km/h, slightly down from 60 km/h, is the appropriate limit. People will realise that, when they turn into a side street, they ease off on the accelerator and slow down. All the expert evidence is that 50 km/h is the most appropriate speed limit.

One issue is very important and I trust that, if this measure is passed by parliament, councils will move quickly to ensure that they designate appropriately roads that they do not want to be 50 km/h. Many of these are called collector roads, which are not the major arterials such as Anzac Highway but the less busy but still significant transport corridors. We could have a situation that occurred in Victoria where the law was changed but the councils did not move quickly enough to designate the collector roads, which they may wish to keep at 60 km/h. If they wish to keep them at 60 km/h they have to signpost them. They are the feeder roads, which are the next stage up from the residential streets that feed into arterial roads.

I do not need to canvass the issues at great length. It is fairly self explanatory. The bill is very straightforward. The key issue that has been deliberately omitted is whether or not it should apply to country towns, and that matter can be addressed in the near future following responses from country members, the LGA and country councils.

I commend the bill to the House. I believe it has merit. I want to bring the issue to a resolution. I appreciate the work being done by the parliamentary committee looking at road safety, chaired by Angus Redford. That committee has put in a lot of time and effort. I am not trying to gazump that committee, but I want to bring this matter to a head and get it in place before we see a plethora of various speed limits applying in residential streets around Adelaide. The public want it and it has strong support from the RAA and councils and it is up to us to move on this issue and ensure that we come up with a sensible proposal. The default option, the variation to the Australian road rules, is the way to go. It is

inexpensive and can be implemented quickly if it passes through the parliament. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms STEVENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOSPITALS, PUBLIC

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That a select committee be established to consider and report on the following matters relating to the funding of our public hospital system, including medical, dental and aged care services and to matters relating to medical staff (including doctors nurses and allied professionals) employed under public health services in South Australia—

- (a) whether the system an adequately and appropriately funded;
- (b) its interface with the private hospital system;
- (c) whether funding levels and current staffing regimes (including staff numbers and hours of duty) are resulting in a negative impact on patient needs and care in both metropolitan and country hospitals;
- (d) whether funding levels and current staffing arrangements are resulting in a negative impact on staff, acceptable occupational health and safety standards and the cost of medical litigation;
- (e) the relationship between state and federal funding and any difficulties which arise therefrom; and
- (f) any other related matter.

This motion proposes a select committee to consider matters of vital importance for the people who staff our public hospitals and to the people who use them. We are all aware that, over recent years, since the early 1990s, cut upon cut has occurred to our public health system, and hospitals in particular have borne the brunt of this. However, it has been the more recent events that have led to this motion.

Members will be aware of the serious problems that have besieged metropolitan hospitals since July 1999 when ambulances on bypass from both public and private hospitals were forced to queue at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Public hospitals were full. They could not cope with what should have been predictable demands, and the Premier admitted that the public health system had been at 'breaking point for some time'. Even after this admission by the Premier in 1999, and contrary to the Premier's announcement on 9 March 2000 that the main thrust of the 2000 budget would be on social areas such as health, further cuts were in the pipeline.

The 2000 budget actually targeted cutting services at both metropolitan and country public hospitals. The government targeted reducing by 4 000 the number of people to be admitted to metropolitan hospitals; it targeted reducing by 10 000 the number of people to be treated at emergency services at metropolitan hospitals; it targeted reducing by a staggering 93 000 the number of outpatients to be treated at metropolitan hospitals; and, in a figure found in the glossy publication about the government's regional package, it targeted reducing by 10 000 the number of outpatients at country hospitals.

In an extraordinary contradiction of the Premier's promises, not only did the government plan to cut the number of patients but also it targeted a reduction in the quality of services. The 72 per cent of emergency patients who were treated this year within the required time of 10 minutes was targeted to fall to 70 per cent; and the 65 per cent of urgent cases that were treated this year within the required time of 30 minutes was targeted to fall to 60 per cent. Major metropolitan public hospitals which were already running multi-million dollar deficits faced further cuts in real terms while trying to meet costs of maintaining basic services. Clearly, the only possible outcome would be over-stressed staff and falling standards of service, and that is exactly what has happened.

In his annual report dated November 2000, the Chairman of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Medical Staff Society, Professor Horowitz, said the society became aware in April 2000 that there were no plans to open winter beds at the QEH and expressed concerns about the impact that this would have on efficiency at the hospital. Nothing was done. When the Queen Elizabeth Hospital went into gridlock again in July 2000, the medical staff society says the government reaction was to deny that a problem existed and an attempt to suppress public comment by staff.

The closure of 500 beds had finally reduced the capacity of our public hospitals to a point where they were in gridlock and again had to turn away people in ambulances and cancel elective surgery. Bed shortages resulted in emergency departments becoming so overcrowded that Dr Dunn, the head of the emergency department at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, told the select committee inquiring into the future of that hospital that occupancy rates in the emergency department reached as high as 200 per cent.

The Opposition was given a copy of a memo written by Dr Dunn, the Director of the emergency department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, on 21 September 2000. I will quote from the memo that he wrote to staff in the North-West Adelaide Health Service at that time in relation to how bad things had become in his department. The memo states:

Over the last 18 months I have been steadily reporting deterioration in emergency department performance to Executive with requests that this is passed on to the board and a strategy to address this situation is devised. To date, no strategies have been employed that have reversed the continued trend of deteriorating conditions in the emergency department.

In the last two and a half weeks the emergency department has been required to go on by-pass on six separate occasions. Conditions have been so overcrowded with patients awaiting beds that the safety of additional patients could not be guaranteed. In addition, patients have been herded together in overcrowded cubicles and staff subject to frequent threats and abuse. Patients detained under the Mental Health Act have had to share cubicles with other non-detained patients whilst being guarded, with some staying in the department for two days before a bed is found.

He goes on to say:

Waiting time performance has decreased 22 per cent in one year (80 per cent of all patients seen within time versus 58 per cent of all patients seen within time) and we recently had one patient who, immediately before a period of by-pass, waited 10 hours before being seen. Waiting times in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital emergency department for less urgent cases are now amongst the worst in the country.

He went on to say:

Staff morale is low and falling fast, rates of sick leave have markedly increased and junior doctors are increasingly reticent to work in the emergency department. The conditions for patients and staff have never been as bad—even in the dark days of 1996.

In September 2000, Dr Dunn also wrote to the Minister for Human Services and said:

I cannot put it more plainly—the emergency department is under extreme pressure and every measurable parameter is deteriorating at an ever increasing rate. Staff are barely managing this degree of stress and I do not believe this level of activity can be maintained without a major adverse effect on them. It is also inevitable that a major adverse patient outcome will occur in the near future—minor incidents are already occurring frequently.

As with Dr Dunn, Professor Horowitz warned of 'a number of near disastrous consequences as a result of severe overcrowding' at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and said that it is now frequent for patients to have to wait longer than 12 hours to get a bed. Yet in the middle of last year, the minister said that he had solved the problems of emergency patients from

private hospitals being sent into the public system. Clearly, he has not. Then on 6 November last year we were told that 65 extra beds would solve the problems: clearly they have not. We have a health system that can no longer cope with predictable demands in winter or summer. We have a system that has not been able to adjust for an ageing population—a development everyone except John Olsen has foreseen—and, because 3.6 per cent of patients who have clean surgery where they have no infection become infected as a direct result of their hospital stay, we have a system that records the worst rate of hospital acquired infection across all categories in Australia.

Against this background there is little wonder that medical staff, doctors, nurses and allied professionals have all been warning of the consequences of patient safety and health services in South Australia if this appalling situation is allowed to continue. In the second half of 2000, the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association presented a substantial body of evidence to the government that the working conditions for many doctors in the public health system are inherently unsafe. The medical officers claim that there is a substantial body of evidence that long working hours and increased pressure combine to overload staff and create fundamentally unsafe conditions for both patients and staff, but until now staff have been reluctant to take these issues into the public arena.

According to evidence given to the select committee inquiring into the future of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital by Professor John Horowitz, doctors who speak out against the run-down in our hospital system have been bullied by the state government and are worried about being sacked. The Salaried Medical Officers Association representing doctors working in our public hospitals believes four key issues underpin the current unsatisfactory situation. First, they say that in some areas traditional employment patterns are no longer sustainable. The officers claim that new work patterns based on different shift arrangements are needed to ensure that demands of the job are matched with reasonable working hours and time free of duty.

Secondly, they refer to the dichotomy that often arises between service delivery and doctors' training requirements; thirdly, to deep seated expectations about the level of dedication and the need to be exposed to a range of presentations which expects that many doctors, and in particular junior doctors, will work very long hours almost as a right of passage; and, fourthly, to the issue involving the amount of non-medical work now undertaken by doctors and in particular junior doctors. The officers claim that in many cases better medical service delivery could be achieved by the provision of additional administrative support to enable doctors to concentrate on their prime functions.

Employees seeking change in a system under extreme pressure feel obligated to put a good face on the situation, whatever their work patterns. This applies to a doctor working 80 hours or more in a system that has traditionally demanded and operated in a paradigm where such hours are commonplace and where everybody does it. It also applies to our nurses who are working under extreme pressure and are being required to look after ten to 12 patients a shift. The Nurses Federation says that nurses are working under conditions that are not only a crisis for nurses but also a crisis for people who need access to the public hospital system. What is needed is a proper forum to enable the facts to be ascertained and allow the community to assess what changes are needed to meet realistic modern standards and ensure the

safety of all concerned. What is needed is a vehicle that reports to this parliament without fear or favour and makes recommendations to allow us to move forward in addressing these critical issues.

I can understand the minister's opposition to a select committee to investigate these matters, opposition which he voiced earlier during the week. The minister has said that cabinet has refused his requests for additional funding for our health services, and he is now forced to defend what is happening in our hospitals. I am sympathetic to the position the minister finds himself in. In fact, earlier this week, the minister wrote to the independent members of this House claiming that an internal inquiry would be a more appropriate way to address these concerns. This view is not shared by the medical officers and is certainly not shared by the opposition. It is also not shared by other staff who have lost confidence in the minister and his department, and staff who claim to have been threatened for speaking out.

In conclusion, the opposition has moved this motion in an attempt to have these issues out on the table in an attempt to have in this state a forum at the highest level in which issues can be presented and recommendations made with the hope that we can move forward and fix the situation in which we find ourselves.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Minerals and Energy): I think I am regarded by my colleagues as being a fairly charitable fellow, and I usually give the mover of a motion in this parliament the benefit of the doubt. I have sat back and listened with interest to the motion moved by the honourable member. But she disappointed me. She disappointed me from the outset because, when a motion of such a serious nature is moved, one would expect that, if a member is wishing to establish a select committee in this parliament on a matter that they regard as serious, particularly on a matter pertaining to health, they would move such a motion with regret because something is not occurring in a way in which they would wish. However, that is not what we heard from the shadow minister. No, it was 'with pleasure' that she moved her motion today; those were her opening words.

Within this parliament unfortunately over the more than 11 years I have been here occasionally I have seen some things that are base and crass political, and this falls into that category at a whole new low level. This is not a motion that is moved out of any genuine concern or compassion for South Australians and our health system. This is a motion that is moved for crass, base political purposes—a motion that the honourable member moved 'with pleasure'. Those were her words. It was not with regret but 'with pleasure'. That is how the motion was moved.

Her whole speech was littered with selected information, and I will go through that information with interest, and compare it with the documented facts in relation to the health system. The honourable member was not part of the Labor government that was so unceremoniously dumped before the State Bank saga. That saga was not the only reason it was dumped. One of its many areas of maladministration was the health system. The honourable member believes there are problems with the health system now. However, they pale into insignificance against the system that operated before.

An honourable member: Rubbish!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Well, the honourable member interjects 'Rubbish', so I will share with the parliament some documented facts relating to the health

system that was there under the last Labor government up until now, facts that will be put on the record.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The honourable member has moved her select committee motion and read her stilted speech, which was probably put together by some of Labor's union mates. She has read her diatribe into the record; now, she can sit back and listen to the facts. She might not like them, but the facts will go onto the record.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Well, the facts will go onto the record whether she likes it or not. When this government came into office, the 1992-93 total admissions to South Australian public hospitals was 275 000. By 1999-2000, admissions had gone up to 339 377—an increase of 64 318 admissions. I regard that as a pretty significant achievement: to see our public hospitals under a Liberal government (after Labor's maladministration) now putting through that extra number of people getting access to health services.

Much has been made of the emergency departments by the honourable member. Well, I have some information in relation to those as well. In 1992-93, in the dying days of Labor's maladministration, 371 048 people received attention. In 1999-2000, that figure rose to 463 044—an increase of 91 998 people who received attention in emergency departments in our hospitals. Again, I regard that greater throughput as a pretty significant achievement—a slightly different picture from the one which the member tries to paint in this parliament.

The honourable member also made much about outpatient attendances, and I also have some information in relation to those. In 1992-93—again, in the dying days of Labor's maladministration—outpatient attendances totalled 1 299 362. In 1999-2000, that figure increased to 1 483 803—an increase of 184 441. Again, that is a very different picture from that which the member who has moved this motion today would have us believe. One must ask what the reason is for her motion. She has moved it with pleasure, not with regret. She is hurling unsubstantiated information at the parliament, and for one reason only: to try to score political points in the most crass manner possible.

I have some other interesting statistics that are worth sharing with the parliament in order to gain an appreciation of what happens in our hospitals on a weekly basis. In South Australia each week 6 509 people are admitted to public hospitals; 8 880 people are treated in emergency departments; 28 456 services are provided to outpatient clinics; 351 babies are born; 1 252 women are screened for breast cancer; and nearly 700 people undergo elective surgery. That is a magnificent effort by the men and women who work in our public hospitals: full credit to them for being able to manage this sort of a workload.

The figures relating to elective surgery do not include what has happened in recent days, because we all know that Labor's union mates are doing their best to try to disrupt elective surgery in our hospitals. I encourage the shadow minister to try to exert some influence over that, because I suspect that she does have some influence over the crass union activity involving our hospitals, which is ensuring that people who are waiting for elective surgery cannot have it. I refer, again, to the lack of compassion that we have seen during her stilted pre-written address today. It was probably written by her union mates, and it demonstrates that she has no compassion or feeling on this issue. This is simply a crass

attempt to score political points—and a pretty poor one at that.

The honourable member may well get a select committee. I actually think that there could be an advantage in it, because I would like to see a few facts put before such a committee. It may well be that the honourable member has pulled the pin out of a hand grenade and it will explode before she gets a chance to drop it. It could be very interesting to see what comes out of it, because it will expose the crass nature of this little exercise. It is a shame that the TV cameras were not on the honourable member when she presented her address. I look forward to the time when internet television is available in the parliament, because it will encourage a few members on the other side perhaps to think twice about the way in which they present themselves.

The public could then see her lack of genuine compassion and concern on this issue, see how stilted was the address delivered to the Parliament (pre-prepared by her union mates) and see exactly what lies beyond this. If this select committee becomes a reality—and I suspect that it probably will—the advantage for the people in this state will be to see just how members of the opposition are acting in this Parliament. It will give them an opportunity to see the facts presented before the Parliament.

At the end of the day, what can be shown in undisputed fashion through this committee is that, while the health system is a difficult system to administer and none of us will stand here and say that it is perfect—no system can be—compared to that which was in operation under the maladministering Labor government, it is a heck of a lot better than it was.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I rise not with regret but with hardly contained anger to second the motion, because the diatribe that we just heard from the Minister is evidence pure and simple—and very poorly put, I might add—of exactly the attitude that this government has towards the plight of South Australians when it comes to our health system. This Minister, representing the government—he is the duty Minister in the House at this time—basically told us that there was not a problem in our health system.

The people of South Australia are hurting; constituents such as mine and those of every member of this House, who come in time and again telling of the falling standards in our health systems; telling their individual stories of when they cannot get a hospital bed; telling of their anger when they see billions of dollars of state assets sold, yet money being cut from our hospitals, just as it is being cut from our schools and as it has been cut from our police. As with all aspects of this government's attitude, it is one of denial.

It is the same in my own portfolio when it comes to one of the most pressing problems in education, the appalling drop-out rate. What is the government's response? It quibbles with the figures; quibbles with the facts; and does not even admit that there is a problem. That is exactly what the minister said to us in this place: 'There is not a problem.' His argument was that there are more admissions into hospitals than there used to be 10 years or however long ago. Of course there are: we have an ageing population.

The demand has grown out of all proportion, but the real question of this government should be: is that demand being met? And the answer is no. The test is not how many are going through your hospital doors; rather, the question is whether the demand is being met. And what are the priorities of this government if it is spending money on consultants; on

icons; on buildings; on blow-outs in contracts; on bad deals and deals with mates, often; on corporate welfare that is not well targeted, when they cannot deliver hospital beds to people in need?

That is one of the most fundamental jobs a government has to do, and all that this government can say is: 'There is no problem.' Well, there is a problem: all of South Australia knows that there is a problem, and I am disappointed that the Minister for Health did not even have the decency to come into this chamber to deliver the government's response but left it for another minister. That is an appalling situation, but it is not unique, because it happens on many motions all the time.

Are we meeting demand? No. Our ambulances are bypassing emergency departments, and our hospitals are full so much of the time. I recently spent a week in hospital. I do not want to talk about my own experience, because it is not relevant in this context, because it was quite a happy experience; it was the birth of my baby son. However, that week in hospital gave me pause to think about what doctors and nurses have to do and the pressures placed on them. It was a worthwhile experience to me, and I think many would benefit by thinking from a patient's point of view. I got to know a doctor's point of view; over a period of time I got to understand the work load and the hours put in by the obstetrician who was treating me, as well as being aware of the pressures on his personal life. We developed quite a rapport, because we have some similarities in that regard.

My greatest respect has to go to the nurses who work in our hospitals. While I had a good experience in hospital, I had a complication, which was picked up by a midwife, not a doctor. The nurses are overworked and not only do what they are required to do by the job description set out on a piece of paper but they give of themselves and are patching up a failing health system. The system is in crisis but is being ignored by a government and minister who are quite happy to continue blaming the federal government. The federal government blames the state government, and what is the result? The state government says there is not even a problem as far as it is concerned; because it might be spending more in absolute dollar figures than a few years previously, then it is doing its job. It is not doing its job, because it is not meeting demand.

This select committee is exactly what parliament must do. This select committee gives a platform to identify exactly what the problems are. That platform has been missing. We have seen medical professionals and others in the industry whistleblowing on what is happening in the system, and we have seen attempts by the government to hobble that criticism. This platform will give the opportunity for problems to come out in a protected and bipartisan way, where all levels of the health system can give evidence so that we can acknowledge as a parliament that there is a problem. The opposition knows well that there is a problem and has raised it, but somehow this is falling on deaf government ears.

This is a necessary move, and one which the public of South Australia wholeheartedly support and want, because their bottom line is that they want the problem fixed. In order to fix the problem you must first identify it, admit there is a problem and resolve to do something about it. Despite the sale of all the assets, all the increases in taxes and revenue coming in the door, this government has cut hospital and human services spending. That is an appalling situation to put South Australians in. It is not only with regret that I find this

motion before the House necessary: it is also with anger, reflecting the pure anger out there among the South Australian public.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I have been listening with much interest to the member for Taylor's contribution in support of the motion. The discussion about anger and regret is interesting. I certainly believe that the health system should be a top priority of any government. I have continually voiced the concerns of my constituents to the government and to the minister when problems have arisen. I must say that I have been answered promptly and that the government has addressed the problems in relation to health which I have raised and which concern the public. If we follow the opposition's demands for committees, I fear that we will have more committees than we have members of parliament to sit on those committees.

Ms White: That is because we have more problems than members of parliament.

Mr SCALZI: The opposition appears to be committed to committees and not committed to dealing with the problems they raise.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Of course, that is no different from what is happening in Victoria. The Bracks government has established more committees than there were in the years of the Kennett government. There is committee after committee. The public of South Australia does not want committees. It does not want the government and the opposition squabbling over health. It just wants the job to be done. That is what it wants. I speak with a bit of experience in the hospital system. I spent 15 years in and out of hospital from 17 years of age until 30 years of age. I was an orderly at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for six months. I am privileged to be a member of the Public Works Committee that has looked into the increasing public works at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Lyell McEwin Hospital (in the honourable member's electorate) and I was at the opening of the upgrade of the theatres at Modbury Hospital.

I take a particular interest in health and I know that there has been an increase in demand. There is no question that there has been an increase in demand for services. But, as the minister outlined yesterday, there has been an increased response from this government to the increase in demand. The figures show that not only in the public works programs that this government has put forward but also in the treatment. As the minister outlined yesterday, in 1992-93, 275 000 patients were admitted to hospital and in 1999-2000, 339 377 people were admitted to hospital—an increase of over 64 000.

Which other government has had to deal with that increase in demand? I agree that we should have an adequately and appropriately funded health system. This government agrees with that. Why have a select committee to see whether or not it should or should not? In relation to interface with the private hospital system, this government is committed to having greater cooperation between the public and private systems. This government and the federal government have done something about it. The federal government has given rebates to stem the flow of people going into the public system. It has given greater access to the private system which enables those needy members of the public who cannot afford it access to the public system.

This government has done something about it, and I am sure some members opposite have taken advantage of joining the private health system since the incentives have been

given. There needs to be cooperation between the private and public systems. It is no use grandstanding and saying, 'We need select committees.' We need to get the job done. This minister is working hard to ensure that in difficult times funds are available for health—as the government has given priority to education as well.

What happens when this government realises that we should put more money into health and other services? Members opposite, when we give up a race, squabble about why we have given up a race. They cannot have their cake and eat it too. On the one hand, they make such an issue of it, and what do they want? Another committee—'Let us have committees.' Members of the public do not want committees. They are sick and tired of governments and oppositions squabbling. They want to get the job done. This government is committed to getting the job done: it is committed to health and education as a priority.

As I have said, as a member of the Public Works Committee, I have seen first-hand the increase in capital works, which will address a lot of those issues. Were funds put aside when members opposite were in power? Where were the funds? They knew that there would be an increase in population, and they knew that there would be increased demands.

At the same time, let us be realistic. If one looks at the health standards of South Australians, one will see that we have a lot to be proud of—for example, look at the rate of success with respect to breast cancer and other areas in South Australia. We are leading the nation. Another example is life expectancy. Members opposite do not tell us about that. Of course, more needs to be done, and this government is committed to doing more. The Minister for Human Services often has been seen lobbying the federal government to make sure that the funds are available for aged care.

Ms White: But what has happened?

Mr SCALZI: Do you think that a select committee, amongst all the other committees that you are committed to, will deal with that problem? Let us get on with the job and do something.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: We are doing that. The minister is now working on the current staffing levels. We have offers on the table for the nurses. I have great respect for the nursing profession, but let us get on with it. Let us not just play politics with the health of South Australians.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Yes—and we are directing more funds and resources into health and education and, as soon as we do that, we hear cries from the opposition, which is more concerned about the race. Members of the opposition have to be careful: they might not only miss the race, they will miss the bus.

Mr Hanna: Isn't there a problem in hospitals?

Mr SCALZI: Of course there is a problem. Has the member not been listening? We are dealing with it. There is a problem, and there always has been a problem. It is how one responds to the problems. Committees will not solve the problems: you have to have the funds available to deal with the situation. This government has got the economy right: it understands the difficulties and the increasing demand for health services, and it is addressing that. It is continuously negotiating with the federal government to make sure that funds are available.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SCALZI: Members opposite might wish to go to the major hospitals from time to time—apart from the headlines—and go to see the people who are there.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I have, when I have gone to see some friends and patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I know the hospital inside out, and I have walked around, not on a tour—

Ms Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SCALZI: When was the last time I spoke to a nurse?

Ms Rankine: In a public hospital.

Mr SCALZI: Not that long ago. And I can tell the member that I have seen patients who have come out of hospital within the past 10 days. Let us deal with the problem. This government is aware that there are problems, and we are addressing them. This government is aware, now that we have the economics right, that we must address those issues—not only with respect to health and education but also with respect to other social infrastructure—

Time expired.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I think that people are getting a bit excited about this select committee. In one way, that is good, but it would be even better if we could solve some of the issues that confront our hospitals. The terms of reference focus on some of the key factors at the moment, including the federal-state funding arrangements, and I think that is where a lot of the current difficulties stem from. As members know, the federal system has some advantages, but it also has a lot of disadvantages, as can be seen in relation to the Murray River and hospital funding: the commonwealth collects most of the money and then generously dispenses some of it out to the states for hospitals.

The problem of waiting lists and the demand on hospitals is not new. I was looking at some figures from 1992, when Labor was in government, and there were huge waiting lists at the Flinders Medical Centre (I can make those lists available if members want to have a look at them). So, it is not a new issue. There have been some seasonal factors recently: the heatwave and, prior to that, an epidemic of the 'flu in the middle of last year, and that is likely to continue.

So, there will be episodic situations where the hospitals are under great pressure and the hospital staff do an excellent job. However, there seems to be a problem in relation to funding for some of the services, and I commend the government for providing money for capital works. I also commend the present minister, who has been an outstanding Minister for Health; when I realise that he has responsibility for Family and Youth Services and the Housing Trust (which is about 43 per cent of the total budget), I think he does an excellent job.

However, something needs to be addressed in relation to the funding. I am not an expert to know whether the hospitals use their money efficiently and effectively, but there seems to be difficulty in getting adequate funding for our public hospitals, and I know this from the people who come into my office. For instance, an 83 year old lady who needs a hip replacement had to wait 10 months to see a specialist and then another two years on top of that to receive the replacement; a senior student with chronic tonsillitis had to wait nearly a year to have her tonsils removed; a young adult with impacted wisdom teeth will have to wait four years to have those wisdom teeth removed. So, there is a problem. Some people would say, 'Well, take out private health cover.'

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Mines and Energy has had his opportunity to speak and the member for Wright will have an opportunity to speak, if she wants it.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: People say, 'Why don't they take out private health insurance?' That is a very expensive option for a lot of people, and many people have taken out the minimal commitment in order to get the tax benefit, knowing full well that they will never go into a private hospital because they will end up with a big bill at the end of the day. I have the top table for hospital cover, but for being prudent in that respect you get penalised when you go into a public hospital, and you receive a bill at the end of the day: in effect, you are paying three ways. So, there are a lot of problems in the system.

I am not naive enough to think that this select committee will solve all those problems but it will, I hope, if people go about it the right way and not just use it as a political point scoring exercise, provide some possible strategies. The key strategy, of course, is that cabinet has to provide extra money and the federal government has to ensure that it provides sufficient funds. I forget the exact percentage, but I think that at present something between 10 and 20 per cent of our hospital beds in the metropolitan area are taken up by people waiting to go into nursing home accommodation. Nursing home accommodation is the responsibility of the federal government but the state government is now carrying those people in our public hospitals, taking up beds that could be available for other people. That is just one example of a situation that is unacceptable.

If members look closely at the terms of reference, they will see that this select committee will provide the opportunity to generate some sensible and constructive outcomes. We should approach it in that way. I have been very impressed with the President of the AMA, Dr Michael Rice. He calls a spade a spade and does not hold back. I think that is important. We know that various groups will play politics with this emotive issue but I would urge members to look at this as an opportunity to get to some of the core issues, and hopefully get them addressed. That will mean support from both the state government, in terms of cabinet support for funding, and the federal government, in terms of its contribution to our important public hospital system.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I support this motion. My electorate has three public hospitals. Country hospitals do experience all the problems of city hospitals, but also they experience other problems that are quite unique to country hospitals. My electorate includes the Coober Pedy Hospital, which is a relatively new hospital and one which is working very well. I have the Roxby Downs Hospital, which is almost a state-of-the-art hospital, and I have the Whyalla Hospital. I was very interested to hear the member for Taylor talk about her recent stay in hospital for the birth of her young son.

