

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 14 March 2001

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

NATIVE BIRDS

A petition signed by 380 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the government to repeal the proclamation permitting the unlimited destruction by commercial horticulturalists of protected native birds, was presented by the Hon. M.R. Buckley.

Petition received.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 830 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the government to fund intensive care facilities at Noarlunga Hospital, was presented by the Hon. R.L. Brokenshire.

Petition received.

FIREWORKS

A petition signed by 1 271 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ban the personal use of fireworks with the exception of authorised public displays, was presented by Ms Geraghty.

Petition received.

STRATHMONT CENTRE

A petition signed by 3 341 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ensure the immediate repair of the Strathmont Centre to comply with state and commonwealth standards, was presented by Ms Geraghty.

Petition received.

HOSPITALS, ADVERSE EVENTS

In reply to **Ms STEVENS** (7 December 2000).

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: During 1999-2000 the department, through Aon Risk Services, received 135 medical malpractice claims and paid \$171 760 in compensation on those claims.

In 1999-2000, the total amount paid for malpractice claims was \$5.649 million. This payment was for 323 claims made during the previous 10 years, from 1989-90 until the end of the financial year 1999-2000. Two cases account for \$2.6 million of the \$5.6 million.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

The SPEAKER: I lay on the table the supplementary report of the Auditor-General on the electricity businesses disposal process in South Australia: arrangements for the disposal of Optima Energy Pty Ltd, Synergen Pty Ltd, Flinders Power Pty Ltd, Terragas Trader Pty Ltd and ElectraNet SA: some audit observations.

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

That the report be published.

Motion carried.

LAW AND ORDER

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement in relation to the latest efforts by our government to crack down on crime and on those who commit offences.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Our government takes the issue of law and order very seriously. Every South Australian has the right to feel safe in their homes, in their streets and in their communities. Parents must be confident in the knowledge that, when their child goes to school, they are not at risk. They need to feel confident that, when their teenagers are visiting the city, they are safe. The elderly need to be confident of living in their homes without fear of invasion. There is no more important issue than that of protecting lives and property, in our opinion. It is why we have put a strong focus on working with our police and our communities to fight the crime rate, increasing our police numbers and introduce programs across our schools to address law and order in our community.

Mr Speaker, you would know that, in 1999, the Premier convened a task force to look specifically at police numbers, resources and issues around policing in South Australia. We worked with the police, and the result is an additional 113 police this year going through the academy. While the recruitment of these additional officers above the ongoing recruitment attrition program was only supposed to begin with the April graduation this year, we have been progressing so well on our targets that we have been able to bring forward the process. Already 26 of the promised additional 113 police have graduated, and at today's ceremony the Acting Commissioner of Police and I welcomed 16 new officers to the force. This is on top of the almost 200 police who graduated in 1999-2000, a number which is almost 35 per cent above the level of attrition. I expect that, by the middle of this year—June 2001—we will have graduated almost 450 police in the last two years, some 70 per cent above the level of attrition for that period.

When one realises that the government also has been increasing civilian numbers within our police force so that we can allow sworn officers to be out and about concentrating on police work and not sitting behind a desk, the picture that emerges is one where there are more officers on the beat than ever before. Importantly, these additional officers are going where they are most needed in the community. Since June last year, 19 police officers have been posted to the South Coast local service area; 32 to Holden Hill; 33 in Elizabeth; 17 in Port Adelaide; 35 in Sturt; and 48 in Adelaide. A further six police have been posted to areas like the West Coast, the Riverland and the midwest, or the Whyalla area. And out of today's 16 new graduates there will be new postings in the local service areas of Elizabeth, with three; Holden Hill, one; Sturt, three; Port Adelaide, three; the South-East, one; Hills-Murray, one; the midwest, two; and Adelaide, one.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: But we realise that additional police on the beat is clearly only part of the equation. We have backed this up with a number of programs that focus on those committing drug-related crimes, car thefts and assaults. Members of the community expect action, and we are delivering it to them.

Today I can inform the House that, as part of the government's weapons moratorium, more than 1 100 weapons have been handed in to the police. The range of weapons surrendered includes more than 850 knives and daggers of various types; catapults; nunchakus; pistol crossbows; bayonets; and knuckle-dusters. We have had more than 2 100 calls about the state government's new laws. The special weapons internet site received just over 1 540 hits, and an estimated 23 000 pages were downloaded from it.

By getting weapons off the street, putting more police on the beat and tackling crime in innovative ways, our government is not only focusing on a safer environment for all South Australians but, importantly, is helping maintain the important social fabric that binds our community in South Australia together. And let us be quite clear on that point. We will not tolerate a 'softly, softly' approach on crime. But what we will do—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: We saw the softly, softly approach when Labor was in office, and we will not tolerate that. What we are doing is working with families and communities to help people break the cycle of crime so that the social fabric to which I refer is maintained and continues to be rebuilt.

Special operations and taskings are an important tool in tackling this issue. That is why South Australian police have put in place programs and operations such as Operation Mantle. We are turning the tide in the war against drug related crime. We want to stop our young people turning to drugs and then, inevitably and sadly, to a life of crime to support a drug habit. Those who sell drugs to our young people are the worst of offenders.

In the past five months more than 400 people have been arrested by Operation Mantle for drug related offences. This includes 44 for offences related to heroin possession or dealing, 39 for amphetamine possession or dealing and almost 200 for cannabis possession or dealing. We are having similar success with another ongoing police operation called City Safe, which targets those offences against the person that occur in the city of Adelaide.

Under the City Safe operation the police have examined the crime statistics and have been able to identify those times of the day when crime is more likely to occur in the city. We have then increased the numbers of police on patrol to match those high risk periods, and I believe the results have been impressive. Since August last year there have been 75 arrests for carrying an offensive weapon, five arrests for firearm offences and four arrests where people have been carrying an object with clear intent to damage.

Another success story has been Operation Vigil, which is a police effort targeted at reducing the incidence of car theft. I am pleased to be able to inform the House that early information on this operation indicates that it is having a significant downward impact on the number of car thefts taking place. As I said at the outset, our government is committed to ensuring that every South Australian feels safe in their homes and communities. By combining our efforts, working with communities and increasing our police numbers, we are going a long way toward achieving that goal.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I bring up the 12th report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

HOSPITALS, FUNDING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):

Does the Minister for Human Services agree with statements made by the AMA that an extra \$90 million a year or more needs to be injected back into the health budget to make up for Olsen government cutbacks over the past few years? After the 1999 budget, the Minister for Human Services said that cabinet had refused him more money, despite his best efforts to convince his colleagues. After the 2000 budget, the minister said that it was again a cut in real terms and warned of increased pressure on hospitals and of a further increase in the number of South Australians forced to go onto waiting lists for surgery. The AMA's South Australian spokesman, Dr Michael Rice, has claimed in recent months that our hospitals urgently need at least an extra \$90 million a year. Does the minister agree with that figure?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): This issue was raised in October or November last year, and Dr Michael Rice released a statement to this effect at that time. I pointed out publicly at the time that the claim that funds for the health sector had been cut were incorrect and that in fact this year \$44 million more was being put into hospitals compared to the previous year. That figure is now available publicly. As a result of enterprise bargaining negotiations that have now been concluded, that figure will have to be further increased this year as well as in subsequent years. That has been supplemented by Treasury as part of the enterprise bargain that has been negotiated. The increase in funding for hospitals this year is \$44 million plus whatever the figure is in terms of the EB agreements. I cannot provide those figures off the top of my head. I know that one in particular was \$4 million extra. So there will be over \$50 million in extra funds this year.

An honourable member: In real terms.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, I am saying that we are supplementing the budget to the extent of \$50 million extra this year.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The point that Dr Rice has raised—and I have agreed with him on this—is that the public hospital system is facing a significant increase in demand. That is because of the ageing population. Dr Rice has also highlighted some of the problems in terms of the shortage of aged care beds. So people who have had to go into acute care and who then need to be able to get out into a nursing home cannot find a nursing home bed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have made it very clear that this year we have had \$44 million extra, plus another \$4 million, plus some further money under the EB agreement. Therefore, the whole basis of any claims that funds to the hospital system have been cut is entirely incorrect.

VICTORIA SQUARE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Will the Premier outline to the House the state government's concerns about the latest problems facing Victoria Square?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): It is untenable that tourists and South Australians who work and live in our city have to face harassment in areas such as Victoria Square. It is not tenable for visitors in the state to be scared to go outside their hotel room for fear of being accosted. The latest media reports highlight that it is an issue that will not go away without some difficult decisions having to be made. Our city is the public face of our state; it is our drawcard; it is the gateway to what our state offers to visitors and tourists alike. As part of the Capital City Committee, the state government and the Adelaide City Council last year launched City Safe, a project targeting hot spots or problem areas within our city, designed to respond in a proactive way to different hot spots within the city. City Safe involves our police, health workers and social workers, and has been successful.

Today, I have referred the latest issue facing Victoria Square to be placed on the top of the agenda of the City Safe project. I have said publicly that it is time for some action relating to Victoria Square. If a dry zone is put in place, we need to ensure that we have appropriate detoxification centres, as well as sobering up centres and social support services. We are not in the business of sweeping this issue under the carpet. For too long we have seen the pros and cons of a dry zone argued without any action. The state government believes—and I certainly strongly believe—that it is time to trial a dry zone not only for Victoria Square but perhaps for the entire CBD area. In Hindley Street and in Rundle Mall we already have dry areas designated.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Indeed, the whole CBD would be an area where we now need to look at this issue. The Adelaide City Council is currently in a consultation phase, attempting to work through what is clearly a very emotive and challenging issue for both sides of the argument. Consultation involves the state government, through the Department of Human Services, and also the State Office of Aboriginal Affairs, appropriately, would be involved in any discussions that we have.

I am aware that there is opposition to a dry zone. I understand that the Leader and the former Lord Mayor are opposed to such a move but, as I have said, it is an issue which is not going to go away without some tough and difficult decisions being made, and it is now time for some of those decisions to, in fact, be made.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The state government is not prepared to wait another year before the issue is addressed, before we, as a community, take some real steps to deal with the issue. To that end, I advise the House today that, if there is no breakthrough on this issue, the state government will be prepared to look at avenues to allow a dry zone trial across the entire CBD to go ahead. We recognise, and I want to make the point, that initiatives by the government and the council should endeavour to deal with underlying social issues. I want to make the point that this is an exceptional case and it is not to be taken that we would put this measure in place in other dry zones and usurp the role of local government in recommending, in the first instance, to government the introduction of a dry zone. So I make the point that this is an exceptional set of circumstances and not to be taken as a precedent that would apply in other areas. But the matter simply has to move forward and it is something that we will now take up with the Adelaide City Council. It should be recognised that this is an issue that has prevailed

for far too long and it is now appropriate to take some positive steps forward to implement policies that look after the interests of all South Australians as well as visitors.

HEALTH FUNDING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question again is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Given statements by the minister that the sale of ETSA would provide an extra \$2 million a day for health, is the Minister for Human Services—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: They're a bit uptight over there, I think. I can start again; I am quite happy to—plenty of time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order on my right!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Given statements by the Minister for Human Services that the sale of ETSA would provide an extra \$2 million a day for health, is the minister confident that the government will approve his confidential pre-election budget submission for an extra \$486 million over four years for health?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The opposition has been given a—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It must have been a long lunch. The opposition has been given a copy of the minister's pre-election budget submissions to both the Premier and Treasurer for an extra \$135 million in the May budget and \$486 million over four years, and I quote directly from the budget submission, 'to reduce unacceptable delays for medical treatment'. These bits, of course, amount to less than one quarter of the \$2 million a day.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition has raised this issue of \$2 million a day for health alone, and I suppose he is also suggesting \$2 million a day for education and everything else. The government throughout has said that it anticipated a \$100 million a year improvement to the budget through the sale of ETSA. That works out, to start with, to \$2 million a week.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This figure has been out there. It is nothing new. The \$100 million has been commented on by the Auditor-General. I think the Auditor-General acknowledged that it might be a little bit more than \$100 million. So the figure is out there.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. The minister will resume his seat.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The minister seemed to have misunderstood the question: it is \$486 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —he has signed off on—your budget submission to your Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will resume his seat; there is no point of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I return to the fact—and no-one can deny this—that the government said that the sale of ETSA would improve the bottom line of the budget by about \$100 million a year, that is, by just under \$2 million a week.

What the Leader of the Opposition has raised then is that everyone knows that we are in the process of bidding for money for the next year's budget, and that is a subject for discussion—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Leader of the Opposition for interrupting the House.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—first with the Treasurer and Treasury officials, and then with cabinet; and before long, by May, you will know the outcome.

LAW AND ORDER

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Police, Correctional Services—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. I bring the member for Hart to order and also warn him.

Mr Foley: What about the members opposite?

The SPEAKER: Does the member wish to be warned a second time? I will not put up with this interjection across the chair for the rest of the afternoon.

Mr SCALZI: Will the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services outline to the House the new program that police are conducting with the education department to address the issues surrounding law and order within our South Australian schools?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I am delighted to be able to outline the program, and I appreciate the member for Hartley's question. Particularly considering his background in teaching, his interest in young people and his commitment to the community of Hartley, I know that he will be very pleased with what I am about to say. In conjunction with my colleague, the Minister for Education, the government is setting up a trial program in the education department schools in the both Elizabeth area and the Port Pirie area in the mid north. This is a trial only and, if this trial proves to be the success that I believe it will when evaluated, it will be the government's intention to take this right across schools in South Australia.

The crux of the program is for a police officer to be selected to work specifically with the school community in each of those areas. Having just listened to the comments of the member for Hart, I would suggest that, if this sort of program was around when he was at school, he would have a much better understanding of manners and what happens in a community than he does now. However, we are determined to improve that for the community of young people in South Australia.

At the moment, two days of workshops are being held, whereby the people involved in this trial program will receive information on both crime reduction and crime problem solving issues. The workshops importantly will also focus on local people, local communities, teachers, principals, school councils and the students working with police and education representatives to build on the already strong links that we have been developing in the last seven years between police and education. I highlight one, that is, the development content when it comes to the curriculum around illicit drugs. These two areas will now work even closer together to raise awareness during the adolescent years about the importance of police and communities working together.

We will be particularly targeting the year six to year 10 students. I have been concerned for some time, thinking that

we could do better, and indeed we need to do better when it comes to young people understanding the parameters in which police have to work, and also police and the rest of our community, including myself, having a better understanding of the needs, requirements, and opportunities of young people in a region and the pressures to which they are subjected. What the Liberal Government is doing is putting in place stronger links between the community, the police and schools.

I would like to highlight a couple of other points. A detailed evaluation of this trial will be undertaken by the University of South Australia Centre for Research and Education. This program and trial will run until the end of term 3 this year. The program will include the following schools: Elizabeth South Primary, Paralowie, Swallowcliffe Primary, Fremont-Elizabeth High, Smithfield Plains High, John Pirie High, Peterborough High, Napperby High, Airdale High and Solomontown Primary. Nothing concerns me more when I see a small group of young people who do damage in our community—street crime, vandalism to the schools, arson, and so on. I am sure every member in this chamber would agree with that. Members should talk to a young person who has gone to their school and experienced that sort of vandalism and crime and sometimes, unfortunately, harassment.

This program is all about addressing that. This will augur well for rebuilding that community fabric to which I referred in the ministerial statement. I applaud all those involved in this program, and I put on the public record the state government's absolute commitment to backing support for what is a very good initiative in long-term crime prevention and in long-term building up of the community so that people continue to enjoy what we do enjoy in the state when it comes to our environment and our ability to travel around and capitalise on what the whole state offers. I am sure that with the commitment we have we will see this program further develop after the evaluation. It is something that has been happening for a long time in rural South Australia, where police officers have a close, integrated commitment and understanding of their community, and we are going to broaden it throughout the metropolitan area and the whole state.

HOSPITALS, FUNDING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given that the Minister for Human Services' confidential pre-election budget submission shows that the minister—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You do not think it is confidential. It has 'confidential' stamped across the top.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Given that the confidential pre-election budget submissions show that the minister has requested an extra \$50 million for increased activity, \$8 million to fund winter bed strategies and an emergency workload strategy, and \$35 million to pay off debts accumulated by South Australia's hospitals, does he think that cabinet might finally listen to him, given that this is an election year?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): As I have indicated to the House already, everyone knows that at this time of the year negotiations on the next budget are under way. The outcome of that will be known when the budget is handed down in the House. I do not intend to comment further.

