

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 4 April 2001

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

Members interjecting:

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

GAMBLING REFORM

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I wish to make a statement in relation to the significant progress my government has made in the area of gambling reform. A number of us have said, 'Enough is enough', when it comes to poker machine numbers. That is still my view. But, importantly, it is time to do more to tackle the ongoing issue of problem gambling. It is time to set up a regulatory system to manage the gambling industry in a cohesive fashion; institute measures to prevent problem gambling; and provide assistance to those people for whom gambling has become an addiction.

The House will recall that last year we put in place a temporary freeze on gaming machine applications, at which time I undertook to come back to this place with a comprehensive approach to problem gambling. That review process has now been completed, and I have been given a substantial list of recommendations which we intend to put to the House soon. I want to place on record my appreciation for the efforts of the review group who have worked together on this key social issue. The gaming machine review was chaired by Graham Ingerson, member for Bragg, and the members were Angus Redford, MLC—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Spence!

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Members of the review group also included Stephen Richards, Chair, Heads of Christian Churches Task Force on Gambling; Dale West, Executive Director, Centacare Catholic Family Services; Mark Henley, Senior Policy Adviser, Adelaide Central Mission; Peter Hurley, President, Australian Hotels Association; John Lewis, General Manager, Australian Hotels Association; and Bill Cochrane, Vice President, Clubs SA. The group consulted widely and received submissions from a variety of sources, including members of parliament, the Leader of the Opposition among them.

One of the key recommended reforms is the establishment of an independent gambling authority. The new authority will have regulatory responsibility for all gambling activities in South Australia. Importantly, it will have responsibility for regulating existing industry codes of practice. In the case of gaming, this makes a number of measures enforceable across the state, such as the installation of clocks in venues, the ban on the cashing of cheques in venues, and the ban on gambling while intoxicated.

The authority's functions will be extended to incorporate research and to report on the social and economic impacts of gambling. It is proposed that the authority will become the government's principal gambling research body.

We have accepted the review group's recommendation that the freeze on gaming machine numbers be extended for a further two years. This will mean that one of the IGA's first tasks will be to ascertain whether, at the end of that period, the freeze on gaming machines in South Australia should continue, or whether any other mechanism to address gaming machine numbers should be introduced. This will have two valuable consequences. First, no new gaming machine licences would be approved for a minimum period of 2½ years—that is, from 7 December last year. Secondly, any permanent measures will be based on detailed research. We will also act to establish a minister for gambling so that the functions of the Treasurer can be separated from the gambling regulation.

Notwithstanding these significant reforms, the review has identified a number of changes that can be implemented as soon as possible to help counter problem gambling. These include:

- Banning of autoplay facilities on all gaming machines in South Australia. Removal of this function requires the player to make conscious decisions regarding each game cycle and will minimise the incidence of players playing more than one machine at the same time.
- Specifically banning the introduction of note acceptors on all gaming machines in South Australia. While note acceptors have not been approved by the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner to date—this will ensure that they can never be installed in South Australia.
- Establishment of a barring register for problem gamblers to be administered by the authority. Those persons on the register will not be permitted to enter gaming venues. Gamblers may voluntarily elect to place themselves on the register; gaming venue operators can also recommend that a person be placed on the list. Numerous problem gamblers have informed the committee that they would feel more comfortable being barred by a third party such as the authority.
- A daily limit to be enforced on all cash withdrawals from ATM and EFTPOS facilities on premises that contain gaming machines (proposed limit—\$200 per day). Controls on ready access to cash are seen as a key mitigating factor against problem gambling.
- The minimum rate of return on new gaming machines will be increased from 85 per cent to 87.5 per cent.
- It should be noted that these amendments are proposed to apply to all gaming venues in South Australia, including the Adelaide Casino.

These measures will have an impact in South Australia. They will also impact on licensed clubs throughout the state. The government has funded a study into a range of issues impacting on licensed clubs in this state, including that of gaming machines. It is my understanding that the clubs industry is seeking an equitable position relative to the hotels industry. Upon receipt of that report, it is my intention to review the options presented in relation to licensed clubs. I commend the work of the Gaming Machine Review to the House. We now have an opportunity to put in place the most comprehensive gambling controls in the nation.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I bring up the 14th report of the committee and move:

That the report be received and read.

Motion carried.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I bring up the 15th 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): My question is directed to the Premier. Given today's statement by the Minister for Human Services that 'Governments run the public hospital system and governments have to provide the funds for that,' why has the government underfunded hospitals by \$35 million over the past four years; and will the Premier approve the minister's specific budget request for an extra \$35 million in this year's budget to wipe out these hospital debts? On radio today, the Minister for Human Services said that public hospitals in South Australia had run up debts totalling \$35 million over a period of three to four years.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Human Services.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: The question was directed to the Premier, sir.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): That is correct. In fact, I think that I gave information about this in the estimates committee last year. I gave information about it several months ago in answer to a question. The total debt is somewhere around \$35 million to \$39 million, depending on what you include in that debt and over what period you take the debt; but it is an accumulated debt and we have been having ongoing discussions with Treasury as to how to treat that. So far, it has been funded in cash terms by the Department of Human Services. We have raised with Treasury the extent to which that should now be brought to account in terms of the accounts and therefore dealt with.

Treasury has been working through with us as part of the bilaterals for this year's budget. There is nothing unusual about that: it has been known outside this place. In fact, I think that the member for Elizabeth, or some member in this House, when a green document was talked about in this House several weeks ago, mentioned the fact that we had specifically asked for this. So, there is absolutely nothing new about this at all.

In terms of the cash side of it, we have been handling it within the Department of Human Services. The hospitals have been handling it in terms of the accumulated loss. Most of it, in fact, relates to the North Western Adelaide Health Service. The North Western Adelaide Health Service had a—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —\$12.6 million ongoing debt from quite a few years ago, in addition to an accumulated debt of \$7.1 million projected by the end of this financial year at the Lyell McEwin Hospital and \$6 million at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Members will see that the bulk of that debt involves the North Western Adelaide Health Service. I am sure that when the budget comes down there will be some form of answer involving the specifics as to how Treasury wants to handle this in accounting terms, but up until now the Department of Human Services has carried that

load from the hospitals, and I stress that they have not had to suffer from the cash flow implications of that debt.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Hart!

INFORMATION ECONOMY

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Can the Minister for Information Economy advise the House of the benefits to South Australians of cheaper high-speed connections to the internet?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Information Economy): This question relates to something which will be, frankly, a determinant of South Australia's economic future, particularly in rural and regional South Australia. This government provided a blueprint for developing an information economy in South Australia when the Premier in August last year launched the policy 'Information Economy 2002—Delivering the Future'. That actually contrasts greatly with the platform for government of the Labor opposition which devotes five paragraphs to the information industry.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Labor opposition platform makes four references to information technology and it makes no reference at all to the information economy. What that means is that the policy vacuum of the opposition in fact reinforces the view that the Labor opposition does not realise that the information economy contains a lot of elements of social policy, as well as any policy involving where the ones and zeros go. If one looks at the ALP platform for government, one can only suggest that it might have been written by Fred and Wilma Flintstone. The government's IE 2002 policy was noted in the Adelaide media as follows:

In one stroke, places South Australia in the vanguard of e-commerce in our part of the world. It sends a message of constructive flexibility and it will create a perception of the state as a place with a positive future—if the government follows through.

I am delighted to inform the House today that, indeed, the government is doing just that and in fact following through and delivering the policies. Less than an hour ago, I was with senior executives of Telstra—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: —where there were some significant outcomes quite deliberately following from a part of the government's IE 2002 policy. I know that the member for Flinders and all rural South Australian members and constituents will be particularly interested in this: Telstra has announced that all South Australians will have access to the internet at metropolitan prices with untimed local calls. That is an absolutely significant advance, because it means that the whole of South Australia will get access to the highest quality service at equitable prices, whether they are a student in Booborowie, a farmer in Yorketown or a rural resident somewhere in Waikerie or wherever.

The announcements quite deliberately build on the Pathway SA initiative which was announced in December 1999 and brought 19 extra points of presence into rural South Australia. In addition, not only will rural and regional South Australia benefit from a flow-on from the government's policies but Telstra today announced the commissioning of the broadband cable system in metropolitan Adelaide which is a major significant step forward into the information

economy future. It allows between 40 and 50 per cent now, growing with demand, of Adelaide homes to benefit from what some commentators have called AORTA (Always On Real-Time Access) to the internet. That means that there is no dial up and all that sort of stuff; you just plug in and you are available to the world at broadband speed. I am sure that those members opposite who have tried to use the internet—and I hope that some of them have—would be tired of waiting for data-rich downloads. Frankly, it takes too long. As of tomorrow when this system is commissioned, that will change. That means there will be availability of streaming videos, CD quality sound, word access to e-commerce and a range of other services and interactive opportunities for our economy.

As I have said before, information economy policy is not just about industry development. It relates to bringing the community together to bridge what a number of commentators have called the digital divide. It is our goal to make sure that no-one misses out on participating in the advantages of the information economy, unless they make a choice to do so. We cannot actually dragoon people into taking opportunities, but we would want the only people to be left out to be those people who have made a personal choice to do so. Telstra's announcement today as part of the IE 2002 policy certainly delivers the infrastructure which means that promise will become a reality. Whilst Fred and Wilma still have not worked out what the information economy is, we on this side of the chamber are busy delivering the future. We are ensuring that South Australia is the envy of other states, that we are most connected state and that we are able to take advantage of everything that the world offers through the information economy. Frankly, to quote Rove McMannus and Adam Hills yesterday, South Australians might say: 'Go you big red fire engine!'

HOSPITAL OVERDRAFTS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Given the minister's denial that hospitals had been asked to fund their debts with overdrafts at private banks and the minister's statement that he would not approve hospitals having overdrafts, why are hospitals already using bank overdrafts to fund their operations? In an interview on radio this morning, the minister said:

... and in terms of raising an overdraft with a private bank, that would require my approval and that of the Treasurer, and I can tell you I wouldn't allow that to occur.

Annual reports show that in the year 2000 the Royal Adelaide Hospital had a bank overdraft of \$1.7 million; in 1998 the Queen Elizabeth Hospital had a bank overdraft of \$3 million; in 1999 Noarlunga Health Services had a bank overdraft of \$193 000; and in 1999 the Julia Farr Centre had a bank overdraft of \$196 000.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): What the honourable member fails to quote is what I said on radio this morning—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I said on radio this morning that any hospital accounts are made up of a broad combination of a whole range of accounts. Some of them are research accounts, private fee accounts, equipment accounts, research and development accounts—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will be heard in silence.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —and some of them are donations from the community. Then you have the part which is the publicly funded public hospital side of it. What I have indicated—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Exactly, and for the public hospital side of it we would not allow them to go out and raise money against the private banking sector. That is the case. That is fully funded by the Department of Human Services. Because the public hospitals are large teaching hospitals, they carry on a range of other activities for which they have bank accounts; one would expect it. For instance, they get substantial moneys each year from the National Health and Medical Research Foundation. They are paid at certain periods. They have to be able to fund that—they know the money is coming, but they have to be able to fund it.