I visited Roxby Downs before Christmas and some 176 women in that town were pregnant. I believe that Roxby Downs has the highest birthrate in Australia. The problem is that Roxby Downs does not have a resident obstetrician who can work with the women, so all those women must leave their town and go elsewhere to have their babies.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Ms BREUER: Sounds like it. This is one problem which is quite unique and which does happen in country hospitals. I know that the hospital at Ceduna is in a similar situation.

That hospital also affects my area because anything west of Ceduna is part of my electorate. Women in that area also must travel elsewhere to have their babies. It is a very difficult situation. I am sure that the member for Taylor would appreciate that it is very difficult for women at the time of the birth of a child not to have friends and family around. I am very proud that SACRRAH (South Australian Centre for Rural and Remote Area Health) is located in my region at the Whyalla University campus.

SACRRAH has contributed greatly to improving health services in our region. The centre undertakes a total look at health services in regional areas. It has carried out considerable research in the area and I would request that, if it is established, the centre be consulted by this committee because serious problems exist with respect to staffing country hospitals with professionals. The centre has done a lot of work on this issue. SACRRAH is headed by Professor David Wilkinson. I was very pleased recently to hear that the centre has been chosen as one of the regional clinical schools. Hopefully, as a result of that selection and as a result of staff being trained, including doctors, in country regions we may be able to keep some of those medical practitioners, including nursing staff.

Figures have been released by SACRRAH with respect to its research which indicate this incredible proportional gap between GPs who practise in country regions versus GPs who practise in city regions. A country GP cares for 2 000 or 3 000 patients whereas a city GP may care for 500 or 600 patients. The figures are amazing and I certainly hope that the committee consults with the centre. I would like to have been appointed to the committee because of SACRRAH; however, I will ensure that the country perspective is given to the committee. Whyalla Hospital certainly has experienced staffing problems over the years and it still is experiencing problems.

Staff in that hospital are working under incredible pressure. One reason for the problems experienced in the Whyalla Hospital relates to the maintenance of the hospital. There have been some major problems this week, particularly with the hot water system. I do admit that money has been allocated to that problem. I spoke to the minister about the problem this week and some \$700 000 has been allocated towards maintenance of the hot water system. Unfortunately, the system spat this week and it has been necessary to relocate patients to other areas which has caused problems. Also, unless they are very urgent cases, patients have not been able to be admitted.

Three or four weeks ago I toured the hospital to look at some of the work that was occurring and to talk to staff in the hospital. That visit occurred during that extremely hot weather and I was very disturbed to hear about, realise and experience the lack of airconditioning in the hospital. The airconditioning unit is very old, it is run down and, in some parts of the hospital during that very hot spell (the hottest that we recall in Whyalla), fans were installed in the corridors of the surgical and intensive care areas in an attempt to keep patients cool. For staff who are already over-worked and over-stressed this situation was very difficult.

My office received a number of complaints about this and, as I said, I was also able to experience it first-hand. I want to remind the minister on the record today that he gave me an undertaking on ABC Radio, and he personally gave me an undertaking this week, that the money will be allocated. The problem has been given priority one but, in the past two years, the money still has not come through. However, the

minister has given me an assurance that that airconditioning unit will be repaired by next summer. In Whyalla, we do not have any choice, it is the only hospital we can go to, so we must make sure that conditions are maximised for our patients. I thank the minister for his assurance and I will keep him to his word.

I support the establishment of this important committee. We cannot bury our head in the sand. There is a problem in our hospitals and we are all aware of that. It is interesting, as mentioned by members opposite, that there is increased demand on our hospitals, given that patient stays are so much shorter these days. A young woman I know in Whyalla was admitted yesterday morning and had her appendix removed. I rang today to have some flowers delivered to her and was told that she would be out after lunch. I remember the days when patients stayed in hospital for 10 days when they had their appendix out. However, there is increased demand despite the fact that patient stays are much shorter.

We have to support the establishment of this committee. We must have this inquiry and we must look at conditions in our hospitals. Contrary to the member opposite, who said that this motion was ridiculous and that we did not need to waste our time, I believe that, as members of parliament, it is our responsibility to make sure that our health service is up to date and adequate, and this committee will address a lot of those problems.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): In my opinion, this motion to establish a select committee is highly irregular and sets a dangerous precedent, but not because it seeks to set up a select committee, because that has been put before this House on many occasions. What is highly irregular and what worries me is that there is a determination to have this voted on today without our side of politics having any chance to go away and think about it for the next few days.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I am surprised to hear interjections from opposition members because, if we try to bring in a bill with less than a week or so for consideration, there is a huge uproar and outcry from them that they have not had a chance to look at it. Now they are saying that we should consider this motion in a matter of minutes. Surely this type of motion needs to be looked at carefully, and I would have thought that there are definite possibilities for amendments to it to make sure that we are not wasting our time, but I can see from the reaction opposite that this is a political stunt. That disappoints me greatly, because it will not prove anything. The opposition seeks to set up a committee, and we have heard the arguments from both sides.

We know what is happening in Victoria. There was a change of government in that state just over a year ago and since then 360 new committees have been set up. There might be more than that. If you want to put off until tomorrow what is supposed to be done today, set up a committee. That is the best way of putting something off. We saw what happened in Victoria when Labor was in power. It bankrupted Victoria, it brought it to the lowest level, even lower than South Australia for a while. The Liberals brought it back up to a solid position and now the Bracks government does not know how to handle it, so everything is being thrown to a committee. Over 360 new committees in a year!

I shudder to think what would happen if this opposition ever got into government here. We would go back to a stage of committees, and that is being highlighted today with this motion to establish a select committee. Opposition members

are prefacing what would happen if they got into power. I would weep for South Australia if, in the foreseeable future, Labor got back in because all the good work in the state would be undone in the first four years, and I can guarantee that to the people of South Australia.

The subject of health services is interesting. At the end of last year I was given some statistics from a survey that was done around Australia on what people thought of our public hospital system.

Ms Rankine: You are well prepared. You were doing it last year.

Mr MEIER: Just listen. For those who had been in a hospital in recent times, 96 per cent said that they felt the hospital system was very good to excellent. For those who had never been in a hospital in recent years, how many said that it was very good to excellent? Not 96 per cent but only 26 per cent said the hospital system was very good. It was interesting that the member for Taylor said that her experience in hospital was very good. So many people who have not used the hospital system are misled into thinking, because of what they read in the paper, that it is no good, but of those who have been in hospital 96 per cent Australia-wide say that it is very good to excellent.

A survey was also conducted on people who apparently do not listen to the news or read newspapers (and apparently shift workers come into that category); these people were targeted and asked how they thought the hospital system was going. The result was roughly 50-50, with 50 per cent saying that it was not very good and 50 per cent saying that it was very good to excellent. So, you can use statistics and figures to show what you want.

Therefore, this committee will do nothing, in my opinion, to improve the current health system. There is no question. The Premier admitted yesterday that we have problems in the health system: we always have and always will. It will never change because additional resources could always be brought in.

Let us consider our hospital and health system in comparison with that of any other country in the world. We rate up with the best in probably every category. In fact, our quality of care is recognised as being better than any other country. Our cancer cure rate is 16 per cent better than that in any other European country, and we have the best survival rate for breast cancer out of the 12 countries surveyed. So, we have an excellent report card in that respect.

People in this chamber know that the increase in cost of health care is going up at a rapid rate, and the amount of money we are putting in is not able to keep up with that rapid rate. If the opposition says, 'Increase taxes', fine, I am happy to listen to its policy. I was amused at the time of the change of government in New South Wales when Mr Fahey was ousted and Mr Carr came in. During that election campaign the Labor Party, then in opposition, said that the streets of Sydney were unsafe. It was a scary situation: law and order was a big issue, as crime was rampant in Sydney, and apparently the Liberals were the cause of it. A change of government occurred. A few months later, the then minister responsible for the Olympics, Michael Knight, was being interviewed on the radio. The interviewer said, 'Look minister, you will be bringing hundreds of thousands of people to Sydney: what will you do about law and order and the crime on our streets?' This was a few months after Labor had got in, having said that it was the most unsafe place in the world. What did Michael Knight say? He said, 'What, the

streets of Sydney for overseas visitors? These would be the safest streets in the world—we have no problem at all.'

Ms Rankine: What's this got to do with the health system?

Mr MEIER: This whole health issue here is a political stunt. You are seeking to create scare tactics and a scare environment when in fact you know full well that when your government was in power the health situation was in a far worse situation than it is today.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I do not believe there is any greater issue of concern in the minds of South Australians at present than the state of our public hospital system. I commend the member for Elizabeth for taking this important initiative, which everyone in this parliament should support. It is an initiative that I believe all South Australians will welcome. They have suffered long enough. They are sick and tired of witnessing the decimation of what was once one of the best public health systems in the world. They are sick and tired of seeing their loved ones suffer from a lack of appropriate care and a lack of quality treatment. That is not in any way an indictment on our doctors and nurses who are stretched to the absolute limit in our hospitals: it is a direct result of a lack of funds and a lack of staff. Our doctors and nurses in South Australia are some of the best trained and most sought after in the world. It does not matter where they go: they are employed with glee. We know what this government wanted to do with our public health system. We know it does not have a commitment to a public health system. It wanted to—

Members interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: Your agenda was to privatise the public health system—first, the water supply; then ETSA; and our public hospital system was fair and square within your target until the Modbury Hospital situation arose. Modbury Hospital was going to be the great flagship of health privatisation in this state. Instead of that, your ship sank. You were not prepared to go any further because it has been such an abject disaster. It has been an abject failure in all aspects. Not one undertaking that the government gave in relation to that privatisation proposal has happened—not one! What happened to the private hospital that was going to be built on the Modbury Hospital site? It reached the stage of becoming just one floor in the hospital and then it was closed down. I have spoken on the issue of Modbury Hospital on a number of occasions in this House, in relation both to personal experiences and to those of residents in my electorate and, let me tell the House, their concerns continue. The confidence in the public health system in this state continues to deteriorate.

My concern about this matter, involving our major public hospital servicing the north-eastern suburbs, was such that I put a motion to the House in the last session seeking an investigation into patient care at that hospital. This government shows so little regard for the care of patients and staff at that hospital that not one member spoke on that motion. They allowed it to lapse. That is an indication of their contempt. I look forward to debating the member for Elizabeth's bill on the establishment of a health ombudsman because, clearly, when things go wrong in the public hospital system in this state people have no confidence and nowhere to go to have issues resolved. We clearly need someone who is independent, has a knowledge of the hospital system and can fairly arbitrate in relation to these matters.

We heard the minister yesterday tell us about the very generous offer that he has put to the nurses in relation to the current dispute.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: They were the minister's words, not mine. Nurses are probably one of the most dedicated and most responsible group of workers in this state. They are now making a desperate stand—and not about things that benefit them: their stand is about—

Mr Williams interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: Their pay claim has been met. You may well laugh. The member for MacKillop has previously made statements in this House about our health system. He thinks it is a big joke. He thinks it is a joke that people are left on trolleys; he thinks it is a joke that old ladies cannot get their hips replaced; he thinks it is a joke that patients are left to die on mattresses on the floor. Well, let me tell him that the people of South Australia do not think it is a joke, and he will find out about that at the next election when he is no longer the member for MacKillop. He can sit with that smug look on his face then and we will see who has the last laugh.

Nurses in South Australia are fighting for appropriate care for their patients. Yesterday, the minister quoted figures involving the number of people treated in public hospitals, and we were subjected to that again this morning. What he does not tell us about is the number of people who are readmitted: readmitted because they were pushed out of hospital before they should have been, because they are not getting the care they should get, because there is no longer preventative programs in place—they are no longer funded—and because they no longer get the home support they need. Let us not kid ourselves: the Minister for Health is no lady with the lamp; he is not out there to fix the hospital system and nor is this government.

Today this government will be shamed into action. It is gagging medical staff, it will not allow them to speak out about it. I know that, for example, in the oncology ward at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital where people are being treated for cancer, when we have had heavy storms, the rain runs down the inside walls of those wards and the staff are not game to speak up because they know they will lose their jobs. You will should be ashamed of yourself—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: You should not be able to hold your head up in this place; you are a disgrace.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not shout the chair down or he will be in real strife.

Ms RANKINE: This government continually shows how out of touch it is. It continually wants to give up its basic responsibilities as a government. It continually shows how little it knows about the needs of the people of this state. It has a lack of credibility. Again it has the wrong priorities. It is so way out of touch, it is on the way out.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I have just discovered from listening to that diatribe from across the chamber and a couple of the other contributions from members opposite exactly why the Labor Party is seeking to have a select committee; that is, it is bereft of knowledge of exactly what is happening in our hospitals. Members opposite are bereft of all the information that is in the public sphere. They are bereft of the good work that has been done in the public hospital system in South Australia; for instance that nonsense

a moment ago about this government's creating a situation where we have roofs leaking in public hospitals.

The reality is—and the minister spoke about this when answering a question yesterday—that the previous Labor government not only caused massive debt in this state, and ran a budget deficit on an annual basis of \$300 million, but it allowed the infrastructure of this state to wind down to an abysmal level. It did it to the schools, the hospitals and the roads, and that is why we have hospitals that are substandard now. The legacy that was left to this state after 20 years of almost continuous Labor government is absolutely appalling and it is an absolute disgrace for members opposite to suggest that it is as a result of this government that we have some problems in our hospital system.

We are not denying that there are problems in the hospital system. We are acknowledging that, but I am urging the House not to support this motion to set up a select committee because this is a politically motivated stunt. Members opposite are already shamelessly prepared to cause great angst and anxiety to people in our communities, particularly the elderly and infirmed. They are putting about a perception that our hospitals and our public health system is in failure mode, when it definitely is not. The public hospital system in this state is under pressure, we acknowledge that. We also understand the reasons and we are addressing the problems.

As other members on this side know and the member for Hartley rightly pointed out—and I sit with him on the Public Works Committee, as does the shadow minister; and she knows exactly what has been happening with regard to capital works in public hospitals in South Australia—we have spent \$500 million in the last seven years. As the minister said in his answer yesterday, in 1985 the then Labor government promised to spend \$10 million a year on the QEH until the turn of the century. Not one dollar spent—and they have the temerity to suggest that this government has been the cause of the problems in the public health sector.

The temerity of them is absolutely outstanding. Given the ignorance that has been displayed from members on the opposite side of the chamber, I can understand why they would want to have a select committee. They do not even have regard for the information given in this House or that which is available in the public arena through the popular press. They do not make use of the information they can access through their work on standing committees of the parliament. Rather, they wish to pursue this political stunt.

Mr Scalzi: Like Victoria.

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes. They take no action and have no ideas. They simply decide to set up a committee. It has absolutely fascinated me that, in the 3½ years that I have been a member of this parliament, a lot of talk and nonsense has come from members opposite about the problems we have in the health system and other areas of government responsibility. Not once has the shadow minister or the Leader of the Opposition suggested a policy, and not once have they suggested an initiative.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Eighty-five clauses! Smoke and mirrors! We are addressing real problems in a real way. The figures that the minister brought to the attention of the House yesterday in answer to a question indicate that total admissions to our public hospitals since this government has been in power over the past seven years have increased by 25 per cent. I heard the following quip from across the Chamber early in the debate, 'Yes, but we have an ageing population.' We have an ageing population, but it is not ageing at quite

that rate, and we know that we have a virtually static population in South Australia.

In the past seven years the total population in South Australia has hardly changed at all. In fact, when we took over government the population was declining; people were leaving South Australia in droves. That is one thing that we have arrested and been able to manage to turn around because we have the fundamentals right. We have the fundamentals of the economy right, and now we can work at a greater rate—and we have been working at this the whole way through—on getting some of these major social issues under control. We are concentrating on health, education and law and order. They are the areas in which we are doing things. We have already committed \$500 million to capital works and the health system. We have negotiated a good deal with the nurses. In spite of the nurses wishing to—

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I'll tell you exactly why they are staying out. It is because a few nurses see the political advantage for their mates in prolonging this dispute and trying to sheet home the blame to the Government. Last week in my electorate I had a meeting with some people involved in the health sector. At the end of the meeting, after we had talked about some important issues and initiatives that we were promulgating in our area, I asked some of the people who are professionals in the health field and who work on a daily basis, 'Is this 1:4 ratio necessary? What is the real situation?' The answer was, 'Certainly in hospitals, in acute care wards, in post operative care wards and where it is necessary we have a high staffing ratio'—as the minister said yesterday—'quite often of 2:1.' That is, two staff per patient, on three shifts, 24 hours a day. We have those high staffing ratios in the areas they are needed.

The Nurses Federation is calling for a ratio of 1:4 right across the board, in every ward and in every hospital right across the state. I asked these health professionals in my electorate and they said that, in some of the major teaching hospitals in the city, staffing ratios approaching that may be appropriate in particular areas. However, when you get out into major regional hospitals, a staffing ratio somewhat below that would be appropriate and, as you moved out into the small country hospitals, a staffing ratio considerably below that would be appropriate.

The ridiculous thing is that the Nurses Federation has called for a staffing ratio based on what it is telling the community has happened in Victoria, yet it just has not happened in Victoria. Indeed, it cannot happen in Victoria because, even if the government of Victoria said, 'Tomorrow we will introduce these staffing ratios,' the staff are just not on the ground; they are just not available. So it will not happen. The Nurses Federation knows that.

I conclude my remarks by saying that, unfortunately, it is my understanding that the House will probably support the motion, despite the fact that I think it is a political stunt and a nonsense and will be a waste of time for everyone other than those members opposite who are having great difficulty getting their mind around the truth of exactly what is happening in our hospitals.

The member for Wright asked what happened to the private hospital that was to be built at Modbury Hospital. She might be interested to know that, today—and at that time—there is a 45 per cent over-supply of beds in the public hospital sector. This is one of the problems, and we know it.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: But you want a select committee to tell you what we already know. Together with many of my colleagues, I believe that the government is getting on with producing, and in fact has produced, a health system in South Australia which would be unmatched anywhere in the world.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Reynell, could I ask that the conference be conducted off the floor of the chamber. The member for Reynell.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): It is important to vote on this matter today, so I want to emphasise and support everything that has been said by members on this side and contribute briefly to the debate. I am particularly pleased to see that this motion contains a term of reference relating to the interface with the private hospital system. We have heard some rhetoric and abuse across the chamber today about what the government's role has been in relation to the private health system and whether or not it has changed, which I think is one of the issues that needs to be considered.

However, I want to go back to May 1998 when I was fairly new to my work on the Public Works Committee and when I received the submission for the Modbury Hospital redevelopment project. I could not understand why one of the government's objectives in relation to this work was to commission a private hospital to improve access to private facilities for residents of the north-eastern suburbs.

At that stage it was beyond my understanding—and it still is—as to why the government believed that it had a responsibility to provide private health care for the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. It is the government's responsibility to provide public health care. The market system will provide private health care, if that is appropriate.

This is just a small indication of this government's confusion in relation to its approach to health care. Several members on this side have noted the fact that it is very difficult to understand exactly all the implications of what is happening in our hospitals, because staff who know what is happening have been coerced into silence. One of the areas in which I keep on hearing little pieces of information, both from people working in the health system and from those who have been using it, is in relation to the arrangements about the use of the private health system.

Constituents who have gone to Flinders Medical Centre as public patients, expecting to be treated in the public hospital system, have come back to tell me that they have ended up in the private system. They quite like the carpet, but they are worried about how much money is being spent from the public system to support the private system and whether the public system is getting a fair deal in the arrangements that have been made with the private system. Staff members keep on suggesting to me that this is not the case. It is very important that this term of reference be explored comprehensively.

We have heard from members opposite about the increased attendances in public hospitals. We have heard from members on this side that one of the reasons for this is that people are discharged too early and, therefore, are readmitted. Every time I hear this, I deplore the way the system is being managed and staff are being forced to do things that they know, in the best interests of the patient, should not be done. Another issue is the way in which the statistics are kept. Again, through the Public Works Committee, there has been an indication that there is a change in the way in which the statistics are being kept.

Our own private experiences are worthwhile here. Some time ago my partner was taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital in a life-threatening emergency. The treatment, accordingly, was absolutely superb. He was seen immediately, and I cannot praise too highly the ambulance officers who attended to him. It was with some amazement that, some six months later when he went for a checkup, he discovered that he was having an inpatient band attached to his wrist because he was considered to be an admission.

As far as he was concerned, he was just going down there for an hour or so to find out whether everything was okay. He was treated as an inpatient and, between the time that he was told to sit in the waiting room while some tests were processed and when he was seen some time later, he in fact went back to his workplace—with the badge saying that he was an inpatient. He should never have been treated as an admission: he was simply an outpatient going for a checkup. I have confirmed through the Public Works Committee that he should not have been treated as an inpatient.

So, we also need to look at these things. It is not really important to find out whether the statistics are being fudged: what is really important to find out is that services are being delivered and people are getting the services they need. I have also taken offence at the implications from several members opposite that the action of our nurses at the moment, in not lifting industrial bans, is for political reasons. I find this a gross insult to 700 nurses who attended the meeting and who are perfectly capable of making decisions for themselves.

These are the people who run our hospital system: who every day make decisions about the good treatment of patients. The suggestion from members opposite is that these same people are incapable of making decisions for themselves about the best way to manage an industrial situation relating to the health of our hospitals. Of course they are able to do this for themselves: they are good, honest-thinking people.

I want to conclude by giving one example of the sorts of problems that come out of this mismanagement of the health system. This relates to a constituent whom I doorknocked the other day. She had not bothered to come and see me as she did not think it was worthwhile, but when I knocked on her door she was certainly going to tell me her story.

Just before Christmas she was taken to the emergency services at Noarlunga Hospital—and I am very pleased to see those services upgraded. They provide a much better working environment and a much better environment for patients. She had dislocated her shoulder; she had done this many times before. This time she was advised that it was up to the stage where reconstructive surgery was required. She was referred to Flinders Medical Centre to get an appointment. The first appointment she could get was 27 July. She was also advised that, if surgery was required—and it was certainly the opinion of the doctor attending her at Noarlunga that it would be required—it would probably be a 24-month wait before she could have surgery.

This woman has a husband on a disability pension and two young children. The fact that her shoulder is dislocating constantly means that she is not able to do things like hanging the washing on the line; neither can her children or her husband. This family is expected to manage for about two years with this absolute insult to the way people can handle their domestic arrangements. It is just intolerable; and somehow they are expected to manage it for two years. I contacted the Flinders Medical Centre to see whether these details were correct. Indeed, they are pretty well correct; the

only difference was that the wait for surgery might be only 18 months. That is what the list is at the moment, but there was no indication of what the list might be by the time my constituent gets to see the upper limb clinic in July.

This is what the mismanagement of our health system means to individual people. This constituent has family, relatives and neighbours, many of whom will have to help out in the two years before this surgery is undertaken. Of course they know there is a problem in the health system. Of course they know the opposition is not exaggerating it, and of course they know the mismanagement of the health system by the government members opposite is just an indication of how they mismanage everything.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I do not intend to speak for very long; I think the case has been adequately put by my colleagues on this side. I know that this is a very important issue for my electorate, so I wanted to get on my feet and support it. I will read one letter that I received recently about health. I could read hundreds of letters in here, because I recently surveyed my constituents about health and got hundreds of replies. I know that all of us on this side receive phone call after phone call about people who are on waiting lists and who have been in the same sorts of circumstances as the member for Reynell has just described. The letter that I am about to read describes what is going wrong with our health system and why we need an inquiry. What has happened is that the hospitals have been so badly squeezed that the care has been left out of health care in many cases.

I received this letter from a gentleman who lives next to a woman of 77 years of age. On 23 January that woman broke her arm in three places and was sent by ambulance to Flinders Medical Centre, where she received an X-ray and was then sent home in a taxi with her arm in a sling. She was told she could not stay overnight, because there were no beds. The woman lives alone—remember, she is 77—she is independent, so she would not ring other pensioners for help, and that night she had to get into bed with her clothes on because she could not undress herself because of the breakage and the pain. Fortunately on the morning of 24 January, Flinders apparently relented and sent a taxi to take her to Blackwood Hospital, where she remained until 31 January. She was then transferred to one of the rehabilitation wards in the Repatriation Hospital, where she remains to this day.

I guess this woman is lucky that she had to spend only one night in agony, but there must be many more who are not made that offer. It is disgraceful that that 77 year old woman with her arm broken in three places was sent home with a sling and that was about it; no care, no after care, no bed and no other help at all. If the members on the other side think there are no problems in the health system they really need their heads read. There are great problems in our health system, and I hope this committee will help solve them.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I was amazed by the speeches of the Minister for Minerals and Energy and those of members on the other side and the attitude of government members in respect of this issue, particularly in relation to the criticism levelled at the shadow minister for daring to move this motion to establish a select committee. I remind members that every member of this parliament is entitled to move a motion, introduce a private member's bill, or seek to set up a select committee to look at any matter. That is their democratic right and that is what the institution of parliament is about. It is unfair that any member should be criticised for doing

their job and for supporting something in which they believe strongly.

I cannot understand the government's attitude in opposing this motion. If, as the government says, there are no problems with the health system, it should be only too happy to have an inquiry to vindicate that view. If the health system is in good shape, when the evidence is taken and the findings of the select committee come down, the report of the select committee will reflect that. The fact that the government is opposing the setting up of a select committee indicates to me that it is frightened of what evidence will be given and that it is trying to cover up an inadequate health system.

The minister also criticised, very unfairly, the nurses' recent industrial action. Nurses are wonderful people. They are long suffering, responsible people who do not take industrial action lightly. The fact that they have been forced into this position means that the health system is in crisis and that they have taken this step as a last resort.

The minister asserted that under Labor the health system was in a bad state. I point out to the House that about four years ago, along with other members of parliament who have constituencies in the western suburbs, I was invited to a Queen Elizabeth Hospital board meeting. At that board meeting it was pointed out that the cuts that this government was imposing on the QEH, in particular, were starting to bite and were hurting the hospital. I remember at the time that the then member for Peake, Heini Becker, objected to this and said that there had been cuts under the previous Labor government. He was told by members of the board that there had been cuts under the previous government because there was fat to be cut; but he was also told that there was no longer any fat to be cut and they were cutting into the bone. That situation has continued. The health system is in crisis. I support fully the shadow minister's call for the establishment of a select committee.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I will speak briefly in support of this motion by the shadow minister for health which seeks to set up a select committee to consider various matters concerning the public hospital system. Without exaggeration, every week I hear stories from people about their disappointment at the disaster in the hospital system. One area of concern relates to waiting times when people actually arrive at hospital. Many cases have been reported to me of people who have waited for perhaps 12 hours in pain and agony in the casualty area. Another area of concern involves those people who wait, literally for years, for surgery which might be considered elective in a technical sense but which will have a dramatic impact on their quality of life. For example, knee surgery which will enable a person to walk again or eye surgery which will enable them to drive a car again. They are fundamental matters.

I am pleased also that the proposed select committee will look at the interface between the public and private health systems. This is of particular relevance to the Flinders Medical Centre and the private hospital next to it. Many patients have told me that they have gone into the public hospital only to wake up in the private hospital. I have also heard of patients who do not want to pay the private hospital gap, even if they are insured. There are a number of problems around private health insurance and the gap payments that must be made.