SCHOOL VANDALISM

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Can the Minister for Education and Children's Services detail to the House initiatives undertaken by the Department of Education to curb the number of devastating arson and vandalism attacks on South Australia's public school system? I point out to the minister that I am aware that vandals have been smashing windows in schools in my own constituency. They have been on the roofs of schools turning off air conditioners, and they have been involved in other anti-social behaviour at tremendous cost to the long suffering taxpayer, when this money could be better spent on improving the system.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Attacks of vandalism and theft on our property are debilitating. They cut right to the quick causing enormous pain and anguish. It makes no difference whether our schools are attacked by vandals or arsonists. In fact, some \$7 million is spent each year by my department in cleaning up vandalism attacks involving graffiti, theft and firebugs. Too many incidents of damage are reported by our schools which bear the brunt of what is a longstanding dilemma for the whole community. Damage costs can range from \$50 involving a graffiti attack on a school to several million dollars involving an arson attack resulting in a school fire and the loss of buildings.

No-one in this place would argue that that money would be better spent on our students, and my department is playing its part to reduce this public waste of money. In a bid to combat the problems we have initiated and will continue with a range of measures to combat arson and vandalism: we have video surveillance, security detection and better lighting in schools; we have taxi watch at schools—

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: An excellent idea it is. We have excellent cooperation with the taxi industry in our state. If passengers are dropped off in the locality of a school, the taxi driver will take a look into the school and if there is any occurrence of behaviour or people on the property that he or she thinks is suspicious it is reported to the police, and I thank them for that. To combat this problem further, in January we introduced in the southern districts a program which has reduced crime by 22 per cent and which caught five offenders for vandalism in those southern schools. The significance of that program is that it involved the principals of the schools, the police and the security officers of the department.

Email has been used in that principals reporting any act of vandalism on a school site send an email to the police and to our security people to get fast action to ensure that we can take measures to combat the vandalism that is occurring. The plan now is to include or expand that program into the northern suburbs. The program is working well in the south and there are areas in the northern suburbs where significant vandalism is occurring; I now wish to take that program to the northern suburbs. What I need, though, is the support of the community because schools are occupied for only six hours a day.

Many people living alongside schools would see acts of vandalism or movement on school property and I would ask them to join with us, the department, the police and the greater community to report that to their local police station to ensure that we can act quickly on any vandalism that does occur. This sort of action, as the member for Stuart has said, is completely anti-social. I cannot work out the mind of people who undertake this sort of act. The money that we are spending in repairing our schools would be far better spent on the curriculum and on our school students.

DENTAL TREATMENT

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. How long would it take to clear the backlog of 92 000 people now waiting for dental treatment if the government approves the minister's budget submission for an extra \$17 million for dental services? The opposition has a copy of the minister's submission to the Premier and Treasurer for an extra \$17 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STEVENS:—over the next four years to reverse 'the silent epidemic of dental decay and gum disease'.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): As I indicated to this House only last week, and I would refer the member for Elizabeth to the answer I gave in this House whilst debating the dental bill, this year the government has put an extra \$3.5 million into dental care; \$2 million of that amount has been specifically allocated to provide a special service through private dentists, and we have been able to increase very substantially therefore the activity level. The other \$1.5 million has been provided to the South Australian Dental Service, which will increase the number of treatments there.

I point out to the honourable member that, in the first six months that that scheme has been in operation, approximately, we have reduced the waiting lists by 10 000 people. That is the first major turnaround that has occurred since the federal government cut off the \$10 million a year funding for dental services. We have a 10 000 reduction in the waiting lists for public dental services, and that is a very substantial drop—it has dropped from about 98 000 to about 88 000, in general terms. I believe that we will see further substantial drops occur as we continue that program. I will not comment in terms of what I think the honourable member was putting down. They were four year bids; they were not one year bids. She had rolled—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member is now acknowledging that they are, in fact, four year bids. I have highlighted how successful our present proposals are, and I have highlighted the fact that we would like to keep those going. Therefore, the steps that we have already taken in the public dental service area are resulting in a substantial benefit out there in reducing waiting lists. We want to keep that going.

ATHLETES WITH INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise the House if South Australian athletes with intellectual disabilities are still banned from competing in international events and, if so, what action he is taking to reverse the discrimination?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As honourable members may recall, on 29 January this year the International Paralympic Committee (or the IPC, as it is well known) suspended from IPC membership the International Sports Organisation for Athletes with Intellectual Disabilities. The President of that organisation also was suspended from the IPC Executive Committee. This decision effectively meant that no athlete with an intellectual disability from any country in the world could compete in any event conducted by the IPC.

At the time, the ban sought to stop any intellectually disabled athlete from competing in any paralympic event—that is, a world championship and, if the decision remained in place, the up and coming Winter Paralympic Games in Salt Lake City. This decision was prompted, of course, by the discovery that last December some 10 of the 12 members of the gold winning Spanish paralympic basketball team for athletes with an intellectual disability were, indeed, not intellectually disabled and thus were not eligible to compete. As a result, members of the team have been forced to return their medals.

The IPC management committee has certainly expressed strong concerns regarding the reliability and the effectiveness of the eligibility assessment that is presently used to test whether athletes meet the criteria to compete in IPC sporting events for athletes with an intellectual disability. In every paralympic sport, as I am sure the House would be aware, criteria are established to ensure that athletes meet certain eligibility requirements. The IPC has indicated that it cannot permit athletes with an intellectual disability (commonly referred to as ID athletes) to partake in events until it is certain that all requirements to guarantee elite standards are met, and that a quality and fail-safe system evaluating the ID athletes is in place and, indeed, has the full confidence of the IPC committee.

The APC Chief Executive (the Australian Chief Executive) Brendan Flynn, issued a statement at the time to the APC board, as follows:

The APC statement I am conveying is that the decision is an overkill and athletes are innocent till proven guilty and hopefully once the IPC investigation findings are released then the guilty groups...be suspended and all other ID athletes/groups be reinstated.

The government has some sympathy with that view. A complete review of the eligibility assessment was ordered by the IPC, and the appointed IPC Investigation Committee recently presented its report to the IPC Executive Committee. The Australian Paralympic Committee (APC) and the Australian Sport and Recreation Association for People with Intellectual Disabilities (AUSRAPID) have already strongly petitioned the IPC to overturn its recent decision to ban all ID athletes from various events. It will not be any surprise to this House that organisations world wide have protested to the IPC, prompting it to release another press statement in February clarifying its decision and recognising the concerns shown by the world of disability sport.

The government of South Australia is very disappointed by the decision and the heavy handed and carte blanche

approach of the IPC to this matter. As Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing representing the intellectually disabled athletes of this state, I sought but unfortunately was not given the opportunity to make a presentation at the 9 March meeting in Salt Lake City personally to put the case on behalf of the intellectually disabled athletes in this state. I further prepared a letter of support on behalf of the government to Ms Marie Little, who is the President of AUSRAPID, to help her put her case to the international body. The international body also prepared a motion to present to the IPC to reflect what have become worldwide concerns and condemnations of many organisations and governments with regard to the IPC's decision and approach in handling this matter.

Further, on behalf of the intellectually disabled athletes of this state I wrote to the Secretary-General of the IPC and the President of the International Olympic Committee, seeking the assistance of those two organisations in expressing the government's concerns on behalf of the South Australian people.

I am advised that the outcome of the meeting held last weekend by the International Paralympic Committee is that a blanket ban is still in place until more stringent criteria are approved and sanctioned by the committee. However, in a rather confusing outcome, a provisional registration may now be applied to enable international competition. So, although there is a total ban, there is some system of provisional registration, so that is a slight step in the right direction. Unfortunately, and most disappointingly, a cloud of uncertainty still hangs over all intellectually disabled athletes who competed at the Sydney 2000 Paralympic Games. South Australian athletes with an intellectual disability deserve a lot better treatment than the blanket discriminatory treatment currently being handed out by the IPC.

On behalf of those intellectually disabled athletes in South Australia, the government will continue to seek a fairer outcome to this issue and make sure that some integrity is restored to the intellectually disabled category of the high performance sports for athletes with a disability.

EMPLOYMENT FUNDING

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Employment and Training and Minister for Youth confident of cabinet's approving the additional \$290 million he has requested in the May budget for new employment and training programs over the next four years? The opposition has a copy of the minister's confidential pre-election budget submissions for the next four years which seek an extra \$201 million for employment development, an extra \$53 million for skills development and an extra \$36 million for youth empowerment.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Employment and Training): In the light of that question I ask the House to reflect on the Leader of the Opposition's record when he was employment minister. By working with my cabinet colleagues and the community of this state I have had the great privilege of consistently seeing a lowering of the unemployment rate in the past 18 months to nearly two years. I refer the Leader of the Opposition to the Premier's answer yesterday concerning how South Australia is forging ahead. I do not know how much I will get in the budget process. As in the case of my colleague the Minister for Human Services, the Treasurer will inform the House on budget day of whatever budget bid I achieve. Be it \$1 or \$100 million, I

guarantee you that the outcomes will be quantifiably better than have ever been produced by the rabble opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My question is also to the Minister for Employment and Training, and I guess it could be further to the last question that was asked. Can the minister—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I've got a copy, too.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. It wasn't the honourable member who leaked it to us.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind members about frivolous points of order.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would like the minister to advise the House on the most recent unemployment figures for South Australia and, in particular, will he advise the House regarding the claims that have been made recently concerning the so-called gap between unemployed South Australians and the rest of Australia, and the suggestion that that gap is widening?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources): I would be most pleased to do so, and I thank the member for Heysen for his question. After all, the Leader of the Opposition, while he appears to be interested in budget bids, is on the record as saying a Labor government would make employment its number one priority. Yet we come in here day after day, and the only people who ever ask questions on employment figures are on this side of the House. There is great interest in employment, but what do they do?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: No, that was about a budget bid, not about employment figures. I was stunned, and I continue to be stunned monthly, by the negativity and the churlishness shown by the usual political suspects every month after the release of the unemployment figures. While the January 2001 figures showed a fall in the percentage of jobless in South Australia, down to 7.3 per cent, that did not cramp the style of the prophets of doom, and they do not just reside opposite. However, the member for Lee—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The last time I saw such a small brain in such a large body it was in a museum, and it was labelled 'dinosaur'. That is enough from the member for Ross Smith. The member for Lee told ABC Radio:

I guess one set of figures by themselves can never be comforting, because you have to look at the overall figure which takes in a 12 month period.

When there is a glitch in the figures and they go up, the member for Lee does not bother with the 12 month period. He takes the one month period as it suits him. The member for Lee wants it both ways. He moans when the unemployment rate rises, and he moans when the unemployment rate falls. The member for Lee appears to be infected with an early case of foot-and-mouth disease.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I'm sorry, I'll talk to the leader afterwards and get the same joke writer that he has and improve my jokes for him. Fact: in January 2000, the trend unemployment rate in South Australia was 8.1 per cent. Fact:

in January 2001, the trend unemployment rate in South Australia was 7.4 per cent. Fact: in January 2000, the trend unemployed people in South Australia, in our state, was 59 600. Fact: in January 2001, trend unemployed people in our state was 53 400. Youth unemployment in South Australia: January 2000, 31.6 per cent; January 2001, 24.9 per cent. We acknowledge that that is still too high, but we are now the third lowest in the nation, and we are below the national average—something that the Leader of the Opposition could never claim in his time as Minister for Employment.

Then we have Mr Negativity in another place—and he beats the member for Lee—the leader of the Democrats, who misinforms ABC Radio listeners that the gap between us and the rest of Australia in terms of unemployment continues to grow. Wrong again. In January 2001, the gap between South Australia and the nation's unemployment rate had narrowed to just over half a percentage point.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Elder says it is likely that I am talking myself out of some money. I would think, member for Elder, that this whole House would applaud if we did not need any further money for unemployment programs. If we had full employment in this state, we would not need the money.

So we can go—and perhaps should go—through pages of figures. I will not delay the House with that today. The message from the Premier and the message from every minister here is clear: that this state continues to improve. South Australia continues to prosper because, for seven years, we have had good, stable leadership. We have good government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: We have good government and we have good policies. In conclusion, I look forward to the Leader of the Opposition, Stephanie Key and the Hon. Carolyn Pickles visiting my electorate next Monday. I am not at all offended that they did not inform me. I apologise that I cannot be there, but I ask all my electors to ensure that they attend and question you closely on policy, because I have said to my electors, 'I am sure that if you question them on policy you will keep us in government for the foreseeable future.'

MURRAY RIVER

Mr HILL (Kaurana): My question is also directed to the Minister for Water Resources. When will the minister take action to stop the degradation of the Murray from dairy farms returning manure polluted water to the river from government owned irrigation areas between Mannum and Murray Bridge? On 28 March last year the minister told the House that he had a management plan to solve the problem of highly polluted farm water being drained back into the river system. However, the opposition has a copy of the minister's pre-election budget submissions for the next four years which describe the rehabilitation of the Lower Murray swamps as a medium to long-term requirement still subject to developing an option study. While \$400 000 has been allocated for this option study, no money has been sought from cabinet to do any actual work.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources): I thank the shadow minister for his question and I refer him, again, to numerous statements by the Premier and by me on this matter. I also refer him to Monday night's *Four*

Corners program. This is a long-term problem that requires a concerted solution. If you want to tell the Minister for Primary Industries and Resources and the people of the Lower Murray swamps that they have done nothing and that they are not doing anything—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The interjector asked when we are going to start. The answer, quite simply, is that we have started. We are spending as much money on it as needs to be spent at this point of time. When we get to the next stage and more money is required, I will go, with the Minister for Primary Industries and Resources, to cabinet and we will get the necessary resources.

Mr Koutsantonis: You won't be around then.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I am more likely to be around, sunshine, than you—much more likely. This government is not going to be a populist government, pushed and shoved because the opposition has suddenly discovered the Murray River. The Premier has been talking about the Murray River for nearly two years. The Premier created a ministry of water resources. Your total policy is less than a paragraph, yet you have the hide to stand up here and ask what we are doing and say that we are not doing it quickly enough. We are doing it much more quickly and much more effectively than you, and, what is more, we will not waste \$7 billion in the attempt.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Deputy Premier advise the House of the current status of the outbreak of foot and mouth disease internationally and the impacts of that outbreak on the Australian meat industry?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): Obviously this is a very important topic, and in the member's electorate not only is the meat industry vital but it is prospering and it would be devastating to see any turnabout. There is no doubt that foot and mouth disease and BSE have both been devastating to Britain, and the further news this morning that both France and Argentina have found foot and mouth disease means that many more producers and economies around the world will be harshly affected. One of the side issues involved is the question of food safety. I think people need to realise that foot and mouth disease is in no way a food safety issue.

I think members also need to be aware that this type O 'pan-Asian' strain, which is the one evident in Europe at the moment, was first found in India in about the 1990s and it has spread. While the British outbreak has had a lot of publicity, there have been recent outbreaks as well in Japan, Taiwan and Korea, which, while they have not had the same publicity, have had our quarantine people well and truly on stand-by for quite some time. In respect of the impact of foot and mouth on an economy, not only are the farmers in Britain affected at the moment but the tourism industry, manufacturing industries, retail, and even sport and the racing industry are all affected. Certainly, it will lead to some very long-term problems.

The quarantine situation in Australia is important to understand. It is very stringent. The sheer volume of people who have come into Australia over the last 20 or 30 years as a result of cheaper and quicker air travel really presents an enormous challenge. We have had only one foot and mouth outbreak in Australia which occurred about 130 years ago. It was a very small outbreak which means that our quarantine

system is set up extremely well. The greatest risk, of course, is the number of people coming through and any goods they bring, but some very stringent protocols are in place. As I have said, the quarantine service has an excellent record.

It is important to understand foot and mouth disease. The scenes depicted on television sometimes lead you to believe that it is an absolute killer of animals or whatever. What you are dealing with is a highly contagious disease of cloven-footed animals such as sheep, goats, pigs and cattle: it does not affect dogs and cats. As I said, there is no human health significance. While it only causes low mortalities, the big problem is the high virulence of the disease and the fact that it has an enormous impact on production. So the virulence of the disease and the impact on production are the issue, not that it is an out and out killer; and once again, there are no human health aspects to that.

I would like to assure the House, first, that while there are always ever present risks of foot and mouth disease, our quarantine barriers are stringent, are being policed well and have been successful; and, secondly, that all authorities are prepared; in the case of an outbreak there are plans right across Australia detailing how we deal with that. We sympathise with those many producers across the world who have been devastated by this disease, and I assure the House that all steps are being taken to ensure that Australia is kept free of foot and mouth disease.