The Hon. J.W. Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The point I have made and which I reiterate is that we would not allow the public hospitals to go out and raise overdrafts against private banks to fund public hospital activities.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They are not—they are raising that money to fund other activities within the hospital, and I have already explained that. I suggest that the honourable member sit down and reads the full transcript of what I talked about this morning, because I made it extremely clear indeed.

ELECTRICITY, NATIONAL MARKET

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): You might get a surprise at what is going to happen. Will the Premier update the House on his calls for a national review of the national electricity market?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I thank the member for Bragg for his question because it is an important one. I indicated recently that we would put in place a task force to review the impact of the national electricity market on South Australia. In addition, I indicated that in South Australia, as with New South Wales and Victoria, there are unintended consequences flowing from the national electricity market. I also called for a national review of the market and for the leaders of the states and territories to be given the opportunity to debate this issue.

I also indicated to the House that I had written to the Prime Minister to ask him to put it on the agenda of COAG's (or the equivalent of the Premiers' Conference) next meeting. This was the same approach as last year, when the House would be aware that we asked for the rehabilitation of the Murray-Darling Basin system to be placed on the Premiers' Conference agenda; that was agreed to. The outcome of that is stage one of a rehabilitation or salinity strategy to look at the eventual rehabilitation of the whole Murray-Darling Basin system and the Murray River, which is so important to us.

I report to the House today that the Prime Minister has agreed to list South Australia's call for a top level review of the national electricity market for the next meeting of the Council of Australian Governments in June. That is an important first step forward. States and territories will now debate the need for a national review as part of the broader discussion that is needed in this country about the direction

of Australia's energy policy. This is one component of Australia's energy policy that ought to be debated.

I have also called—and will reiterate at the Premiers' Conference or COAG meeting—for a ministerial council to be established to oversee the workings of the national electricity market. This will allow the states and territories to have a direct input to the performance of the national market and, importantly—and I note that New South Wales and Victoria with Labor governments are equally concerned and want to debate this issue, as does South Australia—ensure that there is from a government and political perspective an input in terms of the operation of the market. It is not simply as the Keating model had it: separated from the political process and oversight.

Let us not forget that the national electricity market, which we are bound to comply with under competition payments and principles, was put in place by the Keating Labor government. The model operating across—

Mr Foley: Signed off by Dean Brown.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I can understand the sensitivity of the member for Hart. He is the person who expects credibility after standing on a picket line to oppose Pelican Point and in the same breath going out and complaining about generating capacity. Where is the credibility of the member for Hart on this issue? It is absolutely zilch—zero! The national market that we have to comply with was a Keating Labor government model, and there is no argument about that. In fact, the National Competition Commissioner is the model that we have to comply with.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Now, 18 years into the model put forward by Mr Keating, it is an appropriate time to look at—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Elder.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —the national electricity market—how the theory is being put into practice, what the unintended consequences are and what we need to do to minimise those unintended consequences. I certainly welcome the fact that New South Wales and Victoria have acknowledged this call as a national problem and have supported our call for a national review. It is in contrast—

Mr Conlon: It's a bit too late.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Elder says this is a bit too late. The member for Elder—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The member for Hart, who has now gone silent on this—and he might well be silent on this issue at the moment—has taken up this issue in an attempt to inflame it. Labor produced this model but does not want to be part of the solution. At least Labor in New South Wales and Labor in Victoria are looking to and want to be part of the solution. It is like the State Bank: they created the problem but were not interested in a solution to the problem, because it was simply too hard. There are hard options.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I state for the record that Premier Dean Brown signed off on the electricity market.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I remind members of the rule regarding frivolous points of order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In reply to the very frivolous point of order—

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: In reply to the frivolous interjection by the member for Hart, I remember, as this model was being developed under the Bannon-Arnold Labor government with the Keating Labor government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Minister for Police.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —that it was the member for Hart who was the principal adviser to Lynn Arnold who actually developed this message of—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: So, let us not have any more hypocrisy of Labor in South Australia, standing on the sidelines and wanting to criticise. We have Labor's model, and we will carefully work through the solutions to it. The contrast could not be more stark. Labor in Victoria and Labor in New South Wales want to fix it: Labor in South Australia just wants the political gain. They want to raise the issue but they do not want to be part of the solution. It is typical of the Labor Party, which has no idea, no policies and no intention of creating a policy.

HARRIS SCARFE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Given the profitability of Harris Scarfe's South Australian stores, what progress has been made in the Premier's negotiations to secure a positive future for the company's 1500 employees in this state? Following the Premier's discussions with Harris Scarfe's bankers, is he confident that the voluntary administrator, Michael Dwyer, will continue to allow the company to trade and run it as a going concern in order to avoid the imminent appointment of a receiver imposed by the ANZ?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

Mr Wright interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): This is a serious issue, and I would ask members to at least treat the issue with the degree of seriousness that it deserves. I indicated to the leader yesterday that my endeavours would be to ensure that we get a position where Harris Scarfe can continue to trade, that as best we can we secure the jobs of the workers in the Harris Scarfe stores and, thirdly and importantly, that the 5 000-odd creditors who have supplied goods and services to Harris Scarfe be paid as much as possible. In that way we will avoid the domino effect for small and medium businesses which might have supplied goods to Harris Scarfe, which now do not get paid and which in turn through no fault of their own are put in a dire set of financial circumstances.

As I have indicated to the House I have had a number of discussions with the directors, as has the CEO of my department, in terms of wanting to liaise, facilitate, cooperate and broker, in a sense, between the parties the maximum opportunity for the voluntary administrator to discharge his duties. We are not conversant with all the circumstances. Some of what has been put to me about the management of

the accounts of Harris Scarfe over the past five or six years is a significant worry. There has been good endeavour by the former chairman and current chairman and principal shareholder of Harris Scarfe to work their way through. I would simply say that, from the dealings I have had with the Trescowthick family in the past couple of days as they have worked assiduously to try to meet the three objectives I have talked about, I commend them for at least taking this initiative and trying to work their way through the issues they are now confronted with. We are not conversant with all the details.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am going to get to that part of the question if you give me half a chance. It is important to put this in some context. At the request of the directors I have had discussions with the principal bankers in relation to outstanding amounts. The outstandings with the financial institutions are a lot higher than I first thought they might be. The financial institutions have a duty of care to their shareholders to minimise any losses that might occur in any finalisation. I am encouraged, however, by reports that Harris Scarfe in Adelaide is a profitable operation—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, in South Australia. If you separate the operations in a number of the other states, the Harris Scarfe South Australian operations are profitable. They have a high turnover rate of stock in terms of the retail industry. It is my understanding that they turn over stock on an annual basis at a greater rate than applies in the retail industry generally in Australia. Therefore, in discussions I have had with a number of financial institutions, they have indicated to me that they would anticipate that in any recapitalisation that might have to take place there could be a number of purchasers for ongoing operations of Harris Scarfe. That brings about greater certainty for the work force in Harris Scarfe, and that is one of our key priorities.

I have put to the financial institutions that it would be in the interests of the voluntary administrator and those like the Trescowthick family who are trying to work through this assiduously—at least as it has been explained to me and as I understand on the information given to me—to get an outcome in the best interests of all the parties. To facilitate that, the voluntary administrator might be the best course for a period of time until such time as we can be fully conversant with the circumstances.

A financial institution that has a very substantial exposure in this matter will at the end of the day make a commercial decision. I cannot vary what their commercial decision would be, but for putting in place guarantees. I have indicated to the House, to the directors of the company and the bankers that the government of South Australia is not in a position to contemplate a guarantee being put in place in the current circumstances that are before us. That being the case, we have no leverage other than an attempt to persuade them to defer any other action they might take to protect their position. Of course, at the end of the day the banks will make a commercial decision. They have given me an undertaking that they would speak to me before taking any other action. I take on face value that they will do that, because the discussions to date have been cooperative in terms of wanting to minimise the downside for all the parties concerned with Harris Scarfe.

I cannot be more definitive other than stating that the government is not considering providing a guarantee, an underwriting or a cash injection, and I do not think the circumstances as put on the table to me at the moment would

demonstrate that that would be an appropriate course of action. That being the case, as I have said, our leverage in terms of the bankers is one of persuasion rather than alternative financial support to underpin their commercial decisions. In fact, the banks have responded to our requests to date. They have held action which, as of last Friday, was going to be well before this point in time.

So, I thank the banks for at least responding positively to our initial request to allow a voluntary administrator to be put in place. I understand that the voluntary administrator has made quite good progress in identifying the core of the problem—that is, how the sequence of events has unfolded. I am sure that a number of regulatory authorities will be interested in this matter eventually.

Suffice to say, we will continue to cooperate but without any exposure of taxpayers' funds at this stage in an endeavour to try to bring about the three key objectives I have mentioned before: a continuation of trading—a restructuring and recapitalisation of the company so that it can continue to trade; jobs being created; and, as best we can, getting a return for those who have supplied goods and services for the creditors to Harris Scarfe.

DRY ZONE, CITY

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): Can the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services advise the House whether the police believe a dry zone is beneficial in maintaining law and order in our streets?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. I am pleased to advise the member and also the parliament that the police certainly are supportive of a dry zone. The Commissioner of Police went on the public record saying, 'Police welcome the council's decision,' and 'The police are strongly supportive of a dry zone trial.'

This is not a recent decision of the police department in Adelaide. In fact, late last year police publicly came out and in effect really encouraged a call for a dry zone not just in Victoria Square alone but importantly for the whole of the CBD. If one goes back a lot longer than that, one sees that the police have historically been calling for this for a long period of time.

Mr Condous: Why didn't it happen?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: We will talk about that in a minute. I acknowledge that police have been wanting to see this dry zone as a way of being more effective in dealing with drunken behaviour and crime that is unfortunately and sadly associated with it. Whilst I will not go into the details of it, it is my understanding that the police department did put a confidential submission to the Adelaide City Council documenting the reasons why the police believed that this was so important.

As I indicated to the House yesterday, there is clearly a situation where the police were trying to control the safety of the streets of Adelaide with one arm tied behind their back. This will free that arm and give them two arms to enable them to police properly. Like the government, the police do support the dry zone trial, and I will explain why.

Police, more than anyone in this community, are acutely aware of the cycle of violence that does result from drunkenness. They are aware that a dry zone is an important part of a solution in allowing them to deal with criminal behaviour before it starts. Right across the state, wherever I go—

including in my own electorate—dry zones that have been put in place in areas such as the Esplanade and in the Onkaparinga and Alexandrina council areas have proven to help police keep street safety.