A number of constituents in Mitchell Park, for example, live there specifically because they are close to Flinders Medical Centre if something goes wrong. In emergency cases

a number of these residents have been taken in an ambulance not to Flinders Medical Centre or Daw Park General Hospital but, rather, to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which is the very thing they wanted to avoid by moving close to Flinders Medical Centre.

I am really shocked at the response of government members to the motion. To suggest that there is nothing wrong with the health system is really putting their head in the sand. It is completely ignoring the disappointment and concern that is widespread in the community—certainly in my area. The government should be ashamed of its record on health care and funding for hospitals.

I support the motion, and I believe that the first step towards solving the problem is a thorough and open public analysis of what is wrong—whether funding is the answer; to what extent funding is the answer; and to what extent reversing privatisation is the answer. This select committee will need to address a number of issues, and I believe that it is the first step to getting our health care system back on track.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): In closing the debate on the motion, I would like to thank the members for their comments, particularly members on this side of the House and also the member for Fisher, who supported the motion and who acknowledged the importance of proceeding with such an initiative.

I would like to make a few comments in relation to the contributions of various members during the debate. First, I would like to respond to a few points made by the Minister for Mines and Energy. He, interestingly, resorted to personal abuse, and I guess we all know that when people have no argument to put forward—no strong argument, no facts on which to base a proper response—they resort to personal abuse and, of course, we saw that again. We have seen it before from this minister and, no doubt, we will see it again. We had it again today.

I moved this motion with pleasure, not because I am pleased with what is happening in our health system and not because I am pleased with the suffering that has been so evident over recent years amongst our constituents across this state. Rather, I did move an initiative where we, as parliamentarians, will have an opportunity to do our job: to sit down, to work through the issues and to come up with some constructive solutions.

It is interesting that the Minister for Mines and Energy thought that I should have talked about regret. I do not regret being able to do my job: I look forward to it. I welcome the opportunity, and I will be rolling up my sleeves and getting down to working out some constructive solutions to fixing the problem.

I also was accused by the minister of being factually wrong. I invite the minister to look at the budget papers for the last year and the press clippings and the statements that were made. Everything in my speech was absolutely backed up factually. People will know that I do not get up and talk off the top of my head—as the minister did today and as he does so often.

The member for Hartley said that we did not need a committee; that we needed action. I agree that we need action but, unfortunately, we on this side of the House are not yet in a position to deliver the action. We soon will be. I am very pleased to have this committee, because I know that, in about eight or nine months' time, it will be my job, and I want to get a head start on this, because I am not prepared to sit on

my hands and make out that it is not happening, and no-one on this side is prepared for that to occur. It will be a different style of government altogether, with different priorities.

The member for Goyder said that there always have been problems, and there always will be. What a defeatist attitude! We are not prepared to have that sort of attitude. We are prepared, on this side of the House, to say that health is a priority for our government to be, and that we are prepared to get in early and start looking at the situation.

The minister, to a degree, even though he said at the beginning of the week that he did not support a select committee and that it was not necessary, acknowledged that there were problems. He said that his solution was to set up a 15 person committee from within his department and they would deal with the issues. The problem is that the time line for this committee is September 2002: it is a bit late. The fact is that it is all happening now. The government will be gone in 2002. We need action and we need it now and this is the committee that can do it.

Finally, it is quite clear from comments from the members opposite that they are in a complete state of denial, and this point has been made by a number of my colleagues on this side of the House. I find it really sad that members opposite have got to the point of accusing us of a political stunt and accusing the doctors and the nurses of a political stunt. I wonder if they actually think that the people contacting their offices—they must be contacting members opposite as well, because they are contacting us—are also engaging in a political stunt. The fact is that they are not. Take your blinkers off, be honest with yourselves: there are lots of problems. It is not a matter of our pointing the finger at each other and talking about 10 years ago, yesterday and now: let us get on with a committee and find some solutions, look at the future and work out how we can get out of this mess.

Motion carried.

The House appointed a select committee consisting of Ms Bedford, the Hon. Dean Brown, Mr McEwen, Ms Stevens and the Hon. D. C. Wotton; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Wednesday 30 May.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I move:

That Standing Order 339 be and remain so far suspended as to enable the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the House.

Motion carried.

SWAN REACH WATER SUPPLY

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That this House calls on the government to direct SA Water to provide, within the next 12 months, all residents, businesses, institutions and allotments in Swan Reach with a potable, filtered water supply at appropriate pressure, regardless of elevation above the level of the Murray River, at no direct additional expense to the ratepayers.

I wonder how many members in this place have to put up with a water supply that will not run through a shower rose; a water supply to the school which their children, or grandchildren in some instances, or nephews and nieces if they do not have any children, or the children of their friends, go where there is no pressurised water supply available for firefighting—leave alone for the school's domestic needs—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, I well understand what the member for Stuart is telling me. In a good part of the township, in fact, there is an inadequate water supply, by the standards of the 21st century. Even a place such as Yunta has a reticulated water supply from a dam that has been there for many years, yet what I am talking about is not a figment of my imagination; it is a fact of life for the people of Swan Reach. That is in spite of the fact that it is on the Murray River and it is in spite of the fact that the Swan Reach Pumping Station delivers not just a pressurised supply of water to the Mid North and Yorke Peninsula through the Stockwell Pipeline, but also, and more importantly, it is a filtered pressurised supply. Towns such as Clare get their water from Swan Reach, even though it is miles away.

Towns such as Maitland are included in that reticulated supply of potable filtered water that is metered, yet in Swan Reach, on what is called the upper level, not all the residents in that town can have a pressurised supply of potable water, leave alone the fact that absolutely every resident, including the school, has no filtered water. Why is it that the government cannot find the funds to take the pipeline from the filtration plant seven kilometres to Swan Reach? It is not a big town and it is not a big ask. If it cannot, in its opinion, supply the pipes to get the water from the existing facility of the pump house and the filtration unit, surely to God, surely for our sakes, as a civilised state, we as a parliament can direct the government to install a small filtration unit and an adequate supply of pressurised water to enable all those homes and the school to be supplied with such water.

It is, indeed, the reason why the township cannot and does not expand, and it is a chicken and egg problem. Whenever people have wanted more power to be reliably supplied any time over the past 40 years the argument has been, 'Well, your town's not big enough.' Whenever the local member has argued for a better water supply the response has been, 'The town is not big enough', yet when you go to prospective investors to establish industries there that would—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: We are debating Notices of Motion/Other Motions No. 1 on page 6, which states:

That this House calls on the government to direct SA Water to provide, within the next 12 months, all residents, businesses, institutions and allotments in Swan Reach with a potable, filtered water supply at appropriate pressure, regardless of elevation above the level of the Murray River, at no direct additional expense to the ratepayers.

All members in this place pretty well take that for granted, but the people of Swan Reach cannot, and I have been drawing attention to that fact ever since I have been here. Successive ministers have always used this chicken and egg approach which says that, if you do not have a big enough population, you will never get one. No business will go there because it does not have any water. I encouraged one business, Oakdale Potatoes, to go there. That business is investing millions upon millions of dollars in the development of irrigation properties well back from the river using state-of-the-art technology.

That industry will expand the number of permanent jobs in Swan Reach and it will also provide a quantum leap in the demand for power. It will justify, on that ground, the investment of the additional capital necessary to give a reliable power supply to the town. That will make it feasible to hook up three phase power to the pumps that are there at present to lift the water from the river to the tanks where it is chlorinated at such high levels (because the water is not

filtered) that it produces trihalomethanes and other carcinogens—which most members in this House know are a consequence of these high levels of chlorination required to make the dirty water safe—thus putting the health of those people at risk.

We have removed that risk by filtering all of Adelaide's supply, but we still say it is okay for the folk in Swan Reach. I do not think it is. I do not think it is reasonable; I do not think it is fair. I think it is about time they were given the same consideration as everyone else on the Swan Reach through Stockwell pipeline that supplies the Barossa, the Lower North, the Mid North and Yorke Peninsula. If we can build a pipeline for 200 kilometres to deliver potable filtered water to all those other communities so far away, why cannot we build it just eight kilometres to the people in Swan Reach? Why cannot we make it safe for the kids at the school to have clean, properly filtered, low chlorinated water available to drink? Why cannot we have adequate supplies to fight fires on hot days? On the upper level, there is no pressure.

Something has to be done. The piecemeal improvements that have been undertaken to date are unreasonably inadequate and totally unfair. The Premier and the member for Schubert are extending the pipeline on a non-viable basis into the northern Adelaide Hills. It is going into the northern end of the Premier's electorate and into the member for Schubert's electorate through the communities of Eden Valley and others that are outside the Barossa Valley. If it is good enough to do it for them, why is it not good enough to do it for the folk in Swan Reach and other similar communities that have been ignored and left out?

I draw attention to this more especially because there are so many indirect supplies in the town, and this is the crunch point for me in the argument. The supply of water as an indirect supply simply means that, if you want water and SA Water's pipe does not go past the front of your property, you have to buy some polythene hose pipe, usually high density, and connect it to a meter that will be put on someone else's land several hundred metres away. You roll out your own pipe at your own risk, after you have permission from the council to do so, along the roadside.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: It is called an indirect service.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, that is what I am talking about. It is an indirect service and it has to be installed. What the minister does not seem to understand, and what no other minister has ever bothered to do anything about, is that these indirect supplies are within the limits of the town. It is not as if they are in rural areas. All the other indirect supplies around South Australia are outside surveyed, proclaimed township areas.

One of my constituents, Mr Simmons, a pensioner, has had to install his own. When one of the neighbours between his home and his meter, several hundred metres away, decides to clean up the weeds along the roadside and drive along with a rotary slasher, and if the sand drift has shifted and exposed his pipe close to the surface, the slasher blade goes through the loose sand on the surface and cuts his water supply, so the poor bugger has to pay excess water. If it is not that, it is the neighbours cleaning up the rubbish. They pile it up in heaps and, when they have a good day to burn it, they set it alight and cook his bloody pipe. He has to pay for the excess water and replace the pipe at its own expense, and he lives in the town!

Do members think that is fair, civilised or reasonable? Well, I do not. If he was outside the town I could understand it. That is the system we have. But he is not outside the town,

and there are many others like him. If the government of the day thinks it is fair to renege on the promise that was given to Tom Stott by Steele Hall to provide a reticulated supply of safe potable water to all the residents in the township of Swan Reach—and subsequent ministers have ignored that promise ever since that day—and if the government thinks in the 21st century that it is fair and reasonable to do it, it has another think coming.

I doubt that the Liberal Party will get more than a handful of votes on polling day when it is next held in Swan Reach unless it does something about this, and anybody who votes for the Liberal Party in Swan Reach will be someone who has visited there to take an absent vote from somewhere else. The folk in Swan Reach are ropeable about this. If a minister went up there now, after this last summer with the way the heat and water supply have been, I would not be held responsible for his safety. Those people are normally placid, reasonable folk. But, by hell, they are angry—and for good reason. I call on the minister and the government to get off their backside and give the people of Swan Reach a fair go and a decent water supply before the year is out.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I can understand the feelings of the honourable member in relation to the provision of adequate water supplies because, as someone who comes from a part of South Australia with limited supplies of water and who has had to supply his own, as have my neighbours, I know the costs involved. I have been involved in running water in excess of 19 kilometres, so I understand clearly what the honourable member is saying. I have in my constituency places like Hawker which have shocking quality water. Places like Stirling North have a proliferation of indirect services. One of the things that concerns me greatly is that I just wonder what is the charter of SA Water. It does appear to me that it seems rather reluctant, to put it kindly, to want to connect more clients to the system.

I have in my constituency other areas that are suffering badly, and I am aware that around South Australia there are places like Streaky Bay where the only solution to the problem is desalination. That is the only solution to the problem at Hawker, but I do not know who will pay. When we have a huge quantity of money going to the arts and other things, I wonder what are the priorities. I am one of those who strongly believe that we will have to give serious consideration—and time is running out—to the quantity and quality of water available in South Australia. Unfortunately, too few people understand that we have a potential crisis in this state, and it is not only the quantity but the quality. If people think that we can just ad infinitum go on sinking bores into aquifers and pumping out water without any regard to the future, they are not facing reality. It is a very serious matter.

Constituencies such as mine which have reticulation systems looking after small towns are under tremendous pressure. Not only is the system overloaded, but to find adequate sources to supply that system is a grave difficulty. It is something to which we have to give serious consideration. SA Water has gone from being a fairly intransigent bureaucracy to a government corporation: one which was losing money to one which is now putting money into the general revenue of the state. My point is that we should be reinvesting a considerable amount of that surplus on operations back into upgrading and improving systems.

Mr Lewis: Like Telstra's social obligations.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is right. I understand that SA Water is making in excess of \$40 million to \$50 million

profit and I am pleased about that but I want to see some of that money reinvested in these small communities so that they have the opportunity of being connected. We have a system in place where most meters are limited to five litres a minute, wherever you are. Therefore, I know that at places like Eyre Peninsula there are very grave concerns about availability of water.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, I have very grave concerns. There are difficulties on the outskirts of Port Augusta where there are five acre, I think it is, blocks of land where it is terribly difficult to get a connection. You would think you were trying to gain access to the Crown jewels, such is the difficulty of getting people hooked up. I have had some most interesting debates with our friends at SA Water about why they cannot hook up some poor fellow to water. It should be a condition of sale of such land to tell people what the availability of water is. People should not be able to buy land and be of the view that they are going to be automatically hooked up, because after they buy they suddenly say, 'No-one told us.' So it should be a condition of sale so that they are fully aware. Obviously, it is going to affect the value, but it is not fair to let people buy land when there is no water available. They should be fully aware of it and what steps can be taken to get it connected and what the cost will be, because a lot of people do not understand. As the honourable member pointed out, if you have to run polythene pipe, you have to put it in properly or you will be like my poor constituent who did not realise it was leaking and he received a tremendously high account for excess water because he did not know it was running onto the ground.

So, I understand completely what the honourable member is talking about. For years, I was involved in making representations to get water extended west from Ceduna to Penong. We got it to within about 8 kilometres: we have not quite got there yet but I intend to continue to pursue the matter. The council has managed excellently a very good scheme at Ceduna in cooperation with the communities at Denial Bay and at Koonibba. It was a very sensible operation, although there are some problems. But that is taking place elsewhere. I think that we have spent enough down here and that it is time to spend more money to connect these people to what is a basic necessity of life.

So I understand and appreciate what the honourable member is talking about. The area he is talking about is not far from my constituency anyway, and I have had dealings there with people on other matters. So I say to the honourable member that I think this matter needs to be addressed and I will talk to my colleagues in relation to this and a number of other matters as they affect my constituency. A number of areas need additional investment to ensure that people can be connected and that existing schemes can be expanded.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

OLYMPIC FOOTBALL MATCHES

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this House congratulates the government and all those who contributed in making Adelaide's Olympic football matches at Hindmarsh Stadium such a resounding success and, in particular, the players, volunteers, officials and spectators whose enthusiasm contributed to securing our Olympic history and putting Adelaide on show to the world.

In moving the motion which stands in my name I rise to point out to the House, and I am sure everyone would agree, that

the Sydney Olympic Games were a staggering success, surpassing even the loftiest expectations of the nation and the world, and that Adelaide played an important part in those games. Indeed, some international journalists have gone as far as to suggest that Australia should become a permanent home for the games. I am not sure that I would go so far, but it was certainly a resounding success.

In the interests of brevity and in order to get this motion agreed to by the House, I will contain my remarks to a few minutes, because I am sure that there will be general agreement that the part played by Adelaide in hosting the soccer events during the games was a fine achievement by Adelaide, by South Australia and by all concerned. I feel very proud of that significant role and the community should be congratulated for the amazing support that it provided for the Adelaide based Olympic events.

Through the staging of six preliminary football matches and one brilliant quarterfinal over a 10 day period at Hindmarsh Stadium, our purpose-built home of Olympic football in Adelaide, we again showed the rest of Australia that, when it comes to staging a major event, you cannot beat South Australia. We even beat Sydney to opening the games with our first football match and own spectacular gala opening staged two days before Australia's golden girl, Cathy Freeman, lit the Olympic cauldron at Homebush. The sight of the best footballers in the world racing out onto Hindmarsh Stadium in their bid for Olympic glory was among the first images from the Games to be beamed around the globe.

The Premier (Hon. John Olsen) and the Minister for Tourism (Hon. Joan Hall) are to be congratulated on the outstanding success of the Olympic football project, flawlessly managed by Peter Lang, in conjunction with SOCOG Adelaide and the tournament director, Sam Ciccarello. It is my aim today to pay special thanks not only to those who have worked for more than two years to ensure the success of our event but also to the countless number of volunteers who gave up their time for no pay to play their part in Olympic history.

The television footage of football teams from such great sporting nations as Chile, Nigeria, Korea, Honduras, Spain, Morocco, Japan, Italy and the United States and their arrival in Adelaide was such a fantastic site, with fans turning out in their droves to welcome their heroes to our great state. Only in Adelaide could fans so easily meet the teams, grab an autograph or pose for photographs with their heroes, and there is no doubt that such a warm welcome will be long remembered by those athletes. In fact, young Italian football superstar Andrea Pirlo said that the support of fans would provide a fantastic boost to his team, with Adelaide's strong Italian community providing 'a piece of Italy that will give us strength'—as he put it.

Adelaide, of course, was already a favourite city for the Korean Olympic Football Team. It was at Hindmarsh Stadium in January where it went on to blitz Nigeria, Egypt and Australia to win the coveted four nations tournament. Just as she welcomed all the teams to Adelaide, the tourism minister was on hand to welcome the 55 strong entourage of Korean players, officials and media at a special function at the Adelaide Hilton International on 7 September. Her commitment and support for the entire event is a credit to her, the government and the whole state.

Those warm welcomes were just a taste of our renowned South Australian hospitality. Thanks to the hundreds of paid staff—everyone from police and ambulance workers, caterers and cleaners to drivers and doormen—and the boundless

enthusiasm of our volunteers, the athletes were greeted at every turn with efficient, professional help and a warm, friendly smile.

South Australia has a strong and proud tradition of the community coming out and volunteering their time to help with the success of major events; and our former Formula One Grand Prix and the Masters Games are prime examples of that. It was not just the athletes, dignitaries and team officials who benefited from our volunteer effort, although they were full of praise for our volunteer drivers, interpreters, medical teams, competition managers and accreditation venue logistics and protocol staff. More than 111 000 fans crowded into Hindmarsh Stadium for the seven matches—on three occasions the crowd passed 18 000. Volunteers were on every corner, guiding spectators to their seats or offering advice and warm greetings.

Adelaide's wonderfully diverse multicultural community ensured that all teams had the home support that they deserved—the fantastic range of colours, flags and banners throughout the event clearly proved that. Although Aussie Rules has always reigned supreme on the football fields of South Australia, for those 10 days (13 to 23 September) football truly captured our hearts. And did we not see some fantastic performances at Hindmarsh? Our stadium has won praise from players and team officials, fans and the world governing body FIFA and is recognised around the world.

The quarter-final capped off the spectacular Olympic event in Adelaide, with the United States beating Japan in a nail-biting finish, winning a shoot-out penalty 5:4. An amazing 1 200 Japanese fans had flown to Adelaide for the event. Off the field in Adelaide, the work of so many in running the Olympic football project is clearly paying dividends. No-one summed it up better than Signor Vincenzo Marinelli, the Acting President of the Italian soccer federation, who said of Adelaide:

Life here is so easy going and the people are so friendly and courteous, nothing seems to be too much trouble for them.

Thanks to the fantastic organisational skills of the Olympic football project and SOCOG Adelaide, the cooperation and devotion of Adelaide's work force, and the brilliant volunteer effort by the South Australian community, we all proved ourselves winners, and we showed to the world what a fabulous soccer stadium we have here, and what a fabulous soccer tradition we have. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): The opposition is pleased to support a motion of this nature. I note that in his motion the member for Waite has identified a range of key people. Following the Olympic Games, it is appropriate to have in the parliament a motion of this nature. Principally, we should never forget that the Olympic Games are put on for the athletes. Certainly, we would want to pay a tribute to all those other groups that have been recognised in this motion. However, let us put the emphasis where it should be, that is, fairly and squarely on the athletes. When the Olympic Games were first staged, it was intended that they were for the athletes. Unfortunately, far too often through history and the various Olympiads in other countries, the games have drifted away from the athletes.

At the Sydney Olympics, and also here in the small part we played in staging the soccer as a part of the games, we can be extremely proud of the fact that the games were put on for the athletes, who were the focal point, just as they should be.

I would like to recognise two other groups involved in the Olympics, one of which was the vast number of volunteers, who played such an important part. In neither Adelaide nor Sydney—and I saw them operate at both venues—have we seen volunteers carry out their quality work with such enthusiasm. The second group I would like to recognise is the public. At the end of the day, it was the public which ensured that good crowds turned up to all the games; and those crowds became involved in the atmosphere. The volunteers ensured that, irrespective of who was playing, the feeling was one of great excitement—and I went to three or four different matches during the tournament—and the public really got involved in it.

Because of the lack of time at my disposal, I will not extend my comments, because we would like to vote on this motion today. It is important that we do not let this motion drift too much further down the track. It has been on the Notice Paper for some time.

Mr Lewis: I have some amendments on file.

Mr WRIGHT: I might as well keep talking if that is the case.

An honourable member: Yes, you might as well, if that is the case.

Mr WRIGHT: Yes. Will the honourable member definitely move an amendment?

Mr Lewis: Of course.

Mr WRIGHT: Okay. In that case—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Scalzi): Order! The member for Lee.

Mr WRIGHT: In that case, there is no need for me to finish my comments today, because unfortunately we will not be in a position to vote on this matter today. It is something of which we should be very mindful: that, whether people agree or disagree with motions of this nature, they are, in part, time relevant. Let us not hide behind the truth. There has been great controversy about the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium, and that controversy continues. However, this is not the time to debate that. This motion has been moved in good faith in this House, and it relates to the athletes, the volunteers, the coaches, the medical staff and the public.

Debate adjourned.

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

FIREWORKS

Petitions signed by 6 697 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ban the personal use of fireworks with the exception of authorised public displays, were presented by Mrs Geraghty and Mr Hanna.

Petitions received.

ALDINGA POLICE STATION

A petition signed by 69 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ensure that the Aldinga Police Station is open 24 hours a day, was presented by Mr Hill.

Petition received.

DENTAL SERVICES

A petition signed by 58 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the government to fund dental

services to ensure the timely treatment of patients, was presented by Mr Hill.

Petition received.

NOARLUNGA THEATRE

A petition signed by 81 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ensure the continued access by the community to the Noarlunga Theatre, was presented by Mr Hill.

Petition received.

SCHOOL PARKING

A petition signed by 153 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the government to review student drop off and pick up parking at State schools, was presented by Ms Thompson.

Petition received.

WATER CONTRACT

In reply to **Mr CONLON** (8 November 2000).

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Mr Nuriaman is a highly respected businessman in his own right. He has extensive business and government networks and a wealth of business experience.

His knowledge, expertise and the respect he carries were established long before his brother Nuriana became governor of West Java.

Mr Nuriaman was engaged by the SA Water manager in Indonesia after a search for an appropriate person to assist with the SA Water international business. His appointment was fully in accordance with Indonesian Law.

Mr Nuriaman's assistance and dedication have proved to be invaluable. He is a key member of the team.

Mr Nuriaman's background is industry and economics. In addition to his work in Indonesia, he has trained and worked internationally. Whilst he is now retired, he is actively engaged as President, Chairman or Board Member of land, mining and computer businesses in Jakarta. He also has extensive experience as:

- Member of West Java Chamber of Commerce and Industry Board
- Vice Chairman West Java Promotion and Business Linkage Board
- Vice Chairman West Java Agribusiness Development Board
- Chairman of the West Java/South Australia business Council

Mr Nuriaman is paid approximately \$A1 200 per month. This is for an average of 15 days per month, and equals approximately half of what would be paid in Australia for one day of an equally qualified consultant.

It is worth stating that the value obtained from Mr Nuriaman's assistance is very high and his appointment has proved to be very valuable indeed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

- ElectraNet Transmission—Lease and Report
- ETSA Utilities Distribution—Lease and Report
- Flinders Power Northern Power Station—Lease and Report
- Optima Energy—Lease and Report
- Synergen—Lease and Report.

MOTOROLA

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yesterday in the House issues were raised in relation to the Cramond and subsequent Prudential Management inquiries. These documents were not in my office for four months, and I reject the inference from

members opposite that my office withheld them. I have also previously informed the House that I have ordered an immediate inquiry as to why these documents were not produced at the time of the original Cramond inquiry and why it is only now that they have come to light. The way in which these documents have come to light is of great concern to me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: As to the question of whether or not these documents would have had any implications on Mr Cramond's findings is a matter that only Mr Cramond can answer. In view of that, I have today asked the Crown Solicitor to refer the documents to Mr Cramond to obtain his view as to their material relevance.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: Yesterday the member for Stuart asked me to rule on a matter of privilege, alleging that the member for Ross Smith had been prevented from properly discharging his duties as a member of parliament by the state ALP Secretary and the ALP Caucus. The member for Ross Smith has since communicated with me and advised me that he is unable to provide me with any information to substantiate the matters raised by the member for Stuart for to do so would be in breach of the rules of the ALP and of the resolution—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come back to order and remain silent. These are serious allegations and this is a serious reply. I will read that paragraph again. The member for Ross Smith has since communicated with me and advised me that he is unable to provide me with any information to substantiate the matters raised by the member for Stuart for to do so would be in breach of the rules of the ALP and of the resolution carried out by the SPLP last Tuesday and would result in his expulsion from the party. In the absence of this supporting material from the member for Ross Smith to the matters raised by the member for Stuart (other than press speculation), I am unable to rule that a prima facie breach of privilege has been established.

LE MANS RACE

The SPEAKER: The member for Hart has asked me to rule on whether the Minister for Tourism may have misled the House when she made the statement:

The fact is that I informed the race organisers on Friday that I could not deliver a race this year.

I note in the statement by Mr Panoz dated 26 February that he is quoted as saying that the minister informed his people on the Thursday 'that she was having difficulty in obtaining sign-off on the agreement and that she was suggesting the investigation of a combined event.' Also in his statement, Mr Panoz refers to the 55 minute conference call on the Friday between himself, the minister and Mr Rainsford in which they all discussed the combined race. That raises the question as to why they would be discussing a combined event if the single event was not under threat.

In another statement by Mr Panoz on 27 February, he stated that he was not aware of the Premier's decision to cancel negotiations for future events. The emphasis here is on the words 'future events', not the 2001 event.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members might be interested in the sequence of events. I note that the Premier's speech notes

(when he made the announcement) referred only to not picking up the option for the Le Mans race this year, which raises the continuing confusion over the company's reaction to cancellation of a single race or the whole series. Mr Rainsford, in a statement dated 26 February, stated that neither he nor Mr Panoz was informed of the Premier's decision.

However, when asked on 5AA on Tuesday 27 February whether he knew of the possibility of the race falling over, Mr Rainsford replied: 'Yes, I was involved in the conversation with the minister'—and they then went on to discuss the races being merged. I also note that, on 5AN on Monday 26 February, Mr Rainsford stated that the minister called him into her office to tell him that there were difficulties and that the circumstances had changed. This led to the telephone hook-up with Mr Panoz on the next day.