SCHOOLS, LAPTOP COMPUTERS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Education and Children's Services confident that the government will approve his plan to provide all 13 000 teachers in government schools with a laptop computer at a cost of an extra \$42 million over three years? Copies of the minister's pre-election budget submissions show that the minister first requested funding for the laptops for teachers in last year's budget and that his request is now a priority for the May budget in the lead-up to the election.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Minister for Police for interjecting over the chair.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): This question raises the fact of information technology in our schools. We all well remember the amount of money that the Labor Party spent when it was in government on computers—a mere \$360 000. Members should compare that with the \$85.6 million over the past five years. You are pathetic to bring up that sort of question. This government has done more in terms of information technology and in terms of ensuring that our students and our teachers are equipped for the information technology area than the opposition in government would have done in 50 years.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hartley for interjecting over the chair.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services. Who comprised the CFS board which voted to reject the annual report of the chairman

of the board for the 1999-2000 year from Mr Michael Pengilly and to replace it with the report of the current chairman Mr Kym McHugh? How long had each of the members of the board who voted to reject that report been CFS board members at the time they voted? When was the meeting held? Was the vote to reject the report of Mr Pengilly unanimous?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call on the minister, I draw the member's attention to multiple questions. It does cause some difficulty.

Mr Lewis: I only get a question once every three weeks!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come back to order. The member for Hammond full well knows he gets frequent questions. If I get rhetoric from the member for Hammond like that the Chair may not see him as often as he does.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I will detail the board members as requested. I do not have all the names here at my fingertips, but my understanding is they were existing board members for some time. I will answer a couple of other points with respect to the questions from the member for Hammond. I cannot remember all of them because they were so multiple. But I first received a copy of the CFS Annual Report when it was forwarded by the Acting Chief Executive of the CFS on 27 September 2000. The annual report included a board report written by the presiding member, Mr Kym McHugh. The annual report was not tabled at this time due to the fact that audit comment from the Auditor-General on CFS financial statements was not yet complete. On 27 November 2000, the Auditor-General's report on CFS financial statements became available. A completed annual report, including the Auditor-General's comments, was not received in the Department of Justice until 6 December 2000 and it was received in my office on 7 December 2000. The annual report was subsequently tabled on time, within 12 sitting days as required by the Public Sector Management Act. I will write to the honourable member and let him know the names of the board members. My understanding from advice I have sought is that it was a unanimous decision.

SCHOOL LEAVING AGE

Ms WHITE (Taylor): Given the statement by the Minister for Education and Children's Services that the school leaving age would be increased from the beginning of the 2002 school year, can the minister explain why funding for this initiative has not been included in the minister's pre-election budget submissions? The decision to increase the school leaving age from 15 years to 16 years was announced by the Premier on 8 October last year. Although the minister has said that this would cost \$6.3 million, the minister's submission to the Premier and Treasurer for funding over the next four years does not make any request for additional funding to actually do it.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Neither does the rest of the funding for students in our schools. The point is that it is part of Treasury's allocation to my budget; it is as simple as that.

HOUSING, PUBLIC

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Minister for Human Services advise the House how public housing in South Australia compares with other states in the Productivity Commission's report on government services 2001?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): The report of the Productivity Commission makes very interesting reading because it highlights how well the South Australian Housing Trust does and how well South Australia provides public housing compared to other states of Australia. It is well known that South Australia has approximately twice the level of public housing through the Housing Trust compared to other states of Australia. If one looks at some of the specific figures, though, produced in the Productivity Commission report, one sees that they highlight that South Australia could, without dispute, be classed as having the best public housing authority within Australia.

For instance, in terms of tenant satisfaction, South Australia had the highest level of 'very high satisfaction' and also the highest level of 'satisfaction'. Combine those together and 75 per cent of our tenants were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied'. With respect to 'dissatisfaction', one finds that South Australia had the lowest level in Australia. If one looks at, for instance, the administration cost per dwelling, one sees that South Australia had the lowest administration costs per dwelling of any of the states in Australia and, in fact, was substantially below the national average.

If one looks at, for instance, which state allocated the greatest number of houses on a needs basis, one sees that in fact it was South Australia—almost twice, or something like 80 per cent above, the national average. If one looks at the proportion of new tenancies allocated to people with special needs, again, one will find that South Australia is the highest in Australia and well ahead of the national average.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It shows that, in terms of public housing, the Housing Trust in South Australia performs the best of any state in Australia, and that is despite the fact that we have twice the level of housing on a per capita basis than the national average. I was somewhat interested to see that the member for Florey yesterday in this place gave a speech about housing—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Florey was actually questioning whether the payment under the new home owners' grant scheme, which has just been increased from \$7 000 to \$14 000 for a new home where it is a new-built home—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, she was out there criticising. I think it is appropriate—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, she was asking whether the money should have been used for other means. I think that the member for Florey and the Labor Party in this state should put down a clear position: do they support the new home owners' grant or do they not? Do they support the \$14 000? Let them stand up and be honest. Do they support the \$14 000 grant or do they not? Let them tell the building industry and the new home owners, who are wanting to build houses, whether or not they support the \$14 000 grant, because I know what—

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

Ms KEY: My point of order is that the minister does not seem to be answering the question. He is now trying to bash the ALP rather than answering the very strangely constructed question asked by the member for Schubert.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume her seat. I have been listening very carefully to the response. At this point I do not believe that the point of order can be upheld. Minister.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, sir. I will be brief. I restate the point that the member for Florey and the Labor Party in this state should go out publicly and say whether they support the \$7 000 grant for people buying an existing home and whether they support the \$14 000 for those people who are out there as first home owners, wanting to buy a new-built home; and, if they do not support that, let them stand up and say so. But yesterday, the member for Florey in this House questioned the value of the scheme. You cannot question the value of the scheme and then be out there supporting it.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

Mr CONLON (Elder): I rise to put on the public record a response to some things that were said by the Premier yesterday in regard to the latest inquiry into his dealings with Motorola and, in particular, to deal with the matter of the confidential report given to the Premier by his Chief Executive Officer, Warren McCann, yesterday. Of course, it was sought to be used by the Premier as some sort of comfort for him. It is a document of some 83 paragraphs, and it comes as no surprise to me to find that the Premier, in trouble on this matter, has had history rewritten for him not five or 10 paragraphs in but in the very second paragraph. This is the report of the Premier's Chief Executive.

The opening paragraph states that, in December 2000, a memorandum was received by the Minister for Industry and Trade which refers to the missing documents. The second paragraph states that 'parliamentary and public controversy ensued.' Well, I am sorry, I beg your pardon, that is not what happened. What happened was that the Treasurer received the hidden documents in December last year, sat on them and no-one saw them until the opposition produced them and asked a question 1½ weeks ago—then controversy ensued. For the Premier's Chief Executive Officer, in the first two paragraphs of his 83 paragraph report, to suggest that it occurred otherwise is extremely misleading and can only cause us to have real doubts about the rest of the report of the Chief Executive Officer; and those doubts would be realised by any reading of it.

I might go so far as to say that, the way that this matter has been dealt with, Warren McCann might well be called Terry McCann because he would make a very good minder to this Premier as Arthur. Mr McCann, apparently, is pretty relaxed about all this; he does not see any problem with it. His report goes on to refer to a welter of documents which were relevant and which did not go to the Cramond inquiry. He goes on to report that some documents were destroyed, apparently, through a proper process. I have worked in government and I have been in this place for three years. and I have never come across the proper process for destroying primary documents because it is an extraordinary thing to do.

There may well be some guidelines somewhere for destroying old archived documents, but I can tell members this: state government archives are crammed with old documents because you do not destroy government documents. The proper process for destroying government documents is not to do it.

Mr McCann then goes on to refer to missing documents, but apparently that is not a worry: they just went missing. There are lost documents, but that was not a worry, either, because it is quite reasonable to lose a document in this government. He explains the government's processes. The only defence the Premier can have is that, according to this government's processes, it would be reasonable to lose documents—apparently they do it all the time.

I want to address a few other matters in the short time available that absolutely defy belief. The primary finding that the missing documents did not matter much because they were not particularly relevant relies on Mr McCann's view that the defence of a breakdown of communications between departments on Motorola did not arise until after Cramond reported; no-one would have known that before. Well, I am sorry, that is a massive invention. If the media were here they would tell members about the times that the Premier went out in public and talked about, to use his words, 'the turf war between departments'.

They will tell you about how this contract supposedly wiped out the side deal; but it was never sent to the other department, and that is why the side deal was never wiped out. This is a massive invention. All it would lead me to believe is that I am very glad that we have got an independent inquiry into this matter and that we have not relied on the Premier's Chief Executive Officer or on this report.

I will note only one other thing in closing. Apparently the Premier's most notorious Mr Fix-it, John Cambridge, is no longer the flavour of the month—because the report has made some criticisms of his evidence to the Cramond inquiry and then excused it. But what they said was that his evidence was that he thought the contracts had gone to OIT, but he was not sure. If he can make that criticism, what has he got to say about Mr Dundon's evidence and Mr Patriarca's evidence? Mr Cramond was led to believe that the contract never went there. What has Mr McCann got to say about that evidence? They gave evidence, and we have documentary proof that they received the contract and never told Mr Cramond.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to raise a couple of important matters that have been brought to my attention by constituents. The first is the matter of body piercing, which is able to be carried out on juniors without any control on the part of the parent. This matter has been brought to my attention by a number of constituents in my electorate. One of those people, who wrote to me following a telephone conversation that we had on the subject, expressed concern that his 15 year old son wanted to have body piercing carried out, and that apparently there are several premises in Adelaide where he may be pierced without a parent's permission. My constituent goes on to say:

If my child requires a—

Mr ATKINSON: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I think that this is a very relevant topic but I think we have a body piercing bill on the *Notice Paper*, and this anticipates discussion on an order of the day.

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Spence able to assist in identifying the bill? Mr Atkinson: The summary offences bill.

The SPEAKER: The chair is in a difficult position here because, whilst a notice of motion has been given, I do not believe we have a bill that has been tabled to give the chair any knowledge of what is in the bill. Under those circumstances, I think I am compelled not to uphold the point of order and call the member for Heysen.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have certainly not seen any reference to this matter in legislation and, indeed, I will be very interested to know what that bill contains, for the very reason that I am concerned in bringing this issue to the notice of the parliament at this stage. In fact, I have made my concern known to the Minister for Human Services, who advises me that it is really the responsibility of the Attorney-General. My constituent writes:

If my child requires a medical procedure, to be done by qualified staff, our permission must first be given. It seems an anomaly that an unqualified—

and the emphasis is on the word ‘unqualified’—

person may insert metal into my child’s nose, eyebrow, lip, tongue, or elsewhere, without my permission or knowledge, in ordinary shop premises that are not subject to the health requirements of a hospital.

My constituent continues:

My main concern is of the potential health risk. Some people with eyebrow rings have been partly paralysed because of damage to a nerve in that area. What if a ring became caught in machinery? I am also concerned that a permanent hole or scar may remain after the fashion has passed, which could be regretted for life. Some rings or studs are the thickness of a roofing nail, rather than thin wire as in traditional earrings.

He goes on to say that he believes that tattoos may not be put on a child without parental permission, and he expresses the view that he believes that the same type of legislation should be adopted or extended to cover body piercing, without creating difficulties for communities in which the practices have been traditional. So, I will be interested to see any legislation that comes forward. It is certainly a matter of concern to my constituent, and I share that concern.

The other matter that I wish to raise concerns the reduced allocation of funding made to the catchment management subsidy scheme. A councillor in my electorate has received advice that the state government has reduced its allocation to the scheme by some \$1.9 million, or a cut of 50 per cent. With such a substantial cut to funding, it is not possible for priority works within that particular council to continue, and a considerable amount of concern is being expressed about that matter.

I have written to the Minister for Water Resources and have received a reply from the minister, and it is my intention to speak further to him about it. I strongly advocate a return to the level of funding that the community requires in this matter. Because of the difficulties council experiences with flooding and stormwater management, that is of critical importance, and it is vitally important that this matter be dealt with as a matter of urgency.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): Since 1997, three ministers with many plans have tried to resolve the complex issue of water allocations in the South-East. Minister Wotton tried twice—valiantly—and failed. Minister Kotz flip-flopped like a fish out of water and failed. And now Minister Brindal, who has a plan—perhaps even a cunning plan—but cannot get it through his party, also has failed. Why has each of these

ministers come unstuck? Is it because of the complexity of the problem? I believe that that is part of the explanation. The real reason lies, though, as it often does, in politics and vested interests.

The minister summed up the competing forces well in his ministerial statement of November 2000, where he referred to the traditionalist and the contemporary views of how water should be allocated. Each camp has its champions who battle it out in the media and at the ballot box, and sometimes the courts. The ministers, sadly for them, keep getting caught in the crossfire, and that is exactly what has happened to Minister Brindal on this occasion. Minister Brindal knows how this matter should be resolved but he was rolled by his party. Let me go through some of the history.

On 6 July 2000, the parliament approved his water resources amendment bill, which picked up important recommendations of the South-East Water Select Committee. The bill had gone through a conference of managers from the two houses to consider amendments from the other place dealing with the important issue of forestry and how its water use should be managed. The opposition allowed the bill to proceed without the amendments following a commitment by the minister that he would address the issue in the next sitting. The minister said on 6 July that, after consultation:

I will then present to cabinet and the Liberal Party room meeting during the spring parliamentary session a policy with a view for introduction of the bill into the parliament in that sitting.

I said at that time:

The minister well knows that his credibility is on the line over this issue.

In the spring session—that is, in November—the minister came back to the House with a ministerial statement, saying that he needed yet more time to consult. The member for Gordon, who I believe has played a constructive role in relation to this issue, said, ‘Bring back parliament early to deal with this matter,’ and we supported that call. He also said that if no bill is presented there will be a motion of no confidence in the minister.

The week before parliament was due to sit, the minister finally took a bill to cabinet, which I believe signed off on it. However, a voluntary Liberal Party meeting later that week rolled the minister, following an impassioned plea from the member for MacKillop that the bill would kill him electorally. Members should be aware that it was about this time that the country people were putting, or planning to put, Liberal and National MPs to the sword in both Western Australia and Queensland. The Liberal Party panicked and effectively voted no confidence in the minister. If the Liberal Party has no confidence in him, why should anyone else?

When parliament sat last month the minister put a bill, but not one dealing with the thorny forestry issue. The minister issued another ministerial statement saying that yet more time is needed for consultation. The fact is that the minister cannot get anything sensible through his party, and he is trying to bide time.

In passing, I note that the minister attacked me in his ministerial statement for not attending consultations in the South-East. This was a pathetic attempt by the minister to shift responsibility. The fact is that the minister’s office contacted my office on 4 January, a Thursday, to invite me to a meeting in the South-East on Tuesday 9 January. Notwithstanding the fact that I was on leave at the time, I would have attended the meeting if I had had more notice to enable me to change family commitments.

Back to the history. Following the minister's failure to introduce legislation, the members for Gordon and Chaffey made it clear to the government that they and another Independent would support a no-confidence motion in the minister unless a series of key issues was addressed. Against the wishes of the Deputy Premier, the member for MacKillop and Hon. Angus Redford in another place, the tail once again wagged the dog and the minister's second reading speech of 1 March addressed these issues. Is the minister off the hook? No. He still has to deliver a satisfactory piece of legislation to deal with the forestry issue. He is squeezed between party room revolt and a vote of no-confidence. He obviously hopes that the issue will go away or someone else will fix it. As he says in his second reading speech, 'The government has been unable to come up with a solution as quickly as previously expected,' and, 'In presenting this bill, I provide the opportunity for members to debate such changes as they see fit.' In other words: please fix the problem for me.

The issue will not go away; development in the South-East is stalled, uncertainty prevails and tempers are flaring. A solution must be found which ensures the sustainable use of the water resource which protects existing users and which allows for forestry development. It needs a commonsense approach, not the ideological rhetoric of the member for MacKillop, whose position on this resembles very much that of One Nation. In arguing that farmers have an absolute right to grow on their land whatever they choose without taking into account the effects on other land users is just plain wrong. If we adopt that argument, how can we face farmers in Queensland and New South Wales and tell them that we need more water for the Murray? They will simply respond by saying that they have a right to all the rain that falls in their state.

I conclude by quoting from a recent article in the *Australian*, where a Queensland cotton farmer had this to say:

I think South Australia's being very greedy. . . not only do they use all their own water, but they take 25 times that from other states and still say they're short, when Queensland uses only 13 per cent of its own run-off.

Time expired.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I wish to continue the comments that have been made by the shadow minister in relation to water issues and in so doing perhaps put a slightly different spin on this. The shadow minister talked about the forestry problem. Actually, forestry is a victim of a more fundamental problem. I will explain briefly to the House what the two problems are and, again, I hope people on the conservative side of politics will ask why they are putting pragmatism ahead of policy. The two problems were created when the bill was amended last year. In the deadlock conference the two problems were made very clear to the minister. The minister gave a commitment in the spring session that he would attempt to solve the two problems.