The police, the government and the community clearly know that if we take alcohol out of the mix of problems we have a lot better chance of addressing the crime problem. Unfortunately, whilst the police, the community and the government know that, the fact is that the Labor Party does not know that.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The member for Peake says it is not true. I would ask him to listen to this. They are so lost on this issue that the Labor Party cannot agree amongst themselves what should happen. First of all we had a silence for 12 long months, where there was no comment whatsoever from the opposition on what they would do to keep the streets of Adelaide safe if they ever got a chance in government. Of course, there was some comment from the candidate for Adelaide, the previous Lord Mayor—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:—the only comment that the member for Peake might want to listen to. What the Labor candidate said was that dry zones will not make the streets safe. That is what she said when she was in charge of the city of Adelaide, and that is why dry zones did not occur. Now, of course, after months of silence, this morning I heard the Leader of the Opposition saying, ‘A dry zone sounds good, but it will not work if it is not linked with a range of other social supports and services, and without those social supports, without an infrastructure of support’—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Was the Leader of the Opposition in the House yesterday? Was he listening? I think not, because the Premier made a statement yesterday where again the Premier offered \$500 000 for the infrastructure but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Spence for the second time for disrupting the House.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The Labor leader clearly, again, did not listen to the Premier. The Premier has, on behalf of the South Australian community, led the debate on this matter. The council has listened, and this is a good outcome for keeping our streets safe. It is no good trying to be a do-gooder in the Labor Party—you have to be an action party—not a party that does not get on with the business. Today we have seen a Labor Party that has, again, reinforced to the community of South Australia that they are soft on drugs, soft on crime and soft on decisions. Effectively, what we have seen with the Labor Party is that they are absolutely split and divided on this issue about dry zones in this state. That is why the Leader of the Opposition has been silent for so long.

In conclusion—and of interest and very relevant to this debate—when members look at their desk calendar today, they will notice a quote that is relevant to the silence of the Leader of the Opposition on dry zones for 12 months. It says—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader for the third time. I would like him to bear in mind that it is automatic now that if he interjects once more his future is in the hands of the House and not mine. He will be automatically named if he interjects once more.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The desk calendar quote to which I refer is very appropriate to the Leader of the Opposition’s silence on this issue and his procrastination on all important issues where we need genuine bipartisanship—there was an opportunity here for that and it was not delivered: ‘An easy job seems mighty hard if you keep putting off doing it.’ The Liberal government is doing it and the Leader of the Opposition is dodging it.

Members interjecting:

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

HOSPITALS, LOANS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Given the minister’s statements to the estimates committee on 21 June 2000 that Treasury would compensate health services for the cost of implementing the GST, what requests did the minister make to the Treasurer for extra funding to meet the cash flow crisis in our hospitals before asking hospitals to take out loans? On radio today, the minister said that his department had been talking to hospitals about taking out SAFA loans because of a \$10 million cash flow crisis created by the GST.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): As the honourable member has said, publicly I gave evidence to the Senate inquiry and acknowledged and was asked specific questions about the impact of the GST. I pointed out then that there were going to be long-term benefits in terms of reduced prices but that that would take a while to flow through but there would be an immediate cash flow problem. Although hospitals are GST free, they still have to pay GST on a large number of items and then be recompensed by the commonwealth government.

If I look across the whole of the Department of Human Services, that cash flow implication is about \$10 million at any one time. In addition, there are other matters, which I will not go into. There are problems in terms of the compensation in the housing sector in various areas which will flow through. So, the hospitals are confronted with a specific issue, that is, that they must fund their part of the \$10 million across the Department of Human Services. That is an issue about which we have talked to the Treasury.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am talking about ‘we’—the department has talked to Treasury about this and we are looking at how to fund that by the end of this year, which is when we will need to overcome the cash flow problems of the individual hospitals.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Will the Minister for Human Services advise the House on the latest equipment installed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to help treat cancer patients more effectively?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I attended the Royal Adelaide Hospital Cancer Centre just before lunch today to launch the latest linear accelerator and the three dimensional planning system for radiotherapy. As Professor Olver and Dr Yeoh pointed out, this equipment makes the Cancer Centre at the Royal Adelaide Hospital the best equipped cancer centre in the southern hemisphere. The centre now produces a range of equipment and, most importantly, the three dimensional planning system for radiotherapy allows MRI and PET scans

to come together to look at, quite uniquely, both the physical tumour and the biological tumour, which allows therefore the radiotherapy to be directed very carefully and accurately.

The objective of the latest linear accelerator creates a three dimensional beam from three different directions. The beam targets specifically the tumour. It is extremely accurate without all the heavy lead weights that have had to be used in the past. This piece of equipment can, within a couple of millimetres, very accurately define the exact location of that tumour. I saw on screen a live example of what was currently occurring within theatre as a person was, in fact, being irradiated. The accuracy with which a tumour can be pinpointed, in addition to the dosage, is quite remarkable.

Very importantly, now, this allows those people performing the procedure to come very close to other vital organs that could not possibly be irradiated because of the accuracy of this information. In particular, the linear accelerator that I launched today is being used almost completely for paediatric work. I was told that the hospital was treating a 3½ year old boy who had a massive tumour at the base of the brain where it joins the spine and, with incredible accuracy, doctors are now able to treat that. The benefit is that it is possible to provide a higher dosage for the tumour and to reduce the damage done to healthy tissues nearby.

It is now possible to direct the treatment very specifically at the tumour and to no other part of the body; and to ensure that the period of dosage is reduced quite substantially as a result of the accuracy and intensity of the treatment. What does this mean to people in South Australia? It means that now, probably, they have the best cancer treatment they will find anywhere in Australia and, in fact, the results are showing it. If one looks at South Australia and, for instance, the five year survival rates from breast cancer, one can see that we have the highest rate in a 12 country comparison around the world—the highest rate; something like an 81 per cent, 82 per cent survival rate in five years from breast cancer. Compare that to, say, the UK where it is about 61 per cent. We have the second highest five year survival rates for colon cancer and lung cancer in this comparison. Not only do we have the best equipment but also we are now producing some of the best results in terms of survival of people from breast cancer and other forms of cancer.

The other statistic where this shows through in terms of the quality of care is that for the first time last year South Australia had an actual drop in deaths from cancers, even though over the past 20 years the incidence of cancer has grown by about 20 per cent and continues to grow by at least 20 per cent over each 20 year period. So, there is a significant increase in the incidence of cancer. There is also a significant increase in the diagnosis of cancer, yet the death rate from cancer is actually falling in total numbers.

This shows that the treatment we are able to provide now, thanks to the medical and nursing staff and also a very substantial investment in a number of different programs, is starting to reap a benefit for the South Australian community. I pay a tribute as well to teams such as the BreastScreen team, because we have the highest participation rate in Australia in terms of breast screening. I also pay a tribute to other groups such as the Familial Cancer Centre at the Women's and Children's Hospital which is designed to genetically track cancers through families for conditions such as colon cancer and breast cancer and, as a result of that, have very early detection and therefore far more effective treatment.

Through the investment of the government in equipment such as the linear accelerator and the three dimensional

radiotherapy planning system this morning, and the \$7 million that we have invested, we can now see some direct benefits in terms of the quality of health care for South Australians, and we are starting to win the fight against cancer within this state.

HOSPITALS, FUNDING

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Who is telling the truth about funding for South Australian public hospitals? Yesterday, the minister said that South Australian hospitals had a \$10 million cash flow crisis because of the GST. In federal parliament today, the federal health minister, Dr Wooldridge—your Liberal colleague—said that the only problem in hospital funding in South Australia was caused by the Olsen government's cutting \$20 million. So, who is telling the truth, Dean?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): What's new? The federal minister has used this figure before, and I have pointed out previously that, unfortunately, the junior officer within his office who took out the figures, like the Labor Party in this state, could not read the notes at the bottom of the accounts. There was a change in accounting procedure and the \$47 million, amongst other things that were previously put into indemnity insurance, has been dealt with differently and is no longer included.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, I am pointing out that the junior staff member in Dr Wooldridge's office only picked it up because—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Elizabeth made exactly the same mistake here. Therefore, in relation to the interjection 'You got it wrong' across the chamber from here, the fact is that you did get it wrong.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What are the facts? The facts are that this year we are putting \$48 million more into our hospitals than we did last year—\$48 million more, not \$20 million less, as just claimed by the member for Elizabeth. In fact, I would suggest to the member for Elizabeth that—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —before she causes any more embarrassment and reflects—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I also warn the member for Heysen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can assure members that there is absolutely no point in the proceedings degenerating into one member trying to one-up the other. In the end, someone will pay a penalty. I suggest that members come back to order and give the ministers the right to be heard in silence.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: All I can say is that if the member for Elizabeth is so shoddy in reading the budget papers brought down, then heaven help our health system if she was ever to be minister—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—because clearly she cannot even sit down and read the annual budget. The facts are clear. We as a state government have put \$48 million more into our public system this year than we put in last year, and that is a substantial increase. It shows that, if the honourable member knew her facts, she would not even embarrass herself by asking such a question.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Education and Children Services report to the House on the key features of the draft TAFE amendment bill which will be released for public consultation this week?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Today I announced that a further period of public consultation and comment on the proposed TAFE legislation begins. It is a chance for everyone interested in further education to contribute their view. The proposal will substantially change the focus of vocational education and training in South Australia. It provides TAFE boards with the power to respond quickly to the community's training needs and build stronger links with business and industry. The result will be more jobs for South Australians, because our young people will have access to high quality training which meets their needs and specifically the needs of industry. This bill broadens vocational education and training, which is crucial to our state's knowledge and skills base. We are committed to giving students, staff and local communities access to real and positive involvement in their TAFE institutes and to the delivery of education in their area.

The proposed amendments mean that our TAFE institutes will be more flexible. It will enable them to listen and to respond directly to the local community and to the individual needs of students. This is further evidence that this is a government of action, with focus and with policies, with many workable solutions, with much progress and with many ticks for the right choices. However, the only tick Labor will get is one from a Nike product, straight off the shelf. The Leader of the Opposition claims that he supports a strong TAFE system, but still there is not a policy in sight, not one—zip, zero, zilch, nothing, nil, 'Sorry, not home'! There are no focused TAFE initiatives. What do we hear instead? Silence. One could call it 'Silence of the Rann.' Not only that, there are no white papers; there is no whitespeak at all. In fact, the dictionary defines this—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I can tell you are looking forward to this point of order, sir. Given that I am cognisant of my own warning status, do you think that you might just perhaps advise members opposite against their constant interjections on their own minister, as well as the use of members' surnames?

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will resume his seat while he still has a seat to sit in. I just ask members to reflect for a while, look into a mirror and just see the level of interjections that float either way before they get up and complain about how other people are interjecting on them. The behaviour in this place is degenerating into something which is appalling, and a lot of the members who get up and complain about the interjections are some of the worst offenders. If members looked into a mirror sometimes, they would understand what is going on. I have been particularly lenient with a lot of members, and I have been particularly lenient with the leader, because he is the leader, but I do not

expect this to continue as we go further into this election year. I just give that general warning to all members. I have been very tolerant, but my tolerance for members' present conduct is running out very quickly.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As I said, there are no policies on the other side and in fact we can turn to the dictionary for this, which defines such things 'as made without a plan or done by chance as "Rann-dom".'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I also caution members in the following regard. The chair has been particularly concerned over this last year about the way members use Christian names and refer to each other by names. I understand where the minister is coming from, but the chair will not sit here and put up with the calling of members by names, surnames, Christian names or whatever as it does nothing else in this Chamber but lead to a pattern that is not healthy for the chamber.

NATIONAL YOUTH WEEK

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Youth. Will he explain some of the main initiatives undertaken this week as part of National Youth Week celebrations?