The nub of the issue is that there is nothing in the statements attributed to Mr Panoz and Mr Rainsford which have been tendered so far which contradicts the actual terminology used by the minister in the House when she claimed that 'she could not deliver a race this year', which is the form of the words which are being called into question. As a result, I do not give precedence to a motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. I remind members of my ruling yesterday on automatic calling and naming.

QUESTION TIME

MOTOROLA

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier name all those people who had access to the Motorola files that have been called in from all government agencies and who were responsible for ensuring that all documents would be given to Mr Cramond in accordance with the Premier's undertaking to this House in December 1998 that 'all documents, all documents will be made available'?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): That is almost an impossible task. How would I know which public servants in which government agencies responded to the call from the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to source the documents from dozens of agencies? That is an almost impossible task. I advised the House yesterday that I sought (on I think it was at least two occasions) advice as to whether all documentation had been sourced and, as I informed the House yesterday, I was advised verbally that, in fact—

An honourable member: By whom?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: By the then chief executive—that they had in fact been sourced. I also draw the attention of the House to the issue related to Marineland. The House will recall that a select committee was established in relation to Marineland and that on, I think, two occasions after a call for documentation, further documentation arrived. In fact, a whole filing cabinet was identified much later—and the member for Hart would know about this because he was an

adviser to the then minister (Hon. Lynn Arnold). I would give credit to this extent: I would expect that, when they did the trawl for documents, in all good will they would have attempted to do so; and, in fact, a whole filing cabinet was found after the inquiry had anticipated that all documentation had been received. So, let the opposition be a little more precise and accurate with the innuendos and allegations that it puts before this House.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, it is wishful thinking, because members opposite have to reflect back only a very short period of time.

POLICE CALL CENTRE

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I was taught as a teacher to wait until the kids are quiet.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Hart to order. The member for Hartley will get on with his question.

Mr SCALZI: Now that the pilot police call centre has been operating for just over a month, will the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services outline to the House any preliminary information that demonstrates the effectiveness of a separate dedicated facility for 11 444 calls?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I often discuss with the member for Hartley his interest in policing and the protection of the community. In September last year, or earlier than that, I acknowledged that I had some concerns about the technology with respect to 11 444. My main concern—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I will also talk later about the importance of remaining cool, calm and collected when you make phone calls.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: As I said, I acknowledge that there were problems, and the problems in South Australia with 11 444 are the same problems that all jurisdictions have been experiencing, primarily because of the enormous amount of increased reporting of incidents via mobile telephones. As we all know, one in every two people in Australia now has a mobile phone. What we did last year, with some financial input, was work on the re-engineering of the whole of the 11 444 area.

However, it was still evident to me that more had to be done so that we could get a better response structure for the community of South Australia and an improved customer focus when members of the community ring 11 444. Four weeks ago we implemented a pilot call centre project for 11 444, which we are running at this stage from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. with some flexibility, starting at 8 a.m. and going to 11 p.m., Monday to Friday. So, we are taking a snapshot with this pilot of what we could do with 11 444 if a call centre were set up for a 24 hour, seven day a week service.

In that four weeks, 10 500 calls came in to the 11 444 call centre. Those 10 500 calls, I am pleased to say, were answered in an average of 17 seconds, which is a fantastic result. I will not be too pre-emptive in saying that that is the

way that we will be able to do it for ever in future. We will wait for the rest of this pilot project, which is not expected to be completed until the end of July, and then we will look at a full evaluation to see what we can do to improve customer service with SAPOL and 11 444.

Another important fact to consider is that, with 40 000 calls in total coming into SAPOL over that period, we have seen 25 per cent of the calls going into 11 444 and being handled there. That indicates that, if the pilot program became a full, 24 hour, seven day a week program, we would see a reduction in the workload of the life threatening 000 communication centre of about 50 per cent. That is an enormous reduction and would allow those police officers to focus more on life threatening issues. We will continue to monitor and evaluate this pilot project, and I will be happy to report to the House.

I would also like to report to the House on some of the concerns about the 11 444 number that have been raised by the member for Napier. I received a copy of a press release from the member for Napier—although I would not have known she was the member for Napier, given that press release. One would have to wonder what a red ribbon seat Labor voter would think about the sort of service they were getting from someone who seems to spend all their time everywhere else but the seat of Napier. But, of course, that is just an example of what a Labor member would do if they were ever put into government. The member for Napier put out a press release on 11 444, and it is the biggest dog's breakfast of a press release that I have ever seen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: This press release came out on Wednesday 31 January this year—

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, sir. Standing Order 98 provides that the minister cannot debate an answer. He is clearly doing that.

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

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The bottom line is that this was in January. I announced in September that we would re-engineer and do more with this issue. We have delivered on this, and here we have the member for Napier calling for an overhaul, days after we have actually developed the pilot project.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Sir. He is clearly now flouting your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that, when rising on points of order, members at least wait until the chair acknowledges them. In the honourable member's enthusiasm to get to his feet, his whole point of order was lost, because he was not being listened to.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: In answer to the points raised by the member for Hartley and the point about 11 444, we acknowledged the position with 11 444 in September. The Labor Party was asleep for four months on an extended holiday. We have delivered and are improving a service.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that, consistent with your previous ruling, the honourable member is clearly flouting Standing Order 98, and I would ask that you rule.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that last sentence was an infringement of standing orders. It might have been getting close, but it was not there.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Not only will we continue to develop and evaluate this 11 444 project but this

year we will spend about \$40 million on capital works for police, 113 additional police officers and 245 going through the academy this year. We will continue with the radio network, which is vital for police. The police commander I went out with in the Tour Down Under said that the best piece of technology SAPOL had had for as long as he could remember was the new radio network. We are looking at a call centre project and are committed to making sure that the right resources go to SAPOL to deliver services to the South Australian community that the Labor Party is not interested in delivering. It is not even interested in finding out what we are doing as a government to help the community of South Australia.

MOTOROLA

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): I direct my question to the Premier. What was the location of the missing Motorola documents withheld from—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Not all your back bench thinks it is funny.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will start again. I direct my question to the Premier. What was the location of the missing Motorola documents withheld from the Cramond inquiry for the five years prior to 8 December last year, when they were sent to your office? I ask this particularly after the Premier's answer to my first question. All documents carry a file number, a bar code and movement control, revealing who had them and when. This will reveal the paper trail and who had possession, control and access to the so-called missing documents.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): That is exactly what I want to find out. Why do you think we are going to do this inquiry? I want to know where they have been, and I want to know who has been sitting on these documents. As I said to the House yesterday, I do not know, but I want to know.

BERRINGER WOLF BLASS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Premier advise the House of the expected effect of the commissioning today of the new \$30 million Wolf Blass winery at Nuriootpa; and what was the production of wine grapes in the South Australian 2000 season?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I am delighted to have this question from the member for Schubert. Along with the Leader, the member and other members, I was at the opening of the first stage—a \$30 million investment by Berringer Wolf Blass at Nuriootpa. It is the first of some \$120 million worth of investment. The majority of the infrastructure—the steel vats and the other equipment that has been installed—has been purchased from South Australian companies. It was indicated to me during a tour through the factory that a deliberate decision was made to attempt to source a whole raft of manufactured goods from within South Australia because in fact their durability was higher than sourcing out of Europe various wine infrastructure to go into the production and manufacturing of wine.

The facility is certainly first-class. It is a company where the Wolf Blass Yellow Label premium wine is now the top selling red wine in Canada. I was advised that exports have increased by, I think, 32 per cent in a six month period. That

indicates the sort of investment that is taking place through viticulture in the Riverland, McLaren Vale, the Barossa, Coonawarra and the Adelaide Hills where our wine industry is gathering significant momentum. That is actually passing back into local country towns, communities and districts a vibrancy and a spend, for example, in transport, wine labels and wine bottling. And of course we have secured AMCOR to invest in a very substantial new wine bottle manufacturing facility, as the member for Light knows, just outside Gawler.

Part of the reason for that is to put more competition into input costs for the wine industry, that is, wine bottles. In the past we have had only ACI but, by AMCOR's being attracted to South Australia and establishing a facility at Gawler, it will put a competitive base in wine bottles so that particularly small wineries that do not have the same purchasing power will have competition in the marketplace to reduce their input—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes; because there is competition their input cost of wine bottles will be reduced. It also involves the jobs that are generated from it. The direct economic activity at this particular facility is about \$385 million. That translates to an expansion in the community of something like \$500 million. So, the impact of investment is very substantial.

As a result of that, we can be pleased to see our wine exports expanding substantially. One has only to look at the recent statistics out of the United Kingdom: exports from Australia into the United Kingdom have increased by 5 per cent, whereas French exports into the United Kingdom have reduced by 4 per cent. Effectively, by the end of this year there will be a 2 per cent margin between our exports into the United Kingdom and France's exports into the United Kingdom.

So, it is anticipated that next year we will, in effect, beat France in exports to the United Kingdom. That is not bad, from the southern hemisphere, the other side of the world, compared to a country that is virtually a neighbour of the United Kingdom. With companies such as this now investing here to go into the Americas to expand that market, this is an industry that will continue to grow, continue to invest, have benefits for small-medium business and underpin our export market increase that we have seen in recent times.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Does the Premier still insist that his former adviser, Ms Alex Kennedy, had no role whatsoever in preparing or handling any documents for the Cramond inquiry, and will he table a statutory declaration in which Ms Kennedy states that she had no involvement with the Motorola documents? It has been reported that, for two days in late 1998, Ms Kennedy was locked in the cabinet room where all the Motorola documents were being held. The Premier has told this House that Ms Kennedy was simply checking his travel records to answer an FOI request, even though she was not the FOI officer for the Premier's department.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I think Mr Cramond makes reference to that on page 7, 8 or 9 of his report.

NURSES

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Flinders has the call. Please let us have some courtesy.

Mrs PENFOLD: Can the Minister for Human Services inform the House of the outcome of the meeting with the nurses union held earlier today?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I met at 1 o'clock today with Lee Thomas and Rob Bonner of the Nurses Federation. We have had, I guess you would say, constructive and useful discussions. Those discussions are due to continue later today when I am able to get away from the parliament.

I do not wish to comment further than that, although I would bring to the attention of the House that, as of today, 663 admissions to public hospitals have had to be cancelled because of the industrial bans imposed for the metropolitan area. If one includes the country figure in that, the number of admissions is now up over something like 800, and most of those would be for elective procedures that have had to be cancelled. So, the human cost of those industrial bans is now very high indeed. My concern is for those people, because the longer the bans continue and the longer the cancellation of elective procedures continues, the longer those people will have to wait for their procedures once the bans are lifted.

I am hopeful that we can continue to work through the issues in a constructive way. I stress the fact that, obviously, the union representatives will have to go away after today and consider the issues, but I have been at least encouraged by the positive way in which they have sat down and had the discussions with me.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Can the Premier guarantee to this House that neither his Chief of Staff, Ms Vicki Thompson, nor his close associate, Ms Alex Kennedy, nor any other member of his staff culled, shredded, altered or tampered with any of the Motorola documents which should have gone to the Cramond inquiry?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CONLON: A number of Liberal sources have alleged—

Members interjecting:

Mr CONLON:—you make me, and I will—to the opposition that, at a luncheon held in the Alphutte restaurant in early 1999, the Premier's Chief of Staff, Ms Thompson, stated that she and Alex Kennedy had previously shredded documents that would have been material to the Cramond inquiry. The opposition has been informed that former and present Olsen staff attending that luncheon included Christopher Argent, John Deller, Jen Eddy, Christian Kerr, Nick Papps and Robert Underdown. So, be careful in case one of them tells the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is now commenting.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): The fact is that from his last statement the member for Elder does not have anything substantive to back up what he has just said. He has nothing to back up what he has just said.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Certainly to my knowledge no-one has done what the member for Elder has alleged in this House. The member for Elder stands up in this House and makes these broad allegations without any substantive background information or evidence. He has no substantive

base and he stands up and makes these broad and outrageous allegations. This is an opposition that wants government for the sake of government; this is an opposition that does not have a policy direction, and the member for Elder—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Let me refer to the member for Elder's grievance yesterday, because this is a material point. In his grievance yesterday, the member for Elder—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the leader to order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In his grievance yesterday, the member for Elder said that these documents that he now has in fact destroys my case—or whatever the point was that he was making. He went on to say that in April 1994 they were forwarded to the Office of Information Technology. The member for Elder's grievance yesterday was based on a false premise. The documents referred to them going two years later, that is, 1996 and not 1994. The member for Elder—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No. Perhaps the member for Elder—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Minister for Police and the member for Stuart.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Perhaps the member for Elder might have the good grace to now apologise for what he said in his grievance yesterday.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr Conlon: This is outrageous.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Go back and check the record. The member for Elder's grievance yesterday was based on a totally false premise on dates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Hartley.

WORKCOVER

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Can the Minister for Government Enterprises advise the House what the government is doing to raise community awareness of workplace injury?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I thank the member for Colton for an important question about an important topic which affects everyone and every worker in South Australia. It is fortunate for all South Australians that, after what was a real mess left by the Labor Party when we came into government, we were able to rescue the WorkCover Corporation from decay. When we came into government, the WorkCover Corporation was unfunded to the tune of \$276 million. Whilst that rolls off the tongue easily, it means that the representatives of the workers, so-called, were subjecting every potentially injured worker in South Australia to a deficit-funded organisation; and, hence, their benefits were at risk.

We now have a fully funded WorkCover thanks to the government making a number of very difficult and tough decisions. A fully funded WorkCover is excellent for all workers in South Australia because it allows WorkCover to concentrate on its core business, which is the prevention of workplace injury. Research by WorkCover shows that with its Work to Live campaign the message is getting through, because workplace injury rates are being reduced. Current statistics indicate that there are more than 45 000 workers with reported injuries, and it is thought that there may be up

to another 50 per cent that are unreported. This is still an unsatisfactory number for me and for the government and certainly for everyone who is in the workplace.

It was with great pleasure this morning that I launched WorkCover's new extension, the next step in this campaign, and the television advertisement which forms the centrepiece of the campaign and which is called 'Figures'. Again, the campaign features nakedness as the previous advertisements did. This advertisement uses the nakedness of people who collectively form a giant body to indicate the vulnerability both of the individual worker and of the company in the instance of workplace injuries. The Figures campaign will premier this Sunday on television and I would fully recommend every member of parliament to leave their work for a couple of minutes—because I know that is what we will all be doing an Sunday night—to watch this advertisement, because it is quite spectacular.

The previous campaign won a number of awards for its focus and I am confident that this campaign will carry on that good work. Public awareness campaigns, though, are nothing without best practice to back them up. WorkCover is doing an excellent job with this and it is developing its own corporate knowledge to support the objective of preventing further workplace injury, and it is doing this on a global scale. It is doing it so well that I am pleased to remind the House that, in association with the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority, WorkCover will be staging the Fifth International Congress on Work Injuries Prevention, Rehabilitation and Compensation at the Convention Centre between 18 and 21 March this year. The second national workers' compensation symposium will be held concurrently.

The program is of an extraordinarily high standard because WorkCover now has an international reputation for doing its job so well. More than 150 presenters from 20 countries will attend, including some of the world's foremost experts in the field of work injury prevention, rehabilitation and compensation. I would hope that WorkCover's work will be further stimulated by the outcomes of the congress. The congress is terrific news for South Australia: not only does it allow us to strut our stuff with respect to how good we are at the moment and intending to be even better in preventing workplace injury, but there will be an immediate economic benefit from this congress.

I am told that about 700 delegates will attend the congress from Australia and 25 overseas countries. They will obviously support—as we have heard from the Minister for Tourism frequently—local businesses through accommodation, buying meals, going on tours, both before and after and, indeed, perhaps with some delegates during the congress, shopping through the three day event, and so on. It is estimated that this congress may, in fact, generate income of \$2.5 million to South Australia, which is clearly an immense benefit to the small businesses which will be, in their own way, hosting the delegates.

As I indicated, WorkCover is producing the goods. The new Figures campaign is excellent and I would hope that all members of parliament will extol the virtues of the Work to Live campaign. I am confident that in making the workplace a safer place to be we will make for a more productive and a better South Australia.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Given the Premier's ostensible anger that documents crucial to the Cramond inquiry had not

been supplied to Mr Cramond, what action will the Premier now take against the Minister for Industry and Trade (Hon. Rob Lucas) given the minister's failure to advise the Premier of these documents during the past 10 weeks? In a ministerial statement last night, the Premier advised the House that his chief of staff became aware of these documents and forwarded them to the Minister for Industry and Trade last December. The Premier's statement did not indicate what the minister has been doing with these documents since then, despite the fact that the Premier met with the minister before last night's ministerial statement.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): As I indicated—

Mr Conlon: Did anyone read them?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Pardon?

Mr Conlon: Did anyone at all in the government read them?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am sure they have.

Mr Conlon: Years ago.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, that is where you are wrong. As to the copies that were referred to, as I said, the chief of staff was at a meeting other than in the office at North Terrace. Some papers were handed over. It related to the Chief Executive Officer of DIT wanting a public apology. Members will have noticed that the Chief Executive of the Department of Industry and Trade has been in some difficulty with public utterances, and he was told that he had to clear all such matters through his minister. Therefore, on the basis that he wanted a public position put down to correct his 'gung ho' attitude, I think it was, it was referred to the minister to look at.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the honourable member for Heysen!

Mr Conlon interjecting:

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

ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage advise the House on what action the government is taking to give South Australians greater access to important environmental information?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I thank the honourable member for his question. We all understand his personal interest in matters relating to the environment. As the House would be well aware, the government collects environmental information from all sorts of sources on different environmental issues, whether it be air quality, water quality, waste management issues or biodiversity issues. That information can be distributed and reported in a number of ways to the broader community, and it is usually in a printed format, which is all right for those of us who are academically inclined but more awkward for those who do not have the background to understand exactly what the reports are saying.

As a result, the department has done some work on how it can present environmental information in a more user friendly and informative format for the broader community. A new web site, which was launched in the last three or four weeks, is designed specifically to try to educate the community about environmental reporting. Slowly but surely, as the department does more environmental reporting, it will be able to put that information onto the web site with

explanations about exactly what the environmental reporting means.

The web site provides far more flexibility in the way information is presented and it is far more user friendly. We have been able to divide the web site into different levels of information, so there are levels that are user friendly for schoolchildren; other levels provide more information for secondary students; and there is also quite detailed information for tertiary students and academics who are doing detailed research papers.

There will be a long-term benefit from this process because the broader community faces very complex environmental issues on a regular basis. There is no doubt that, through community education programs and general community awareness, the community is becoming more interested in and educated about environmental issues. They want to know what is happening around them and how we deal with it. Through the web site, not only will we be able to provide monitoring and the base data but we will also be able to take the opportunity, if appropriate, to explain exactly what the monitoring means.

We will be able to explain what Murray River water quality issues, River Torrens issues and biodiversity issues mean. We will be able to put into layman's terms what the monitoring is and exactly what that means for our community. Through that, our community will be better educated about what is happening in their environment.

Some issues take years to show trends, and water quality is a bit like that. Water quality data take a number of years to develop some form of trend that can be measured and commented on. However, with other issues such as waste management, a response can be obtained far more quickly, but it takes a longer time to develop a trend about biodiversity. Importantly, the web site will also allow the government of the day to put down its policy response to an issue. We will be able to show the monitoring data, explain what it means for the community and set out the government's policy response, highlighting what action we are taking to address the issue. We think that is important because we as politicians all know that some of these environmental issues are long term, and a good example is the Murray River. We all acknowledge that it will be a significant issue for some time to come.

By putting down long-term action plans on this website it brings the community with us about where we want to go in respect of environmental solutions. That empowers the community with information and we think gives the community a far better understanding of some of the environmental issues we face and where that might be heading policy-wise in future. Long term, for governments and parliaments, that means that it will make the community more open to change. It will make the community more educated about the need for behavioural change. The whole concept behind putting monitoring on the website is the fact that we think we will be able to use it as a tool to educate the public about the very important need for them to consider that their individual actions will have a beneficial or negative effect on our environment, and through looking at what is available on the website we think we will ultimately be able to convince the community to be involved in long-term behavioural change.

We have started it with some base data. We accept that more data will go on in due course, and it will slowly build as the monitoring becomes available. Environmental monitoring is an important tool and in the long term will

greatly benefit the broader community. I recommend that members take the opportunity to visit the website, look at what is available and refer their constituents to it.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Will the Premier tell the House who it was during question time yesterday that told him that the missing documents had not been held with all the other Motorola documents in the Premier's office and just how they knew so quickly?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Because a member of my staff telephoned the author of the letter. The member for Elder did not release the letters of the Chief Executive of the Department of Industry and Trade enclosing the documentation to the Ombudsman. Also he sent it to the Prudential Management Group.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I think you have been a little selective again, Patrick. I think you have been a little selective about documentation.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Oh, did you?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, I didn't. When you raised the question we inquired with the Chief Executive of the Department of Industry and Trade as to what this was about. He then said that these matters had gone to the Ombudsman. That is the reply.

PHOTOVOLTAIC REBATE PROGRAM

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Minerals and Energy advise the House of the rebates available through the photovoltaic rebate program and indicate the benefits this program can provide to both rural and metropolitan South Australians?

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Minerals and Energy): I thank the honourable member for his most unexpected question. I always know that the member is particularly interested in opportunities in our state. I am well aware that he has a keen interest in energy efficiency and that he is particularly an advocate of renewable and sustainable energies in our state. I am also well aware that the honourable member has been encouraging people in his electorate to take advantage of opportunities relating to the state's photovoltaic rebate program.

This government has been very pleased to partner with the federal government in a venture that has the opportunity to deliver particular energy efficiencies to South Australians, not only in metropolitan Adelaide but also within rural regions. Those who live within rural regions of our state have the opportunity to make even greater gains than those in metropolitan Adelaide, particularly if they are presently generating their power needs from diesel generators or the like, which are particularly expensive. A \$31 million scheme over four years has been announced by the federal government to allow South Australians, be they community groups or individual property owners, the opportunity to access funds to assist with the installation of photovoltaic systems within their property.

It is important that members understand that with photovoltaic systems I am talking of something that is distinctly different from solar systems such as solar hot water services, because photovoltaic systems utilise a solar cell which is

placed in a position where it attracts sunlight, much the same as cells on an office or school calculator. Light energy is converted to electricity, whereas, in a solar system, heat from the sun is converted into energy.

The rebates that are available and administered by the state government—which, as I indicated, are in partnership with the federal government—are up to \$10 000 for a community group and up to \$7 500 for a household. Many South Australians are now taking up the opportunity to apply for such grants—individuals, rural property owners, and also a number of community groups (including schools and local government bodies) are taking advantage of this program.

It needs to be remembered that, while the program is generous—a maximum of \$10 000 for a community group and \$7 500 for a household—these systems are not without expense. To install a system that is grid connected in an area already connected—for example, in the township of Millicent in the honourable member's electorate—would cost in the vicinity of \$20 000, for a system which attracts a \$7 500 rebate. For a slightly larger system connected to a community connected scheme it may cost about \$25 000 with a \$10 000 grant. So there is a payback time, obviously, of some duration before it becomes a fully economical viable proposition. However, where there is a diesel generator involved—and I know the honourable member has a number of constituents on rural properties who rely on diesel power—the payback period is obviously much shorter and can be as few as three to five years to cover the cost of expensive diesel to generate power. I know the honourable member and, indeed, many of my colleagues are encouraging particularly rural property owners to take advantage of this scheme.

I am optimistic that South Australia has the opportunity to become an Australian and, indeed, a world leader in the provision of power through alternative sources. This particular program for households offers considerable opportunity. The honourable member, of course, is in the fortunate position of having an electorate which is suitable for other forms of power generation as well. I know that he is a strong advocate of encouraging people in his electorate to look very seriously also at wind power generation. The honourable member's electorate and, indeed, that of my colleague the member for Flinders are two fabulous places for wind power generation and, in the very near future, in the electorate of the member for MacKillop we are going to see the state's first wind farm, which will be a significant facility, and I also very much look forward to seeing that occur.

So there are considerable changes occurring within our state at this time for alternative power generation and that, of course, has been made possible not only through partnerships such as this one with the federal government, but also due to the fact that Australia is a signatory to the Kyoto Protocol to commit ourselves to a reduction in CO₂ emissions. This has resulted in a myriad of opportunities for funding assistance for alternative power generation schemes and the one about which the honourable member asks me, the photovoltaic rebate program, is indeed one that I commend to members of the House to ensure that their constituents are aware of these exciting energy opportunities and the rebate opportunities that are available.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): Who informed the Premier that there had been a breakdown in communications between government agencies over the Motorola contract and did the

Premier mislead this parliament when he first revealed this alleged communication breakdown on 26 November 1998? The Premier first claimed that there had been a communication breakdown between government agencies on 26 November 1988. The Premier's office had been holding all government agency files on Motorola for three months by the time the Premier offered this information in his defence.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): No, I did not. The member for Elder ought to go back and look at the documentation and the dates on it. The assertion contained in his grievance debate yesterday is on a totally erroneous base.

TAFE ENROLMENTS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise the House on the record numbers of students currently enrolled in TAFE courses around the state?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): This is an important question because we can be justifiably proud of our TAFE institutes in South Australia, as they have built an excellent reputation of quality training and supplying quality courses to our young people and those who wish to retrain in South Australia. The reason why that has happened is that they have very direct links between industry and TAFE institutes to ensure that the training they provide to young people, or to others in the community, is directly relevant to the jobs they will undertake when they join the work force. It is the very reason why TAFE institutes stand at number one in Australia in terms of delivering outcomes and jobs for young people in South Australia.

Through these courses they attain the skills that they need for their chosen field, and we are certain then that they are very attractive to industry in terms of picking up employment. However, let us look at some facts regarding TAFE enrolments, particularly over the period from 1996 to last year. In 1996, 90 000 students were enrolled in TAFE. Last year, it had risen to 98 500. That is an increase of 8 500 students over four years. Members have to remember that this was a time when user choice came into the marketplace as well. Therefore, for TAFE to pick up that level of increased enrolments is nothing short of outstanding.

The other thing that has happened is that TAFE is now liaising with the universities and our schools to ensure that we have a seamless progression for young people between school and TAFE; that is, they get accreditation for subjects they have studied in TAFE and accreditation for TAFE learning when they go to university. This ensures a smooth transition when students move between the various levels of education.

Let us look at some of the areas in which there has been increased enrolment. Enrolments in textile courses are up by a staggering 475 per cent; manufacturing and processing courses by 166 per cent; community services courses by 105 per cent; and marine construction courses by 103 per cent, just to name a few. It continues with aquaculture, recreation and food processing courses.

A survey undertaken by the National Centre for Vocational Education Research—and I mentioned these figures earlier—indicated that a total of 91.4 per cent of students in South Australia obtained jobs or went on to further study after graduating from TAFE, which is quite incredible. Nine out of 10 students who attended TAFE achieved that. I think that is an excellent commendation for the staff and lecturers

at our TAFE institutes, and they are to be congratulated for the outstanding results that they are achieving, and I certainly do so.

This government has strongly supported our TAFE students, because since 1998 we have committed some \$700 million towards TAFE students. Under this government, TAFE has emerged as a key player in economic growth in South Australia. We have only to look at the Murray Institute of TAFE, for instance, which covers part of my electorate, the member for Chaffey's and others. In 1998, it was supplying some 465 000 hours of tuition. Last year, it topped one million hours of tuition delivered to students across South Australia. That is not isolated, because I know that in the member for Gordon's electorate at Mount Gambier it is also close to one million hours of delivery.