Let me explain the first of them, which is a problem I call 'double dipping'. The minister well knows that the basis of the new water holding licences was that a landholder contributed to recharge, because rain falling on the land seeped through the ground into the underground unconfined aquifer, therefore the landholder contributed to recharge. To give landholders recognition for that recharge, water that was not already allocated was made available on a pro rata basis and, to give title to this water, new water holding licences were created. These water holding licences were given to land holders irrespective of whether or not water was under their

property that could be extracted for irrigation purposes. Furthermore, these licences were able to be traded. So, now we have the most remarkable situation, where a landholder who did not have any water under his property that could be extracted for irrigation could sell that water to a neighbour, who could put down a bore and use this licence to extract water.

That was bad enough, but the flaw went further. The landholder who had now sold his water to a neighbour can turn around and enter into a land use change—forestry and other examples—and in so doing use the very recharge that he had just sold. So, there is a fundamental flaw in the amended Water Resources Act, and I call it double dipping. Farmers can sell water and turn around and use the same water. The minister conceded that there was a flaw in the act. He went further to say that the Democrat solution was not tenable, but that we would find another one. Nearly a year later we have not been able to find another one. Importantly, people following the debate must understand that that is the genesis of the problem—a fundamental flaw.

The second issue in the act is not so much a flaw as a matter of principle.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: The minister acknowledges that he has also put on the record that it is a flaw, but his colleagues keep rolling him, denying that it is a flaw and setting him up. So, the minister is becoming a victim of political pragmatism overruling policy in his own cabinet and party room, so I thank the minister for that interjection. The second issue is a matter of principle that, having given legal title to somebody, you cannot take it back. In theory, in fully allocated hundreds all recharge is accounted for, and accounted for in such a way that somebody has a property right for that recharge. Now, of course, if you do anything in a fully allocated hundred which impacts on recharge—in other words a recharge interfering or impacting activity—you are now actually taking back water that has been already been allocated to someone else. So, this time a principle is at stake and, again, the minister cannot get his own party to put this principle ahead of pragmatism.

All his party needs to say is that, having given this property right to someone, we will now protect it, keeping in mind that in some circumstances people have paid significant money for this resource. If you turn around now and enter into an aquifer interfering activity, you are stopping that recharge; in other words, you are giving it back to someone who has not paid for it and taking it away from someone who already has a right to it. These two flaws were created when the act was created last year, and they remain flaws in the act. We continue to look to the minister for some leadership and backing from his own party so that we can resolve these flaws and move forward.

Ms BREUER (Giles): This afternoon I want to talk about Woomera. Last week I spent two days in Woomera. I went up there to talk to the community about the proposals to release some of the people from the Woomera Detention Centre into the community. At the previous weekend minister Ruddock had met with invited members of the community, when he put forward the proposal that some 25 women and children could be allowed to spend the last four weeks or so of their detention outside the compound in the township of Woomera. I placed an advert in the local paper and was able to meet with a number of residents on 8 and 9 March who wished to make some representations to me about the

proposed release of these women and children into the community.

I met with many of the residents, including the Chair of the Woomera Board who advises the Department of Defence on community matters. Her view is that the town is deeply divided on this proposal. Some are very supportive of it, some are not supportive at all, and many are waiting until more arrangements are known. There was overall concern about the lack of information that has been provided to the community about what to expect; for example, the issue of security guards, who will actually be watching these people in the township and whether they will be spread out over the township area or concentrated in one area.

Some 20 families of security guards working at the centre have recently settled there. Those families are concerned about what sort of ill feeling there will be amongst these people living in their town towards them and their families. Many of those officers are saying that if they had known that these people were to be released into the community they would not have accepted, because they do not want to put their families at risk. There is also the issue of children in the schools and how that will work, if the children of guards will be mixing with children of the inmates. So, there are some major concerns on the Woomera board. I also met with the new area administrator from the Department of Defence. He has no views either way on whether this would work, but he is concerned about the townspeople and what sort of reaction they are getting.

I also met with Father Jim Monahan, the local Catholic priest from Roxby, who has visiting rights to the centre. He is of the view that many of these women will not be prepared to take up the offer. I pay a tribute to him and Sister Anne, who do a lot of work with those inmates. Representatives of the business community have concerns about people coming into the community. I met with quite a number of individuals who have very strong objections, but also some who are quite supportive of this. The overriding impression that I got was that very little information has been given out, and people are expected to make decisions on this without having many facts. I do not see the Ruddock proposal as much more than window-dressing, and I would be very surprised if it actually happened. One of the areas that seemed to me to be of most concern was the school, where they are likely to experience problems. I asked what information had been given to them and was told that there had not been much communication with the school. They are really only going on gut reaction and wondering how this will work. There has been no communication from the federal and state authorities. I asked what information had been given and was told that this was the case.

There were many other issues with the school; for example, the integration of the children with those other children, and what sort of support would be given to the school. They would really need to have a full-time counsellor working at the school. They would also need to have ESL teachers working there. A lot of their resources would need to be increased. They would need SSOs, because of the transients who would be working in the area. So, some major issues are involved. My overriding question is: why has there not been any consultation with the school at this stage? Overall, we need to give those people in Woomera a lot more information about this matter. It is not likely to happen. It is probably an electoral ruse, and nothing will happen until after the federal election. However, I certainly have concerns for the people in that community.

The other point I picked up while I was there is the issue of the siting of the radioactive waste dump. What a travesty that appears to be. There are some major concerns in the Department of Defence about the site that has been chosen, but they cannot talk about this. It is located in the main area of the Woomera rocket range. This is a ludicrous position as projects are ongoing there. The Kessler project is likely to start in the near future; the space lift project and other ongoing defence projects are happening there all the time; and they are putting this radioactive waste dump in the prime location. This does not bode well for the future of Woomera, and I certainly hope that they will look at the other two locations which were originally considered and which are away from the rocket range.

Time expired.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today, I would like to comment on the success of the water catchment boards, and especially the Torrens catchment board in my area. I am sure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, would be interested in this matter, as you were the minister who introduced the water catchment boards in 1995. In 1959 and in the 1960s, I remember growing up as a boy in the Glynde area in my electorate, when I went to the Torrens in the Felixstow and Marden areas. Certainly, the river was much different from how it is today. A lot of people talk about the good old days, but my memory of the Torrens is as a swampy area with bamboos, old cars, glass and rubbish. On 4 March I took part in the clean-up day, in which I have been involved for several years. I commend both the Norwood Payneham and St Peters council and the Campbelltown council, which look after a lot of that linear park. Each clean-up day, I note that there is less rubbish, and it is a good day to confirm that the environment is improving. I commend the work of the catchment board, the local government and, of course, the state government to give our waterways, and in this case the linear park, priority.

I have also noted with much interest the effect that the water catchment board has had in the light industrial area of Glynde. The catchment board, Josh Bruce, who was the stormwater protection officer in the Glynde area, and the local schools have all worked together to make sure that the waterways are cleared up. I have seen the effects of the trash racks that have been installed in my area. Not often does the water catchment board get the recognition that it deserves. I attend as many board meetings as I can, and I have attended all the community meetings that have been held in my area. If we are to succeed in clearing up our waterways and improving our environment, we must have cooperation between the local community, the local government authorities, the local business community and, of course, the state government. I can see that that is working. I would like to commend Jay Hogan, the Presiding Member of the Torrens catchment board, for the work that is being done in the area.

Much still needs to be done, and I am sure that, with the framework that is in place, a lot will be done. It is important that we own the problems of the environment locally. It is no good thinking globally unless we act locally. It is no good acting locally unless we have the cooperation of all the people involved. I have seen first-hand that that is taking place between the catchment board, the local councils, the local schools and the business community in my area. I commend those groups' working together, and I look forward to continuing to work with them so that we can ensure that the environment that we all wish to aim for is achieved.

Time expired.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON DETE FUNDED SCHOOLS

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Wednesday 25 July.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: RIVERBANK STAGE 1—PROMENADE PROJECT

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That the 143rd report of the committee, on the Riverbank Stage 1—Promenade Project, be noted.

The Public Works Committee is told and accepts that lack of integrated planning of the facilities within the Riverbank's precinct environs has created barriers to its overall functioning and appeal. It lacks coherent identity and active frontages. A promenade is the first work package of a concept design plan to redevelop the precinct. The committee is told that it will restructure and improve public spaces and link existing attractions and destinations.

The proposal involves the construction of a pedestrian link from the northern edge of the Adelaide Convention Centre extensions east to the Adelaide Festival Centre, where it will integrate with paving grades at the entry of the Playhouse. The structure will form a cover to Festival Drive in front of the Convention Centre extension and existing Convention Centre buildings, and be built over the top of the western administration wing of the Adelaide Festival Centre. Most of the pavement level of the promenade will be at the same level as the top parking floor of the existing (Kings) car park and, therefore, one floor below the plaza level, that is, the car park roof, to the north of the existing Convention Centre. Wide stairs and associated passenger lifts will allow transition between this upper plaza level and the main promenade. The target date for completion of the project is September, in order to complement the hosting of the International Wine Conference in the extended Convention Centre facility, to be held shortly thereafter.

The estimated cost of the promenade project is \$11.68 million, and at this stage it is the only project in the precinct design plan that has been funded. The committee has significant reservations as to whether the proposed project will resolve the precinct's existing problems in a manner that is in the public interest. The committee has not been provided with satisfactory details about the future stages of the development, so we are concerned that future stages of the master plan are yet to be prioritised. The cost of the remaining stages is not known, and at this point the proposal is the only component that is funded. That lack of funding commitment raises the possibility of the master plan taking an inordinate time to complete or being left incomplete forever. The extent of the cost to the public relies upon contributions by other stakeholders. The full availability of north-south access is not possible until all work is done on the north side of the promenade. This will not occur until a subsequent stage, the priority for which is not known.

The committee is particularly concerned that the findings of surveys commissioned to ascertain the public's attitude towards the development of the riverbank precinct and the promenade proposal do not justify the decision to proceed with the project as it is presently proposed. In spite of the intention of the proponents of the project to create the

impression in the minds of members of the committee that the decision was justified, we analysed the data upon which their opinions were based and found that it was unsatisfactory, both in the methodology of its procurement and the qualitative misconceptions in the analysis based on it. The survey revealed a generally positive public attitude towards upgrading the riverbank precinct. However, some of the benefits sought can be obtained by upgrading facilities already there.

Moreover, it is unclear whether the interviewees—the people responding—were given an understanding of cheaper, alternative ways to improve the area. The most recent public survey warns that:

No cost issues were covered in this survey and results may change when these figures are available in the public arena. It would be useful to repeat the survey at a later date to capture a sample of a different time of year and when the proposed changes have been agreed.

The committee understands that no further survey has been undertaken, in spite of that remark. Both surveys found that the public wants an improvement of the lake. Accordingly, the committee is concerned that there is nothing in the proposal to address the unsatisfactory water quality in Torrens Lake. The proposing agency is prepared to work collaboratively with the Adelaide City Council and the Torrens catchment board to develop an appropriate and integrated stormwater management program to achieve improved water quality in Torrens Lake. However, it has not stated how this collaboration will occur or who should take responsibility.

The Public Works Committee accepts that the riverbank precinct should be upgraded and its facilities made more accessible and better coordinated. However, we note the following four points:

- The master plan and its components are an overly expensive means to achieve the proposed improvement.
- The improvements may exceed the wishes of the public.
- The proposal does not give appropriate priority to the public's wish for improved community and family facilities.
- The proposal may only offer improved amenity to particular income groups, that is, upper middle and high income groups.

There are quite a lot of people around the place who come from those two groups, but they do not represent, by definition, the majority of the community. However, given these concerns, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it is not able, therefore, to support the proposed public work.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): As the member for Hammond has said, the committee recognises the need for improvements in what has been defined as the riverbank area. The term 'riverbank' is new to the vocabulary of this state, so that, when people are asked what they think of it, it is pretty hard for them to say. In terms of the riverbank development, it means the area roughly bounded by North Terrace, Morphett Street to the Morphett Street bridge, along the river's edge, up to King William Road and then again up to North Terrace. When members of the community were asked whether they think this is an important area for the state and for them, they overwhelmingly said yes. I think that most South Australians have enjoyed many activities in this area and regard Elder Park, in particular, as a really precious area for the community.

Many of us participate in activities in the Festival Theatre; however, many of us do not. Others of us use the Casino, the railway station, the ASER buildings, the Hyatt Hotel and the Convention Centre. Often, the groups of us that use one of these facilities use that facility only—people go to the Casino without necessarily going to the Festival Theatre. The number of users for the whole area is considerable and there is difficulty in moving around easily in some parts. The Kings car park, the western car park, for instance, was not there when the Festival Theatre was originally designed, so walking up from the Kings car park to the Festival Theatre is a little hazardous, particularly if you are not spritely of foot.

The committee, therefore, recognises that there are matters that need to be improved, but we are also disturbed by this particular project, the promenade project, which is essentially putting an awful lot more concrete in that area, putting a lid on the top of Festival Drive, which forms the connection between the Convention Centre and the Festival Theatre, and has one benefit of allowing easier and safer access from the Kings car park to Festival Theatre, but, otherwise, provides very little in the way of benefits for the community of South Australia.

My view of the purpose of this promenade is that it provides a courtyard area for the Adelaide Convention Centre. The first time that the committee heard about the promenade and the grand stairway was in connection with the Adelaide Convention Centre upgrade and, when it was first brought to our attention, the indications were that the grand stairway would be a connection from the Convention Centre extensions down to the riverbank and that this would improve access from North Terrace to the riverbank for the community and for visitors. However, looking at the Convention Centre extension, you can see that, in front of the huge glass area, the platform for the Convention Centre ends very abruptly, about a metre from that huge glass area at the edge of Festival Drive.

Clearly, this was not acceptable to the Convention Centre management and its proponents who want to see a more continuous area outside the Convention Centre for breaks or whatever else. However, because they recognised, I think quite wisely, that the community of South Australia would not accept a \$96 million upgrade to the Convention Centre, they have broken down the components and have been trying to convince the community that the promenade part of it has to do with the community rather than the Convention Centre.

It is not that I want to attack the Convention Centre: the Convention Centre has been very important in bringing revenue to this state and so will the extensions. However, the extensions are far too expensive. The original estimate of the Convention Centre extensions was \$55 million. They are now \$85 million, and on top of that \$85 million is the \$11 million for the promenade. This state simply cannot afford an extra \$40 million for an icon Convention Centre instead of a functional Convention Centre, which is what perhaps we could get for \$55 million—later figures indicate that probably \$65 million was required—but not \$96 million. It is very disappointing that the press in this state has not come to grips with the fact that this is another waste of public money. We know that \$8 million buys us 200 nurses: therefore \$11 million will buy us those 200 nurses for another year, plus some.

To get back to the Riverbank environment and some of the fuzzy figures that have been used in trying to convince the community that this is a good deal for them, the first ones I

address are the figures used to produce the economic benefit. These were in a report prepared by Barry Burgan which found that there would be quite a considerable return to the taxpayers of South Australia for their investment but, when we look at how that return is calculated, the return becomes much less substantial. In looking at the source of value for existing local users, it is assumed that the improvements provide an additional value of \$3 for 0.7 million users of the area, for a total annual value of \$2.1 million. We are not told how it is that the 0.7 million users who use the railway station, the Casino and everything else each year will feel \$3 better off by virtue of having a lid over Festival Drive and a few other things.

It is also assumed that the project would produce 1 million new users of the precinct per year, with a value in use of \$5. The first stage would be less attractive for new users, and so it is assumed that 0.3 million users would be attracted, with an underlying value of use of \$3, giving an aggregate value of \$0.9 million. All this value is on the basis of our feeling \$3 a year better for having some upgrade of that area by the Convention Centre. There was also assumed to be value coming from a contribution to tourism; and for general tourism it was assumed that the availability of the precinct as an activity would induce 25 per cent of tourists to South Australia to make a trip to the area and spend \$10 in doing so; that is, \$10 they would not otherwise spend in South Australia.

With the staging of the development it is assumed that the proportion falls to 12.5 per cent and the average spent is \$6, giving a total value of \$0.75 million. This is another fuzzy figure. We have already got all these tourists who will flock to the wine centre and spend money that they would not have spent otherwise, and now 25 per cent of all tourists—that is, those who come to visit you, me and everyone else and stay with the family—will go to the Riverbank area and spend an extra \$10. That is wishful thinking at the very best.

In terms of what the public has said about this area when consulted, they have agreed that it is a very important area both for the community and for tourism. When prompted with some suggested changes, their number one priority was for a footbridge over the river, but we have no indication of when this footbridge over the river might materialise. The second priority was for alfresco dining facilities with river views. There are already alfresco dining facilities that could be used and need to be developed. There are alfresco dining facilities incorporated in the Convention Centre upgrade. The promenade gives us the possibility—the possibility only if the Hyatt spends \$1 million to move noisy airconditioning—of two extra facilities, but we already have Festival Theatre and the Hyatt which should be upgraded and new areas in the Convention Centre.