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Youth): I thank the member for Waite for his question and for the obvious importance that he places on youth in his electorate. I acknowledge the importance that some members opposite place on youth because many of them, along with my own colleagues, were present at the launch of this year's Youth Parliament last night. It is a pity that the opposition as an aggregate group do not seem to bother to question much in this chamber the needs of what is, after all—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

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

Mr Clarke interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:—a cohort of something like 20 per cent of our population. As members know, this is the fifth Youth Week in this state, the second National Youth Week—a South Australian initiative followed not only by the federal government but also by every state jurisdiction in this nation.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Ross Smith, for the second time.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Rather than emulate what appears to happen opposite, which is to sit there and do nothing in case you are noticed, this government has been getting on with the job in respect to youth. In the time I have been minister and indeed with the work of my predecessors this government instituted the first ever youth ministerial advisory council, Youth Plus, which has effectively given a range of advice to me as minister and has participated in many other aspects of government. This government has for the first time given youth a true voice at the highest levels and integrated youth policy and youth advice into the fabric of government. I do not think, in the unlikely event that the lot opposite ever come to power, they will even dare wind that back, because it is a positive initiative undertaken by this government.

This morning I had the pleasure of officially launching Youth Net. Youth Net is a coalition of youth worker forces, many from the Christian community, and it will provide a forum for youth leaders and play a part in transforming the youth culture of South Australia. It will provide youth workers and leaders with networks for learning and for developing youth programs, strengthening the youth community and vitalising our youth leaders. That coalition represents at its inauguration something like 50 000 young people in this state. It represents a viable and vital alternative voice of youth in this state and it will be interesting to see what the shadow minister's approach is to such a viable, vibrant and emerging section of the youth culture. We have in the past seen very few voices for youth in South Australia. Now that a multiplicity of voices is emerging, it will be interesting to see how the opposition copes with a view expressed, other than a left wing, socialist, out of date view.

Another worthy goal for an achievement by any youth member is the awards showcase for the achievements of youth. Tomorrow night we will be part of the South Australian Youth Awards Showcase, a new showcase which acknowledges young South Australians' achievements in eight different categories and which will inaugurate a position of Young Person of the Year. The awards are judged by independent experts in their fields, representatives of youth advisory councils and independent members of the community, each of whom has made a significant contribution. So, it is a positive reinforcement of the good that young people are doing in our community.

Finally, under my ministry, but ably led by previous ministers, we have inaugurated Active8, which is a positive program of leadership crossing the borders between government and the non-government schooling sector, which seeks to provide leadership and initiative opportunities—in fact, for the first time in Australia—outside the schooling sector, and which tries to inculcate voluntarism. So, they are positive initiatives of which this government is proud and initiatives which the mob opposite will not have the gumption to roll back even if it eventually gets into power.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr FOLEY (Hart): Given the statement made today by the Minister for Human Services that the GST was responsible for a \$10 million cash flow crisis in our hospitals, does the Premier stand by his statement that the GST is 'good, indeed vital, for South Australia'? Also, are there other government departments and agencies that are facing cash flow crises as a result of the GST?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I am sure that Tom Phillips and every worker at Mitsubishi would say that the abolition of wholesale sales tax, which has enabled them to access a \$225 million contract in the United States, is a very good deal. We are making sure that not only the wine industry but also our manufacturing industry can access the international markets. The abolition of wholesale sales tax was a very important component of that—a very important component.

It is all very well for the member for Hart to selectively make these suggestions to the House, but let us look at the sum total and the interests of South Australia. I put to you that every Mitsubishi worker at the moment would be delighted with the abolition of wholesale sales tax.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Florey. In calling the member for Florey, I point out that I inadvertently

gave two calls on my right. I am now balancing it by calling on the member for Florey.

EDUCATION, INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I am grateful for the opportunity to ask my question, which is directed to the Minister for Education. Does the Education Department recognise and accept the document 'National Indigenous Literacy and Numeracy Strategy 2000-2004' and why, in what appears to be a direct contradiction of key element 4 of that document, are TSPs being offered to English as a Second Language teachers, when it is extremely difficult to staff, with experienced and specialised teachers, remote Aboriginal schools where English is the second language of the students?

Key element 4 of the National Indigenous Literacy and Numeracy Strategy 2000-2004 is:

To facilitate placing the best teachers, suitably skilled and paid, in the areas with the greatest needs—and keeping them there.

I am told that TSPs are being offered within the department when perhaps bonus packages should be considered in an effort to ensure that experienced staff are available to provide for the educational needs of and opportunities for our remote indigenous communities.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I do not have at hand the details that the member requires, but I will undertake to obtain an answer for her.

BORRIKA INSTITUTE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Last week the member for Hammond asked a question of the Premier in regard to the Borrika Institute. I responded to the question as the minister responsible for the Crown Lands Act. This matter arises as the Borrika Institute Committee wishes to sell the property to a private investor.

As the House is probably aware, the institute site at Borrika is dedicated as institute reserve held under land grant volume 1020, folio 63, in a trust for institute purposes. It was proclaimed on 4 July 1914. No fee was paid for the land. The subject property is currently vested in 11 people in trust. All trustees have care, control and management of the land. All trustees are believed deceased. On 14 January 1999 the agency wrote to Ms Drescher of the Borrika Institute committee, advising that the committee had two options to consider to progress the sale. Option 1 was to transfer the title. This would be difficult to achieve, as all the titleholders or executors of their wills would need to consent to the transfer and sign the appropriate documentation. Option 2 was to seek the minister's approval to resume the dedication and cancellation of the trust grant. A freehold title could then be issued to nominated parties on the payment of the Crown's interest in the land, as assessed by the Valuer-General, plus associated fees.

On 12 May 1999 the local council wrote to the committee confirming that the council did not have an interest in the property and has no objection to its disposal. In May 2000,

the agency received a letter from O'Brien Conveyancers on behalf of the committee requesting that option 2 be progressed. Then on 11 July 2000, SAIT Conveyancers wrote to the agency on behalf of the purchaser, also seeking to use option 2 as outlined to resolve the issue. At this stage it is interesting to note that both the committee and the purchaser had written to the government with a preference for option 2, and the council had no objection to the sale and no interest in the land.

Quite rightly, given the complexity of the matter, the agency on its own initiative took Crown Law advice. On cancellation of the land grant, the improvements on the subject land are the property of the minister, as they are erected on the minister's land. If there is evidence that the committee has carried out work to the improvements then consideration may be given to paying reimbursement—paying the community some compensation has never been ruled out. However, the agency has made it clear that that issue is a matter for the minister to decide. Given the circumstances, there is some doubt that the committee has the power to sign a sale contract. Hence, the resumption of the land and the cancellation of the grant to then achieve a sale is the suggested solution. On 7 March 2001 the agency wrote to SAIT Conveyancers to progress option 2, and that offer remained open for 14 days. On 10 March 2001 SAIT wrote back indicating a desire to purchase the institute for \$5 000 and proceed with the sale.

Last week's question by the member for Hammond follows a grievance contribution on this topic on Tuesday 27 March. I take the opportunity to correct statements made by the member for Hammond. The member for Hammond stated:

... the advice, of course, that Crown Law gives is always the advice the minister wants.

Apart from being completely false, it is an unfortunate attack on the integrity and professionalism of the Crown Law officers, who I have found have always acted within their powers in the best interests of the state. Further, it should be noted that I as minister became aware that this issue was within my agency only after question time last Wednesday. I have not sought Crown Law advice on the issue. The member for Hammond also stated:

For a miserable \$5 000 to the minister, government members are going to be like dogs in the manger and prevent the community from getting any proceeds from the sale.

This is also completely false. This matter is still in the hands of the agency. There has been no recommendation from the agency for the government to consider. To suggest that government members are preventing the proceeds from being distributed is simply untrue. That matter will be given due consideration when recommendations have been received.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Quite regularly I am contacted by people who are on age pensions or very low and fixed incomes. They are finding it increasingly difficult to manage financially because of the constant increases in government charges being levied upon them. As an example, one of my constituents who is on an age pension suffers from chronic arthritis and needs additional help to improve and maintain his quality of life. He is extremely angry and upset at all the extra costs he has to pay out of his fortnightly pension. He rightly sees his quality of life as diminishing. For instance, my constituent is visited by a podiatrist who cuts his

toenails, and that is organised by Domiciliary Care at a cost of \$5 per month. A separate visit is organised by Domiciliary Care to cut his fingernails, and that is another \$5 per month. He also uses various health aids, and that equipment, which is supplied by Domiciliary Care, is costing him a further \$20 a month. The equipment supplied to him and other pensioners was without charge until this government introduced a fee for it.

Now my constituent has been informed by the Housing Trust that, after providing a lawn cutting service for the past 10 years for him, they will no longer be cutting his eight metres by six metres rear lawn. The service is now seen by the Housing Trust as not one that it should provide, even though it will continue to cut his front lawn. The additional cost for having the rear lawn cut is \$15 per month. So, given that they are still mowing his front lawn, it seems silly and quite pointless to cease a 10 year practice which he needs.

We have to ask ourselves, as are many people out in the community: is South Australia so hard up that this government has to penny-pinch and nitpick from our aged pensioners? Then we have to take into account all the other fundamental necessities of this man, such as his medicines and dental treatment—all those things that are on top of the normal living expenses that everyone has, including food, gas, electricity and water bills. We can understand when we consider all of that why our aged folk and people on low incomes are so angry about the fees and charges that this government is levying upon them.

On top of all those additional fees that he is paying, his Housing Trust rent, as does everybody else's, increases with each consumer price index increase, and that means another bite out of his and other people's meagre pensions. It is quite clear, and is certainly spoken about much in our community, that the government is out of touch with what people are feeling, what they are saying and what they need. It is about time that perhaps the government should realise that for every \$5 that is spent for a wheelchair or a walking frame, having one's nails cut or the lawns mowed, all of those costs come out of the food budget, the water or power bills, which as we all know are also on the increase.

Our elderly folk, such as those on the aged pension or on low incomes, do go without food. They do not turn on their cooling or heating when they need it most because they have to pay this increase in charges. I have also written to the minister about this, and although the minister encourages people to write in for an exemption from the domiciliary care charges, even though they are on very low incomes, they are poor, their expenditure requirements do not qualify them to have those fees waived.

So, people—and rightly so—feel that this government is very mean spirited in its approach to our aged pensioners, and it will certainly take more than a budget sweetener to convince them otherwise. Their pensions are already stretched to the limit, and they have no means of finding any additional funds anywhere to cover all these extra charges and levies that are being forced upon them. It is simply a case that, if these people cannot pay for it, they have to go without, and that is an incredibly sorry situation.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I have noted with much interest the behaviour of some of the members opposite when it comes to the confidence of trying to form what they believe to be an alternative government. I note with much interest the references to polls that we are dead in the water and so on and, being the member in the most marginal seat, I cop a lot

of flack. I am asked, 'Have you found a job yet?', and 'How is your Saturday reading going?' I find it amazing, because I have a job, I enjoy it and, God willing, will get across the line to make sure that we keep this state in good governance. If we look at the figures of the economic indicators, one would see that, despite the national figures which show that the economy is slowing down and there has been some negative growth, South Australia is going ahead.