It really shows that our TAFE system is competitive, is providing the sorts of courses that students want and that industry is recognised as being important and relevant in terms of employment. It shows how ridiculous the opposition's claims are of TAFE's ability and its claims that there have been massive cutbacks. Given the information from the teachers' union, they are not accurate, because our TAFE system is continuing its success. It is making great contributions towards this economy in South Australia, and it is doing an excellent job for our students in South Australia.

MOTOROLA

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Has the Premier disciplined the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for failing to advise him of the discovery of the missing Motorola documents when the Premier has advised the House today that the Chief Executive Officer of his department received copies of these documents in December? The Premier has just told the House that not only did Mr Cambridge send the documents to his minister Mr Rob Lucas in another place and to his chief of staff Vicki Thomson but also to the prudential management group, of which the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is a member. The Premier would meet weekly with the CEO of his department. Do you want us to believe that he would not have raised this matter with you over 10 weeks?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Once again, you have got it wrong. The fact is that, as you would know and as the Ombudsman would indicate, the documents were referred to him only Thursday last week. My understanding is that it was referred to the prudential management group for consideration yesterday, because the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet told me yesterday afternoon that the matter had been referred to it yesterday morning.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): When did the Minister for Emergency Services first receive a report for the year 1999-2000 from the Chairman of the CFS board, and why did he not table that report in the parliament? Why did he not table the report now tabled on time?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I do not have answers to those questions. I will take them on notice and report back to the House.

WANGANEEN, Mr G.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Will the Minister for Police and Emergency Services advise the House of the exact nature of the fatal wounds sustained by Mr Grant Wanganeen on Monday and how police procedures and training might be improved so that police officers are no longer placed at risk and alleged offenders are safely apprehended?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): As there is a commissioner's inquiry into this matter, it would not be appropriate whatsoever for me to comment at all. We need to wait for the commissioner's inquiry. As I have said very often, a police officer's job is a very difficult one. Given the amount of domestic violence and the number of mental health issues the police have to encounter on a daily basis, my heart goes out to those police officers who never know what they may have to encounter. It also goes out to their families—their wives, children and husbands. I am committed to—and we saw it last year—significant and ongoing increases in the training of police officers. I certainly stand by police officers in the difficult work they have to do. The one thing I am always worried about is their safety and that of the community when they are put into extremely difficult circumstances.

ABORIGINAL REUNION PROGRAM

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Mr—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You might hear a little more about it before we have finished.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You might be right in it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Will the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs advise the House of any action that has been taken to reunite Aboriginal people with those who have been separated from their families and children?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs): I certainly thank the member for Stuart for what is a very substantial question involving a very emotive and sensitive issue. There is in fact a program that does what the member has asked, that is, reunite those people who as children have been separated from their parents and other extended family members. This is a program called South Australian Link-up which is located at and hosted by Nunkuwarrin Yunti in Wakefield Street.

The program started in February last year and a number of very successful reunions have been coordinated, including five last year and four this year to date. Another one is organised for this month. I am told that currently the program has 66 active clients (as referred to by the team), and a further 10 are awaiting assessment to go into that program. The South Australian Link-up program first initiates family tracing and reunion services which include, as one can imagine, some very extensive research leading to initial family contact. There is also ongoing support for family members following reunion.

Because of the very emotional and sensitive nature of these matters, provisions are made for referral to specialist counselling, as well as referral to other appropriate agencies that may provide additional services according to the circumstances in each individual case. The time that is taken

with each client, as members can also imagine, is quite considerable, and it certainly requires a very large degree of patience and certainly an understanding of and respect for Aboriginal culture.

I must acknowledge the efforts of the case workers and the coordinator of the program, Mrs Kay Goodman-Dodd. They are certainly to be commended for their very professional and committed efforts to the people whom this program has already assisted. I had the opportunity to meet with Mrs Goodman-Dodd and the case workers last year, and was taken through the process that they undertake to make sure that these reunions occur not only in the best of situations and circumstances but also certainly with the best of professional intent.

Both ATSIC and the state government, through the Department of Human Services, have provided funding to the link-up program for the employment of the coordinator and the three case workers. The reunions I have talked about have taken place as far away as Oodnadatta; some have taken place in Darwin; and others, of course, have occurred here in Adelaide. It is also important that the awareness of this program actually reaches Aboriginal people and communities across the state. The South Australian Link-up team has conducted a number of community visits, particularly to the rural and regional areas of the state, to raise the public awareness of the program so that Aboriginal people do know that this service is available to them.

In addition, a number of workshops and training programs have been conducted by the team which have complemented the range of community initiatives that have already been undertaken, including participation in the information stall conducted by the Department of Human Services at the Royal Adelaide Show last year.

The work of the South Australian Link-up program is certainly welcomed and endorsed by this state government, and I take this opportunity to sincerely congratulate all involved in what have been outstanding results to date. The practical application of programs such as link-up are the key elements in moving the reconciliation process forward. This government will continue to actively take the steps necessary to support the reconciliation process across this state.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources): I rise on a matter of privilege. Mr Speaker, I ask that, prima facie, you examine this matter and rule that a breach of privilege has occurred in this House and establish a Privileges Committee accordingly. In your ruling today, you said:

[The member for Ross Smith] advised me that he is unable to provide me with any information to substantiate the matters raised by the member for Stuart for to do so would be in breach of the rules of the ALP and the resolution carried by the State Parliamentary Labor Party last Tuesday and would result in his expulsion from the party.

The *Advertiser* (page 14) seems to support the member for Ross Smith's assertion because it purportedly quotes a motion of the State Parliamentary Labor Party, as follows:

Except by way of a collective decision of the State Parliamentary Labor Party, no matter of privilege be raised that would suggest the ALP's state executive may be in breach of parliamentary privilege.

This is a grave matter which directly impinges on the most precious of all our privileges: freedom of speech. On page 84—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —of the 22nd edition of Erskine May we find that the House ruled:

... it is inconsistent with the dignity of the House, with the duty of a member to his constituents, and with the maintenance of the privilege of freedom of speech—

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is the honourable member reflecting on your ruling and, if so, is this the appropriate manner in which to do so?

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair is not taking it that the minister is actually reflecting on my ruling; rather, he is trying to establish a basis on which he may reopen this matter.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Erskine May states:

... it is inconsistent with the dignity of the House, with the duty of a member to his constituents, and with the maintenance of the privilege of freedom of speech, for any member of this House to enter into any contractual agreement with an outside body, controlling or limiting the member's complete independence and freedom of action in parliament or stipulating that he shall act in any way as the representative of such outside body in regard to any matters to be transacted in parliament; the duty—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair has a viable interest in hearing what the minister has to say. I ask for some cooperation.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I will continue:

the duty of a member being to his constituents and to the country as a whole, rather than to any particular section thereof.

On page 112 we find:

The acceptance by a member of either House of a bribe to influence him in his conduct as a member, or of any fee, compensation or reward in connection with the promotion of or opposition to any bill, resolution, matter or thing—

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. If the minister is attempting to raise a new matter of privilege, should he not establish a prima facie case rather than argue the merits of his entire argument at this point?

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is still using Erskine May to establish a legal basis for the request, as I interpret it.

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

The acceptance by a member of either House of a bribe to influence him—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —in his conduct as a member, or of any fee, compensation or reward in connection with the promotion of or opposition to any bill, resolution, matter or thing submitted or intended to be submitted to either House, or to a committee, is a contempt.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Well, if the honourable member wrote Erskine May, let him quote it. I will continue:

Any person who is found to have offered such a corrupt consideration is also in contempt. A transaction of this character is both a gross affront to the dignity of the House concerned and an attempt to pervert the parliamentary process implicit in members' free discharge of their duties to the House. . .

Finally, on page 124 there is a direct reference to 'improper influence'. I apologise to the House that in one hour I have

only found those few references, but I am quite sure that Erskine May throughout supports the notion of freedom of speech in this House and that that freedom of speech can be neither limited by an outside body nor coerced by other members of this place. Mr Speaker, I ask you to examine this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair paid careful regard to that extract from Erskine May over the last evening, and spent a considerable amount of time going through it. I noted also that the honourable member referred to the article in the *Advertiser* as purporting to represent a situation. The reality is that I took advice and spoke to, I think it was, the member for Stuart and the member for Ross Smith.

It is all very well to make allegations, but when I confront the honourable member affected by them and that honourable member says, 'I am not able to give you any evidence that says that my duties as an MP are being curtailed,' then the chair has considerable difficulty. While I acknowledge everything that the honourable member has said about the rights of members to have the freedom of parliamentary privilege to go about their business, the chair is not in the business of being involved in any games or any other resolving of people's issues.

The honourable member has had ample opportunity in approaching the chair to say that he does have a difficulty out there, but he chose not to. As long as he chose not to, it puts the chair in this difficult position of having to say that at this stage, whilst matters were raised by the member for Stuart, in fact the honourable member who was affected by them has been to the chair and said that he is not able to provide any evidence to the chair.

The honourable minister and anyone else in this House has the opportunity to move a motion, and the motion then could be worded in such a way that the House will make a decision if it wants to set up a privileges committee. I also pick up another point that the honourable member made, that is, that the chair does not set up privileges committees. All that I would have done is set aside time for a debate to take place and the House would then take that course. The House has the option of taking the course anyway, if it wishes to give notice and set up a motion.

Under the circumstances of the agenda being played here today and the fact that I interviewed the honourable member and he could not provide me with any information in the way of minutes or factual evidence that he was in fact aggrieved, I took the course of action that I did. If any new evidence comes forward, I will be perfectly happy to re-examine the issue.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: On a point of order, Sir, I merely seek clarification in that the member for Ross Smith's justification for not providing you with that evidence was that he had 'a contractual agreement with an outside body.' Can I ask—

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

Mr CONLON: Not only is the minister now reflecting on your ruling, but he is debating it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will allow the minister to speak as long as he keeps purely to the Erskine May aspects of this question.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I merely seek clarification. As the member for Ross Smith's justification for not providing you with further evidence was that he was relying on the fact that he had a contractual agreement with an outside body, can I then seek advice from you as to how we

may get that contractual agreement considered as a matter of privilege?

The SPEAKER: Order! the chair spent a considerable amount of time last evening and again today considering this matter. There is an agenda being played here. The chair made a ruling today based on the fact that members were given an opportunity to say that they were being aggrieved but chose not to take that opportunity. If they want to take that opportunity and say that this is happening, that is fine, but while they keep coming back to me and saying, 'I am not prepared to say that I am being aggrieved and provide you with the evidence,' I am not varying my ruling.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! the member for Elder has the call.

MOTOROLA

Mr CONLON (Elder): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move forthwith a motion without notice regarding the establishment of an inquiry into matters surrounding the Cramond inquiry.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (25)

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

NOES (21)

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

Majority of 4 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Mr CONLON: I move:

That this House calls on the Premier to establish an inquiry headed by an independent senior counsel and assisted by an ex-public servant of high standing to inquire and report into the following matters associated with the inquiry of Mr J.M.A. Cramond into allegations concerning the now Premier in regard to Motorola:

- determine whether material evidence, written or oral, was not supplied to Mr Cramond and the reasons it was not supplied;
- determine whether any oral evidence given to the Cramond inquiry was misleading, inaccurate or dishonest in any material particulars; and
- determine whether any person or persons did or failed to do anything which caused relevant evidence not to be presented to

the Cramond inquiry or caused inaccurate, misleading or dishonest evidence to be given to the Cramond inquiry.

The House calls upon the Premier to ensure that the inquiry has the powers to subpoena documents and witnesses and to take evidence under oath and calls on the Premier to report to the House on 13 March 2001 regarding the names of the persons to be appointed and the commencement date of the inquiry.

The motion will come as no surprise to the House given that I grieved on this matter yesterday. As I said at that time, the House is dealing with an extremely serious matter. It appears to the opposition that there has been a cover-up in regard to a very serious matter and that there has been a failure to provide to a judicial inquiry duly set up by this parliament all the evidence and all the relevant documents that would have allowed that inquiry to do its job properly.

As a result of that failure, it is plain that key findings in the Cramond inquiry are wrong; that verbal evidence given to the Cramond inquiry was, at best, misleading and potentially dishonest; and that, as a result of those matters, the Cramond inquiry was fatally flawed, and the subsequent report of the Prudential Management Group turned upon equally flawed assumptions and, as a result, was also fatally flawed.

The opposition discovered in this process documents which the Cramond inquiry, on 10 different occasions, said did not exist and the absence of which was a basis for its key findings. The documents also made it very difficult to sustain the defence of the Premier in regard to the Cramond allegations, that is, that there was a mix-up between departments and that the relevant department which gave preference to Motorola was never provided with a copy of the contract and, if they had had it, the defence is that they would not have extended that preference.

With regard to the comments of the Premier today, I make clear what I made clear in my grievance yesterday (and which the Premier seems to believe is not correctly reported in Hansard), namely, that the documents which have been revealed and which were said not to exist show that in April 1996, just in case—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: That is what I said yesterday, and I say again today, because that is what the documents say. In April 1996, the 1994 contract was sent to OIT by the Economic Development Authority. In July, it acknowledged its receipt. It called for a legal audit of it; it acknowledged that that would occur. Other documents acknowledge discussions by officers of the department in regard to those contracts and, months subsequent to that, the contract was signed to give preferential treatment to Motorola. The Premier's defence lays in tatters.

Our main concern is that (and we note the response of the Premier in this regard) these missing documents, it appears, came to the surface again in December last year. They went to the Premier's office but his Chief of Staff apparently did not think that they were important and sent them somewhere else. They went to the Treasurer's office. We learnt from the Premier that they went to the Ombudsman, and apparently they went to the Prudential Management Group.

What we find here today was no acknowledgment of the existence of these documents from the government until a question was raised by the opposition, at best, 10 weeks after senior members of this government were put in possession of them and, if the Premier is to be believed, should have been alerted that serious material documents did not go to the Cramond inquiry. I put to this House that, if we had not asked

questions, we would never have heard about the missing documents.

My concern is this: on this side of the House over the past year we have had repeated leaks from Liberal sources saying that documents had been removed, that Cramond had not heard the whole story and that evidence was not true, and we dealt with those responsibly. There appeared to be no substantial evidence that we could put forward. We now have the evidence. We now want to know whether all these allegations that have been made by other members—other Liberal people—are true. We want to know whether it was just these documents that went missing or whether other documents went missing. We want to know just what evidence to the Cramond inquiry was not truthful or was misleading, and we want to know what evidence should have been given. Most of all, we want to know how it could occur that, from three different government agencies, documents on exactly the same matter, documents damaging—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I will explain to the Premier, if he does not understand. I am glad that he gives me the opportunity to explain this. The documents from the Economic Development Authority sending the contract to OIT went missing. The documents at the Office of Information Technology acknowledging receipt went missing.

Since the Premier has not been following this, I refer to the third document that has never appeared. It is obvious from the documents that OIT sought an audit from Crown Law on the contract. That audit also never went to Mr Cramond. That audit would have been very interesting reading because it occurred before preference was given to Motorola pursuant to the contract late in 1996. Three agencies, Mr Premier—three.

The Premier would have us believe that it all happened by accident and that, somehow by some extraordinary confluence of celestial circumstances and coincidence, documents concerning the transfer of a contract to the Office of Information Technology went missing from their files. At the same time they accidentally went missing from the files of the Economic Development Agency, and at the same time they accidentally went missing from the files of the Crown Solicitor—all documents about exactly the same matter and all about a matter that went to the heart of the Premier's defence and destroyed it.

We believe that this inquiry is necessary not only to determine why these documents did not go but what else did not go, and not only just what evidence was dishonest but what other evidence was dishonest. We want to know the truth. This is the most serious matter on which I have risen in this House. It is a matter of a cover-up that goes to the heart of the government. The Premier has a large number of questions to answer. We are not satisfied that the Premier's office should be investigated by the Premier's office: we want a full independent inquiry, and we would like truthful answers.

The SPEAKER: Will the member for Elder please bring up a copy of the motion to the chair so that it can be distributed to other members?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I am happy to accept the motion moved by the member for Elder, and I do so for a couple of reasons.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, we would have agreed to the suspension after one or two people called for it.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: No, we would have. Anyway, you please yourself.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Just to attest to that, the member for Elder and some other people knew that prior to the suspension I would agree to this. Anyway, be that as it may, I am happy to agree to this motion, happy to come back on 13 March because, as I said yesterday, I am sick and tired of the web of intrigue with which the member for Elder seeks to, with half-truths, build a scenario. This matter has to be cauterised and cauterised once and for all.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Hart.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: There is too much valuable time of this parliament and myself being spent on this issue that is not relevant to the interests of South Australians and their future.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: That is why this matter has to be cauterised. The member for Elder is talking about an incident of seven years ago—seven years. Seven years ago this issue was raised by the member for Elder. What I want to do is get this matter cleared. That is why at the start of Question Time today I came in and said quite clearly I was happy for Mr Cramond to go back and revisit the components, but if you want to do it another way, that is fine by me. As I said in my answer to the Leader—I think it was his second question—I also want some answers on this, because it is not about asking me questions, it is about my asking some questions also as to the advice that was given to me, in terms of all that was previously made available. And so this side of the House supports the motion.

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): I will speak just briefly to this motion. I rise to support it. I support the motion because at this stage in this parliament we have a crisis of confidence in the processes behind government. I think it is vitally important for confidence within the community that this matter be dealt with.

I commend the Premier for supporting this motion. It is not an easy thing for the Premier to do, but there are difficulties behind the scenes that need to be dealt with within the departments. The Premier and the opposition have agreed that this is the appropriate course of action to take, and I commend both sides of the House. The report that will be subsequent to this inquiry, I am sure, will make interesting reading. A number of questions will need to be answered to gain the confidence of the South Australian public in this parliament and in the processes behind government, and that is why I support this motion.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I still do not have an answer to the question I asked of the Premier during question time on Tuesday about the code of conduct for ministers. It goes to the very heart of this matter. That is something which I do not think ministers in this government generally understand, and the answer given by the Minister for Emergency Services today further illustrates that point. Let me remind all members of the House of what I have been saying for years and what I have been saying in more recent times, that is, that all ministers will recognise that full and true disclosure and accountability to the parliament are the cornerstones of the Westminster system, which is the basis for government in South Australia today.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: You will get your turn, sunshine. The Westminster system requires the Executive Government of the state to be answerable to parliament and through the parliament to the people. Ministers will recognise that they have an obligation to account to the parliament fully and effectively for all moneys they authorise to be spent, invested or borrowed. Ministers need to be reminded, I guess, that they ought to pay particular regard to sections 251 and 253 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. In this state, had we established when it was fashionable to do so, though I am not sure that it was necessarily sensible, an independent commission against corruption or a criminal justice commission, a handful of ministers in the Liberal government since it took office in 1993 would now be behind bars. That is not drawing a very long bow.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: In fact, it is not drawing a bow at all.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair has a real concern with the direction the honourable member is taking. He must be very careful not to reflect on members.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I am not sure what you are telling me.

The SPEAKER: I am telling the honourable member not to reflect on members.

Mr LEWIS: I believe that you, Sir, are getting a lot of assistance from the member for Bragg. If he thinks that he knows your job better than you do, maybe he would like to take it on. The member for Elder said, 'We want to know.' Well, I do not care what the Labor Party wants to know. Frankly, I want the public to know. All members in this place have a delegated authority that we get from the people in our electorates at the time of the election, and that is a delegated authority and a trust. It is not about our feelings about ourselves or each other; it is about the interests of the public and not what is of interest to the public; and it is what is in the public interest.

It may be of interest and it may cause excitement but it is not about that: it is about what is in the public interest in the way that ministers conduct themselves and the way in which they relate to parliament and their responsibilities in the parliament. Of this inquiry let me say that I am less than satisfied. It does not go as far as it needs to. Sufficient power is not being provided through the proposition as it sits before us this afternoon to get to the nub of the matter.

Nothing short of the powers of a royal commission will enable that to be discovered as it relates to this matter. Such power, once properly exercised as it would be, would for all time exonerate the Premier and/or any other minister who has had any hand in this matter and the staff of ministers in their respective offices, or otherwise condemn them and let them take their chances with respect to the way the law would then deal with them, according to whatever it is they may have done that would cause the inquirer to report the matter unfavourably against them to the parliament.

Let me say to the Premier through you, Mr Speaker, that it does not matter how long ago it was. It is a heinous crime, if you are a minister in the parliament, to mislead parliament, to know that you are misleading parliament and to state falsehood. It is as much a crime as it is to commit felonies against the person in the wider community, because you abuse the institution that all of us rely upon to give us our rights as citizens, and you abuse the trust that all of us have

in the ability of the institution to perform in that way in the public interest.

I have been saying this since before I became a member of parliament, I have been saying it since I have been a member of parliament, and at all times until more recent years most people in the parliament thought I was simply playing politics. Well I am not and I never have been, because I have been in countries that do not have a Westminster democracy. I have been in countries where they do not have any democracy, and I know what it feels like to be pursued by people who have untrammelled power to do what they will with you when they catch you, and that is not nice. Yet those of us who take this institution for granted and laugh about the consequences one way or the other as though it is here for our entertainment are very much mistaken and are abusing the trust the public has given us when they have given us that delegated authority.

I say now to the Premier that, when the information provided to retired Chief Magistrate Cramond was found by him to be deficient in both the number of documents and the substance of the verbal evidence, he should have required that to be reopened. He should have reported that to the parliament. Indeed—

Mr McEwen: But he didn't know.

Mr LEWIS: He says he didn't know. How could he have not known, because he knew of the existence of the documents and could have easily discovered that during the course of his own inquiries into the matter, which I am sure he would have made. Why otherwise would he have invited me to consider the Cramond report before it was tabled in parliament and what I might do about it? I honestly told him then as I have told him ever since and as I tell him more firmly now: he should resign.

Mr Foley: Who should?

Mr LEWIS: The Premier. I do not tell him that in malice. I tell him that out of the respect I have for this institution and what it means for the safety of all of us.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I hope that I eventually get an answer to the question that I put to the Premier about the code of conduct which we all adopted in 1993 and which I have quoted from during the course of this week and again today. The habit, as though it were an entertainment and a sport, that ministers have to dodge questions that they should be able to answer directly is not in any sense in compliance with that code of conduct, nor is it in the spirit of Westminster parliaments, conventions and traditions.

Altogether, it saddens me that the government, knowing that it has not got the numbers, is drawn screaming and kicking to yet another inadequate inquiry. I wonder whether this inquiry, once established, will have the power to subpoena ministers to appear before it and give answers under oath. If it does not, it is a gross waste of time, not just a waste of time. It must be able to do that and it must be able to do likewise with any and every other citizen, including all public servants who may have information relevant to this.

I said 'citizens' deliberately because I have been told by people who were involved in this business relating to Motorola and the government radio network who have either since left the Public Service or had nothing further to do with it that there was corrupt dealing and that all of that was done before the formal process of the contracts was commenced so that it fell outside the terms of reference of the people who were charged with auditing that process. It happened ahead of time. The cake, its ingredients and what it would look like,

was cooked before the formal processes were begun. I have not been able to get material evidence of that, but why would men and women of standing in the community, men and women who were trusted and who were known to have told the truth all their lives, otherwise come to me and say those things and lie in the process? Why would they do so? It is entirely inconsistent behaviour for any and all of them to behave in that way. I do hope, although I am not confident, that such an inquiry will produce the result that it seems the majority of members of this House expect.

Mr McEwen (Gordon): I am somewhat disturbed by the member for Hammond. It is important that we all understand what we are dealing with here at the moment and that we set aside two fundamentally different issues. We are not discussing here today whether the findings of Cramond are in any way flawed. We are not today pausing even to reflect on those findings, which we dealt with at another time. What has shocked South Australians today is to learn that the process was flawed. What we are looking into today is a matter that ought to be of concern to all of politics because, as much as we expect robust debate in this place and we understand the cut and thrust of the political process, we have learnt today that there is a flaw in the judicial process. That is something that we must all take very seriously because that is a crisis of confidence in all of us.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr McEwen: Well, it was an inquiry by a retired judge.

Members interjecting:

Mr McEwen: The point I am trying to make is that we have learnt today that the discovery process leading up to the determination of a matter was flawed. We have to establish whether that happened by accident or by design. That is the important issue here, so all of us should focus on what went wrong in that process and ensure that that never occurs again, and please allow that process to run its course before we ask ourselves another question.

At the end of this process we will ask, 'Why weren't these documents discovered and are there yet other documents that were not discovered?' At the end of that process, rightly we can ask another question: 'Have these extra documents (and perhaps documents yet to be discovered) in any way changed materially what was considered in Cramond's making his determination?' But, please, do not jump too quickly to that matter. That is totally inappropriate at this time. Please, all of us, reflect at the moment on the matter before us, which is simply the matter of asking why the discovery process was flawed: was it by accident or was it by design and, if it was by design, who was responsible?

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): During the course of the last week we have seen a number of ministers made very uncomfortable by questions that have been legitimately asked of them as to why they behaved in the way that they did or failed to behave in the way that they should have; and as to why they had information which they should have provided publicly but did not do so. The most recent illustration of that, of course, was when the Minister for Emergency Services, clearly, had a report provided to him by the Country Fire Service Board, yet did not table it in this House and sought another report. At least, that is what the evidence suggests to me. I have a copy of two reports, after having written to the

person who was the chairman of that board and demanded from him, under threat that I would take out a writ of mandamus in the Supreme Court requiring that he deliver to me (as he did) a copy of the report that he ostensibly provided to the minister in June.

That person, Mr Michael Pengelly, I suppose did not welcome the strength of my demand. It was an inquiry and it was put politely, but it was put very firmly. Having written to him in those terms, I sent a copy of my letter to the minister. The minister, on the first day of sitting, tabled that report. However, when I came to look at it, I discovered that the report that was tabled was not the report written by Mr Pengelly but the report written by Mr Kim McHugh, who had been a member of that committee for only five months during the year 1999-2000 and who, following his membership of five months, became chairman of the CFS board when the government—acting on the minister's recommendation, I guess—chose not to reappoint Mr Pengelly as chairman but to appoint Mr McHugh. How Mr McHugh could know the full gamut of business conducted by the board prior to that time is beyond me. I do not reflect on Mr McHugh because I know him to be a decent, honest and honourable man of integrity. He is Mayor of the District Council of Alexandrina. I am talking about the ineptitude of the process that was involved.

Secondly, at the beginning of the week the Minister for Tourism found it difficult to answer questions about whether or not she had told Mr Panoz before the announcement was made by the Premier that the Le Mans car race series was over. Mr Panoz claims, and so do other people involved in that enterprise who are not part of government, that no such advice was given to them at any time. Whom do you believe? I note that the minister said nothing to that effect outside this chamber, and I wonder whether that enables any of us to come to a likely conclusion against the minister's version. I leave that question in the air, but the fact remains that what was said by the minister outside this place and what was said by the Premier outside this place are pretty much at odds: it did not go to the heart of the matter, and it is pretty much at odds with what was said inside this place.

Equally, there is the ministerial statement made by the Premier yesterday concerning the matters which we have been considering during question time today and which have become the subject of the proposition adopted by the House a few minutes ago: I wonder about the credibility of that, too.