The next preference of the community was for open air theatre on the river. Then they wanted better pedestrian access from the plaza to the river—we get a little of this. They wanted landscaped grass areas surrounding Festival Centre entrance. When we look at the spontaneous comments, they were all about greenness, clean water and family fun areas, not concrete.

Time expired.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): I have a few comments to make in support of the comments already made by the presiding member and my colleague the member for Reynell. Essentially, we are looking at an \$11.68 million walkway. The crux of the matter is that the majority of the Public

Works Committee believed that that significant amount of money was too great to be spent on a project of this nature. I will make a few brief points because essentially they have been made previously. No-one on the committee doubts the fact that there needs to be an upgrade in the area. We accept the fact that the development that has occurred in that area from King William Road to Morphett Road on the riverbank has been uncoordinated and there has been a lack of integration in planning of facilities.

However, we have significant reservations as to whether the proposed project will achieve a result that is in the public interest. I will mention some particular categories. Firstly, we have not been provided with satisfactory details about future stages of the development. We were concerned that future stages of the master plan were yet to be prioritised; that the cost of the remaining stages is not known; and at this point the promenade is the only component that is funded. We were concerned that the timing and the level of the funding that the government, Adelaide City Council and other stakeholders are able to invest in precinct improvements will influence the period taken to fully realise the precinct's potential. This lack of commitment raises the possibility of the master plan taking an inordinate time to complete or being left incomplete.

We were concerned at the extent of the cost to the public relying upon contributions by other stakeholders and we were concerned that the full availability of north-south access is not possible until all the work is done on the north side of the promenade, and that work will not occur until the subsequent stage. We were also concerned, and the member for Reynell mentioned this in particular, that surveys commissioned to ascertain the public's attitude towards the development of the Riverbank precinct and the promenade do not justify the decision to proceed with the project as presently proposed. The presiding member summed up the major points that the committee set out in its recommendations, and I will repeat them.

We accept that the Riverbank precinct should be upgraded and its facilities made more accessible and better coordinated. However, in our view, the master plan and its components are an overly expensive (\$11.6 million) means to achieve the proposed improvements to the amenity; secondly, that there is a danger that the nature of the improvements exceed the wishes of the public—that is a response to the consultation; thirdly, that the proposal does not give appropriate priority to public wishes for improved community and family facilities; and, fourthly, that the proposal may only offer improved amenity to particular income groups.

It might be of interest to members to note that this is only the second project—certainly that I can remember—that the Public Works Committee has considered where the committee has not recommended the proposal. We do not do this lightly. The first project was the well-known Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium stage 2 development, and this is the second project that falls into that category. With those few words I complete my remarks.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ROCKY RIVER PRECINCT REDEVELOPMENT

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That the 144th report of the committee, on the Rocky River Precinct Redevelopment, be noted.

Rocky River is not the place from which the member for Schubert and his late father have come, but, rather, a place on

Kangaroo Island. Significant public funds are being invested in the strategic upgrade and improvement of tourism infrastructure on Kangaroo Island. This includes effort and resources focused on tourism facilities and management infrastructure within Flinders Chase National Park. The Rocky River precinct development is a key initiative.

As a member of the Public Works Committee, I was angered by the decision made by the government to build the road through the national park from Rocky River to Remarkable Rocks and the cape without reference of that work to the Public Works Committee. Clearly, the government and national parks decided that they could not cop the scrutiny of the Public Works Committee of the proposed work and decided, therefore, to simply ignore the law. I wonder if the national parks would accept the same judgment of other instrumentalities and, more particularly, other citizens who ignore laws which the national parks think are important to their own management arrangements. I think not.

However, to proceed with this particular work at Rocky River, let me explain that the Public Works Committee accepts that visitor facilities and park management infrastructure should reflect the status and profile of the park as one of South Australia's prime natural assets and tourist destinations—and we hope that some stupid koala management policies are soon to be amended to prevent the destruction of many of the food species of eucalypts which are presently being devastated by the escalating population of koalas that are feral to the island.

There are presently significant visitor management conflicts and problems at Rocky River that can be attributed to a combination of factors. These include the following:

- a lack of a strategic and well-planned approach to the development of visitor and management facilities over the past 60 years;
- increasing visitor numbers, including a change in visitor profile and a greater access by commercial tour operators to the island and this particular part of the island;
- a significant change in the expectations of the government, the visitors, the tourism industry and the general community at large of the standard of facilities that must be provided in a major park; and
- the site infrastructure at present is operating beyond its limit and, accordingly, power (electricity), communication and water services are operating below acceptable standards. That could have serious health implications for more than one reason. The government is to be commended for attempting to do something about it.

The proposal comprises a major upgrade of tourism and infrastructure facilities for the Rocky River precinct, the administrative centre and entry point for visitors who come to explore the natural and historic features of the surrounding 150 hectares of semi-cleared natural bushland. The key objectives of the proposal are as follows:

- conserve the natural and cultural heritage of the precinct, and enhance community understanding and appreciation of the significance of these assets;
- cater for visitor expectations and needs, and park management requirements, while minimising the impact that will have on natural, cultural and scientific values.
- provide outstanding, memorable and high quality natural and cultural experiences for our visitors in that precinct;
- act as the major centre for park management operations in western Kangaroo Island;
- be a prominent showcase for best practice development of tourism, visitor and management infrastructure;

- provide for high quality camping and heritage accommodation opportunities;
- provide quality private accommodation for remotely located National Parks and Wildlife SA staff;
- provide educational and interpretive opportunities into the significant zoological, botanical, cultural, archaeological and palaeontological resources of the site; and
- facilitate partnerships with academic and research institutions such as the universities and the museum.

The Rocky River precinct has highly significant palaeontological deposits, along with the presence of archaeological artefacts. It is proposed to relocate and, where necessary, demolish existing park management infrastructure that has a significant impact on these deposits. This will facilitate the implementation of the integrated palaeontological and archaeological research plan for Rocky River which has been prepared under the guidance of the Rocky River scientific reference group. The committee understands that the proposal will achieve a number of benefits and desirable outcomes as follows:

- recreational experiences that meet the needs of a broad range of people visiting the site;
- interpretive opportunities that enhance visitor enjoyment and appreciation of the park;
- facilities that meet the expectations and functional requirements of all stakeholders;
- effective management of the area and the park in general over the next decade and beyond;
- sensitive and consistent design principles leading to significant reduction in current intrusions on visual amenity;
- enhanced protection and conservation of the significant natural and cultural heritage values of the area; and
- value for money environmental management and infrastructure which minimises energy use and pollution.

The project is expected to be completed in June 2002 at an estimated cost of \$7.615 million, and revenue projections indicate an increase over 10 years of \$2.965 million. The committee understands that an economic analysis of the project estimates that it will provide economic benefits between \$10 million and \$26 million for Kangaroo Island (including the construction effects) and between \$5 million and \$20 million for the state (excluding construction effects). The analysis shows that the project will support of the order of 20 new jobs by year 2006, based on a low growth scenario and of the order of 80 jobs in a high growth scenario. The most fascinating aspect of the work, as we saw it, for me, was the richness of the palaeontological specimens to be found at shallow depth around the edge of the ancient lagoon.

The range of animals, now extinct (or at least the skeletal remains of them), is amazing to date and excavations have barely, to use a colloquialism, scratched the surface. I look forward personally with interest for the rest of my life to seeing what comes from there so that I will have some better understanding of just how diverse the species were in recent history in Australia. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee recommends the proposed public work.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I support the committee's report and applaud the proponents for the way in which they have gone about developing this project. It is an appropriate and value-adding development of a unique natural resource. The site inspection the committee was able to undertake gave committee members an opportunity to appreciate what natural

resources we have in Rocky River that we certainly could not have appreciated by reading all the papers in Adelaide. One aspect to which the member for Hammond referred is the swamp area. I want to read some of the information the committee heard by way of evidence about Black Swamp as it certainly offers the potential to be an extremely important archaeological site and one that, in time, every South Australian will know all about. If the sorts of indications we received are in any way realised, we will all know about Black Swamp. The information given to us by one witness is as follows:

The Rocky River development adjoins an historical swamp known as Black Swamp, which includes some highly significant fossil deposits, including a large number of megafauna, which were those fearsome creatures that roamed the Australian continent over 40 000 years ago. We had giant wombats and enormous marsupial lions. Our intention at this site, which we do not understand well at the moment, is to undertake some major archaeological and palaeontological fossils, to do some excavations to better understand what is happening at this site.

The intention is that it will remain a tourist attraction whilst still being an important natural resource area. A witness also told the committee:

We are in the process of finalising a research plan that looks at how we are going to undertake research at this site, how the archaeological and palaeontological digs will be undertaken. That plan should be finalised early next calendar year [that is this year] and then we would be looking to work in closely with the Museum, and particularly Flinders University. . .

It was quite exciting to see that there is a plan for us to explore this potential wealth that we have. We also questioned the witnesses about the tourist market for Kangaroo Island and how the Rocky River development would impact on that. Some of this was in the light of another fact that few South Australians know, namely, that North America often sees Kangaroo Island as being second only to the Galapagos Islands in terms of uniqueness of its flora and fauna. It is in our backyard, so we just think of it as being lovely Kangaroo Island and a great place to catch wonderful whiting; we do not realise just how important it is on the world scene. In talking about the type of tourism that might be attracted by this development, one witness said:

It is a fact that there will always be a one day tourism market on Kangaroo Island. That is what the market wants. Many people in the market just do a one day trip. It is either all they can afford or all their itinerary can allow them. So I think really what we are looking for here is to capitalise and expand on a different market, if you like, particularly the international sector, where we can either attract more additional clients or the existing ones that we have will stay longer than they currently are. So I do not think we will see a major change in the clientele; it will be more trying to catch a new clientele and expand the stays of current clientele.

This is an important economic development, as well as the development of our natural history. I want to mention one aspect of the project that does present a challenge, that is, the site service infrastructure which will cost approximately \$1.2 million and which has been allocated to the various components of the project. I want to mention particularly that when anyone reads the report and sees that three additional residents for staff will cost \$932 000 they do not think that we are providing staff with accommodation that has an indoor swimming pool and sauna. The house designs that the committee examined are, in fact, quite modest homes. The high cost relates to the necessity to provide infrastructure in an area where there is no on-site electricity, water or sewerage.

I commend all the people who have worked on this project and those who appeared at the hearing and on the site

inspection. We saw a number of officers, particularly from parks and wildlife, who were obviously committed, enthusiastic and excellent public servants. We also saw a happy relationship with consultants who, on this occasion, seemed to be taking ownership of the project to such an extent that one of the consultants drove the bus on our tour of inspection. This visit served only to reinforce the importance of site visits for the committee's understanding of the complexity of projects and the value of the project to the state. I commend the project to the House.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: TORRENS ROAD UPGRADE

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I move:

That the 145th report of the committee, on the Torrens Road upgrade, be noted.

Torrens Road, between Fitzroy Terrace and the railway line at Ovingham, is an important part of the arterial road system serving the inner western suburbs of Adelaide. The proposal to upgrade Torrens Road will reduce traffic movements through the city of Adelaide and generally improve the efficiency of movements within the metropolitan area. This is in line with the Adelaide City Council's design to reduce traffic through the central business district. An interim scheme developed as part of this project for the intersection of Torrens Road, Fitzroy Terrace, Jeffcott Road and Park Terrace has the flexibility of being developed to cater for the predicted traffic volumes up to the year 2011.

The work required to implement it will be part of improvements for Fitzroy Terrace that will be investigated in the future. The purpose of the project is to satisfy a number of functional transport requirements at both regional and local levels. These are to:

- improve safety for all road users, including heavy vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians;
- create an efficient and vital link for all traffic movement through the area, and these include both a north to south movement as well as an east to west traffic flow;
- contribute to achieving an effective link to the ring route around the central city of Adelaide as part of the Adelaide Better Roads project;
- improve the safety and access for local road users.

It also seeks to provide an improved facility for use by public transport and commercial vehicles that will provide reduced operating costs for the industry and minimise life-cycle costs. The expected project outcomes are:

- an improved traffic flow through the area by increasing the number of turning lanes for all movements and the introduction of a communication link between the railway crossing and the junction signals;
- an increased efficiency of bus movements through the introduction of bus priority measures such as bus priority lights and lanes;
- improved safety for cyclists by the introduction of cycling facilities throughout the entire project;
- improved visual amenity through extensive landscaping to the central median, service road separators (that is the central swales) and other areas. This includes the planting of mature tree species;
- reduced noise and vibration levels by the introduction of noise barriers on both sides of Torrens Road and using noise reducing asphalt; and
- reduced maintenance and vehicle operating costs.

The residents in the vicinity of Torrens Road have written to the committee expressing their concerns about the proposed upgrade. However, after detailed discussions with Transport SA, the committee is satisfied that the proposal will result in the improvements expected by Transport SA.

We have been told that it is no longer necessary to construct the Ovingham overpass proposal. Therefore, the surplus land will be subject to the normal process of offering the land to other government agencies, council, or, if no interest is shown, sale on the open market. The estimated value of this land for medium density residential use is \$1 million. I personally believe that the sale of the land is ill-advised. By the time that it is required, it will have escalated to a price far greater than the benefit to be now realised, compounded annually by the discount rate of the CPI to that time in the future. That is a remark that I make personally, not as chairman of the committee but as an ordinary member of the committee.

Governments are notoriously ignorant of how to best judge where to make investment. If they wish to make good use of the facilities in the meanwhile, there is no reason why transportable accommodation up to two storeys high cannot be constructed on the site for the duration of the time for which it is not required, and for the premises so created to be appropriately landscaped with suitable types of vegetation and, furthermore, for the precinct to be made attractive in the meanwhile—that it is generating a market valued rental income.

The economic benefits of the project derive largely from reduced delays at the signalised intersection and improved road safety performance. The present value of total road user savings over the 15 year analysis period is estimated to be approximately \$45.3 million, and the present value of the total capital cost of developing this project is approximately \$4.7 million. On this basis, the benefit cost ratio is 9.6 and the net present value is about \$40.6 million positive.

The economic analysis also indicates that the proposed project will do the following three things:

- it will significantly improve local amenity by undergrounding ETSA services, developing an extensive landscaping scheme and it will provide a range of measures to reduce the impact of road traffic noise levels in that neighbourhood;
- it will reduce travel times through the neighbourhood; and
- it will improve the reliability of passenger transport to those using it.

The committee is alarmed to discover that work on the Ovingham station commenced prior to its report being tabled. The committee is advised that the need for the work was twofold. Firstly, TransAdelaide had indicated that there was a need to improve the visibility access at the station and, secondly, the proposed widening of Torrens Road could not proceed without a reduction in the length of the platform of that station. The committee is told that \$135 000 already has been spent on this work and that there is a total allocation of \$500 000. I think it was no accident, and that it was deliberate to commence work before the committee had considered the proposal.

The committee is of the view that the work undertaken at the railway station is inextricably linked to the Torrens Road upgrade project, given that disability access would not have been provided at the Torrens Road end of the railway station if it had not been for the need to shorten the platform. As such, the Public Works Committee considers that the work was unlawful and was undertaken in contravention of section

16A(2) of the Parliamentary Committees Act. Notwithstanding this serious concern, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work and also draws the attention of the House to the fact that the government still arrogantly ignores the law when it suits it.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): The Torrens Road upgrade is an important part of the ring route development and, therefore, an important part of allowing traffic to move freely around this city, to minimise environmental pollution and to cut down on crashes that occur as a result of frustration and poor road design. The chair has referred to the aspect of the work with which the committee was concerned, that is, that one aspect of it took place before the committee had conducted its investigations and reported to the parliament. This is not an acceptable way for any government to do business.

The reference was considerably delayed in coming to the committee. It was postponed several times, and it seemed that there was a fair bit of debate within government as to whether or not the overpass proposal should continue or whether this was the appropriate way of going about it. We were aware of a lot of concern by a small group of residents, who were very active and who collected thousands of signatures to a petition objecting to the work. Just what the nature of the discussions in government was we never really knew, but we certainly did become aware of the concerns of the residents of the Torrens Road area. I want to acknowledge their concerns and, at the same time, indicate that it was not really within the committee's sphere to deal with some of the matters that they were raising. It seems that residents were concerned that there not be upgrading of roads, because this would be a barrier to increasing the amount of transport, particularly heavy transport, that would be undertaken by rail. While the increase in rail transport might be an objective that many members of the committee—and probably all of us—would share, leaving Torrens Road in the unacceptable condition that it is in is not the way to go about doing that. The transfer over the last couple of decades of heavy transport from rail to road has been quite a complex matter, fed by a number of issues, some of them being governmental and some of them relating to conditions of trade. Just not upgrading Torrens Road was not going to solve that problem. But I do want the residents to know that we did look carefully at the objections that they were raising, including issues about loss of parklands for roads and planting trees that were not suitable for the area. They also had concerns about graffiti in the area.