Yesterday, I noted with much interest that, when the member for MacKillop asked the Premier a question about these figures, there was a deadly silence opposite. These figures are from the ABS—they are not made up by the Liberal Party: they are statistics from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and I would say that they would be a reputable organisation in giving us an indication on how the economy is going. As the Premier said yesterday, the ABS figures underscore South Australia's good economic performance and, importantly, underscore that our economic performance is leaving the rest of Australia behind in a number of areas: new motor vehicle registrations—up 8.1 per cent in February in South Australia, the third best figure of any state; retail trade growth is up 7.7 per cent—also the third highest.

There have now been seven consecutive months of strong retail growth, spending on cars and consumer goods, and this shows that South Australians have money in their pockets and have the confidence to spend. The strong national growth of 7 per cent in new car sales is good news for South Australia, because we depend so much on the motor vehicle industry.

There were newspaper headlines yesterday about Mitsubishi exporting to the United States. However, we do not get such questions about the economy from members of the opposition. We know that gross state product has increased. We are second only to Queensland in having positive growth.

It is true that we need to improve some things and concentrate more on health and social infrastructure. This government acknowledges that, but unless the economy is functioning well there can be no funds for health, education, social infrastructure and the like. If there is no money in the bank, it is impossible to extend in any other area. It is like someone having a mortgage with no flexibility—when the need arises, more money cannot be borrowed.

We know what the situation was in the past, although I do not believe that we should dwell on the State Bank. Rather, we should concentrate on what alternative policies the Labor opposition has. In other words, this is what we can deliver in times that are difficult nationally. South Australia is way ahead in investment and in exports: we export to more countries than any other state in Australia. One should ask the questions: where would South Australia be if it was in the hands of the opposition? Also, where would the opposition take the state with those exports? I believe there will be great risks for the people of South Australia—I am talking not about the past but about the risks of the present—

Time expired.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Today I would like to advise the House of a significant event which happened on Friday 23 March in the electorate of Florey and which saw the opening of the Modbury Special School's new unit, the Correa unit, which is the culmination of the aspirations of Julie Aschberger, who is the principal of the school, her dedicated staff and the parent community involved in the school.

Modbury Special School now can boast with this new unit perhaps the nation's leading teaching area for autistic children. The transformation in the children and, indeed, the teaching staff, and no doubt the parents and families of these 10 students who now enjoy the benefits of this outstanding initiative, is remarkable. Every autistic child in this state deserves the opportunity to be able to use similar facilities.

There are many features in the unit, tailored for the special needs of autistic children, who have an innate ability to climb and have much difficulty remaining calm. Class teacher Colin Blute and two school service officers work to provide curriculum delivery to these children. Autistic children are very agile and have excellent gross motor skills, and are well coordinated. Their climbing ability is well catered for by the climbing wall inside the unit which can be altered to maintain interest and challenge to the students. The play equipment outside the unit also offers climbing opportunities.

The teaching area has work benches and storage areas for TV and video and the individual programs of each student. All these areas are serviced by roller doors so that there is easy access for the staff and so that the children cannot climb on the shelving. Suspension points throughout the unit allow for swings to be hung from the ceiling so that the children can gently rock themselves backwards and forwards to remain calm. There is also a 'quiet' room where the children can practise relaxation. This room also incorporates a projector for stimulation by visual imagery, which is beneficial for some of the students.

The toilet area has many features that make this aspect of the daily life of both the staff and the children so much easier. The kitchen unit encourages students to learn the functional skills of food preparation while eliminating climbing opportunities. There is a computer room where children are encouraged to use the PCs on a daily basis, and the whole unit is airconditioned and features maximum use of natural light. There is a control room where teachers can manipulate settings within the unit and use two-way mirrors to look into both the computer and the quiet rooms. There is also a dedicated workroom where students can work one on one with their teachers or in small group activities.

Sensory learning is catered for in the rice bowl area. This is a particularly interesting area where students can calm themselves by playing in different mediums: they use sand, rice, macaroni or shredded paper; so there is plenty of fun for all. A variety of textures and finishes are used throughout the unit, with curved walls and benches; and all mortar and brickwork in the unit is rendered so that it cannot be used as climbing areas. To access the outdoor area there is an operable wall, which allows students to access both the outdoor and indoor areas at all times during the day and to choose where they would most like to work.

There is also a bike track around the outdoor area and use of different surfaces, such as outdoor carpet and grass. Also, a waterfall area is situated beside the perspex panels in the walls, which allow the students to look outside to see what is going on. All in all, it is a safe and fun environment and a real place where students can learn to maximise their own abilities. I commend Julie Aschberger and her team: Sarah Paddick, architect; John Garras, builder; Ray Thalbourne and Roger Zammit from the Department of Administrative and Information Services; and Ken Randall, Principal of the Modbury South Primary School.

Mr Randall's help in allowing this area to be taken over by the Modbury Special School was, of course, the reason that the whole project could proceed in the first place. It is a

purpose-built facility for these students. It was designed to be interactive and relevant to the learning style of autistic students and it is a place where they will be able to go and where they want to be to have fun and to learn. I cannot tell members how impressed I was with what I saw on the day. The difference in the students, even for someone such as myself, was remarkable.

I understand from the federal minister who opened the facility that it is the best in Australia; it is the only one of its kind, and I think that it is a great shame that we cannot allow all autistic children to have access to these areas. The other good part about the Modbury Special School is that it is designed so that a new unit can be built on the other side of the playground.

Time expired.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I want to discuss a sad issue which is one of concern and importance not only in my own electorate but also in the general area encompassed by the South Coast Police LSA with respect to road trauma. It is not easy for a local member to talk about this because it is a controversial issue. Many people often think that speed cameras and laser guns are for revenue raising rather than slowing people down. We have tried hard in my electorate, and I commend the police attached to the South Coast LSA for their great work with respect to the traffic problem, because it is one of the busiest local service areas in the state.

I commend the South Coast LSA for its great work and the fact that, in the last full 12 months of reviewing the performance of police local service areas, it leads the state. I congratulate all those police officers under the leadership of their commander, Superintendent Madeline Glynn. But the police cannot, as an officer told me recently when I attended a tragedy that resulted in two fatalities down the road from my own home at 4.30 one morning, sit alongside drivers and remind people constantly that you do get drowsy when you drive; that sometimes when you think that you are all right, if you get in the car and travel for a half an hour, three quarters of an hour or, in some cases, an hour and a half in our area, you do get drowsy; and that, particularly when you are getting close to home, you tend to relax and possibly become complacent.

You need only one thing to go wrong on the road and you can have a fatality. What I have done as police minister in the past 18 months is try to be more proactive in terms of reminding people that motor vehicles are potentially lethal weapons. It does not matter how good a driver you are: accidents are exactly that, accidents—unintentional but with potentially catastrophic results. We have been erecting electronic signage, and I hope that people will take notice of these large orange electronic signs being erected around the regions.

The idea is to remind drivers constantly of the dangers in the area and to remind them to put on their seat belts; that speed does kill; that alcohol kills; that their children should be wearing seat belts; and that you must stay focused on the road conditions. Prior to last weekend the signs indicated (and, sadly, it could be increased now to an additional death given another tragedy on the weekend) that, in the south, 10 people have died this year. In addition, we have seen an enormous number of road casualties caused by accidents. In fact, I have been talking to my own brigade, the Mount Compass CFS (which has just been accredited for road

accident rescue), the Morphett Vale CFS and SAMFS at Christie Downs—and I know what the Aldinga Beach CFS has been doing—the South Coast SES and the Noarlunga unit of the SES, all of whose workloads have never been busier.

It is not only about road improvements. The roads in the south are generally pretty good, but a lot of people use those roads. It is a fast-growing area with a lot of young and older children. We need to be careful not only on the main roads. Unfortunately, most of the accidents that occur end up in tragedy. Interestingly, most of the fatalities have occurred on main roads: the Main South Road, the main Victor Harbor road, and the main road from Sellicks through to Yankalilla. A school principal in my area raised with me his concern about people who are speeding through school crossings when he is trying to get young people home safely at night.

I just cannot believe that people, as he estimated, are doing 60 km/h in some of the back streets past schools in my electorate when there are hundreds of young people anxious to get home to mum and dad. We all have a duty of care on the road. We also have a duty of care to the elderly who may not be able to cross the roads as quickly as some of us who are not senior citizens. It is ultimately the responsibility of the drivers to watch out over pedestrians and cyclists. I encourage people in the south to be very careful on our roads.

Time expired.

Ms BREUER (Giles): First, I congratulate all those involved in the 100th birthday celebration in Whyalla on Saturday. It was a wonderful day. It was attended by thousands of people, and it certainly helped to foster that community spirit of which we are so proud in Whyalla. I particularly congratulate all those people who participated and there were many hundreds—the people who took part and watched. I would especially like to congratulate James Winter, who directed the celebration so ably under very trying circumstances (he came in at a late stage), the committee who helped organise the event, the sponsors and, in particular, the Whyalla council. I would also like to congratulate Dangerous Curves, two women who compered the concert on Saturday night in front of thousands of people. Congratulations to all involved.

Yesterday, in another place, the Hon. Mike Elliott asked a series of questions relating to the Oak Valley School in the Far West. I asked these questions some 18 months ago and still we have no results concerning that school. The school is in dreadful condition; occupational health and safety are not considered for staff; and students work under appalling conditions. The community has been requesting a new school for some seven years but it still has no result. This is not an isolated incident. I am appalled at the conditions in all Aboriginal schools in the Far North and in the west of our state. Today the member for Florey asked a question relating to the provision of teachers in schools in the Far North and the minister had no answer. I believe that this Minister for Education and Children's Services condones and promotes some of the worst racism and discrimination I have seen; and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs never speaks of school conditions, never appears to work to actively improve conditions, and also condones this racism and discrimination—because what else is it?

For 3½ years I have waited for conditions to improve in my time in parliament, but nothing has happened. It is racism. Children and staff in the schools in the Pitjantjatjara lands and the Far West, such as Oak Valley and Yalata, are existing in third world conditions. The buildings and surroundings are

disgraceful; they are old, dilapidated classrooms; they are unsafe and unhygienic; and they have unsightly school grounds and facilities. Maintenance is minimal and fraught with problems. Rip-off contractors go into those lands; they charge exorbitant prices; they produce shoddy and inappropriate work and decimate school budgets in the process. Bureaucracy seems unable to respond quickly or effectively to the issues involved and places the problems in the too hard basket.

Pipalyatjara School was told in 1996 that it would be rebuilt. That was five years ago. There is still nothing in the budget so on Education Department timelines it is another two years before it will be considered. Fregon has been on the list for years. Nothing has happened. Amata has shoddy buildings; the shabby play area is appalling; and it has maintenance problems. A door repair at Amata cost \$3 000. How can a school budget cope with this? Some of the issues which arise include tardiness in the process required, such as a review of the facilities. It is planned but it has not happened at Pipalyatjara. Amata is on the list to be replaced. An architect has been engaged, but nothing has happened. Bureaucracy cannot seem to handle more than one project at a time.

There are problems with Partnerships 21. For example, when the money was allocated to Pipalyatjara School, the fact that there were two campuses some 100 kilometres apart was not considered—and that matter has only recently been resolved. It is bureaucracy at its most inefficient. I have said it before in this place and I will say again: would anyone in this place allow their children to attend schools under these conditions? Would Minister Buckby and Minister Kotz allow schools such as this to exist in Adelaide? Of course not. Meanwhile, teachers, principals and superintendents all tear their hair out in those lands. They work hard; they fret over the conditions; and they battle under dreadful conditions. I admire and respect them greatly.