Time expired.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I rise today to discuss a couple of issues in my electorate that have been of outstanding success in recent times; and given the resumption of parliament only this week I have not had a chance to put this on the record. First of all, I would like to speak again about the success of Taste of the Race Tour, the success of the Tour Down Under and the way in which it was supported by our local community in the Willunga Basin, and indeed the whole of the Fleurieu Peninsula. As members would know, this is the third Tour Down Under and, on each occasion, we have seen even a further commitment by a large group of volunteers, together with the City of Onkaparinga and, importantly, the business and resident associations, to ensure that we get an even greater opportunity to display what the McLaren Vale wine region, indeed the Fleurieu Peninsula, has to offer the world.

This year I accompanied the Police Regional Commander in the command vehicle which led the race not only to see how the new radio communications network was working but also to see first-hand the preparation and commitment of thousands of people from my own electorate, and indeed neighbouring electorates in the region. On this occasion I particularly congratulate Willunga for its excellent effort and commitment to this event for which it received an important award. Importantly and in conjunction with this, I had the opportunity to be involved in the opening of a new section of the bike, walking and jogging track from Seaford to McLaren Vale. This project has been a joint effort by a number of us. I was fortunate enough to be on the working party. The Minister for Transport (Hon. Di Laidlaw) supported financially and in kind some of the development of this track and the City of Onkaparinga also put in an enormous effort both in kind and financially.

When this whole track is finished we will have over 30 kilometres of excellent track from Willunga to Hallett Cove allowing people to connect with all the other bike tracks and to go either to our beautiful beaches along the coast or into the wine region to do some tasting. The other important thing about this is the health and fitness of our community. Not only does it provide families with the opportunity of being able to use this track—something which I see regularly—and to enjoy the opportunity of spending time together but also it enables them to keep their families fit.

The other point I raise relates to the Noarlunga Theatre Company. The Noarlunga Theatre Company is a fantastic theatre company, which during the year provides thousands of people with the opportunity of being able to watch the local talent. I was privileged to be able to go—unfortunately not for the whole event due to workload—to part of the performance of *Cosi*, an Australian comedy that was written by Louis Nowra. Talking to a number of people that night, they said how important local theatre productions are not only for providing the opportunity for locals to develop their drama and theatre experiences but also in providing the opportunity for local people to attend an enjoyable fun night at a reasonable cost and not having to travel to Adelaide.

I know the state government puts some funding into the arts in our area, as indeed does the local council, and I am sure that that is money well spent. The reason why the Noarlunga Theatre Company is such a successful theatre company is due to the commitment of all the people who head up the board and do all the work behind the scenes in organising the plays, promoting them, looking after all the staging and so on. What has happened as a result of the Noarlunga Theatre Company is that a lot of young people have been given the opportunity to develop their creative talents together, which, hopefully, will further their opportunities to advance into full-time work in the arts and theatre. I believe that this theatre company has a big future. It already has a lot of scores on the board in our region. I am sure that if it continues to keep focused and it continues to get some support from the state government and the City of Onkaparinga it will do well in the future. Arts, tourism, the wine industry, the Tour Down Under and those sorts of events are all helping to develop our region both culturally and economically.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. When the five minute grievances were introduced into sessional orders and then into standing orders, they were regarded as classical grievances, namely, an opportunity for opposition members and backbenchers to state their griev-

ances before the grant of supply to the Crown by the parliament. Now we have the unusual situation in which a minister of the Crown grieves notionally against the government of which he is a part. Could I ask you, sir, whether the notion of grievances embraces ministers of the Crown?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Spence would be aware that, for as long as the chair can recall, the opportunity has been provided for ministers to participate in the grievance debate procedures and have talked about various issues.

Mr Atkinson: Such as?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not appropriate to have a debate about this; the member for Spence knows that. I am quite happy to talk to him about that privately. It is appropriate that the information the minister has brought to the House be raised through the grievance debate.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no reason why he should not.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Over the past few months, the issue of fireworks has been of major concern within the community. Quite frankly, it has created a great deal of misery for many thousands of people who live in either the metropolitan or rural areas of South Australia. It is true to say that we in the community have been driven to the point of despair over fireworks being let off at all hours of the day and night. My Torrens electorate office has been inundated with calls from hundreds of families who have just had enough of what has become a menace in our society. I know that the councils, the CFS and animal welfare organisations have also received hundreds of complaints from the public who have been protesting about the dangers of fire and the loss of their quality of life because of the improper and illegal use of fireworks that has kept them awake at night, driven their pets mad and also caused property damage.

Today, I presented a petition to the House signed by some 5 924 people, and many more are yet to be returned, because our community is sick and tired of the irresponsible use of fireworks. My colleague the member for Mitchell also presented a petition asking for a ban on the public use of fireworks, because he, too, no doubt like other members' offices in this place, has received numerous complaints. Clearly, the public is saying that enough is enough. It was reported that 23 bushfires were started by fireworks on New Year's Eve and that over 500 dogs around Adelaide suburbs fled in terror. Some pets were seriously injured, and some tragically killed, leaving their owners devastated; for example, Bronwyn and Steve Sinclair, whose pet Sabby was killed on the road because he was terrified and terrorised by fireworks.

During the Christmas period we heard that police seized three tonnes of illegal fireworks from shipping containers at Port Adelaide and that the number of illegal fireworks had mushroomed in Adelaide since 1995-96. It is clear that our community is genuinely concerned and it wants a ban on the public use of fireworks. Like others, I am very happy to support organised public displays put on by accredited pyrotechnicians and also those who are authorised to do so for cultural and religious purposes, because in general these events do not terrorise our community and are under pretty decent control.

Our problems have stemmed not just from the use of illegal fireworks but through the use of legally bought fireworks which have been used outside their permit hours.

Complaints from the public to the police and the council are ineffective, because we have insufficient resources to chase up the complaints and, as a result of this, many South Australians, particularly where it is happening consistently in their areas, are suffering a nightmare existence. This whole sorry saga has greatly eroded the quality of life for families. They often have to cancel social engagements because they have to stay home and look after their pets or they are concerned about property damage. People are starting to feel that they are losing their right to live freely and enjoy their quality of life.

Minister Lawson has said that the government would consider prohibiting the use of fireworks during the fire season. If that is the government's only position, it is clearly ignoring the wishes of the majority of the public who have been subjected to noisy and dangerous backyard displays. The fact is that a ban during the fire season will not resolve the noise pollution outside that time, and I do not think it will resolve it during the summer season, either.

The cost to our community is just too great when we add up the loss of quality of life, the property damage, the vet bills and the fines incurred when dogs escape their yards—costs that many people just cannot afford. Why should we have to bear those costs just to pay for somebody else's so-called pleasure? So, we are asking the minister to listen to the call. There will be many more petitions coming in. Listen and get rid of this menace within our community. As I have said, enough is enough.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I raise the matter of telecommunications facilities in residential areas. I draw to the attention of the House the fact that the local council in my constituency, the Mitcham council, is about to find itself embroiled in a very serious court dispute with Telstra over the issue of Telstra's insistence that it erect large transmitting stations and towers within my local community. That is simply not good enough.

On 30 June 2000, the Full Court ruled in the City of Marion v. Network Design Construction that a telecommunications facility was a transmitting station. This decision had wide-ranging implications on the telecommunications industry because most council development plans have listed transmitting stations as non-complying in residential zones and some non-residential areas. By reason of such a designation, most metropolitan councils have had the ability to properly control and manage such facilities in residential zones.

The City of Mitcham recently classified a telecommunications facility at 501 Goodwood Road, Colonel Light Gardens, as a transmitting station being non-complying based on the Full Court decision in the Marion case. Telstra then appealed the City of Mitcham's classification and the ERD Court recently dismissed the appeal and upheld the decision of the council in properly treating the application as non-complying. However, Telstra is to make a further appeal to the Full Court, with statewide implications. Telstra has put the council on notice that, should it lose the Full Court appeal, it is likely to appeal further to the High Court.

The Full Court decision that has been made is a common-sense and logical decision and provides planning authorities with appropriate control mechanisms to deal with mobile phone towers in residential areas. Members would be aware that, if a facility has special merit, it can still be approved as non-complying. Telstra seeks to challenge the Marion council Full Court decision and, if successful, it will substantially

erode a planning authority's ability to properly control such facilities, particularly in sensitive residential zones.

As the member for Waite, I want to make it clear to the House that my local community is very concerned about this issue of transmitting stations, and I am sure I am not alone in that. I am sure that many members here share both my concerns and those of my local community. Those concerns are many, but they focus on two key areas: first, the issue of safety and, secondly, that of amenity. In respect of safety, most sensible people and I acknowledge that the facts and the science of transmitting towers and the possible health implications are a little uncertain. Experts around the world have been working on this, and reports have been made. There is, however, sufficient doubt about the safety of these towers to be causing considerable stress and discomfort out in the community.

I hope that we do not find in 20 or 30 years class actions being taken against telecommunications companies (as we have seen in the case of smoking) on the basis of injuries occurring to people as a consequence of the erection of these towers in communities and general residential zones. I hope that we do not face a huge debacle in the years ahead when we suddenly discover that these towers are a serious problem.

I say to Telstra: these towers are not wanted in residential zones. The design of these towers can be adjusted to make them more pleasing to the eye, less of an obstruction and less objectionable. Some telcos are doing that. I suggest that they should have a market advantage, and that we should be saying to telcos: if you design these things sensitively, customers should support you.

Telstra risks community outrage and the community abandoning its products and services if its competitors can erect more amenable towers and facilities around the city and avoid residential zones. I say to Telstra: negotiate with councils (in particular, the Mitcham council) and listen to the people. I appeal to all members of the House to consult with their communities and to come together to try to seek an amicable resolution to this vexed problem.

Time expired.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I often speak in this House about the lack of response, or inappropriate response, of this government to the real problems facing South Australians, particularly in my constituency. I often refer to the funding crisis in our public schools, and this morning my focus was on arguing for the setting up of a select committee into the funding of our public hospital system.

However, this afternoon I want to draw attention to two other issues that are of concern to my constituency and the whole of the public of South Australia. I refer to the problems that we are having with our electricity system and police response times. I do this today because an event, which took place in my electorate quite recently in January, was a good illustration of the link between the problems that we are having in my electorate with the electricity supply and police response times. I am prompted to do so because of the comment in the House today of the Minister for Police when he referred to the 11 444 call centre and the way in which calls to the police for emergency assistance are handled.

On Saturday 13 January—I do not have the exact figure—I am told that more than 2 000 people attended a national race meeting at the Virginia speedway. At about 10 o'clock, just after one of the heats had been completed, there was a power blackout. Power blackouts are not new to my electorate. Since 1995, when I was newly elected, I have raised with the

government the severe problems that we have been having in the electorate of Taylor. In fact, I have lobbied hard for a more reliable power supply and, indeed, there have been upgrades to the power system. However, they have not been enough. In a way, members of my electorate have been quite smug about the rest of South Australia having to endure what they have had to deal with for quite some time, such as poor, unreliable feeders.

On this day, the blackout at this event lasted for 40 minutes. What happened was quite disturbing. An attempt was made to ring the emergency police number (000), because a large number of people were in darkness for 40 minutes; the situation involved high speed cars; people were trying to get out of the venue; and a number of children were running all over the place.

It was potentially a very threatening situation, so there was an attempt to call the police on the 000 number. The operator there tried seven times to call the 11 444 number. It was twice engaged, and it rang out completely on the following five attempts. The people at the track tried to call the 11 444 number. They were pressured because there were confused people in darkness. They had to hang up, and I understand that one of the organisers ended up ringing her son, who is an SES member, and he came out to erect emergency lighting.

Eventually, they got the police by ringing the Two Wells police station, which contacted the Elizabeth police, and they were the ones who attended. In darkness there were people on the gates with money, there were children, there were confused people, and it was just lucky that there were not speeding cars at the moment when the blackout struck, because that would have led to real disaster. The spokesperson for the police at Elizabeth said that there was a real possibility that the police attendance number could ring out after hours at peak times.

That is not news to many South Australians who have been in life-threatening situations and had these problems with the phone system, but that is an admission of a real problem, an urgent problem that must be addressed. This example is just one of the potentially life-threatening situations that can arise if both these issues are not handled quickly.

Time expired.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I wish to discuss two matters this afternoon. A few weeks ago I had the pleasure of attending the Cadell Prison to participate in a graduation ceremony, and I wanted to bring to the House the excellent way in which the management and staff are conducting rehabilitation courses at that prison. They have a system whereby a number of young offenders are given a 17 week course that provides them with social skills and skills necessary to participate in and become worthwhile citizens of the community.

I thought it was a very well-run program, well thought out, being implemented by staff who were enthusiastic, considerate and obviously had the interests and welfare of those people in the institution at heart. I would very much like to commend and congratulate them for the manner in which they conducted that program, which is ongoing. I was very pleased to have the opportunity to attend and observe the graduation, because I believe that the institution plays an important role in South Australia. It is also very important in that local community, and I believe that the people administering the prison set a fine example in prison administration,

and South Australia can be very pleased with the way in which they are carrying out their duties.

The other matter that I would like to discuss is my continuing concern about the attitude of certain unruly elements within society who have no regard for other people's property or persons and who have taken it upon themselves to disrupt elderly people's lives and generally to act in a thoroughly outrageous way towards sections of the community that have paid their taxes, have lived their lives and clearly, at this stage of their lives, want to be left in peace and quiet to get on with their lives with some dignity.

What concerns me is that with policing there appears to be an absolute obsession with traffic. On Monday in Port Augusta I observed two speed cops at one service station. What were they there for? Were they there to patrol the streets of Port Augusta in the evening after dark, to get after these villains, these gangs that are roaming the streets harassing and annoying decent people, or were they there to go out on the road to try to catch some unsuspecting motorist who may be doing 125 kilometres an hour on some of the best roads in South Australia?

Was that their purpose? Or was it to check their number-plates or some other trifling and nonsensical thing? I want to know. I will give another example. On Australia Day I attended a number of functions, and I had to go to Cockburn. I went into Yunta. There was one police car at a service station there, and one of these fellows with jodhpur sort of clothes on got out looking very unfriendly towards the community. He was generally observing people. To my surprise, just as we left, another police car arrived. There were two police cars in Yunta, yet only a very short time before that an elderly woman in Port Augusta was murdered in her home. If someone is doing 125 km/h on the Barrier Highway, what harm are they doing? They are doing no harm; it is a damn nonsense. It is an insult to people's intelligence that police are out there trying to book them. I do not care what anyone says; they will get public criticism while they are obsessed with writing out these damned tickets. In my view, there has been an abuse of the on-the-spot fine system, and my constituents have had enough of bloody villains and hobos running wild. They should be kicked up the backside.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You are a weak, vacillating fool, that's what you are. You haven't got the political courage to stand up to anything, and so we don't take any notice of you.

Mr ATKINSON: I rise on a point of order, sir. The member for Stuart has referred to me as a 'weak, vacillating fool,' which is unparliamentary. I take umbrage and I invite him to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The chair asks the member for Stuart to withdraw.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am quite happy to withdraw, Sir. I am surprised the honourable member would draw attention to it to have it recorded twice in *Hansard*.

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I bring up the 148th report of the committee, on the Women's and Children's Hospital Day Surgery Unit Redevelopment—Final Report, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

That the report be published.

Motion carried.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Police Superannuation Act 1990 and to make a related amendment to the Superannuation Act 1988. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This bill seeks to amend the *Police Superannuation Act 1990* by consolidating the superannuation arrangements for members of the schemes established under that Act, and the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme. The bill also seeks to make a number of minor technical amendments to the *Police Superannuation Act*, as well as to bring the structure of the invalidity provisions under the police pension scheme into conformity with the provisions applying to public servants under the *Superannuation Act 1988*.

Currently, police officers who are members of one of the two defined benefit schemes established under the *Police Superannuation Act*, are also members of the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme. The Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme was established in 1988 to provide a 3% of salary "productivity benefit" in the form of a superannuation benefit to police officers. The requirement for police officers to be members of two schemes creates unnecessary and additional administrative work, and confusion amongst members. This bill therefore seeks to merge the benefits of the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme into the two defined benefit schemes under the *Police Superannuation Act*. The amalgamation will simplify the superannuation arrangements for police officers, whilst at the same time maintaining the existing overall level of superannuation entitlements. For police pension scheme members, the amalgamation will not result in increased pension entitlements as the merged benefit will be maintained as a lump sum. The amalgamation will also result in no change in the current costs to Government.

This bill will also have no impact on those police officers who are members of the Triple S Scheme.

The *Police Superannuation Act* currently provides that all terminations of service after age 55 are taken to be retirements on account of age. This means that where a member terminates service on the grounds of invalidity after age 55, an age pension rather than an invalidity pension is payable. The current provisions disadvantage those officers who are forced to retire after age 55 due to an unexpected and serious deterioration in health. There is also evidence that some officers are bringing forward their invalidity retirement to gain the higher invalidity pension benefit payable before age 55. The bill therefore seeks to amend the Act to restructure the invalidity provisions in the police pension scheme so that officers can retire on the grounds of invalidity at any age up to age 60. The proposed amendment will make the invalidity provisions of the scheme consistent with the main State Pension Scheme for public servants.

An amendment is also proposed that will introduce a facility to enable members to make additional voluntary contributions. The facility will provide an option under which members may invest money in order to accumulate an additional superannuation benefit. The additional voluntary contributions made by members will not attract any matching employer money or benefit. Such a facility is already available in the main State Scheme for public servants, and the balance of the accumulated contributions and interest will only be available to members on the termination of service.

The other amendments being proposed in the bill deal with technical issues of the same kind recently addressed by amendments to the *Superannuation Act 1988*, in respect of the main State Scheme. For example, the amendments being made to Sections 14 and 15 of the Act relate to the proportions of benefits that the Fund can support. As these proportions are actuarially determined, the

Government believes the proportions should be based on the latest actuarial report and set by the Board rather than the Minister. The amendment to Section 40 is of a technical nature and will bring the original intention of the income assessment provision into conformity with actual Board practice. The amendment will enable the Board to assume a person's income from remunerative activities is received over a full financial year, thus providing an incentive for persons in receipt of an invalidity or retrenchment pension to seek part time or short term work. Section 43 is also being amended to provide that where a person becomes entitled to a pension on account of being at least 55 years of age, or a spouse becomes entitled to a pension on account of the death of the member, a guaranteed minimum amount will be paid as a benefit from the scheme. This amendment is the same as a recent amendment made to the *Superannuation Act*, and will provide for the minimum benefit to be equivalent to 4.5 years of pension less the value of any commutation paid as a lump sum. This "term certain" arrangement will enable simplification of the accounting arrangements, and provide greater certainty of entitlements to members, without any cost impact on the Government. The bill also contains a technical amendment to the *Superannuation Act* in relation to this same term certain provision, in order to maintain conformity between the provisions in the two Acts.

The Police Superannuation Board, the Police Association, and the Police Department have been fully consulted in relation to these amendments. All these bodies have indicated their support for the proposed amendments.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts new subsection (7a) into section 4 of the principal Act. The new subsection provides that a person whose employment terminates on invalidity in the circumstances referred to in the subsection will only be taken to have retired if he or she had reached the age of 60 years.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 10—The Fund

This clause makes amendments to section 10 of the principal Act that are consequential on the insertion of new Part 5A by clause 19.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 14—Payment of benefits

This clause amends section 14 of the principal Act so that a proportion (fixed by the Board) of a pension or lump sum payable under the Act will be charged against the contributor's contribution account. These provisions are similar to section 43A of the *Superannuation Act 1988*.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 15—Reports

This clause replaces subsection (4)(b) of section 15 of the principal Act. A similar amendment was made to the *Superannuation Act 1988* earlier this year.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 21—Retirement

This clause amends the formulas in section 21 of the principal Act to take account of the closure of the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme by new section 46A inserted by clause 23.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 22—Resignation and preservation

This clause amends the benefits provided on resignation by section 22 of the principal Act to compensate for the closure of the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 23—Retrenchment

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 25—Termination of Employment on invalidity

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 26—Death of contributor

Clause 12: Amendment of s. 28—Retirement

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 29—Retrenchment

Clause 14: Amendment of s. 31—Invalidity pension

Clause 15: Amendment of s. 32—Benefits payable on contributor's death

Clause 16: Amendment of s. 33—Benefits payable to contributor's estate

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 34—Resignation and preservation of benefits

These clauses amend the benefits provided by sections 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33 and 34 of the principal Act to compensate for the closure of the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme.

Clause 18: Insertion of s. 38A

This clause inserts new section 38A into the principal Act. This provision enables the saving of administrative costs by the closure of contribution accounts that do not need to be kept open. A similar provision (section 43AA) was inserted in the *Superannuation Act 1988* earlier this year.

Clause 19: Insertion of Part 5A

This clause inserts new Part 5A of the principal Act. This Part will enable an active contributor to the Scheme to invest additional money in superannuation benefits on terms and conditions determined by the Board. New section 38D provides for the keeping of accounts in the names of investors. Section 38E provides for the payment of benefits.

Clause 20: Amendment of s. 40—Effect of workers compensation, etc., on pensions

This clause amends section 40 of the principal Act to streamline the reduction or suspension of pensions because of the impact of workers compensation payments or income from remunerative activities.

Clause 21: Insertion of ss. 42A and 42B

This clause inserts two new sections that are similar to section 47A and 47B of the *Superannuation Act 1988*.

Clause 22: Amendment of s. 43—Repayment of balance in contribution account

This clause amends section 43 of the principal Act. Subsection (2) is replaced with a provision that guarantees the equivalent of at least 4.5 years of pension payments.

Clause 23: Insertion of s. 46A

This clause inserts new section 46A which terminates the Police Occupational Superannuation Scheme. Where a contributor is entitled to preserved benefits under that Scheme when it is terminated by subsection (1), he or she will be entitled to an amount under subsection (2) in place of those benefits.

Clause 24: Insertion of s. 47A

This clause inserts new section 47A which provides for post retirement investment. The section is similar to section 47B of the *Southern State Superannuation Act 1994*.

Clause 25: Amendment of Superannuation Act 1988

This clause amends section 48(2) of the *Superannuation Act 1988*. This subsection and section 43(2) of the principal Act (replaced by clause 22) are similar. Improvements to the subsection in both Acts have been made by this Act.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

HAIRDRESSERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 November. Page 713.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Under the current Hairdressing Act, hairdressing means 'the washing, cutting, colouring, setting, permanent waving or other treatment of a person's hair or the massaging or other treatment of a person's scalp'. The bill amends the definition of hairdressing so that anyone can wash hair or massage scalps. This will enable massage practitioners or nurses to do these things without being in breach of the Hairdressing Act. To achieve this, the final portion of the definition I read is deleted.

The contentious part of the bill is that which establishes a scheme whereby people can apply to the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs to have their qualifications recognised even though they have not done the standard course in hairdressing by either studying at TAFE and doing work experience or by completing an apprenticeship together with lessons in hairdressing. Currently, there are reasonably stringent requirements in respect of the recognition of qualifications. It is what the Attorney-General would call 'negative licensing', namely, one cannot carry on the trade of hairdressing in South Australia unless one holds certain qualifications that are recognised in regulations. People who do not satisfy the regulations but who are otherwise competent can now apply to be a hairdresser if their qualifications are recognised by the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Affairs.

No cases under the act have been reported in the Law Society Judgment Scheme or the South Australian State Reports, so we are not quite sure what it is we are replacing

because that has not been judicially considered. The bill is said to be part of the government's 'comprehensive micro reform program to ensure competitive market outcomes for both consumers and business'. Not much has emerged from the reference group on the hairdressing trade. This is quite a small outcome to its deliberations. Nevertheless, the opposition would prefer apprenticeship to be the principal means of becoming a hairdresser. It regrets that now there are a lot of private colleges which qualify people to become hairdressers without going through the apprenticeship system or by attending TAFE, but the opposition concedes that that is an argument it lost some time ago. The opposition is now willing to acquiesce in the bill.

I should disclose that before I entered parliament I was Secretary of the Australian Hairdressers and Wigmakers Employees Association, and I am a member of the union which currently covers hairdressers, namely, the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association, and that will be apparent from the declaration in the register of pecuniary interests of the parliament, but I mention this in the debate.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: Yes, the Minister for Water Resources is right to say that I am concerned about this bill. I have looked into it quite diligently and consulted the relevant trade union, which I note the Attorney-General in another place confessed he did not do before bringing in these provisions.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister for Water Resources is out of his seat.

Mr ATKINSON: The Attorney makes the point that this discretion in the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is necessary because there cannot be mutual recognition of hairdressing qualifications in South Australia as some Australian states do not require qualifications for hairdressers. I say nothing about wigmakers on this occasion: I am addressing my remarks to only hairdressing. The Attorney points out that in the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory, Queensland and Victoria there is not regulation of the trade, whereas there is licensing or regulation in New South Wales, Western Australia and Tasmania. So, the Attorney says that, if a hairdresser comes from Victoria to South Australia, he or she will not have qualifications to be mutually recognised and, therefore, it is appropriate for the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Affairs to look at that hairdresser's background and to determine whether he or she should be certified as suitable to practise in South Australia. The opposition appreciates that argument.

Having said that, however, I point out that the opposition thinks that the review panel set up by the Office of Consumer Affairs laboured mightily to bring forth this mouse. The idea that, if the parliament of South Australia set up a scheme different from that proposed by the government, if we accepted the amendments of the Hon. Ian Gilfillan in another place that would have required regulations specifying what qualifications were necessary in order to be cleared to be a hairdresser in South Australia, we would somehow have competition payments withheld from the state of South Australia is, I think, drawing a long bow.

I would have thought that hairdressers would have some reservations about people who are not properly qualified being allowed to hold themselves out as hairdressers. It devalues the concept; it devalues the vocation of hairdressing. On the other hand, the market for hairdressing is consumer driven, and people who do not know what they are doing will

not be around for very long. With those remarks, the opposition reluctantly acquiesces in the second part of the bill.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I thank the member for Spence for his contribution.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr CLARKE: My question to the minister is prefaced somewhat along the lines of some of the concerns that the member for Spence has raised in terms of unqualified people acting as hairdressers. The member for Spence says that market forces might sort that out, simply because if they are a bad hairdresser no-one will go back to them. I do not have to particularly worry about a bad hairdresser. The difference between a good and a bad haircut to me is about three weeks, if that.

Mr Atkinson: You don't have a bad hair day.

Mr CLARKE: Exactly, as the member for Spence correctly points out. Of course, hairdressers do not simply cut a person's hair. The definition talks about cutting, colouring, setting, permanent waving—

Mr Atkinson: Shaving.

Mr CLARKE: Shaving, yes. The point is that a poorly qualified person, or a non-qualified person, attempting this work can create havoc with a client's hair. They handle chemicals for colour treatments of a person's hair, and so on. Treatments can affect the client's skin if it is not properly applied, or aggravate a condition that that person has.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: I will just ensure that I never have the member for Spence as my hairdresser and let him practise with the scalpel as a hairdresser. Of course, another point about the consumer is that whereas it might cost me \$15 (which seems a bit redundant to give me a quick shear), for many women hairdressing costs are \$60 or \$70-plus (which is a considerable percentage of their earnings) and, if one fouls up their hairdo, they may not be able to afford to have it rectified for some weeks, or whatever, or they might be forced to have it rectified because they will suffer humiliation, or whatever, because of work or social obligations.

So I am concerned about this liberalisation of who can and cannot be a hairdresser. I am a bit of an old-fashioned type of person in the sense that, as a union representative of the old Apprenticeship Commission or the Industrial Commercial and Training Commission (as it then was), I prefer hairdressers to have gone through a formalised system of training before they are let loose on consumers.