I would urge the residents to take up these matters with Transport SA during the course of the project. I have always found Transport SA to be very responsive to residents' concerns during a project. I have had particular experience of that with the Southern Expressway, and I would urge the residents to take up their particular concerns.

We were assured by the various councils in the area that they also had residents expressing strong support for the development, which would provide, in some areas, much quieter and safer access for local residents. So, it is one of these conditions where there is overall benefit, but some people see problems.

Other than to say that we were concerned about the commencement of work before the committee had reported, generally it seems to be a necessary project and one where community support as well as community distress was well demonstrated. We urge those who are distressed to continue

in a dialogue with Transport SA in an attempt to have some of the issues about which they are concerned resolved or at least better explained to them.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): I am the local member of parliament for the southern side of this proposed road work at Torrens Road, Ovingham. I have doorknocked every home on the southern side of Torrens Road in Ovingham and I have discussed this proposed development with many people. I understand there is some quite militant opposition to the development, but principally from people on the northern side of Torrens Road.

Ms Thompson interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: Yes; as the member for Reynell says, they oppose the increase in heavy vehicles that would be attracted by this upgrading of the road. Opinions on the southern side are divided. Some residents think it is an attractive development; they like the idea of a service road and a barrier between Torrens Road and their suburb. Other people on the southern side agree with those on the northern side.

The background to this is that successive governments have promised an overpass to Ovingham, namely, that traffic would be taken from the top of the hill and would fly over the Gawler railway and then come back to ground level at about Chief Street in Brompton. That is why so much land has been reserved for so long at Ovingham.

When I was first doorknocking for the 1989 election, I came across a man called Mr Titl, who had lived in the area for more than 30 years, and he had seen his neighbours' homes and his local shops demolished to make way for the overpass—except that the overpass was never built. The local hotel on Torrens Road, with which you, sir, might be familiar, called itself the Overpass Tavern for many years, until it just gave up and reverted to the name Bowden on the Hill, because the overpass never came. I think it was first promised by political parties during the time of Premier Steele Hall and opposition leader Don Dunstan. Now it appears that the overpass will never come, and the substitute for it will be this redevelopment.

My principal concern about this redevelopment is access to North Adelaide and the city from Ovingham and access for vehicles coming back to the city along Torrens Road from the direction of Arndale into Ovingham. I am concerned that this development would block off Guthrie Street and would mean that the cars of Ovingham residents wanting to turn right out of Guthrie Street onto Torrens Road and travel south-east towards North Adelaide would no longer be able to do so; and residents driving their vehicles back from the direction of Arndale would be unable to turn right off Torrens Road into Guthrie Street. So, Ovingham would be more pocketed than it currently is with the closure of Barton Road, North Adelaide.

This is a genuine concern. I wrote to the member for Adelaide as long ago as 1999, putting some alternative proposals to him, and I also wrote to his sister-in-law, the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, the Hon. D.V. Laidlaw, about the same problem. In my experience, the transport minister is conscientious in replying to members' correspondence. Indeed, one of her helpful traits is to mark with a vertical blue line the key sentences in her replies. However, I must say that neither the member for Adelaide, who is a cabinet minister, nor the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has replied to my letters of 1999 and 2000

and my many reminder notes. For some reason—

Mr Lewis: I was treated the same way.

Mr ATKINSON: Is that right? You were treated the same way?

Mr Lewis: You won't do that when you get into government, will you?

Mr ATKINSON: Of course not. I wonder what these two members have to hide about the development at Torrens Road, Ovingham. I know that at one stage it was awkward that the southern part of Ovingham, which votes heavily for the Labor Party, was going into the state district of Adelaide owing to a redistribution. I know, too, that the member for Adelaide spent a lot of money appealing against that redistribution, because he did not want 'those kinds of people' as his constituents. He regarded them as having no commonality of interest with his current constituents, although part of the suburb was already in the state district of Adelaide. Anyway, that matter has been resolved, and the minister is not running for parliament at the next election, as far as we know—although I gather there is a vacancy for Liberal preselection for the state district of Croydon, which I would be happy for him to fill.

My principal concern is that the means of getting out of Ovingham to Arndale and the city be preserved as far as possible under this redevelopment, and that the ability to get off Torrens Road when one is coming from Arndale into Ovingham be preserved. If this development goes ahead in the way that is proposed, Ovingham will not only be pocketed from the point of view of getting out—the only way you will be able to get out of Ovingham is onto the service road for Park Terrace or onto Hawker Street—but also, if you want to come from a south-easterly direction along Torrens Road from Arndale, the only way you will be able to get into Ovingham will be to turn right off Torrens Road at Chief Street, Brompton, and work your way via Chief Street, Hawker Street and the railway line back into Ovingham. I think that is unreasonable. I know some suburbs like to be cut off from the rest of the world but, unlike North Adelaide, Ovingham is not one of them.

Debate adjourned.

Mr MEIER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LOCAL GOVERNMENT) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November. Page 608.)

Ms KEY (Hanson): I have had the benefit of receiving a briefing from the Minister for Local Government with regard to the bill and also advice from the Local Government Association. From the outset, it seems that this is a straightforward bill that is necessary due to the introduction of the new act of 1999, where finetuning is necessary to remove any anomalies and to provide some clarity. The major amendments look at state and local government interface, and also look at the relationship between local government and the commonwealth. State acts covered under the old act are taken up in the amendments and refer money to fire prevention, traffic management, parking control, national road rules and

sewerage systems. There are also consequential amendments to the Food Act and the Highways Act.

Under these amendments, the issue with regard to the term of office for elected members of the Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983 is in line with the three year terms for council members. I know that the minister will be moving two amendments to her bill. One of those deals with rate notices. Section 171(4) of the Local Government Act requires that rate notices also contain a summary of the council's rating policy. With the introduction of the option of quarterly rate payments, the legislation obliges the council to send out this information each time. When you receive rates it is my experience that you receive one document, and if you choose to pay on a quarterly basis you basically use the same document and have that information in one kit the first time the rates are sent out. It may be different with other councils, but certainly in the council area in which I live we receive one document. I am sure that the minister can explain that when we get to committee. The amendment proposed by the minister will mean that the rating policy will be sent out only with the first rate notice each year.

The other amendment involves easements on private roads. Councils have the power to grant easements and right of way on public roads, and it is proposed that the power be extended to private roads owned by the council. I have advised the minister that I will be asking her questions about community land and providing the easement and right of way in that area. Today, I received further information from the Local Government Association assuring me that it supports the technical and administrative matters covered in the minister's bill. Further, although the association supports the amendment with regard to the notification of policy rating summary being sent out once rather than four times, if this is the method that the council chooses, it has some questions about the necessity with regard to the second amendment.

As I said earlier, I will refer that matter to the committee stage and ask the minister whether she could elaborate on the necessity for that amendment. The LGA also says that it has not really had sufficient opportunity to consult all its members. Although it does not see this as a major issue, it is not absolutely committed to that amendment at this stage. As I said earlier, I have looked through some of the acts that need to be changed as a result of the new act, and I have some questions to ask the minister about the Food Act and about special provisions and exclusion relating to Coober Pedy. Again, the minister would be aware that I am seeking clarification on this area. Labor's position with regard to this bill is that of support. However, as I said earlier, we will be looking to seek further amplification from the minister.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): For many years the law governing local government in South Australia was the Local Government Act 1934—an auspicious year, because that year Glenelg defeated Port Adelaide in the grand final to win its first premiership. The former Minister for Local Government, the member for Unley, superintended the rewriting of the Local Government Act and its separation into a number of acts, with its reconsolidation principally as the Local Government Act 1999. So, I congratulate the then Minister of Local Government on what was a worthwhile change, a reform, albeit a modest reform, and I participated in those debates. It is one of the achievements of this government.

As part of that transition, it was necessary to introduce holding provisions that would take account of the reform. It was necessary to have a Statutes Repeal and Amendment

(Local Government) Bill, and that was put up to the parliament in 1999 in the wake of the reform. It passed this House and went to the other place, where a very worthwhile amendment was carried by a considerable majority in the other place. Among the supporters of that amendment regarding road closures were all the Australian Democrats, the Hon. Trevor Crothers, the Hon. T.G. Cameron, the only representative of the SA First Party, and the Hon. Julian Stefani, a government member of the other place.

The government refused to accept that amendment, so it gave up on the reform process and abandoned the move for a transitional bill. It came back some months later and introduced the more essential parts of the transition. It broke the transition into two stages. You would have thought that there would have to be a pretty important policy reason for the government to take that approach but, no, sir, I can tell you it was grubby personal financial interests that caused that approach. The minister winces, and well might she wince about the pollution of the policy stream in this state, because the reason the transitional bill was delayed and then cut into two pieces was that two members of the government own real estate that might have been affected by the amendment to the transitional bill. I refer to the owner of 72 Molesworth Street and the owner of 158 Mills Terrace. They ensured, through the Liberal Party room, that the necessary transitional provisions would be cut into two pieces.

The first part is through, and the member for Schubert might be unaware of this but the minister and her adviser are well aware of it. Now we have the second part trying to be spirited through the parliament, hoping that the majority in the other place does not notice. I can assure the minister and I can assure the government that the same amendment to the road closure transitional provisions which were moved and adopted by the other place will be moved again and adopted by the other place, and this little sleight of hand will not work. It is a sorry state when an important transitional provision to a major reform of local government in this state rests on the personal financial interests of the owners of 72 Molesworth Street, North Adelaide and 158 Mills Terrace, North Adelaide.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The Hon. Legh Davis voted in his own interest on consideration of the transitional bill. So, the owners of those two properties will not get away with it. The other thing to say is that, if the Barton Road matter is not fixed up in this parliament, it will assuredly be fixed up in the next parliament when we form a government. I know the member for Adelaide and the Hon. Legh Davis may mock me for what they regard as my obsession with this question, but they are equally, if not more, obsessed, and behind the scenes they have lobbied for this grubby little tactic of splitting the transitional bill in two. The minister knows that I am right: any honest government which had integrity in its policy making process would have introduced the transitional bill as one bill in the immediate aftermath of the reform bills. The split is entirely improper, and we know the reason that the two transitional bills have been split.

I will not detain the House too much with discussion of this issue, but I add that my arguments on the question of Barton Road, North Adelaide have, in fact, been accepted by the government for future purposes and that my arguments were accepted and incorporated into government sponsored legislation. I refer to the City of Adelaide Bill and I refer to the amendments to the Road Traffic Act. My arguments about Barton Road are correct, they are unassailable and they have

been accepted by the government for the future. Never again will one municipality try, unilaterally, to close a road which runs into another municipality. That argument has been accepted—I think it has even been accepted by the minister here. But, the question is what are we going to do about the rorts that were committed before the passage of the legislation? What are we going to do about them?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: I have made the rorting claims outside, repeatedly—on radio 5AA and radio 5DN—and I have distributed them, personally addressed, to people in North Adelaide and Ovingham. So, if the minister is referring to that vexatious litigant, the member for Adelaide, I have never received so much as a solicitor's letter from him in my 11 years in this place. I am quite happy to make any allegation out there that I have made in here about Barton Terrace, and I have done it, ad nauseam. However, I notice that the member for Adelaide has run away from that particular conflict. So sorely have the people of Ovingham vexed him that he is not even willing to offer his name in the district of Adelaide at the next state election. It is real white feather stuff.

An honourable member: He's running away from Barton Road.

Mr ATKINSON: And I must thank the Surveyor General (Mr Peter Kentish) in particular, in his role as Electoral Commissioner, for putting all of Ovingham into the state district of Adelaide in the last redistribution. It shows a fine sense of humour on his part.

There is one stop press that I should add to this and that is, in an attempt to avoid the impact of the amendment that will be moved to this legislation in another place and to try to avoid the impact of an incoming Labor government—which is now more certain than it has ever been—the City of Adelaide, as is its wont, tried one last desperate rort and that is at its last meeting it tried to rename Barton Road to War Memorial Drive so that it could avoid the effect of the previous amendment. That particular rort simply will not work.

So I have to tell the new proprietors of 158 Mills Terrace that, not only will the number 253 bus—which ascends the hill from Bowden and travels past their home and causes them unutterable distress—continue to go past their house; not only will my clattering old bicycle continue to go past their house, whether it is lawful to do so or not; but, in the fullness of time, when Labor forms a government, the vehicles of residents of the western suburbs will go past 158 Mills Terrace.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: I am glad to hear that the member for Hammond defies the road signs of questionable lawfulness and drives past them, and I can assure the House that, in this game of who's got the greater obsession, I will prevail against the Hon. Legh Davis and the member for Adelaide in the end.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): With the commencement of the new Local Government Act at the start of the year 2000 most of the Local Government Act of 1934 was repealed. I understand that this bill repeals further provisions of that act and transfers them to appropriate state acts. I was a member of the government which did all of the work in relation to repealing the Local Government Act and it took thousands and thousands of hours and very extensive consultation with all local governments. Several times, the mayors and CEOs were called in here to consult. I pay tribute to the previous

minister, Hon. Scott Ashenden, and, lately, the Hon. Mark Brindal, who conveyed this bill through the houses. This bill was a long time coming. There were a couple of minor oversights, and this is what this bill is all about, in tidying it up.

Following the commencement of the Local Government Act 1999, a transition and implementation program has been operating to assist council to adjust to the new legislative regime. Some technical matters have been identified in relation to the act and I understand one of these relates to council rate notices. It is a requirement that councils send out rate policy summaries when the rate notices are issued. As we know, rates can be paid quarterly upon receiving rate notices quarterly, but it is not the intent of the act, nor was it ever, that the rate policy summary be sent every time; in other words, every quarter. This policy is only to be sent with the first quarterly rate payment notice, that is, once a year. That is commonsense, but we know that laws have to be spelt out exactly, so councils have quite clearly spelt out that they have to send the information only once in a year.

While talking about councils in general, I remind the House that I spent 10 years in local government and I find it very valuable in relation to my experiences here. I note that several other members are the same. I would like to spend a little time talking about council roads, particularly the closing of roads. The bill that we are considering today also talks about easements on private council owned roads. The current act is not clear in relation to granting easements on a private road. It was never the intent of the new act to restrict council powers in relation to granting these easements. I can remember discussing this in deliberations when putting the bill together. We thought it was an open and shut case, but it was not. I heard what the member for Spence said a few moments ago and one can probably realise why it may have been so.

A lot of my constituents have been successful in applying to close old back roads which have not been used for years which are adjacent to their properties. This is a good opportunity, Sir, to raise this issue because it is an issue that confronts me regularly as a member for a country electorate. Likewise, Sir, it probably confronts you, as well. Some of my constituents have had easements granted to them on these roads and then they have rented the roads, and others have even purchased them. However, as soon as they apply to the council, objections are always received from special interest groups, particularly walking groups and clubs.

The benefits of closing these roads are considerable, and I want to remind the House that it certainly helps to protect the land and arrest erosion problems; also, it controls potential weed problems. I believe that, if walking groups object to road closures, they always have access to private land through the recreational greenways legislation which was an initiative of this government and which was passed last year. I appreciate the attitude of the local government in taking a liberal view when constituents apply for road closures. I have seen that when a farmer acquires an old road and they remove a fence because it had fallen down, they put gates at either end so that people can move through that piece of land; access is given quite freely, as long as they close the gates.

We do need to consider that these old back tracks were surveyed when horses were used as transport and most farms were 600 acres maximum. Now with the consolidation of farms into larger holdings, these roads are largely redundant. People with modern vehicles would rather head to a sealed road and not have their vehicle knocked around on an old back track, which is usually very rough and overgrown with

vegetation on the sides. We also have to consider the motives of some people who drive along these tracks. There are the issues of firebugs and also stock rustling, because it is along these tracks that stock thefts take place in the middle of the night.

Also, many farmers when taking ownership of these roads, choose to plant trees and convert them into nature strips for bird and wildlife corridors. These old roads can be notorious havens for noxious weeds, and there is often a debate on whose responsibility it is to control them. These roads become infested with artichokes, horehound, onion weed and boxthorn; and in higher rainfall areas there is a real problem with blackberries and furze. I am told that, in the Adelaide Hills, furze are a real problem. The bottom line is that these roads are not used and can quickly become full of weeds: it is just a waste of very productive land tied up as a road reserve.