But this government allows these conditions to continue. This government does not care about the conditions for these young people already disadvantaged by their isolation. It is absolute racism and absolute discrimination. Minister Buckby and Minister Kotz: show some initiative and some guts; get your Premier and cabinet to do something about this. Today, the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services said, 'An easy job seems hard if you put it off long enough.' Well, seven years in office and this government has still done nothing about it.

There are other examples of what has happened in some of these areas. For example, funding to repair the leaks in the roof of the main teaching block had been approved but when the workmen went to do it they found that they had not been told the complexity of the job and that they had not brought appropriate materials. I presume they will come back at some stage, but who knows? There is no indication of when this will happen. An administration block was broken into and it took six months for some repairs to be made—and they still have not been completed.

Time expired.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): There are a number of issues I would like to raise today—and one of them must be the Borrika Institute following the statement made to the House by the minister. Before I go to that, let me turn to another matter that has raised the ire and has rankled a number of constituents in my electorate, and that is the abusive enforcement by police—as the Minister for Police was saying earlier

about speeding—in relation to a 40 km/h speed limit past emergency services vehicles. When we passed this clause 83 in the Road Traffic Act we wanted to provide safety for people working on the road, especially at the site of a collision or some other inadvertent misadventure, people who have to try to save the life and limb of someone who has been injured and may be lying on the road. The important thing then is to let the public know that it is not appropriate to drive past them at whatever speed limit applies but, rather, at 40 km/h. Clause 83(1) as was drafted and as passed by the parliament provides:

A person must, while passing an emergency vehicle that has stopped on a road and is displaying a flashing blue or red light (whether or not it is also displaying other lights)—

- (a) drive at a speed no greater than 40 kilometres per hour; or
- (b) if a lesser speed is required in the circumstances to avoid endangering any person—drive at that lesser speed.

There are a few provisions about a median strip and being on the other side of it that are irrelevant to my grievance. What has been happening is that, for instance, one of my constituents drove past a police car that had stopped on the left-hand side of the road. There were no people in sight, neither policemen nor members of the general public. The red and blue lights were flashing. The constituents were driving through Elizabeth, of all places. They saw no reason nor did they believe that they had to slow down so they continued at 67 km/h in an 80 km/h speed zone. Yet they were hauled up about 150 metres or so down the road by another police car, which did not have its lights flashing, and the reason they were told they were hauled over is because they passed an emergency services vehicle, the police car, with red and blue lights flashing, at more than 40 km/h.

Now if that is not revenue harvesting, what is? I reckon that is an outrageous abuse of the law by the police. They ought to refund the fine and reinstate the demerit points to the licence. They did it not only to one but several drivers. It was a deliberate trap set by the police. Whether or not that is the kind of thing they are doing elsewhere is beyond me, yet another constituent has drawn my attention to the problem which they experienced on the South Eastern Freeway where the same thing was done to them. They went past a police car on the freeway. The policeman was off the carriageway, had left his red and blue lights flashing, and was writing out an expiation notice to another motorist. He hailed down the motorist that went past at 100 to 110 km/h stating that he was driving at more than 40 km/h past an emergency services vehicle with its lights flashing. If that is the way the police are going to carry on—these highway cowboys that we've got there—then we are going to be in real trouble. There is a really important public relations exercise to be undertaken, and the sooner the commissioner and the minister understand it the better.

Let me now turn to the matter of the Borrika Hall and point out the following for the benefit of the minister who tried to put a tidy spin on this for the government's position when he said:

The member for Hammond stated the advice, of course, that crown law gives is always the advice that the minister wants.

Well, hell, there have been plenty of instances where I know that to be the case. What about the Hindmarsh Stadium and the advice they got over that? They said, 'What are the options?' Crown Law said, 'Well, these are the options available to you,' so the agency said, 'Well, we want this one.' So that's what they got. I know that to be a fact because I have seen the internal documents when it was part of the

inquiry in the Public Works Committee. In this instance, the minister said:

Apart from being completely false, this is an unfortunate attack on the integrity and professionalism of crown law officers.

Oh yeah? If that is the way they behave they deserve it. Further, he said:

Mr Speaker, it should be noted that I as minister only became aware this issue was in my agency after question time last Wednesday. I have not sought crown law advice on the issue.

I cannot help it if the minister does not know what the hell is going on in his department. He ought to be more aware and more up with it. He ought to know. These are the kinds of things that are going to cause problems.

Time expired.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: LE MANS TRACK

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That the 134th report of the committee, on the Le Mans Track project—final report, be noted.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 542.)

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I thought it would be appropriate for me to make some comments in relation to the report on the Le Mans track project and to respond to some of the issues that have been raised by some members and some of the issues that were raised in the report itself. As we know, it is now history that the government decided not to take up the option to stage a stand alone Le Mans race this year. Of course, it is on record that it was a difficult choice for the government to make, but the choice was made.

The Race of a Thousand Years was a superb event, and I would like to place on record my thanks to the organisers, Panoz Motor Sport, as well as to Andrew Daniels and his team who did a great job in putting the event together and building a fabulous track.

It is important to note that the construction of the Le Mans circuit came in well under budget. As previously outlined to the Public Works Committee in our submission, the budget was as follows: the capital costs of the project were budgeted at \$1.94 million; preliminary final costs now indicate this will come in at \$1.977 million, which was slightly above the budget for that component. However, the operational and construction costs for the project were budgeted at \$6.04 million, and the preliminary final cost estimate for that indicates that it will come in at \$5.427 million. Therefore, the budget for capital and operation on construction costs will come in at \$7.98 million, with the project expected finally to come in at \$7.404 million, which is some \$500 000 under budget.

There was a cost involved for the Government, and that related to the fee that was paid by the government to Panoz Australia and the contribution by Panoz Australia back to the South Australian government to assist with the actual track construction. Confidentiality clauses in the agreement with Panoz Australia and the Premier preclude public disclosure of these arrangements. However, the Public Works Committee has previously been notified of these fees, and they remain as previously reported to the committee.

With these arrangements taken into consideration, the total cost to the government of the Le Mans Race of a Thousand Years will, on preliminary final cost estimates, come in as I said earlier around \$500 000 under budget, and that will be about \$7.9 million. The projected budget for the event was

\$8.4 million, as outlined again to the Public Works Committee in our original submission.

It is appropriate, though, to outline to the House some of the details of the dismantling activities in relation to the project, because they have been raised by not only the report itself but also other members. Last month, we provided the following information to the Public Works Committee in a letter to the Presiding Member, and it is important that it be put on record in the House.

The overpasses were removed on time in accordance with the engineering work schedule. Wakefield Road was open one day ahead of schedule, and all barriers were removed from public roads by 9 January 2001, which was considerably earlier than the scheduled date of 23 January. Road openings on the morning of 2 January 2001 commenced on schedule from 7 a.m., and they concluded ahead of schedule, with the early opening of Wakefield Road as previously outlined. Lane closures were scheduled to be concluded on 14 January but were, in fact, completed ahead of schedule on 9 January. All scaffold platforms outside Victoria Park scheduled to be removed on 19 January were, in fact, removed on 12 January. Circuit fencing was also removed ahead of schedule and, in the areas north of Wakefield Road, all fencing was removed by 19 January, and all fencing was removed from outside Victoria Park by 23 January, again two days ahead of schedule.

The submission to the Public Works Committee indicated that all infrastructure would be removed from outside the areas of Victoria Park by 25 January, and this was achieved before that date and in some cases by up to 14 days earlier.

All the electrical cabling and switchboards, transportable buildings, marquees, canopy structures and toilets were removed ahead of schedule by approximately five to six working days; irrigation systems for parks outside Victoria Park were handed back to the Adelaide City Council some two days ahead of schedule; and, as the committee has previously been informed, temporary infrastructure would remain in Victoria Park for the staging of the Clipsal 500 which, as we know, is to be held this weekend from 6 April to 8 April.

The government has recognised the importance of ensuring that the grass condition of Victoria Park was not adversely affected by the Le Mans event and, on the advice and suggestion of the Presiding Member of the Public Works Committee, two horticultural specialists from Munns Lawn Specialists were engaged by Brown and Root on behalf of the South Australian Motor Sport Board to oversee the management of the grass.

It is appropriate to put on record that the consultation that occurred during that has paid off, because I would like to share with the House two extracts from a letter from the city council addressed to Mr Daniels, the General Manager of Clipsal 500, as follows:

I have been involved with car race events in Victoria Park since the first Formula 1 Grand Prix, and I am sure that the pride and care that has been taken in recent months has been the best that I have experienced during that time. Not only has care been taken to improve the condition of grass surfaces but the site managers have re-turfed areas previously devoid of grass and protected them from vehicular traffic by the installation of bollards.

Young trees have been protected from vehicle damage, and even some of the older redgums on Wakefield Road boundary are showing improvement due to increased watering. Finally, further improvements are going to be made within the next few weeks using finance from both council and the events budget to achieve the objective of running a successful and popular event while causing minimal damage.

That is under the signature of Graham Jones, the asset manager of the parklands.

As I said, Brown and Root engaged professional contractors on behalf of the Motor Sport Board, and they were tasked to irrigate, fertilise, decompact and rejuvenate grassed areas within the declared area of the race both during and after the event to mitigate any long-term impact to grassed areas. The potential effect of road closures on retail activity within the city of Adelaide was also an important consideration of the race. Extensive consultation took place between the government, Motor Sport Board, retail traders, Rundle Mall management, local council, emergency services and numerous other parties to ensure that retail trade in the important post-Christmas period was not adversely affected. Feedback from all the parties involved confirmed that they were satisfied with the arrangements that were put in place and they did minimise any potential disruption.

Members can appreciate from this information that the government went to great lengths to minimise the impact of the race on the city of Adelaide, Victoria Park and surrounding areas. The expeditious reopening of roads and speedy clean-up after the event is a credit to all those involved, and I thank all those in the vicinity of Victoria Park for their cooperation and patience in relation to the event.

It is important for the House to note that the total construction period for the 1994 Formula 1 Grand Prix on the Adelaide street circuit was 21 weeks; for the Le Mans event total construction occurred over a period of 15 weeks. That does indicate the importance that the government has placed on minimising disruption caused by the race.

Another issue I wish to discuss is that of the concerns that have been raised by a member of the committee in relation to television coverage. There was a clerical error in the report that was submitted to the Public Works Committee on 10 August in relation to television coverage. The domestic television coverage is correctly described within the body of the report, specifically clause 4.2, which states:

National domestic television coverage through Network 10 is guaranteed in a two hour package to be broadcast on the Sunday afternoon following the race.

Evidence given to the committee supports this statement. Ms Dewhirst, the General Manager of Major Events, described to the committee in her evidence:

National domestic television coverage through Network 10 is guaranteed in a two hour package to be broadcast on Sunday afternoon following the race.

However, clause 2.11 described the television coverage as 'live national coverage throughout Australia'. This is not correct. The word 'live' was included in error. The Presiding Member, Mr Lewis, was notified, and I have previously thanked him for his cooperation in trying to put the correspondence in context.