My question to the Minister comes down to what qualifications the commissioner has for consumer affairs and what expertise do officers in his department have to be able to appropriately classify whether an unqualified person ought to be given approval by that department to act as a hairdresser? What yardstick will the commissioner use to say he believes that a person has appropriate qualifications or past experience to allow that person to work on somebody's head, or something of that nature? There are potential dangers in terms of health and safety; likewise, significant costs to consumers who do not want a botched up job through people being inappropriately qualified.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The commissioner already has a similar power in relation to a number of other professions.

The member for Ross Smith may not be aware, but the advice to me is that the commissioner already has similar powers in relation to the building contractors; land agents; conveyancers; and plumbers, gasfitters and electricians legislation. Like hairdressing, all of those are very important professions—

Mr Atkinson: And trades.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: And trades; professional trades in some cases, and others trade as professionals. The commissioner already has that discretion in relation to those areas, and under the act the commissioner has the opportunity to seek advice and do any research that he or she may wish to undertake to check the bona fides and experience—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That as well.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Well, we will see. It might be another reform. So, they can check and research in relation to the qualification, bona fides, experience, etc. National benchmarks are also in place for qualifications against which the commissioner can compare. This procedure is already used in at least five other areas of employment. It has worked quite well and we see it as a logical step in relation to the hairdressing trade. Of course, many other states do not necessarily have a qualification system, as the member for Spence has already pointed out in his contribution on behalf of the opposition. This allows people coming into a state, if they can convince the commissioner that they have the right skills and experience, to proceed to be a hairdresser.

Of course, there is another safety check. If someone seeks employment to work as a hairdresser with someone operating a hairdressing business, that employer would also do the checks, balances and look at the experience and qualifications of the person. So, there is a dual check in that circumstance. I make the point to the committee that at least another four or five areas are involved. Plumbing, building and conveyancing are all examples where one can go to the commissioner and, based on your experience, pick up a licence if the commissioner is convinced.

Mr CLARKE: With respect to those trades to which the minister refers, I can see that the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs could look at the type of work that a builder, for example, has done and say, 'Yes, that matches all the safety standards; that meets the quality of work that builders meet.' In terms of an electrician, or things of this nature, if a person has played around with power points for the past 25 years and has not electrocuted himself, herself, or anyone else, it is probably not a bad record with respect to being able to be licensed, even if a restricted licence is issued in those areas. Likewise with plumbing, and so on, there are identifiable yardsticks to be able to say, 'Yes, that person has the level of competence to be able to do the work.'

Hairdressing is a bit like viewing art, to a certain degree, because beauty is in the eye of the beholder. A particular person's hairstyle meets one person's criteria as being fine and acceptable but others might say, 'That's a very botched job', or whatever else it might be. What is the objective criteria upon which the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs will be able to rely to say, 'This hairdresser, although he or she has not gone through the apprenticeship system, is competent to be able to perform the range of tasks of a hairdresser and able to satisfy the consumer in terms of their getting value for their money'?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The commissioner will have the opportunity to contact previous employers. As an example,

if a hairdresser comes from interstate or from another country the commissioner could go to the previous employers and seek performance records. The commissioner is essentially checking on occupational health and safety issues, not necessarily whether a style is to his or her liking. The artistic quality is always in the eye of the beholder. The issue of occupational health and safety is the primary reason, I am advised. There is also the opportunity to contact complaint mechanisms in other jurisdictions. If there are industry bodies to which people can complain those records can be accessed. There is enough of a safety net within the system to provide adequate protection in this particular circumstance.

Mr CLARKE: My last point concerns the adequacy of the staffing levels within the consumer affairs department to be able to monitor and deal with consumer complaints. Within the past 12 months, I have had problems with respect to a building dispute that involved a constituent of mine. It concerned a repair job on a veranda that was knocked down in a car accident, and there was a dispute as to the appropriate price that should be paid by the person who damaged it in the first place, with the insurance company arguing for X dollars and the consumer saying it should be less.

When I approached the consumer affairs department to see whether it employed a builder or a person with building experience who could appraise the situation and give a fair summary as to the amount of time that would be required to effect the repairs, the type of material that was purchased and the like, the department's response was that it no longer employed people with such skills. I was told that my constituent would have to purchase some advice from another builder if he wanted to compare costs, like with like. My constituent receives a sole supporting parent benefit, and it cost in excess of \$200 to get another builder out to make an assessment as to whether or not the job done by the first builder with respect to the hours he alleged he spent doing the work was fair and reasonable.

In terms of consumers who have problems with a hairstyle and believe that the work that has been carried out on them is less than satisfactory and below the standard of what one could have expected from a qualified person approved by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, will the commissioner have on staff qualified people who are able to make an assessment as to whether or not the professional competence of the person in question is up to scratch? Alternatively, will it be left to the consumer, such as my constituent in the building instance I gave, to go to another registered hairdresser, get an appraisal as to whether or not the job was done professionally, pay for that service and then try to recover the moneys from the person who was approved by the Consumer for Commissioner Affairs for a price of \$60 or \$70?

It becomes an issue where the consumer gives up, saying that it is not worth trying to enforce their rights because it is just too costly and too time consuming. These are the things that the department should have on tap to be able to resolve these issues appropriately and quickly.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am advised that two industry bodies are available to try to resolve complaints.

Mr Clarke: And they will do it for free, will they?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am unclear as to whether there is a cost for that service. I am advised that, between 1 January 1996 and 1 March 2001, there have been only 39 complaints. So, over a four-year period there have been fewer than 10 complaints a year. Staffing is a matter for the commissioner but I doubt whether the commissioner would take on a full-time staff member on the basis that there are only

10 complaints per year in the industry. The commissioner always has the power to seek advice if that is the commissioner's wish. There is an industry complaint mechanism and then there is the commissioner to fall back on after that.

Mr ATKINSON: Under the national competition principles, there was a possibility that the state government could have deregulated hairdressing altogether. I must say that I was pleased that the government was willing to maintain a negative licensing regime because there was a requirement for some regulation to minimise the risks to public health and the risk of substandard work.

I take the point of the member for Ross Smith that there is a very high cost to consumers in this area in enforcing their legal rights. If a perm or colouring goes wrong, the cost of that is comparatively small and therefore the consumer will be unlikely to get any satisfactory remedy, so it was important to maintain some kind of regulation instead of going to a completely deregulated market like we have in four of the Australian jurisdictions now. So the opposition is thankful for small mercies in this area.

Could the minister, who mentioned in response to a question from the member for Ross Smith that there were two industry bodies that could resolve complaints in this area, advise the committee what is the coverage of hairdressers by those industry organisations? What percentage of hairdressers are covered by those industry associations and what are the names of those two industry associations? Is he including the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association? What is the cost of a consumer making a complaint about a particular hairdressing service to either or both of those organisations?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I thank the member for Spence for his question. I am advised that the two associations are the Men's Hairdressing Association and the Hair and Beauty Industry Employers Association.

Mr Atkinson: Much the bigger, I believe.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Much the bigger, the member for Spence believes. I do not have before me numbers involved in those associations, so I will ascertain that number and advise the member for Spence in due course. It should be noted that, because of the negative licensing system, as I am sure the member for Spence understands, there is less organisation in negative licence industries, because there tends to be not a lot of membership lists and so on as it is a negative licensing system rather than a proactive licensing system, and that is why the industry tends to be more fractured than other industries and not have one central group. I hope that is of some benefit to the member for Spence.

Mr Atkinson: The cost?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I will establish whether there is a cost to go to either of those associations and will bring back a reply.

Clause passed.

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

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

Motion carried.

Clause 4.

Mr CLARKE: I have some questions under the heading 'Appeals' in new section 4B, which reads:

An applicant for a determination may appeal to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court against a determination of the commissioner refusing the application.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr CLARKE: It is an interesting point that the member for Spence makes. I am interested to know whether the District Court is the appropriate place for an appeal to be heard. I assume it is before a judge of the District Court.

An honourable member: You would be right.

Mr CLARKE: Therefore, some significant costs would be involved in an applicant making an appeal, and there would also be the risk of having the Crown's costs awarded against that person in the event that they were unsuccessful. It seems to me that perhaps the District Court is too high a court to hear such an appeal and that it might be more appropriately dealt with in the Magistrates Court or some other jurisdiction where an applicant can represent themselves without the need for lawyers and where, indeed, the Crown would not need practising lawyers to represent it. It seems to me that it ought to be a reasonably simple process of appeal whereby an independent person can ensure that the commissioner has accorded natural justice to the applicant and has used a proper range of objective tests to establish whether the applicant meets the criteria involved. An applicant should not be fearful of making an appeal against the commissioner's decision because of costs.

Therefore, I ask why the District Court has been chosen as the appeal forum and whether the government considered a less formal jurisdiction, perhaps such as the Magistrates Court or, indeed, maybe an arm of the Industrial Relations Commission in South Australia which deals with similar things on a regular basis, in order to prevent legal technicalities getting in the way of natural justice and the merits of the case.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The reason the government chose the District Court is that it has the Administrative and Disciplinary Division which is specifically set up to deal with occupational licensing appeal matters and disciplinary matters. Therefore, for consistency, because of the court's experience in that field, that is where appeals will go.

Mr CLARKE: Are lawyers excluded from representing parties in that division, or are they allowed to be there? Also, are costs awarded, and are they awarded according to the normal schedule under the Supreme Court rules?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The advice given to me is that lawyers are able to represent parties. On the matter of allocation of costs, I would have to have that clarified and forward it on.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WATER RESOURCES (RESERVATION OF WATER) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Water Resources Act 1997. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Water Resources (Reservation of Water) Amendment Bill 2001* addresses a very significant reform for water resources

management in South Australia. At the heart of the reform is the capacity for the Government to reserve an amount of water in those prescribed areas where it is thought appropriate to do so for strategically important economic development or environmental purposes.

It will do so in a framework established through the proposed amendments that ensures the integrity of sustainable levels of resource allocation and protection of existing users' rights.

It is intended that the Government will release water held in reserve under limited circumstances, the requirements for which will be set out in a notice published in the *Gazette* by the Governor. It is intended that the guiding principle for any water released by the Government from the reserve is that it will be leased at prevailing market rates.

Each quarter, a notice in the *Gazette* will be published to detail any allocations made from the reserve. This, together with the publication in the notice of the requirements for access to an allocation from the reserve and the lease of that water at prevailing market rates, will ensure maximum transparency and accountability for the allocation process without affecting the water trading market.

The proposed amendments will enable the Government to reserve water, if it is considered appropriate to do so, in any of the State's prescribed water resources. However, most of the currently prescribed resources are already either fully allocated or are close to fully allocated and the opportunity to reserve water in those resources either does not exist or is limited.

The prescribed water resources of the South East are an exception and it is intended to immediately apply the provisions of this amendment to hold in reserve the remaining unallocated water of those management zones in the five prescribed wells areas in the South East where less than 20 per cent of the available water remains unallocated.

This will assist in meeting several objectives at the same time.

Firstly, the proposed amendments are significant in their own right, in that they enable the Government to exercise strategic control over the appropriate use of a proportion of the State's water resources that are available for use on a sustainable basis.

At the same time, it establishes an opportunity for a prudent and precautionary approach to resolving some of the outstanding and very complex water allocation issues currently being faced in the South East without exacerbating the potential problem through the further allocation of the remaining unallocated water under the terms of the water allocation plan.

In particular it will allow further time to address the complex matter of the impact of land use change on recharge and water availability.

Members will be aware that this is a critical issue in the South East.

On 30 November last year I foreshadowed legislation to address this issue. I informed the House that I would firstly consult with the community in the South East and other stakeholders. I did this. During January I held consultations with the various industry groups, local government and the general community in Mount Gambier, Penola and here in Adelaide. This exhaustive consultation built upon discussions I had already held with groups and local Members of Parliament from the South East.

On 27 February this year I provided the House with a report on the outcomes of those discussions. I indicated then that there are some further issues that need to be looked into, in response to the stakeholder and community concerns. In particular the forestry industry will be confirming its strategic plans for development in the South East and some further scientific investigation and technical work will be undertaken.

To better understand both this Bill and future Government strategy it is worthwhile recording some further remarks concerning the consultation process.

While, as has previously been said, there remains some areas of disagreement, areas of consensus are no less important.

There was unanimous agreement that water should be managed in a sustainable way recognising that there are a range of bona fide interests in water including urban use, environment flows, and agricultural and industry use.

A number of other points were also generally agreed:

- (a) that the rights of existing users should be preserved so long as they are accountable for the use in volumetric terms and that 'best practice' is being progressively adopted;
- (b) that it is desirable to stimulate economic development by encouraging efficient water use and making available

unallocated water as either share entitlements or extraction entitlements based on an approved development plan;

- (c) that the Government should ensure that the cost of holding unused water allocations is significant enough to encourage use. On this matter various views were put and, while there was consensus that there should be a level of payment, the appropriate level is disputed;
- (d) that as a matter of urgency all scientific data as it relates to local ground water systems needs review, an identification made and an investigation undertaken of all data gaps. The Government has acted on this view and on the 27th of February 2001 the commitment of \$300 000 was announced to ensure that this matter is brought to a satisfactory conclusion;
- (e) that a forestry strategy must be developed as a matter of highest priority so that the change of land use issues as they impact on the water cycle might then be brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

Water resources available for allocation in many of the at-risk management areas in the South East have not yet been fully allocated. It is therefore prudent to reserve the remaining unallocated water to assist in any subsequent adjustment to the volume of water available for use from the aquifer, should that become necessary as a result of land use change, in particular forestry. This would minimise the likelihood of further land use changes affecting existing users.

At the same time it would be imprudent not to provide the Government with some flexibility to allocate this water to bona fide purposes where the consequence of not providing access to water might jeopardise the government's economic development objectives for regional South Australia.

Importantly too, reservation of water by the Government will stimulate the market for water in the South East. By holding water in reserve the water available for allocation will have been effectively allocated, either to existing licensees or to the Government through the reserve.

Whereas currently, proponents seeking access to water can be granted an allocation free of charge provided that the requirements of the water allocation plan are met, where a hundred, through the proposed mechanism, now becomes fully allocated, they would now be required to either obtain an allocation through the market from existing licensees or from the government's reserve. In either case, the proponents would be paying the appropriate market rate.

It is intended that the strategic water reserve would be available for allocation to proponents only after they have first made serious efforts to obtain their required allocation through the market and can demonstrate that the market has failed to meet their needs.

In presenting this Bill, I provide the opportunity for members to debate and move such changes as they see fit.

I acknowledge that the Government's position, as currently represented in the Bill, may not present a final solution to the two difficulties as identified by the conference of Houses last year. The Government has been unable to come up with a solution as quickly as previously expected, however the Government will continue to work as expeditiously as possible for a legislative solution to those two problems.

This Bill, as presented however is important in that it ensures that the resource is not allowed to decline further while additional refinements are suggested to the legislation now before the Parliament.

The proposed amendments are therefore significant and timely. I commend the bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Insertion of Part 5A

This clause inserts new Part 5A into the principal Act. If the excess water in a water resource is 20 per cent or less of the water available for allocation, new section 44B will enable the Minister to reserve the excess water in a water resource from further allocation either at all or subject to restrictions. The restrictions will be set out in a notice by the Governor published in the *Gazette* and further restrictions can be included by the Minister in the notice reserving the water (*see* section 44B(2)(c)). Section 44C sets out provisions that apply to the allocation of reserved water that do not apply to the allocation of water generally. Section 44D provides that restrictions on the allocation of water will be set out in a notice published in the *Gazette* by the Governor. Section 44E requires the Minister to keep

the public informed of allocations of reserved water by quarterly notices published in the *Gazette*.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 142—Right of appeal

This clause amends section 142 of the principal Act. The new paragraph inserted by this clause specifically provides for an appeal to the Environment, Resources and Development Court where the Minister refuses an application for a water allocation. However an appeal in respect of the refusal of an allocation of reserved water is excluded.

Mr ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.07 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 13 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27 February 2001

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SCHOOL CARD

3. **Ms KEY:** What number and proportion of students at each of the following schools received School Cards during 2000—Black Forest Primary, Cowandilla Primary, Goodwood Primary, Heathfield High, Linden Park Primary, Marryatville High, Mitcham Primary, Nuriootpa High, Plympton Primary, Richmond Primary, Rose Park Primary, Stirling East Primary, Warriappendi, William Light R-12 and Yankalilla Area?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Further to my response printed in *Hansard* on 8 December 2000 I now provide the 2000 School Card figures for the requested schools.

School	No. of students (Feb. 2000 census)	No. of approved School Card students 2000	Proportion of School Card students
Black Forest Primary	524	122	23.3%
Cowandilla Primary	162	121	74.7%
Goodwood Primary	186	53	28.5%
Heathfield High	718	144	20.1%
Linden Park Primary	542	80	14.8%

Marryatville High	1 074.4	170	15.8%
Mitcham Primary	430	66	15.3%
Nuriootpa High	923.3	192	20.8%
Plympton Primary	287	101	35.2%
Richmond Primary	153	65	42.5%
Rose Park Primary	414	71	17.1%
Stirling East Primary	362	45	12.4%
Warriappendi	40	20	50.0%
William Light R-12	671.6	255	38.0%
Yankalilla Area	366.5	32	8.7%

GOVERNMENT CREDIT CARDS

5. **Ms WHITE:**

1. What are the names and positions of all staff in the Department of Education, Training and Employment who have access to and use of government credit cards, what was the total spent on each card in 1999-2000 and how much related to travel, accommodation and entertainment?

2. What are the names, positions and salaries of all staff engaged in the head office Partnerships 21 implementation team and what are the details of all interstate and overseas travel undertaken by team officers during 1999-2000 including the date, destinations, cost and purpose of travel?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. Departmental systems do not record the title of each cardholder. To compile a list of all cardholders and their titles would require significant additional administrative effort.

2. The attached table lists the names, positions and salaries of all staff of the Partnerships 21 implementation team, along with any interstate and overseas travel undertaken by any of these staff members.

Partnerships 21 Taskforce—Interstate and Overseas Travel (July 1999-June 2000)

Name	Position	Salary	Destination	Date	Purpose	Cost (Travel and Accommodation)
Paul Kilvert	Director	\$104 000	Alice Springs	27/3/00 – 28/3/00	To conduct P21 workshops for all Anangu Schools	\$913
			Edmonton, Canada	23/5/99 – 3/6/99	As leader of an 8 person study group of principals and superintendents to investigate the system of local management in the Edmonton Public Schools system.	\$3 426 (meals paid for privately)
Terry Sizer	Superintendent	\$81 526	Alice Springs	26/3/00 – 29/3/00	To conduct P21 workshops for all Anangu Schools	\$1083
			Edmonton, Canada	23/5/99 – 3/6/99	As a member of an 8 person study group of principals and superintendents to investigate the system of local management in the Edmonton Public Schools system.	\$3 426 (meals paid for privately)
Bronte Stuart	Superintendent	\$81 526	Alice Springs	27/3/00 – 29/3/00	To conduct P21 workshops for all Anangu Schools	\$998
Helen Tunbridge	Superintendent	\$81 526	Brisbane	26/9/99 – 29/9/99	To attend the Australasian Association of Senior Educational Administrators Conference	This trip was not funded from the Partnerships 21 budget
Debbie Graham	Superintendent	\$81 526	New Zealand	23/6/00 – 30/6/00	Annual Australian Primary Principals Association Conference.	During this period, Ms Graham was released from duty from Partnerships 21 to attend the conference but the travel and accommodation was not funded by P21.

The following officers did not undertake any travel:

Name	Position	Salary
Christopher Charlesworth	Executive Officer	\$81 526
James Davies	Superintendent	\$81 526
Robert Heath	Superintendent	\$81 526
Ruth Jones	Superintendent	\$81 526
Nicholas Williams	Superintendent	\$81 526
Michael Sinkunas	Manager	\$70 103
Wendy Benton	Project Officer	\$58 144
Robin Soyland	AS03	\$38 551
Jacqui Wathen	AS02	\$33 462
Natasha Burton	AS01	\$25 128

KOALAS

7. **Mr HILL:** How many koalas on Kangaroo Island have been sterilised under the government's sterilisation scheme, what is the island's current koala population and what was it prior to the scheme, how much has the scheme cost and how much additional funding will be required to make the population sustainable?

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

As at the end of June 2000, a total of 3437 koalas had been sterilised.

In 1994, the koala population was estimated at 3 000-5 000. More recent information suggests this was underestimated and the Kangaroo Island koala population is more likely to be higher than the earlier estimate.

The management program, known as *Koala Rescue*, began in January 1997. An initial budget of \$635 000 was provided from the state and commonwealth governments for the period January 1997 to June 1998. A further \$600 000 has been provided by the state government to June 2001.

PESTICIDES

11. **Mr CLARKE:**

1. What pesticides were the EPA – Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed Protection office referring to in their October 2000 background information brief as being detected in the Happy Valley, Millbrook, Warren South Para and Barossa Reservoirs in the past 12 months and have other reservoirs been tested for pesticide contamination and if so, what are the results?

2. With respect to inappropriate pesticide application; as referred to in page 2 of the background document:

- what was the quantity and concentration of pesticides used;
- what was the level of use which was not compliant with registration and instructions on the pesticide label; and
- was there a failure of government employees or spraying contractors to follow industry best practice and the national code of best practice?

3. What initiatives are currently being planned and implemented to strengthen and improve coordination between government departments and stakeholders; as referred to in page 3 of the same background document?

4. What are the details of the range of initiatives for 'Industry Systems' the government is undertaking; as referred to in page 7 of the background document under 'Use of Pesticides'?

5. What is the precise methodology and frequency of the current water quality testing program with particular regard to pesticides, which pesticides are tested for and what common agricultural, commercial and domestic pesticides, if any, are not tested?

6. Which pesticides are tested for under the Adelaide Hills Catchment Testing Program?

7. With respect to the Mt. Bold Reservoir Weed Management Program, what are the:

- main pesticides and combinations of pesticides used;
- quantity of pesticides used in each of the past three financial years;
- frequency of spraying and any other form of application; and
- success or otherwise of the program?

8. What measures, if any, are taken by government agencies and their spraying contractors to avoid water contamination by pesticides when weeds covering the banks of the Onkaparinga River and River Torrens and tributaries are subject to spraying?

9. What are the government's current and proposed initiatives to educate, regulate, control and monitor pesticide use by government and local government bodies?

10. Has the minister sought and received assurances from the Department of Primary Industries and Resources that they will

ensure rigorous, impartial and objective surveillance and control of pesticides in the Adelaide Hills catchment area and elsewhere in South Australia and if not, why not?

11. Will the Minister ensure that a fully researched and documented bottom line data base is established that will accurately describe:

- volume, type, frequency of use and method of application of pesticides used in the Adelaide Hills catchment area; and
- volume and types of pesticides used by the full range of users in the catchment area?

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

1. The October 2000 background information brief issued by the EPA Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed Protection Office referred to the detection of the pesticides Atrazine, Simazine and Hexazinone. Testing of reservoir waters is the responsibility of SA Water; that agency has advised that all water supply reservoirs in the Mount Lofty Ranges are regularly analysed for herbicides. This monitoring has not found any other pesticide contamination during 1999 or 2000.

2. A wide variety of pesticides are used across rural industry, and domestically, within the Mount Lofty watershed. The quantities or concentrations of pesticides used and information regarding the manner of use is not available.

Where reservoir contamination of particular significance has occurred, such as that detected in the Warren, South Para and Barossa reservoirs in 1998, investigations can lead to discovery of a potential source for the contamination. Investigations at that time found the source to be a granular forestry herbicide applied by Forestry SA to new pine trees during their establishment phase in the Mt Crawford Forest area in May 1998. The method, timing and rate of herbicide application by Forestry SA contractors was in accordance with the label instructions as approved by the National Registration Authority.

3. A number of state government agencies, local government and statutory authorities are actively involved in programs in the Mount Lofty Ranges, contributing to integrated environmental management objectives. These include the Department for Environment and Heritage (DEH) through the EPA, Primary Industries and Resources SA (PIRSA), Planning SA, the Department of Human Services, the Department of Water Resources, SA Water, local councils, catchment water management boards (CWMBs), soils boards, the Mount Lofty Ranges Catchment Program Board and animal and plant control boards (APCBs), and the Australian Water Quality Centre (AWQC). These bodies liaise closely with one another on a wide variety of issues and collaborate on a number of specific programs and projects, contributing specialist expertise, and human and financial resources.

4. The Industry systems initiatives referred to in the background document are indicators of initial key focus areas for the Watershed Protection Office.

5. SA Water tests for pesticides in its water supply systems as part of a comprehensive water quality monitoring program. Pesticide monitoring is based on a risk-based approach. A routine program of monthly frequency at key SA Water locations is supplemented by an event-based program which can be triggered by significant rain events in catchments, by detections of pesticides or by knowledge of an incident that may represent a risk of contamination. If significant risks are indicated, the frequency of routine monitoring may be increased commensurate with those risks.

In the event that pesticides are detected, SA Water looks to the EPA to lead an investigation to determine the cause of contamination and oversee remediation of the cause. SA Water supports the collection of targeted event-based samples in upper catchments as a tool to identify the specific causes of water quality problems.

Pesticide monitoring is based on information available on usage in the catchments and taking into consideration the potential health and environmental impacts.

The pesticides monitored by SA Water are categorised as organochlorine pesticides and organophosphorus & triazine pesticides.

6. The Torrens Catchment Water Management Board has an ambient monitoring program that includes testing for total insecticides (specifically Dieldrin) and total herbicides (including Atrazine, Simazine and Dacthal).

The Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board conducts a similar program.

7. The following information has been provided by SA Water with respect to the Mount Bold Reservoir weed management program:

- (a) the main pesticides used in 1999-2000 are Glyphosate, Trounce, Biactive, and Brush off
- (b) the quantity of pesticides used in each of the past three financial years are:

	1999-2000	1998-99	1997-98
Glyphosate (litres)	80	28	200
Trounce (173g packs)	556	272	4430
Biactive (litres)	157	100	40
Brush off (grams)	1558	335	920
Simazine (litres)	0	0	20
Garlon (litres)	0	6	0

It is of note that no Simazine has been used in the catchment since the Environment Protection Authority direction in February 1999.

- (c) Spraying is generally carried out annually.
- (d) The Animal and Pest Plant Board has acknowledged the success of the program.

8. The current policy and practice of Government agencies and their spraying contractors to avoid water contamination by pesticides during spraying of weeds on the banks of rivers is that only 'Roundup Bioactive' (Glyphosate 360) is used in such circumstances. Glyphosate 360 is recognised as the lowest risk herbicide available for broad application.

9. State and local government agencies are subject to the same regulatory requirements as all other pesticide users and are involved in educational and monitoring programs. These agencies are frequently leaders in the application of new and improved application technology and appropriate choice of pesticide.

10. The Department of Primary Industries and Resources SA (PIRSA) is cooperating with the Department for Environment and Heritage and other partnership bodies in a variety of programs and special projects focussing on improved land management, integrated natural resource management and improved management of pesticides in the Mount Lofty Ranges, including the Mount Lofty Ranges Catchment Program and the Pesticide Use in the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed project.

PIRSA Farm Chemicals Branch is presently working with the EPA and local government to address specific chemical trespass matters and it is anticipated that PIRSA will be a partner in developing measures to address these issues in the future.