I note that the saga of Barton Road continues in this House this afternoon with the member for Spence. I have been in this House for 10 years and I would not mind \$1 for every time I have heard this issue raised in this place. The member opposite smiles, but she has only just arrived. This issue has been absolutely done to death. Again, I was interested to hear the accusations made by the member. I think he makes an interesting accusation, but I think the reason for the closure of that road is all a figment of his imagination. He will not accept the decision made by the council, government, or whoever has been involved, and he spends his whole time here trying to reverse that decision. Well it will be a long time before it is, because he said he will keep doing it until such time that he as the minister gets time to change it.

Well, it will be a long time before that happens and, if we have to put up with another 10 years, God help us all! I give it to the member: he is a very determined 'Character'. I have no opinion on the matter, but there must be some very strong commitment on all sides for this issue to be debated so vehemently. I think everyone now, as a matter of principle, is out to win their case, and I am most concerned that we will go on hearing about this matter for years to come.

In closing, I pay a tribute to the current Minister for Local Government. She certainly has a very good hold on this portfolio. The liaison between the Local Government Association through its President, Mayor Brian Hurn (whom I know very well), and the government has not been better for many years, and I pay a tribute to the minister for that, because it is good that we get on with other levels of government. There is no sense in our being in conflict with them on issues such as this. Certainly, during the whole process, that is, from the introduction of the local government bill through to the amalgamation processes, there were times when local government and this House were in what could be seen as conflict with each other.

As a former councillor, I joined the then minister and the current minister to assist, where possible. I am pleased now that a lot of these battles are behind us and we are all much better off because we now have a new local government act which is far superior to the old one, and we give councils many more powers now than they used to have. They have much more flexibility in relation to how they run their affairs; and, even though many in local government would not admit it, they certainly do owe this government a vote of thanks. That applies particularly to some of the city councils, because some of their powers are now very clear.

Certainly, I believe that this is very timely. A couple of hiccups are always left after a major change to an act such as

this. If these two were the only two that we needed to tidy up, it augurs very well for the original instigators of the bill because, after this, I think the legislation will stand the test of time, and I believe that we will not be addressing this bill again for probably at least 20 years. I certainly support the bill.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I have a couple of things to say about this measure and they are not all that lengthy. I was, of course, if nothing else, entertained by the contribution from the member for Spence, who shortly proposes and imagines he will be the member for Croydon, I think it is. Notwithstanding that, I am curious to know just exactly what the Labor Party will do for that other place, what their policy is—and may I say through you Mr Speaker, the minister would know—in relation to Silkes Road and Reid Avenue, where one council unilaterally decided to close that thoroughfare. I refer to the city of Tea Tree Gully, which closed it in spite of the protests from the people who lived in the city of Campbelltown.

The point at which they closed it was the point on their boundaries where it crosses the Torrens River because there was a ford there. Local residents who had bought land adjacent to Reid Avenue and did not like the through traffic from Campbelltown, Athelstone and Thorndon Park going to and from Highbury, or Dernancourt, using Silkes Road, as such traffic had used Silkes Road for over 100 years, simply dumped loads of dirt on the upward side of the road on the ford and prevented anyone from using that road ever again.

I think that should be reopened, even if it is made into a light car weight bridge with large round culvert sections put in it so that it will infrequently overtop, but when it does, it becomes a fording, and motorists can be warned that, once water comes over the roadway at that point, they ought not to proceed and, were they to do so, it will be expressly at their own risk.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, occasionally. Another ford had to be closed because it was not paved, and that was adjacent to my market garden in James Street, Campbelltown, where it crossed into Windsor Gardens. One of my employees lost one of my utilities one day when a flash flood came down the river and I managed to catch it again about 100 yards down the river by climbing a willow tree, running out along the branch, jumping into the back of the ute and crawling into the—

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Well, cripes, I mean, that is a couple of thousands dollars. In any case, I tethered the ute as it drifted down the current with a couple of hawsers that were already in the thing, and after the river level subsided I went in with my four-wheel drive tractor and dragged it out. Anyway, I am not saying that all fords ought to be left opened or reopened; I am simply saying that that particular road is of considerable significance to the people either side of the river, except those selfish residents along Reid Avenue who protested to the City of Tea Tree Gully.

Mrs Geraghty: They were not being selfish, Peter; there is a danger on that road: that roundabout is very—

Mr LEWIS: That is no excuse. Unsafe roundabouts and other traffic design problems on thoroughfares are matters which must be addressed by the responsible local government authority. If the damned roundabout is unsafe, then it needs to be fixed regardless of whether or not the car comes from the other side of the river.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Only two minutes. I think it is a little further than that nowadays. In any case, while I respect the views of the honourable member, I am sure that she will have the opportunity to put them on the record in due course. If that road is not opened, another crossing for the people living either side of the river needs to be made somewhere else. I cannot imagine exactly where that would be. The escarpment on the fault line further upstream from that is so steep that it would be very expensive to provide a crossing through the Coulls's place (as it used to be) or even downstream from there next to where the water mill used to be. In any case, I think it would be too expensive to attempt to provide a fording with a causeway at a point other than Silkes Road. I leave that matter, and leave it to the government of the day to provide the means, or at least kick some butt, in the local government area to ensure that reconnection can occur.

I want to turn now to the other matter which is of concern to me, that is, the matter of septic tanks. I commend the government for what it has done in that regard. We have been waiting a long time for these provisions, which are quite explicit and sensible for almost every place in the state. Clearly, it is not relevant in Coober Pedy because in Coober Pedy everyone uses a long drop. People live in dugouts and the ground is such that what little water one cautiously and carefully uses for one's ablutions can easily be despatched to the bowels of the earth at fairly shallow depth with confidence that it will not create a problem for anyone else.

We ought to specify the elevation above sea level below which it will not be permissible for anyone to excavate for purposes of construction of a dugout dwelling at Coober Pedy. No provision exists in law here, or in their by-laws, to prevent that. Circumstances could arise where the water table becomes saturated with water, and, if a dugout has its lower floor below that elevation level at which other people are discharging effluent water, such water from one of the neighbours' dugouts might seep in and cause bacterial bloom to occur on a damp wall surface which would put at risk the health of all the people in that dwelling, regardless of whether or not they are a member of the family which lives there. If someone went inside and touched the wall they might end up extremely ill. That is the reason for my remark about the need for a standard elevation below which it ought not be permissible to construct a home; and also a standard elevation to which depth all water ought to be discharged so that it is below the existing level of dugouts.

Coober Pedy is a unique and remarkable place and, without very much difficulty at all, it ought to be possible for us to use our wits to ensure that we do not allow a situation to develop where public health is put at risk, even though it has not happened to date that I know of: there are no recorded cases. Of course, in the case of the long drops used for lavatories, you can go away on holiday during the hot part of the year and when you come back—not every year, because it is not necessary, but when you feel the long drop needs a clean-up—you drop four to six litres of diesel down the hole and a match behind it and burn it out. It is not a problem: it is a good chimney and clears easily. I did not say 'blow it up': I said 'burn it out'. It burns out quite well if it is composted and has dried out, as it invariably does, and it is a commonplace way of ensuring everything is sustainable for the foreseeable millennia during which Coober Pedy might be occupied.

I do hope that the provision of these STED schemes, properly authorised and defined by these provisions, will be

swiftly implemented because, in the past, I think we have got away with things that will not be and are not sustainable in the long haul. We all know that the indigenous people used to move on when the campsite they were occupying became so soiled as to pose a risk to them. They simply shifted to another camp. We cannot do that because we have established, with the assistance of a fellow named Torrens who stood in this place at one time and introduced the legislation, a lands titles system ensuring that everyone owns the land and lives on the land they own where it is appropriate for a resident to do so.

Therefore, we cannot just move on: we must ensure that the appropriate provisions apply in any and every town throughout the settled areas of South Australia where effluent, which may have been accommodated in the surface water table where it exceeded the capacity of the vegetation to extract it, has built up. It is not in any measure other than as a wet medium containing the bacteria which puts us at risk if we come into contact with it. What is more, I think that in some settlements—and this involves problems which really worried me when I was first elected—the ground water is used for domestic water purposes as well as at the point of discharge. I do not think the local folk knew then what they were doing and what great risk they posed to themselves and the health of their children by doing it. That was sinking or using a proline post hole borer to sink holes in the ground on their blocks at a place called South End and withdrawing the water from 25 to 30 feet and using that around their house.

They did not use it for drinking; they used rain water for that—and they had plenty of it. But that very same water was the water through the sand and shellgrit above it which came from their septic systems, without their realising the seriousness of what was happening. We are fortunate that no epidemics have been recorded, but such practices are not sustainable and must not be allowed to continue. That place, now in the electorate of the member for MacKillop, is not the only place. There are hundreds of other places around South Australia where the township relied in the early days on burying buckets, night soil carts, and the like, and, in more recent times, on septic tanks. If a tank is working, it is fairly safe, but you need only one to be malfunctioning—almost certainly the result of mismanagement and abuse by the people who own it and use it—to poison several people and cause an epidemic. Hence the necessity, in my judgment, for these provisions in Division 2A, clause 20A, and so on.

Yesterday I indicated that there ought to be the opportunity to establish settlements in the Lake Eyre Basin. I am not saying that we all ought to rush up there and try to establish a satellite town called Monarto in memory of the one that did not happen. But I am saying that, whilst that is outside the local government area at present, it is possible to go ahead and do it and that, if ever and when ever we allow the development of such settlements outside the local government areas and, indeed, within the local government areas in some places, attention ought to be given in the Local Government Act to the building code as to the type of buildings that are constructed.

My point is that most of those dwellings, especially in the north of the state, ought to be earth-bermed, that means similar to Coober Pedy: if not completely dug in then at least almost completely dug into the ground by selecting high ground that is firm and above flood events in that locality. And in that high ground excavating the space in which the dwelling is constructed, even using rammed earth behind single-faced boards and then finishing off with the roof

structure on the top being carried on the load-bearing steel, or other beams in the rammed earth surfaces, around the rooms.

That is a much cheaper way of constructing dwellings and living in those areas than could possibly be otherwise obtained, because the earth-bermed dwelling will have an interior temperature that varies only two, or at the very most, three degrees from 20° celsius. That is a known fact in South Australia, and that is regardless of whether it is winter or summer. What is more, it would enable people above ground to construct for themselves an outdoor-type gazebo space with a shaded area for their enjoyment in the open air when the air was cool enough at the beginning or, more particularly, at the end of the day most times of the year.

However, their important and secured facilities would be in the home where it is earth-bermed and cool. In such circumstances, then, provision of the means of disposal of effluent water, both sewage and sullage, needs to be undertaken in the same way as I have suggested is appropriate for Coober Pedy with the same provisions applying, namely, that we know the altitude (literally, elevation above sea level) at which it is not permitted to go below with the lowest level floor of the building and the altitude to which it becomes compulsory to drill the holes for the disposal of the sewage and sullage water, if that is what is to be used. Wet flushes in such climate for sewage, though, really are a waste of time. They are not more effective than Clivus-type lavatories.

The other remark I wish to make about the act which, given a chance, I will raise during the course of the committee stage of the debate, is why the Adelaide City Council needs to get \$40 000 a year from the Highways Fund. That is a trifling and piffling amount to leave in there. It costs a hell of a lot more than that to maintain the carriageways around the perimeter of the parklands, which are there for the benefit of all citizens, anyway, and I do not know that it necessarily ought to be undertaken by the City of Adelaide. I think it better that it is undertaken by contracts let from the Highways Fund straight out and get rid of this stupid bureaucracy which, I am sure, costs more in Christmas cards annually and the exchange of other pleasantries and bureaucracy than it is likely to yield as a benefit. I must say that, again, I was entertained by the remarks of the member for Spence who properly drew attention to the transitional provisions about which I wondered, but I need not have—he was bound to pick them up.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Ms KEY: My question relates to some explanation about which I referred in my contribution earlier. The member for Giles and I are quite interested to hear some further information from the minister about this clause as it directly relates to special provisions relating to Coober Pedy. Could the minister explain the necessity for this amendment with regard to the Food Act.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Under new section 28A, the honourable member will notice that there are three subclauses. Subclauses (1) and (2) are based on section 883 of the Local Government Act, 1934, which is to be repealed by this act. Section 833(3) arose from a select committee report on the Coober Pedy (Local Government Extension Act) Amendment Bill. The exemption in section 883 of the Local Government Act 1934 was a transitional arrangement for the

Coober Pedy council to assist in its progress to full operational council.

As a result, except for the very specific provisions of 883 of the Local Government Act 1934, the Coober Pedy council's operations are now governed by the legislation generally affecting all councils. I also comment that this is the last remaining transitional phase that has resulted from the establishment of the council going back to the time when the council was a progress association. Coober Pedy has, at this point, until 30 June 2002 to take up its responsibilities in performing all functions under the Food Act and the Public and Environmental Health Act. The sunset clause enables Coober Pedy council to assume its responsibilities in this respect prior to that deadline, should it be, of course, in a position to do so.

The amendments are consistent with those that were drafted for the previous Statutes Amendment (Local Government) Bill 1999. I also believe that Coober Pedy council at the present is looking to appoint an authorised officer to take charge of all of the conditions that will be necessary to move this process forward.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Mr LEWIS: When was the amount of \$40 000 to be paid to the Adelaide City Council determined, and why was it fixed at that level? What costs precisely is it intended that the amount should cover?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Because we are dealing with transitional areas from one act to another, I can tell the member that clause 6 is a new section that replaces the existing section 300A of the Local Government Act 1934, which, in turn, dates back to 1948. There has been no request through the Adelaide City Council, of which I am aware, for any change or alteration in that sum, and I advise the member that the \$40 000 is providing a grant of up to \$40 000.

Mr LEWIS: I again ask the minister: what explicit purposes is it intended that the funds should be used for? I see, and can read, new section 42B(2), which provides:

An amount received under subsection (1) must be expended by the council in defraying the cost of operations in connection with roads which abut the Adelaide parklands but do not abut rateable property within the city, and with work associated with such roads.

That is a ring route. This is an anachronism. No other city council gets it. I said in the course of my second reading speech that I believe all the funds that are to be expended on road maintenance around the city ought to be treated like similar roads are treated everywhere else in the metropolitan area, that is, they are the responsibility of the department of road transport. Why pay the city council \$40 000, or up to \$40 000, and still go and meet the costs of all the kerbing and stuff like that that has to be put there, anyway, from state revenue sources? Every public works project that I have looked at, where it is dealing with a piece of the carriageway around the perimeter of the Adelaide City Council area, has been met from allocations made by the department of road transport. So, I am just wondering what the gratuity is for—why we bother to retain it. It seems to be an anachronism.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I advise the member (and I am sure he is aware of this) that the Adelaide City Council operates under a separate act of parliament. As I said, this is a transitional clause. The member read new section 42B(2), which states the answer to the question, as he correctly noted. But what, perhaps, he did not read from subsection (2) is that it applies to roads which abut the Adelaide parklands but do

not abut rateable property within the city. This means that they are not road transport roads; they are, in fact, roads for which the Adelaide City Council has responsibility.

Mr LEWIS: So, the minister is saying that it is not only for roads on the perimeter which are the responsibility of the department of road transport—that is, on the outer perimeter of the parklands, the kerbing opposite the dwellings and commercial properties, or a service road, say, at Victoria Park (as there now is)? As I have just said, whenever work is done on all those roads, it is met from general revenue appropriated to the department of road transport. Is the minister telling me that we are giving the Adelaide City Council up to \$40 000 a year to fix the kerbing on places such as, say, East Terrace, where there are dwellings on one side of the carriageway and none on the other; or South Terrace, where there are dwellings and, say, St Andrew's Hospital, or something like that?

Again, if that is the case, why do we not give \$40 000 to Burnside for maintaining the kerbing adjacent to Hazelwood Park or, for that matter, to any other council which has a bit of kerbing adjacent to a park or reserve area which is used by the general public of South Australia as a picnic meeting place? I do not see why we need to retain a special provision to give the Adelaide City Council up to \$40 000 a year. And the minister has not told me what it is for. She says that the bill refers to 'defraying the cost of operations in connection with the roads'. I do not know what that means exactly—the costs of operations in connection with the roads which abut the Adelaide parklands but do not abut rateable property within the city. So far, I have not received a satisfactory explanation. I know that this is my last chance. I think that either the minister does not know or, alternatively, the minister does know but has not been able to explain it to my thick head.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I will try to make it clear; I thought I had explained. The grant is used in defraying operating costs for roads which abut the Adelaide parklands but do not abut rateable property. We are not talking about perimeters: we are talking about roads within the parklands, with parklands either side. That would be roads such as War Memorial Drive, Sir Lewis Cohen Avenue or Peacock Road. Those areas are under the care and control of the Adelaide City Council. That is what this amount of money does. It does not deal with roads that have no responsibility under the Adelaide City Council but do have responsibility under Transport SA.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 10 passed.