Mr Lewis wrote that he had not received the letter until 5 October, although it was dated 29 September. He notified the House formally on 3 October. I thank the members of the committee for their work on this report.

Time expired.

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I want to make a few comments about the Le Mans report and, indeed, Le Mans in general. I do not want at this point to pre-empt the findings of the Economic and Finance Committee, which has been looking into certain aspects of the race but, particularly given the minister's contribution, as the shadow minister I would like to put a few facts on the public record.

The government approached the opposition probably a year ago to brief us on Le Mans, and the minister—I will give her credit—was particularly keen to ensure that the race of 1 000 years received bipartisan support because, as we know from history—and it was not the minister's fault, because she was not in parliament at the time—the Formula One Grand Prix, throughout its life, was the subject of some quite sustained attacking and undermining by the then Liberal opposition. But, quite rightly, the shadow minister for sport, the shadow minister for tourism (the member for Lee) and I, as shadow treasurer, at the time, met with Mr Don Panoz and Mr Bill Spurr from the Tourism Commission, to be briefed initially on the race. Legislation was in parliament, which we supported. I visited—

The Hon. J. Hall interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Yes, and Mr Rainsford, too, was part of the briefing. While in the United States midway through last year on other business, I took the opportunity to pay a courtesy call on Mr Panoz to assure him that the race would receive bipartisan support, notwithstanding that my colleagues took issue with some matters; but, in the main, provided that it was run properly and certain aspects of the race were properly addressed, the race would receive bipartisan support and he could invest with confidence in South Australia. That is the history. The opposition did what it was asked and went further than that. It offered, and I think delivered, a degree of certainty to an international investor that such an investor would rightly want to have.

We attended the race of 1 000 years. It came and it went. Mr Panoz was here for a state dinner in his honour, which is a very rare event, indeed, for a visitor who is not a head of state. I am not quite sure for whom we host state dinners, but I assume that we very rarely host state dinners for people from the private sector. But Mr Panoz received that significant acknowledgment from this government, just as he also received similar acknowledgment at a reception hosted by the Governor, the minister and Premier at Government House, which I attended. (I did not attend the state dinner, but I will not go into that.)

The fact of the matter is that the government did everything, and more, to ensure that Mr Panoz was impressed with South Australia and found South Australia to be an inviting and desirable place in which to invest. Mr Panoz had some other ideas—whether or not they would come to fruition remained to be seen, and certainly now remain to be seen—and looked at some other options. The race took place, and the minister and the Premier were very keen to be seen with Mr Panoz and to be part of that week to 10 day period leading up to it and the period shortly thereafter.

At the conclusion of the race when the cars were packed up and went back to the United States, something went horribly adrift: something went horribly wrong. We have not been able to get to the bottom of it, but I have my own ideas. I think some petty jealousies were involved involving other people connected with motor sport in South Australia. I could go as far to suggest that there was perhaps some undermining of Mr Rainsford's and Mr Panoz's event. It is just a suggestion and I may be wrong, but I think I am closer to the mark than some people would care to acknowledge. But something was going wrong, because these negotiations for future races were under way and Mr Panoz indicated to me that he expected, and assumed, that he would have the races.

I said to Mr Panoz in Atlanta, 'Mr Panoz, it's difficult for any government to stage your race as a stand-alone event, given the cost of putting it up and pulling it down, not to

mention the disruption to the parklands—I am a passionate believer in the parklands—and these are issues that any government, Labor or Liberal, would have to confront.’ He acknowledged that and said, ‘In fact, I have always said we should look at a combined event.’ I said—letting secrets out of the bag—‘I always thought that is the way we should go’: that we should move towards a combined event with V8s on the first weekend and Le Mans on the second weekend, or vice versa.

The Hon. J. Hall interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Maybe it could be rotated every second year so that everyone was happy: Mr Panoz would not complain and the V8 organisers would not complain. At the end of the day, I did not think that was an insurmountable problem. I think that one of the great things a government can do is work as a facilitator—bringing people together and knocking heads together. If we were going to have a great motor racing carnival in South Australia, we had the opportunity to have both a domestic element and an international element to it. Mr Panoz agreed, I agreed, and, should I have found myself in government after the next election, that would have been something, if the government had not already picked up on it, that I would have pursued with much vigour, because it would have eliminated \$7 million or \$8 million in costs.

But, as I was saying, something went horribly wrong. Negotiations were proceeding. Mr Panoz was given every encouragement, I understand. He flew to South Australia to try to conclude negotiations. Admittedly, there were clearly a number of sticking points; but, whatever happened in those negotiations—and I am not privy to the full details—Mr Panoz boarded his aircraft and flew back to Atlanta, Georgia, with the knowledge—or the belief, at least—that he had secured the rights: so much so, that he told NBC—apparently he had time commitment constraints on NBC—‘I think I pulled this off in South Australia. You have to extend it: I understand a deposit has been paid for an extension of those rights.’ He was led to believe that a sign-off would be forthcoming shortly from the government.

Then the most extraordinary thing occurred. Suddenly, the government went cold on Le Mans. For whatever reason, it was not prepared to bang heads together and to get the Motorsport board and the Le Mans people together and agree on a date. It was not prepared to facilitate and, indeed, insist that some agreement be reached. It then led Mr Rainsford and Mr Panoz on a merry dance and kept them hanging on. But something happened. I do not believe that cabinet ever decided that this race would not go ahead. From the evidence that the committee heard, I do not believe that a cabinet meeting ever occurred. In fairness to this minister—and I will go on the public record, and perhaps the minister might like to hear me say this—I do not think that this minister agreed that the race should be cancelled. I do not believe that this minister was part of a process that decided to kill this race off, because, if she was, I do not believe that she would have delivered the insult to Mr Panoz that was delivered to him, that is, a public announcement to scrap this race without a courtesy call, without giving them damage control time, without—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Exactly. She wrote a speech the night before about it. So, I do not think that this minister made that decision. But the problem the minister has is that, in the absence of contrary evidence, she has to be held accountable and responsible for a disaster in terms of the treatment of an international investor and the PR damage done to our state.

The Minister for Tourism must stand condemned for her incompetent handling of this in the absence of any other information. I would like to give her the opportunity to correct the record, because I honestly think she was probably done a significant injustice by the Premier. I think the Premier and his political smarts thought, ‘Hang on, I will race off to that lunch, I will dump the race and be seen to be getting rid of a circus and putting \$8 million towards health.’ I reckon he decided that in his office that morning, but he did not tell his minister. That is why she did not tell Don Panoz the night before.

But in the absence of any information to confirm my theory, this minister must go down on the record as being incompetent in her handling of this and in allowing both Mr Panoz and Mr Rainsford to be insulted and treated with such disrespect, and I am extremely saddened by that.

Ms STEVENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SALISBURY INDUSTRIAL PARK

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That the 137th report of the committee, on the Salisbury Industrial Park—Stage 1, be noted.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 546.)

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): As a local member with an electorate in the northern suburbs, I have great pleasure in speaking to this report on the establishment of the Salisbury Industrial Park. As members would have heard, the proposal came to the committee from the Department of Industry and Trade with a state government commitment of \$16.5 million. The Stage 1 development, which is what we have approved, is located on surplus DSTO land at the back of Salisbury. The total amount of surplus land available for development is 650 hectares, but this project encompasses 56 hectares.

The park is being undertaken as a joint venture between the South Australian government, the federal government and the private sector, and is a direct result of the growing need for new industrial land to be developed. To assist with the Stage 1 development, the state government is to be responsible for the provision of headworks and subdivision requirements; the commonwealth government for site preparation and remediation; and the private sector for the establishment of buildings, fit out and equipment. There has also been a strong collaborative role played by the Salisbury City Council in relation to expediting the project and contributing to certain other areas of infrastructure that are in its role to perform.

The catalyst for this new industrial park has been the restructuring of the automotive industry and, as members know, Holden’s Elizabeth plant is located adjacent to this site. The automotive industry is restructuring the way it conducts its business. Current changes include consolidation of firms resulting in only a small number of very large companies of which Holden is the largest; consolidation of the assembly plant with a move to a larger plant size with specialisation of manufacture in each plant; and finally, a new direction from full design by the car maker to systems assembly where the systems supplier is also the designer—for example, car electronics and line sequence manufacturing.

The other important issue is that Holden will be outsourcing whole sections of its vehicle assembly to suppliers. These sections or systems—for example, engine and trans-

mission, front suspension and brakes—are assembled elsewhere and delivered to the assembly line just in time and as the vehicles are coming down that line and being produced. This makes for the most efficient and effective line production of cars.

So, it was a wonderful opportunity to be able to combine both the needs of General Motors-Holden to be able to continue to deliver high quality and most efficiently produced cars for a global market and the DSTO land which had become available as a result of commonwealth decisions, and indeed to put those two things together to form this park to attract first tier suppliers to set up businesses there, primarily to support Holden's but certainly to support the economy of South Australia and in particular the economy of the northern suburbs of Adelaide which, as we all know, need that economic base very sorely.

So, the Public Works Committee was asked to expedite this project with haste, because a number of approvals and delicate negotiations had to occur within a particular time frame. We were asked to do our work as quickly as possible and, as is our usual practice in these sorts of situations, we did that and gave our approval. But we noted in the conclusion to our report:

Due to the tight time lines associated with this project, several key approvals remain outstanding. Although the committee understands the reasons for this, members are of the view that the project must not proceed until all appropriate approvals and agreements are secured. Further, the committee requires the Department of Industry and Trade to provide the committee with appropriate documentation for all approvals/agreements when they are secured.

The project was signed off by the Presiding Member on 27 October last year, and the committee has still not had any contact from the Department of Industry and Trade in relation to our requirement. We are not saying that those approvals have not been obtained, but certainly their nature has not been conveyed to us. That is disappointing, I must say, because we honoured our part of the bargain but it seems that the department has not followed through on its side. However, the committee will be pursuing that material, and hopefully we will have it forthwith, after the Department of Industry and Trade receives our communication.

Some concerns have been raised about this project among residents in the local area. A number of issues were raised, particularly with Salisbury City Council, about the barriers screening houses from the industrial park. There was also an issue for Salisbury City Council itself in relation to questions over the funding for the main roads through the industrial park, and that is still to be resolved. I understand that Salisbury council is working with those involved now to resolve those matters, and I understand that that is proceeding. I am not so certain in relation to the funding of the main road, but I certainly hope that this will be resolved satisfactorily because, obviously, it must be done and we need to make sure that the park is up and running as soon as possible.

To sum up, it is a wonderful opportunity for economic development, both for South Australia and particularly the northern suburbs. Hopefully it will mean that the Holden plant, which is already producing world-class cars and exporting them to a number of countries overseas, as well as providing for the domestic market, has an opportunity to further consolidate its very significant position in automotive assembly in the world.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: FOOTBALL PARK GRANDSTAND

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That the 133rd report of the committee, on the Football Park Grandstand—final report, be noted.

(Continued from 25 October. Page 245.)