11. The diverse range of users and purposes for which pesticides are used make it impracticable to establish a database of pesticide use such as is proposed in the question.

Rather, the government is developing a strategic approach including education and awareness raising programs and the application of auditing processes for chemical spray contractors.

Work undertaken as part of the Pesticide Use in the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed project aims to identify the different user groups and outline the major chemicals that are being used by these groups.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION CONCESSIONS

17. **Mr HILL:**

1. Does the government intend extending motor vehicle registration concessions to the long term unemployed and if not, why not?

2. What would be the total value of these concessions to all persons unemployed for 12 or more months?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. A pensioner concession benefit was first introduced into the Motor Vehicles Act in 1970. Entitlement to the benefit is dependent on the owner of the vehicle being the holder of a pensioner concession card issued under the law of the commonwealth, or a State Concession Card issued by the Department of Human Services that entitles the holder to reduced fares on public transport.

The pensioner concession benefit (age, disability support, sole parent and carer pensions) was provided in the expectation that the long term status of the owner was not likely to change during the currency of the vehicle's registration. This may not be the case for some other owners, for example people receiving a Newstart or Youthstart allowance, which is the reason why successive governments have never extended the concession to people who are unemployed.

As the member would be aware, there are currently a range of concessions available on the registration of motor vehicles and on drivers' licences. The revenue forgone from the Highways Fund as a result of pension related concessions is approximately \$8 million per annum.

The pensioner concession benefit also provides owners with an exemption from stamp duty on the renewal certificate for Compulsory Third Party (CTP) insurance, which would otherwise be paid into the Hospitals Fund. The revenue forgone from the Hospitals Fund, as a result of the exemption from the payment of stamp duty on CTP renewal certificates, is in the region of \$5 million per year.

The introduction of additional registration concessions would represent a further reduction in revenue to the Highways Fund (which is used in the construction and maintenance of roads)—or would need to be recovered through an increase in the registration charge and the CTP stamp duty from all other vehicle owners.

2. Information provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) indicates that there are some 35 000 people currently receiving the Newstart or Youthstart allowance in South Australia. However, from the information held by the ABS, Centrelink and State agencies, it has not been possible to identify the people who have been receiving the Newstart or Youthstart allowance for 12 months or more and hold a driver's licence or own a motor vehicle.

VEGETATION CLEARANCE

18. **Mr HILL:** What action has the Minister or the Native Vegetation Council taken in relation to illegal clearance of vegetation associated with the construction of a drainage scheme at Bonney's Camp and will prosecutions be pursued and if not, why not?

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

The Native Vegetation Council approved a management plan for the clearance of the proposed drain route through Bonney's Camp on the understanding that this was the only logical route available within the time span of the Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Mitigation Scheme. The plan approved the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board, or its agent, clearing the route. Conditions on rehabilitation and management of the vegetation associated with the proposed drain were placed upon the plan. The placement of a drain through Bonney's Camp has consent of the owners, Wetlands and Wildlife.

The Department for Environment and Heritage has investigated concerns of illegal clearance. Although the clearance on the ground did not entirely match the plan alignment, the overall clearance was not significantly greater than was specified in the plan. Approval for the use of the Bonney's Camp route was given by Wetlands and Wildlife. Moreover, the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board has responsibility for management of the drain construction, including rehabilitation works, to minimise impacts on biodiversity.

29. **Mr HILL:**

1. How many applications were made to the Native Vegetation Council in 1999-2000 for permission to clear land of native vegetation?

2. What was the outcome of these applications, how much land was approved to be cleared and how many trees were removed?

3. How many of the applications involved vineyard development?

4. How many allegations of illegal clearance were received reported to the Council in 1999-2000, how many were investigated and how many prosecutions were made?

5. What auditing of heritage agreement land is made by the Council to ensure compliance with the agreements?

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

1. 183 applications were assessed during 1999-2000.
 2. Of the 183 applications assessed, 136 applications were determined with a further seven deferred for further information. Forty applications were either withdrawn by the landowner or considered to be exempt following assessment by the Department for Environment and Heritage.

Consent was granted to six applications for brush and wood-cutting over 719.5 hectares. It is anticipated that these areas will regenerate over time. Fifteen hectares were refused clearance consent over these same six applications.

130 applications were determined allowing the clearance of 5 949 scattered trees over 4 350 hectares and 845 hectares of scrubland.

3. Twenty-nine applications for vineyard development.

4. 141 reports of illegal clearance were received and investigated with prosecution proceeding with 13 of these cases.

5. The Department for Environment and Heritage has in conjunction with the Natural Heritage Trust employed a number of Bush Management Advisers now located in regional centres. One of their main responsibilities is establishing and maintaining contact with

Heritage Agreement landowners to discuss management of these important areas.

Within this framework the Council has over the last few years established an annual call to Heritage Agreement landowners for grants to assist in the management of these blocks.

Currently, regional staff are as part of their work requirements asked to contact all Heritage Agreement landholders within their regions at least once a year, and visit a third of those same Heritage Agreement areas personally with the landowner and/or manager.

NATIONAL PARKS, MANAGEMENT PLANS

32. Mr HILL:

1. How many national parks, conservation parks and reserves have completed management plans, how many have draft plans and how many parks are without?

2. How long will it take to complete management plans for all parks and what is the estimated cost of achieving this?

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

1. Currently the Department for Environment and Heritage administers 316 reserves proclaimed under one of either the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972, the Wilderness Protection Act 1992, or the Crown Lands Act 1929. Of that total, 119 reserves have gazetted management plans. There is one reserve for which a draft management plan is currently on public exhibition and an additional 14 reserves whose management plans have been through public exhibition and are being processed to finality. There are a further 22 reserves with management plans in the early stages of preparation. The remaining 160 reserves do not have management plans in any of these categories.

2. The current annual budget allocated to the management planning program is \$160 000. If every reserve required a reasonably detailed management plan, it is estimated that, based on a production rate of around 16 gazetted management plans each year, it would take approximately 10 years to achieve a situation where all reserves have formally gazetted management plans. Ignoring inflation, the estimated cost to achieve that end point would be approximately \$1.6 million. However, the department recognises that individual reserves have variable need for management plans. The remaining reserves without management plans are being examined as to their need for attention and planning work will continue to be undertaken on a priority basis.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

37. **Mr ATKINSON:** Which Adelaide suburbs and other areas of the state were blacked out:

(a) on the evening of 1 November, on what criteria were they chosen and by whom; and

(b) during this year owing to interruptions of full electricity supplies from interstate?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

(a) The South Australian transmission entity, ElectraNet SA, has advised that the following areas were affected by the rotational load shedding requested by the National Electricity Market Management Company (NEMMCO) on 2 November 2000 in response to generation shortfalls brought about by industrial activity in Victoria: Cheltenham, Croydon Park, Kilburn, Kilkenny, Port Adelaide North, Kilburn South, Prospect, New Richmond, Thebarton, Tonsley Park, Playford and Brinkworth.

When required to be undertaken under the rules of the National Electricity Market (embodied in the National Electricity Code) in response to a major electricity system disturbance, load shedding is managed in South Australia by the local transmission entity, ElectraNet SA, acting as agent of the market operator, NEMMCO. Load shedding is conducted in accordance with an established schedule of load shedding priorities, approved by the State's electricity planning body, the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council.

Load shedding is generally undertaken so as to avoid significant impacts on industry and essential services. Furthermore, on each occasion, standard practice is to avoid individual suburbs being impacted by load shedding for more than an hour at a time. Load shedding events are also rotated over time so as to avoid multiple impacts on the same areas on consecutive occasions. Whilst there may have been local

network difficulties in some areas, load shedding was rotated on 2 November 2000 in accordance with this practice, with individual substations affected by load shedding for periods of no longer than approximately half an hour.

(b) The only other instance of widespread load shedding resulting from interruptions of the Victorian interconnect during 2000 occurred on 3 February as a result of extreme demand conditions and industrial activity affecting generation in Victoria. I am advised by ElectraNet SA that the following areas were impacted, for periods ranging up to 45 minutes: Campbelltown, Cudmore Park, Kent Town, Kingswood, Lower Mitcham, North Unley, Panorama, Seacombe, Harrow, Linden Park, Magill, Northfield, Ascot Park, Clarence Gardens, Happy Valley, Morphett Vale East, Norwood, Sheidow, Glenelg North, Keswick, Morphettville, Oaklands, Plympton, Athol Park, Findon, Flinders Park, Fulham Gardens, Henley South, Keith, Kingcraig, Mount Barker, Blackpool, Croydon, Glanville, Largs North, Port Adelaide, Queenstown and Woodville.

BEECHWOOD BOTANIC GARDENS

39. **Mr HILL:** Is the Beechwood Botanic Gardens available for private hire and if so, what are the charges and were they let out for private use during 1998-99 and 1999-2000 and if so, when and for what purpose?

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

Beechwood Heritage Garden is available for private hire. Currently, the cost is \$750 for 3 hours for a wedding or \$600 for 3 hours for wedding photographs.

The garden was hired out for a total of seven times in 1998, eight times in 1999 and seven times in 2000.

As provided for by the indenture agreement between the Board of the Botanic Gardens and the house owner, the garden has also been used for private functions.

HMAS HOBART REEF

40. **Mr HILL:** What effect will the proposed HMAS *Hobart* Reef have on fish population and behaviour in the area, will the reef make it easier for recreational fishers and will the minister designate the area as a marine park?

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

Artificial reefs do not necessarily increase the total number of fish available, despite providing shelter and food. Studies of artificial reefs worldwide have found that they act more as fish aggregators—in other words, fish tend to congregate around them. It should be noted that many species of commercially and recreationally important fish tend to use seagrasses, mangroves and salt marsh habitats for breeding, rather than reefs. A proposal for a marine protected area will be considered as part of a whole of government strategy in this area.

PHYTOPHTHORA CINNAMOMI

41. **Mr HILL:** How widespread is *Phytophthora Cinnamomi* in South Australia and what programs and budgets are in place to deal with this problem?

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

Our current understanding of the distribution of *Phytophthora cinnamomi* is incomplete. In the Mount Lofty Ranges, we have recently confirmed its presence near Para Wirra Recreation Park. This is the northernmost known location. It occurs throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges south of this site and on Kangaroo Island. Although other species of *Phytophthora* have been located in the South East of South Australia, *Phytophthora cinnamomi* has not yet been confirmed.

National Parks and Wildlife SA has been investing in programs to mitigate the risk of the spread of this disease during the past four years. A three year strategic plan for the management of *Phytophthora* species was developed in early 1998 and has been coordinated by National Parks and Wildlife SA's *Phytophthora* Species Working Group. A *Phytophthora* education and management position was recently created with Natural Heritage Trust state matching funds to enhance National Parks and Wildlife SA's capacity to investigate, develop and implement *Phytophthora* threat mitigation and education programs across South Australia.

New initiatives to be supported by this officer include:

- systematic survey and testing to map the current distribution of *Phytophthora* species;

- the identification and mapping of areas of high conservation significance potentially impacted by Phytophthora;
- implementation of an action plan to ensure significant biodiversity sites are protected;
- development of policy and hygiene protocols for National Parks and Wildlife SA; and
- development and implementation of an education and training program to provide knowledge and advice to National Parks and Wildlife SA staff, institutions, groups and individuals on appropriate hygiene to ameliorate the impacts of Phytophthora.

The outcomes of these actions aim to provide a skilled group of people in South Australia, who will have the necessary skills to carry on with the process of effective management of the Phytophthora threat to native vegetation.

LAND PURCHASES

42. **Mr HILL:** Has any local government authority sold any land purchased through MOSS or ROSES funds and if so, what provisions exist for the return of the proceeds to the government?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has provided the following information:

Planning SA has no record of any land purchased through MOSS or ROSES (P & D Fund subsidies) being subsequently sold by a Council, other than for some road realignments.

This government has introduced tighter conditions which make it more difficult for open space purchased with P & D Fund assistance to be sold. When land is purchased with P & D Fund assistance, a requirement is that title to the land be cancelled and that Council then holds the land as a reserve under the Crown Lands Act. A council cannot then deal with the land without prior written approval being obtained from the minister responsible for the P & D Fund.

Should land become surplus to open space requirements and is proposed for sale by a council, then the P & D Fund would need to be reimbursed from the sale proceeds, at current market values, and in proportion to the original financial assistance provided.

HOSPITALS, EMERGENCIES

46. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** During 1998-99 and 1999-2000:
- how many emergencies were diverted away from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Royal Adelaide Hospital, respectively, and sent to private hospitals; and
 - how many emergency procedures were carried out at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:

(a) Public hospitals only divert to other public hospitals, except in cases where the patient specifically requests a private hospital. In times of need hospitals make the decision to divert and subsequently follow the agreed diversion policy which was implemented in August 2000 as a working draft. The hospitals are not able to provide numbers of where emergencies are taken, as once the decision to divert is made, the hospital on diversion is unaware of the volume of traffic or numbers of cases transported by the Ambulance Service.

Under the diversion policy, there are specific categories that are not to be diverted:

- patients classified by SA Ambulance as priority one;
- patients with myocardial infarction;
- patients with life or limb threatening conditions;
- patients who have been treated by SA Ambulance Service as major trauma (these patients will be transported to a designated Major Trauma Centre); and
- patients accepted for admission to a critical care service.

(b) In 1998-99, 3 532 emergency procedures were performed in the Emergency Surgical Suite at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. In 1999-00 there were 3 765 which is an increase of 7 per cent. This does not include some emergency surgical cases done in the general operating theatres.

The following figures give an approximate indication of the procedures performed in the Emergency Department each year. The figure is based on one procedure per presentation although many patients have more than one procedure carried out.

1998-99	47 641	Priority 1	1 554
1999-00	47 731	Priority 1	1 712

ACCESS CABS

47. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:**

1. What contractual performance criteria must be met by Yellow Cabs in relation to the operations of Access Cabs and how often is this reviewed?

2. What is the average waiting time for an Access Cab between the weekday hours of 6.00 am and 6.00 pm and how often is this monitored by the Passenger Transport Board?

The Hon DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has provided the following information:

1. Contractual performance criteria to be met by the Yellow Cab Group relate to service standards for the Access Cabs Central Booking Service (CBS), as specified by the Passenger Transport Board (PTB). Details associated with CBS requirements are provided under Section 29 of the Passenger Transport Act 1994, Regulations 12 and 13 of the Passenger Transport (General) Regulations 1994, and Schedule 10 of the Passenger Transport (General) Regulations 1994. The performance of the Yellow Cab Group is reviewed quarterly as part of CBS accreditation requirements. In addition, as part of the Access Cabs contract, key performance indicators are the basis for regular monthly reporting by the Yellow Cab Group to the PTB. These include waiting times, number of complaints, number of commendations and number of jobs cancelled by customers.

2. The average waiting time for an Access Cab during the weekday hours of 6.00am to 6.00pm, as reported by the Yellow Cab group in September 2000, was 8 minutes. This is one of the key performance areas that is monitored monthly by the PTB based on analysis of transmission data between the CBS and all vehicles.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COUNCIL

50. **Mr HILL:** What is the state of the National Environment Protection Council—National Pollutant Inventory Measure funding, what is state government's contribution for 2000-01 and what are its future commitments?

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

In South Australia, the National Pollutant Inventory (NPI) is being implemented under the Environment Protection Act 1993 by the Department for Environment and Heritage.

Funding for implementation was subject to a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the commonwealth and each of the states and territories. The three year MOU was for the period 1997 to 30 June 2000.

During this three year period, South Australia was allocated \$640 000 by the commonwealth to implement the NPI.

This funding was provided by the commonwealth as the NPI is an initiative of the commonwealth, with the individual jurisdictions providing an in-kind contribution by absorbing non salary on-costs.

For 2000-01, the commonwealth is entering into one year MOUs with each state or territory separately as the initial stage of a proposal to enter into a long-term cost sharing arrangement between the commonwealth and the states and territories. The commonwealth is proposing to provide \$176 000 to South Australia to continue the NPI for 2000-01.

Under a previous MOU, an additional \$100 000 funding was provided to carry out aggregate emissions work. In fact, a comprehensive aggregate emission inventory for Adelaide and 16 regional airsheds was undertaken. In detail these were for Adelaide and 5 other major airsheds (Barossa, Port Lincoln, Riverland, Spencer Gulf and South East) and 11 minor airsheds (Lyndoch, Nuriootpa, Barmera, Berri, Loxton, Renmark, Millicent, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Whyalla). Motor vehicle studies were completed for Adelaide and 16 regional airsheds.

Similar aggregate emissions work was undertaken for two major water catchments, Adelaide-Mount Lofty and the Barossa Catchments.

PACKAGE LABELLING

51. **Mr HILL:** What would be the likely effects on the health of consumers should a leading breakfast cereal producer remove the labelling on the packaging depicting the amount and percentage of sugar content and what action can and will the minister take to prevent this action?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The effect of sugar in the diet is not a simple matter, however, it is possible that the impact of removing sugar from food labels could encourage some consumers to make

inappropriate food choices and also lead to an increase in the amount of dental caries in the community.

At a recent national meeting of the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Council I spoke strongly in favour of the right of consumers to know what is in the food they are eating and argued for the labelling of sugar and saturated fat. I am pleased to advise that I received strong support for this view and Ministers agreed that the Australia New Zealand Food Standard Code will be drafted to require mandatory inclusion of sugar and saturated fats on food labels.

WATER QUALITY

59. **Ms THOMPSON:** What monitoring of water quality of the Christie Creek is currently occurring and what information on the quality is available?

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

The Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board monitors water quality at two sites in Christies Creek.

Samples are collected monthly for chemical analysis including nutrients, salinity, heavy metals and dissolved oxygen. Surveys for macroinvertebrates are undertaken twice yearly in spring and autumn. Results are available from the Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board.

In addition, the community based Waterwatch program has 10 monitoring sites at various points along Christies Creek.

Preliminary assessment of the data indicates that the water in Christies Creek is of poor microbiological quality. Other data has not been assessed to date.

SCHOOL CARD

60. **Ms THOMPSON:** For each of the following schools—Christies Downs R-7 & Special, Lonsdale Heights CPC-7, Flaxmill CPC & Primary, Hackam West, Morphett Vale West, Reynella Primary, Reynella South CPC & Primary, John Morphett Primary, Pimpala Primary, Morphett Vale East, Coorara Primary, Christies Beach High, Morphett Vale High and Wirreanda High:

- what number and proportion of students are Schoolcard recipients; and
- how many students have a negotiated curriculum and how many teachers with specific special needs training are available?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

- The number and proportion of school card recipients in the identified schools is as follows:

School Name	FTE enrolment (as at 4 August 2000)	School Card Students (as at 13 December 2000)	Per- centage School Card students
Christie Downs Primary	163	122	74.8%
Christie Downs Special	48	21	43.8%
Christies Beach HS & Sth Voc College	1077	391	36.3%
Coorara Primary	462	183	39.6%
Flaxmill Junior Primary	185	90	48.6%
Flaxmill Primary	254	117	46.1%
Hackham West Junior Primary	186	119	64.0%
Hackham West Primary	291	170	58.4%
John Morphett Primary	220	84	38.2%
Lonsdale Heights Primary	212	127	60.0%
Morphett Vale East Junior Primary	212	111	52.4%
Morphett Vale East Primary	349	154	44.1%
Morphett Vale High	654	288	44.0%
Morphett Vale West Primary	274	151	55.1%
Pimpala Primary	265	83	31.3%
Reynella Primary	590	133	22.5%
Reynella South Primary	230	111	48.3%
Wirreanda High	993	353	35.5%

- The number of students who have a negotiated curriculum plan in the identified schools during 2000 is as follows:

	Students with negotiated curriculum plans FTE Enrolments
Christie Downs Primary School	28.0
Christie Downs Special School	48.0

Christies Beach HS & Sth Voc College	145.7
Coorara Primary School	40.0
Flaxmill Junior Primary School	13.0
Flaxmill Primary School	24.0
Hackham West Junior Primary School	25.0
Hackham West Primary School	43.0
John Morphett Primary School	37.0
Lonsdale Heights Primary School	30.0
Morphett Vale East JPS	25.0
Morphett Vale East Primary School	25.0
Morphett Vale High School	69.8
Morphett Vale West Primary School	48.0
Pimpala Primary School	27.0
Reynella Primary School	25.0
Reynella South Primary School	16.2
Wirreanda High School	70.9

The vast majority of teachers in schools have undertaken some form of ongoing training to support students with specific special needs. Given the wide range of student special needs and the variety of training experiences undertaken by teachers, comprehensive records of staff participation in ongoing programs or specific pre-service course content are not held centrally. Records are kept by individual teachers who maintain their own personal portfolios for use when applying for new teaching positions.

Many pre-service teacher training courses include components of special education. In addition, universities, the department and other organisations such as the Down Syndrome Association offer a range of training and professional development programs for staff each year. These programs range from half-day courses on a specific subject through to accredited modules leading a teacher to a graduate certificate, bachelor of education or masters degree.

Teachers chose to participate in these programs to ensure they are skilled to provide an appropriate curriculum for their students. The flexibility for staff to participate in programs throughout their career ensures that teaching practices continue to be responsive to the needs of their students.

HOUSING TRUST

62. **Ms THOMPSON:** What is the location and number at each location of South Australian Housing Trust maintenance staff, what has been the average waiting time in each maintenance category for the Noarlunga region during 2000 and what were the comparable details during 1996?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: A total of 45 full time equivalents Housing Trust staff provide maintenance services in the field at the following locations:

Modbury:	1 x Area Maintenance Manager; 1 x Field Manager; 4 x Maintenance Coordinators; 5 x Clerks;
Marion:	1 x Field Manager; 4 x Maintenance Coordinators; 1 x Clerk;
Port Adelaide:	4 x Maintenance Coordinators; 1 x Clerk;
Salisbury:	2 x Maintenance Coordinators;
Riverside:	1 x Maintenance Coordinator; 5 x Clerks;
Elizabeth:	4 x Maintenance Coordinators; 1 x Clerk;
Port Augusta:	1 x Maintenance Coordinator; 1 x .2 Clerk;
Whyalla:	2 x Maintenance Coordinators; 3 x .2 Clerks; 1 x Vacant Position;
Noarlunga:	2 x Maintenance Coordinators;
South East:	1 x Maintenance Coordinator; 1 x .2 Clerk;
Port Lincoln:	1 x Maintenance Coordinator; and Relieving: 1 x Maintenance Coordinator.

In addition to these field staff, outsourced managers from John Hindmarsh (metropolitan area) and Property Management Services (country area) provide programmed maintenance and some responsive work such as disabled modifications and half cost fencing.

The service standards for the 3 categories of maintenance work are as follows:

Priority 1—	urgent repairs that immediately affect health, safety or security—within 4 hours.
Priority 2—	urgent repairs that do not immediately affect health, safety or security—within 24 hours.

Priority 3— non-urgent maintenance—the Trust will assess if the work needs to be done.

There is no detailed monitoring against these standards. Rather the approach is to monitor customer callbacks in which tenants advise the maintenance centre of work not completed in a timely manner or to expected levels of quality.

The National Customer Satisfaction Survey is conducted independently each year. This measures overall levels of satisfaction with emergency and non-emergency maintenance, as distinct from the specific service standards listed above.

NOARLUNGA HEALTH SERVICE

63. **Ms THOMPSON:** What are the current staffing levels of each entity comprising the Noarlunga Health Service and in each case, what are their designations and employment status?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Noarlunga Health Service comprises of four sections, which are all managed by a single administration. These sections are:

- Public hospital patients, employing 262.94 staff;
- Private hospital patients, employing 41.14 staff;
- Community Health, employing 73.46 staff; and
- Community Mental Health, employing 29.63 staff (staff numbers are full time equivalents (FTEs)).

The following are actual staffing numbers and not FTEs.

1. Public hospital patients section

Designation	Employment Status	
	Permanent	Casual
Nursing	123	45
Medical	12	13
Ancillary (domestics, cleaners, maintenance)	54	20
Administrative	42	18
Professional	12	8
Technical	3	0
Total	246	104

2. Private hospital patients section

Designation	Employment Status	
	Permanent	Casual
Nursing	17	5
Medical	1	
Ancillary (domestics, cleaners, maintenance)	7	
Administrative	21	
Professional	3	
Technical	2	
Total	51	5

3. Community Health

Designation	Employment Status	
	Permanent	Casual
Nursing	13	1
Medical		
Ancillary (domestics, cleaners, maintenance)	3	1
Administrative	36	6
Professional	24	10
Technical	2	0
Total	78	18

4. Community Mental Health

Designation	Employment Status	
	Permanent	Casual
Nursing	9	2
Medical	2	1
Ancillary (domestics, cleaners, maintenance)	3	0
Administrative	6	1
Professional	11	1
Technical	3	0
Total	34	5

MORPHETT VALE TRAFFIC

64. **Ms THOMPSON:**

1. How many motor vehicle accidents and injuries occurred at both the eastern and western intersections of Emmerson Road and Bains Road, Morphett Vale?

2. How many expiation notices for speeding have been issued to Morphett Vale residents since 1999 and what proportion of all notices issued does this represent?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has provided the following information:

In responding to the Member for Reynell's question, the following clarifications are made:

- Examination of individual road crash reports could not ascertain whether the crashes had occurred at the eastern or western intersection of Emmerson Road. Consequently, the following information is grouped together as intersection crashes at Emmerson and Bains Roads.
- The information is provided by calendar year.
 1.

Intersection	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Road crashes						(to August)
Total Crashes						
Reported	1	3	2	1	0	1
Total Number of Injuries	0	2	0	0	0	0

Of the total of 8 crashes reported between January 1995 and August 2000, 4 were 'rear-end' crashes on Bains Road and 4 were 'right-angle' crashes involving vehicles leaving Emmerson Road.

2. Advice is being sought from the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services in relation to this matter and a response will be provided in due course.

TAX EXEMPTIONS

71. **Mr FOLEY:** What are the names of all omissions, reductions and concessions from State taxes, fees, fines and charges for 2000-01 and in each case, what is the Budget revenue forgone by its application?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

The budgeted cost of relief from State taxes and charges in 2000-01 is as follows:

Item	2000-2001 Budget \$m
Tax Relief	
Stamp Duties	
First home concession	9.0
Inner city area rebate for new home units	0.2
Provision for <i>ex gratia</i> relief	19.2
Payroll tax	
Exporters rebate	3.5
Trainee rebate	16.4
Young persons employment rebate	0.4 (a)
Industry specific payroll tax relief (administered by DIT)	5.3
Emergency Services Levy	-
Remissions	45.5
Pensioner concessions	6.6
Subsidies	
Petrol and on-road diesel	18.9 (b)
Liquor	12.3
Concessions for government charges	
Water and sewerage rates	22.5
Electricity charges	12.7
Transport concessions	14.6
Local government rates	24.7

(a) Although this scheme was closed at the end of 1999, some rebate claims will carry over into 2000-01 since claims are submitted six monthly in arrears.

(b) Comprises \$16 million for ongoing petrol and on-road diesel subsidies and \$2.9 million being the final instalment of off-road diesel subsidies payable in respect of 1999-2000 activity.

There is of course a wide range of exemptions from taxes and charges which reduce the revenue base. The benefit to taxpayers from these exemptions is not explicitly costed in the Budget.

The Budget reports on actual revenue collected and those concessions and other forms of relief, whether provided by way of refund, rebate, subsidy or as part of an explicit concession scheme, which result in a Budget expenditure.