New clause 10A.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I move:

Page 6, after line 1—Insert:

Amendment of s.171—Publication of rating policy

10A. Section 171 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (4) 'each rates notice sent to ratepayers under this chapter' and substituting 'the first rates notice sent to ratepayers under this chapter after the declaration of rates for a particular financial year'.

Amendment carried; new clause inserted.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I move:

Page 6, line 10—After 'land' insert:
or a part of a road.

Amendment carried.

Ms KEY: I seek some clarification from the minister concerning the amended motion of section 201. As I identi-

fied earlier, there has been some concern in the community about community land. Although the community land question has really dealt with the Adelaide City Council and an advertisement that appeared in the *Advertiser* at the end of the year during the festive season, identifying different areas of community land, one of them being the Adelaide Central Market and another, of which I advised the minister, being the Mile End depot in the electorate of Hanson, I ask the minister, for the purposes of this amendment, to amplify what is the definition of 'community land'. I could not find it in the substantive act, so I may simply not have seen it. Will the minister explain the definition of 'community' land and indicate what implications the amended clause would have in those circumstances?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I do not have the actual words of the Local Government Act at the moment regarding community land, but generally community land is that which is owned by the public. Therefore, we regard all local government land as community land unless it is excluded or revoked by a council, and measures are in place, including extensive public consultation, for that to happen. The honourable member brings to our attention circumstances that developed in the festive season, as she called it, in about December, when questions were asked by the Adelaide City Council when it was determining leasing and licensing of stall holders in the Central Market. A great deal of publicity ensued at that time. I am sure the honourable member remembers it well, because I believe it was the Leader of the Opposition and a previous Mayor of the Adelaide City Council who jumped on a certain bandwagon and instilled a great deal of fear among stall holders.

It was suggested that the community land status of the Central Market itself would be revoked and the land sold. As I understand it, the Adelaide City Council was looking at attempting to make a determination concerning the leases and licences held by the stall holders under the Local Government Act as it stood. It appeared to the council from its interpretation of the act that all the financial details of the stall holders and individuals who lease and licence in that area would have to be made public. There was great concern that it was not the intent of the act that commercial enterprises had to provide the financial background of their businesses in terms of making arrangements to lease or licence a holding.

When I was made aware of the public furor that the Leader of the Opposition and Jane Lomax-Smith had created, I looked at the Local Government Act at the time. As has been recognised in this place, the act itself is quite a considerable reform. It also had a degree of flexibility to make a clarification through regulation that would enable the community land status of the Central Market to be maintained, but by regulation we could exclude the fact that the commercial and financial background of market stall holders would have to be released publicly. I made that suggestion to the Adelaide City Council and it was attended to. The Local Government Act sets the community land status very precisely in statute. It provides that it is land owned by local government and, unless there are very good reasons that the public will accept, that land must remain as community land.

Clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (13 to 24) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Local Government): I move:

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Local Government): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): On 30 October 1984 an indenture agreement was signed between the state of South Australia and the Delfin Property Group. This was the beginning of the development of the Golden Grove area, a large area of land which had previously been predominantly farming land. The state government was keen to encourage development of this land, but clearly had some very specific aims and objectives in mind. These aims and objectives have resulted in a special and unique development in South Australia, and one which has been used as a model for further developments both in our state and interstate.

The government wanted land made available to residents of South Australia that was affordable. It wanted to encourage home ownership among those aspiring to establish their first homes, and it wanted to provide a range of housing options for home owners. It wanted planned, integrated and budgeted government services. For the first time it wanted public housing introduced into the Tea Tree Gully area, with a target at that time of 25 per cent of the allotments for Housing Trust homes. These were to be allocated before any allotments were made available for public sale. This was a unique and innovative approach to development, and I believe that on any fair assessment it has in the main been extremely successful. As a resident of Golden Grove I can attest to the fact that it is a very pleasant place in which to live.

The development of Golden Grove is now coming to a close, and before very much longer full responsibility for the maintenance and management of this area will be handed over to the Tea Tree Gully council. Let me point out, however, that the hand-over has been taking place in stages over the entire life of this development. This final hand-over is causing some concern within the community, and that concern is not without some justification. When the indenture was signed back in 1984, the Tea Tree Gully council was not a signatory to the indenture. Not being a signatory to the indenture did not mean, however, that the council was excluded from the decision making processes; in fact, the opposite is true. It was and has been involved in every aspect of the development, right down to the choice of plants to use in our parks and gardens.

However, not being a signatory quite clearly put a number of noses well and truly out of joint. Rather than embrace the development, a culture of underlying hostility developed, and a perception that somehow Golden Grove was taking from other areas of the council permeated throughout the community. A 'them and us' mentality developed and, to some degree, was fostered. The very recent hot summer has escalated the fears throughout the Golden Grove community that the amenity of the area will be allowed to deteriorate once hand-over occurs. In many areas already under the control of the council, mature plantings of trees, shrubs and lawned areas were literally shrivelling before our eyes. If young people in our community had done similar damage to our trees and plants, I can assure the House that they would have been accused of vandalism.

This was happening throughout the entire development and resulted in a deputation of residents going before the

council. The council was clearly impressed with the turn-out of residents—between 100 and 150 on the night—and also with the presentation put forward by the Spring Hill Residents Action Group President, Steve Curtis.

The motion initially put to council was significantly amended ensuring that the public consultation process took place and that residents be kept informed of any decisions or recommendations made by the council. The acceptance of a process of consultation was a great victory for local residents, and in my discussions with Delfin it has indicated its strong support for the establishment of an open process involving the whole community. Council clearly has concerns about the financial impact of Golden Grove on the City of Tea Tree Gully, and that is not unreasonable.

At its meeting on 27 February a motion was passed calling on the state government to conduct an audit of the Golden Grove project. It wants to ensure transparency and accountability for the substantial public expenditure. I do not have a problem with that, but I was bemused to see that discussions held by the council on the same night in relation to the district sports field were held in secret. It seems the council is keen for the state government to be transparent and accountable but is happy to conduct its own business in secret. Anyone reading the minutes could be forgiven for thinking that it is just a little hypocritical.

The financial concerns of the council are not new. At the time of the very first handover some concern about the financial impact of the development on the city generally was raised. As a result of this concern, Touche Ross was engaged to conduct an independent assessment. While I have not seen this report, and it is my intention to request a copy from the mayor, it is my understanding that Touche Ross found that, with all its commitments met, the council would break even on the development around 2002-2003—that is, with all commitments met. That included, among other things, the development of the Greenwich oval, the Wynn Vale community oval, the district sports field and its contribution to the recreation and arts centre.

I understand it did not pay for the Greenwich community oval; that was funded by the two local primary schools that use it. It has sold a portion of the land to fund the Wynn Vale community oval development, a development which should have occurred in 1991-92. The district sports field remains a barren paddock, and this local community has well and truly been led up the garden path about its development with one unsustainable proposal after another announced. The cynical could even suggest this was a deliberate delaying tactic. In any case, the council has been clear that any development will again have to be funded by the sale of a portion of land.

I understand the council met its obligation in relation to the recreational and arts centre, but in return it has a fabulous regional facility, which I venture to say is the envy of many areas. In addition to this, the Community Development Plan 1990, which was endorsed by the joint venture committee and the City of Tea Tree Gully, highlights a number of facilities and services still not provided. These include a library, a shared human services facility, a range of services and initiatives for young people and, of course—and I am sure it comes as no surprise to members of this House—a police station. None have been provided. A purpose-built facility was provided for a library. The anticipated opening date, according to the Community Development Plan, was 1994-95. The facility remains empty—not a book in sight.

It was anticipated that a shared human services facility, accommodating a range of services including the Department for Community Welfare, the Tea Tree Gully Community Health Service, an out-reach of Hillcrest Hospital, the district nurse—the list goes on—would be provided in 1994. In the heart of Golden Grove, in the district centre, we do not even have a doctor. Thirty-five to 40 per cent of the population of Golden Grove is under 19 years of age. The Community Development Plan identified the need to provide services for young people to ensure their positive participation in their community. Funds were allocated to fund a youth development officer for 12 months, with the aim of:

... focusing on the needs, interests and potential of young people living in Golden Grove in order to provide opportunities for personal and community development, skill attainment, communication between youth and adults, and choice in regard to lifestyles and leisure pursuits.

Again, there is no argument from me about those aspirations. My only concern is that it has not happened. I have long pushed for the Tea Tree Gully council to employ a youth officer and for it to establish positive avenues for young people to participate in a meaningful way in our community, but nothing happens. As far as the police station is concerned, the House knows only too well the saga behind that. This House knows only too well about the stalling/delaying tactics and excuses for not providing this essential service, a service identified back in 1990 in the Community Development Plan, and promised with the introduction of Focus 21 and the closure of the Tea Tree Gully patrol base.

All these facilities are not the sole responsibility of the Tea Tree Gully council. However, in any assessment, it would be fair to say that a number of obligations are yet to be met. I am sure that these issues will attract considerable community debate as the consultation process gets under way. There is little doubt, I believe, that Golden Grove has contributed significantly to the city of Tea Tree Gully. In the year 2000-2001, residents attracted rates in excess of \$8 million. The suburb of Golden Grove alone had a rate increase of 19.7 per cent; Greenwich, 12.3 per cent; and Wynn Vale—lucky Wynn Vale—only 10.8 per cent. The residents of the Golden Grove development have, I believe, provided a real financial boost to the Tea Tree Gully City Council. The council needs to embrace the benefits of this development and use it to benefit the wider community. It is counterproductive to take a negative attitude.

During his presentation to council, Mr Curtis made the very salient point: how silly would Salisbury council look if it rejected Mawson Lakes; if it said that it wanted Mawson Lakes to mirror the older areas of council. Instead, it embraces it and is using it.

Golden Grove was not established to be a stand-alone development or to stand aside from other areas. It was not established as an area for wealthy home owners, and it was not established to be a drain on council. It was established to provide a wide range of housing options for ordinary families wanting the benefit of affordable home ownership. It was established as a model development, not a prestige development.

None of these residents are asking council to give them anything they themselves have not contributed to and paid for: all they are asking for is to have what they paid for to be maintained. I am hopeful that in the very near future we will see a sea change of attitude on the part of the Tea Tree Gully City Council as the consultation process proceeds.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): Here it is, just after 6 o'clock on Wednesday. At about the same time yesterday, even though the standing orders provide that the House will sit on Tuesday nights and Wednesday nights after the dinner adjournment, we adjourned. Notwithstanding the fact that the government does not have any legislation because it has run out of ideas—it really is dead on its feet—there are on the *Notice Paper* a substantial number of matters outstanding in the category of committee reports to be noted and/or adjourned orders of the day on those committee reports.

In all, apart from what we have done today, there remain 11 items to deal with. If we then look at private members' bills/committees/regulations, in addition to those 11 we see that there are another 18, making 29 items in all. In orders of the day under the same topic there are a further 17 which, in my arithmetic calculation, takes us to 46 matters. If I look further at other motions, notices of motion, which are listed for tomorrow and which we could be using this time to deal with, in all there are 22, and in my simple arithmetic, that takes us up to 68 matters to be dealt with.

Beyond that, under orders of the day, adjourned debate on motions, there are five, and that takes it up to 73. We have only 2½ hours tomorrow to deal with those 73 matters. In my calculation, that means that if we were to give them equal amounts of time that would be two minutes for each matter if we were to deal with them tomorrow. No-one expects us to deal with them tomorrow, and many of us know that a good number of those orders of the day and other matters listed under private members' time will take well over an hour of debate before they satisfy the desire on the part of members to deal with the substantial elements within each of those topics.

My distress is that the government does not give a damn about private members' ideas. You have only to look at some of the stuff that the government members have moved: most of it is inane and will not accomplish anything. It is the kind of thing where they move to commend the Callithumpian flower weaving society for winning first prize in the exhibition for dried arrangements held in the capital of Kiribati two years ago, or whenever. We never get to their motions, so they are still sitting there.

I am distressed to find, though, that members in this place who are equal with all ministers and government backbenchers are denied the opportunity to ventilate those matters which we believe will contribute to the enhancement of the standard of living in South Australia and to the enhancement of the life we lead, not just the means we need to live it—and, for that matter, the enhancement of the way in which government can be run.

I will not refer to any one particular matter to illustrate my point: I will leave that for honourable members to contemplate when they find later in the session, as we come to its conclusion, that there is a heap of matters on which they would like to have had a say, perhaps, and will not be able to do so. The government alone is not guilty: the opposition is just as guilty, because it has chosen to agree with the government to adjourn early, last night and again tonight. That is all very well: there is no reason why the House cannot suspend the standing orders to such an extent to make it possible for us to deal with these matters while we have the facility of having the House sitting.

Those of us who have to come some distance to get here have already incurred the expense and sacrificed the time to be here. We have come from our country electorates to be in the city for the purpose of having parliament sit. It might be

all very well for those who live around the city to know that they can come back tomorrow after having a good night tonight, and drive in from wherever they are. They only have to make local calls to catch up with constituents. However, the rest of us, if we do not make those calls from here and are unaware of what calls might be required of us until later in the evening, have to meet the cost of making extended local service area calls, or what were formerly called trunk calls (STD calls, or whatever you like) from our mobile phones. I do not think that is efficient, and I think it is quite wrong for the government to think it can get away with it, and the opposition is equally guilty for agreeing to it. Only four of us are Independents, and I am not sure of the attitudes of the other three on the matter. However, I am angry.

Let me turn to another matter to which I drew attention in the grievance debate in the middle of last year. Imagine buying a ticket for \$35 if you were on a weekly allowance of \$10, \$15 or \$20 a week. You save up to buy a ticket to a concert which is billed as a very good concert and one in which you have an interest: you would be mortally offended and expect your money to be refunded if the concert was never held, never performed, never provided. I drew attention to this problem last July. Indeed, I drew attention to it before that, but I did it in a grievance debate. I have written letters and I am getting nowhere: no-one is responding to it. It seems to me that people in Consumer Affairs are too lazy to do anything about it. Young people bought concert tickets in December 1999 and January 2000 to go to a concert which featured—at least in the promotion material—The Likwit Crew and The Alkaholiks. They were, at that time, two very popular bands from the United States. Well, it never happened, and the promoter has been allowed to rip them off, take their money and just walk away. No-one from Consumer Affairs has done anything about it and not one minister has lifted a finger. The Minister for Youth Affairs ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr Clarke: Consumer Affairs.

Mr LEWIS: Consumer Affairs, too; they should be equally ashamed of themselves. This applies also to the people in the Department of Consumer Affairs who assured me on Monday 18 September. I made a note of the fact. Most of the time people get back to you, but they are not only not getting back to me, they are also not getting back to the young people who have written letters and complained about the rip-off that has occurred; and they have nearly given up on it. But, when I was contacted again about the matter recently, I said that I would not give up. On that day, Monday 18 September, I raised the matter with a Kirsty Pickering, to whom I was referred in the Department of Consumer Affairs and who said she would call me back. Well, I have not heard from her; I have not heard from her upline manager; and I have not heard from the minister. The matter goes on.

It was detailed in *Hansard* on 5 July last year when I drew attention to a statement that had been provided to me by one of the people who had bought a ticket for \$35 from their savings. I think it is not just crook: it is absolutely wicked that con men can operate like that and rip off young people and the government does not care. Yet, if it was one of us or someone of our generation, they would care all right. I have heaps of tickets here that have been sent to me, and the concert has never been held. The people's names are on the back of them, and I think it is about time—

Mr Clarke: Go to the small claims court.

Mr LEWIS: Well, you can't because they cannot identify the name of the sod who ran the show or said that he would run the show, although I have given the details of his description and the name of the business that took the money, namely, American Boulevard, to the Department of Consumer Affairs, and I thought that it would have referred it to the police fraud squad to be dealt with. It is about time that it was tidied up. For his pains, the sod ought to be stripped of a few thousand dollars if he does not go behind bars, having done something like that, only to walk away with impunity. Any one of those people would be prepared to testify as to the identify of the person, but not knowing the name. If American Boulevard or its proprietors at that time revealed who was in charge of their business affairs, I am quite sure an identity parade would reveal just who perpetrated the fraud on these young people.

I now turn briefly to another matter, namely, the idiocy of

the situation that obtains in Rockleigh and places in that neighbourhood connected to the Caloote exchange where, if people make a phone call to, for example, the Mannum hospital, which is the hospital most have supported during the course of their life, or in fact ring any hospitals around about, whether up to the hills or Mannum, they will be referred to a telephone number in Berri, and it is not a toll free number. They have to make an STD call to Berri to tell Berri that they need an ambulance. That is very much at odds with the statement made by the minister today in the course of his remarks that there is nothing more important to the government than people's safety—

Time expired.

Motion carried.

At 6.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 15 March at 10.30 a.m.