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): This matter of the grandstand at Football Park is unusual in that the committee is not reporting on its investigations into the project: it is in fact reporting that it has not been able to investigate this project, which both we and the Auditor-General believe should have been referred to this committee. As many members would know, the state government is contributing towards the building of additional grandstand seating capacity at Football Park. The government has also built a \$2.3 million bus terminal facility, and it has also been involved in the sale of lands to the South Australian Football League for car parking.

These are being treated by the government as three separate events. It seems to think that in some way none of them is connected. However, it is the view of the committee that these matters all form one project. It is also the view of the committee that, even if they did not form one project, if the construction of additional seating in the grandstand at Football Park stood alone, it by itself involves an expenditure of public money of a value which means that it should have come to the committee for consideration.

This view was expressed by the committee in its report to the parliament, and it was also referred to the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General addressed the matter in his last report to the parliament. In his report for the year ended 30 June 2000, in Part A, Audit Overview, in relation to the Football Park grandstand arrangement, the Auditor-General states:

In November 1999 the government announced financial assistance in relation to a SANFL project to create a new 7 000 seat grandstand for Football Park. It was announced that the government would contribute \$7.65 million (this is in present value terms) to the \$14.5 million project.

The announcement was based on direct financial assistance of approximately \$810 000 per annum for the project over a period of 15 years—a total of \$12.15 million to be offset by SANFL purchasing land for \$2 million from the government. The financial assistance is to meet 50 per cent of the scheduled repayments associated with a loan facility taken out by the SANFL for the project. The government has no requirement for the SANFL to repay funding and has not provided any guarantee in relation to the project.

The first payment of financial assistance was made in 1999-2000 and was funded under the item 'Administered items for Department of Treasury and Finance, Consolidated Account Items—Contingency Provisions'.

It is understood that the project was not referred to the Public Works Committee on the basis that no money has been provided directly to the cost of construction and the government has not assumed any construction risk or liability for any overruns on the project (should they occur) and has not provided any guarantee in relation to the SANFL's financial arrangements.

While acknowledging these points, it is nonetheless strongly arguable that the level of financial assistance, together with its application (whether directly or indirectly) as a contribution to the project construction, makes it a public work pursuant to the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

This project, together with those comments on in last year's report, again emphasises the urgency for a review and consideration by the parliament of the definition of 'public work'.

What has the community missed out on by the Public Works Committee's not being able to examine this important facility? For one thing, it has missed out on the opportunity for bipartisan support for this proposal. We do not know

whether all members of the committee would have agreed that this was an appropriate facility to be partially financed with government money, whether it was being done in an appropriate manner or whether or not the facilities associated with it in terms of the extra parking and bus arrangements were commendable. We simply have been denied the opportunity to scrutinise these matters. It does not take one to be terribly cynical to say that, after the debacle of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium, the government did not want anybody to look ever again at anything to do with any sporting facility in this state. I can only hope that the financial arrangements and the costs and benefits relating to the Football Park project were more soundly investigated than were those relating to the Hindmarsh stadium.

I was at Football Park last Saturday night and I was very pleased to support my team, enjoy a tremendous third quarter of football and really enjoy the victory. I saw the bus parking terminal and had considered catching the bus at stop 44 in Old Reynella and trying it out for myself, but I did not manage to get organised in time to catch the bus. So, I will have to try that another day. However, I was able to see that, by the time I was driving out of the car park, the buses were all gone; so I could have been home in my bed much earlier than I was in leaving Football Park on that busy night. I can see that there could be great benefits to be had by the football public, by the environment and just in the facility of promoting public transport throughout the community, and getting the community used to thinking 'public transport', through locating the bus terminal at Football Park.

However, this matter was not referred to the Public Works Committee. We do have information that it cost \$2.3 million but, as such, as a stand-alone project, it was not required to come to the committee. Had it been a component of a broader activity around that area, we would have had the opportunity to ascertain much more information about the feasibility studies that were undertaken in relation to the terminal, and about some of the market research in terms of how the facility would be used. Certainly, while I thought it looked like a terrific facility, and could see great benefit to it myself, I have since that time heard considerable comments on talkback that people simply cannot afford the cost of the special event fare to go to Football Park. If that becomes a problem, we will have a \$2.3 million facility sitting there looking very beautiful, and with lots of potential, but no use.

Another aspect is the sale of DAIS land to SANFL. We understand that this is to occur for \$2 million. What we do not know is how that amount was arrived at, whether it could have been sold more profitably on the open market, or whether the public has received best value from the disposal of that asset that has been held by the community.

Another matter that was disturbing in relation to this inquiry was the letter from the Premier to the chair of the Public Works Committee, dated 18 July 2000, in which he indicated that car parking requirements had been imposed by council. The letter states:

SANFL had negotiated funding with its own bankers for the purposes of funding construction of the grandstand and other ancillary projects including provision of extra car parking required by the council as a condition of approval of construction of a new grandstand.

The important point there relates to 'car parking required by the council as a condition of approval of construction of a new grandstand'. It seems that the Premier was, at best, misinformed in relation to this matter and, at worst, not being quite frank with the committee because, when we sought with

the City of Charles Sturt to clarify some matters relating to the Football Park grandstand, the response was that the new 7 000 seat grandstand being built at Football Park constituted a complying form of development and, as such, council was unable to impose any conditions requiring additional car parking.

Again, we see that this government cannot manage things very well at all. It avoided having public scrutiny of this important facility and it avoided the questions that must be asked in relation to public funding of sporting stadia, particularly for a code as rich as AFL football is in Australia, as to whether it is appropriate. It avoided that scrutiny and has not put the correct position in relation to such basic things as car parking requirements. We do not know whether the bus facility will be valuable; we do not know whether the facility will be valuable.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Condous:

That the report of the committee on the Freedom of Information Act 1991 be noted.

(Continued from 25 October. Page 243.)

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): The report of the Legislative Review Committee on the Freedom of Information Act, as provided by the member for Colton in the remarks he made on 25 October, was very interesting listening and makes even more interesting reading for anyone who bothers to revisit the debate on page 242 of *Hansard*. At the time it struck a chord with me. Everything that the member for Colton was saying that the Legislative Review Committee discovered about the way in which the Freedom of Information Act was functioning, or dysfunctioning, is the way in which I have found it to be—although I have that many hares on the run, and foxes to shoot as well, I have never attempted to amend it, and nor have I sought to complain about it.

Indeed, I sympathise with the witness who came before the committee, as we were told by the member for Colton, and pointed out that it might be more appropriately renamed the Freedom from Information Act. There is no question about the fact that two forces are at work against the provisions of the legislation; and it was legislation that was largely instigated as a consequence of the understanding of what had to be done by none other than the Hon. Martin Cameron, who was a longstanding member in the other place. He eventually got people in this parliament to understand the need for it, long after, of course, he had first introduced the concept to debates in the parliament.

Other states in the commonwealth had already established freedom of information legislation of one kind or another and they were functioning, and still are functioning, in some measure better than ours is. The intention was to allow for public access to government documents, subject only to those restrictions that might be necessary for the proper operation and administration of good government. That original legislation was supposed to set out the arrangements by which it will be possible for the public to get access to the information government holds. Because of the tortuous path that it followed in its conception and gestation, I believe that the legislation was heavily amended to the extent that it provides a good many means by which it is possible to avoid such scrutiny.

The ministers want to avoid the scrutiny when it suits their political ends to do so and the Public Service, the bureaux, want to avoid such scrutiny. They do not want people to know what they have contemplated or what they have decided even in the documents that are held by government about policy and the way in which it impacts on the public, according to the way the public have reported it to those agencies, whether through the process of a member of parliament and the ministry or directly to the agency. They just do not want that to be done because they often make big cock-ups.

A classic illustration of that, of course, has been the attitude of the current and previous governments and the bureaucracy throughout to the Leigh Creek coal mine, which is really a coal and oil shale mine; but ETSA, of course, in its collective bureaucratic ignorance, chose to ignore that resource. The oil shale has been destroyed in the process of mining the coal, which is a much less valuable resource than the oil shale itself. Yet when one tries to get information from government about what the government has on its files about the oil shale, one is told that it is not possible to have that information: it is commercial in confidence; it is not in the public interest; it is internal working documents; and all other manner of obfuscation, piffle, drivel and nonsense.

It is a shame, and so it should be, on the heads of the ministers and the public servants who have been co-conspirators in covering that up, in the same way that they cover up other things they do not want the public to know about, even though it is clearly in the public interest to be aware of them. I want to draw the distinction yet again between what is in the public interest as compared to what is of interest to the public. The two are not necessarily the same; in fact, very often, they are quite different. What is in the public interest is those things that enable the public to better understand reasons why government has made decisions one way or another on issues and established certain policies to determine the way in which they govern our society.

That is in the public interest—be aware of that. However, what is of interest to the public is something else again—you know, that could be of prurient interest or novel in the sense that it is the kind of thing that people might wish to gossip about. That is not what drives me and my observations about this report that we have before the House now. What drives me is the need for the public to be allowed to know, in the way in which the act originally intended that the public should know; and that is in spite of what Sir Humphrey Appleby of *Yes, Minister* might want them to know. I reckon that, in this state, we have done better than Sir Humphrey through our bureaux in preventing access to information, and the evidence which was provided to the committee and the careful and responsible examination, which the member for Colton and all other members of that committee gave the evidence, has enabled them to bring down the report that we have before us now, which clearly points out that the operation of the act at present is far too complex and uncertain.

Many witnesses, we are told by the member for Colton, raised that matter. We in this state, as much as anywhere else in Australia, including the commonwealth government, are as bad about that: we are about the worst. For any applicant to be able to exercise their legally enforceable right of access to information when an agency wishes to avoid supplying that information, the applicant, like me, needs to be very determined and very well resourced. That means you must have

plenty of money and plenty of legal advice to get anywhere. That was the first point I think that the committee made.

They went on and made the point that many of the witnesses appearing before the committee pointed out the way in which the Public Service culture had developed in antipathy, and even antagonism, towards the act and inquiries made under its provisions. It is not only this committee which has made that point: the commonwealth Ombudsman has also done so. They said that the operation of drafting of the whole of the Freedom of Information Act needs a drastic revamp, and they have said that the review process needs to remove the current internal review procedures, confine all external review to the Ombudsman or Information Commissioner with a limited right of appeal to the District Court on errors of law only, and that powers of the Ombudsman and the Information Commissioner to formally conciliate and mediate on the disputed application is needed to be established—and that this should also cover cabinet documents. I heartily concur. Unless we do, we will never get the kind of information we should be allowed to get about Kortland and a few other things such as that. It has always distressed me that there has been this ability to cover up without accountability.

Motion carried.

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

A quorum having been formed:

LEGAL ASSISTANCE (RESTRAINED PROPERTY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 March. Page 1206.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Since 1986 most Australian jurisdictions have had legislation for restraining the assets of people charged with certain types of criminal offence and forfeiting the assets upon conviction. Local forfeiture offences are enumerated in section 3 of the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 1996. Tainted property may be restrained under the act pending the outcome of the trial, and 'tainted property' is defined in section 4 as property acquired for the purpose of committing a forfeiture offence, property used in connection with a forfeiture offence, and the proceeds of a forfeiture offence.

All property of a party committing a serious drug offence is presumed to be tainted, but this presumption may be rebutted by evidence led in a court hearing on restraint or forfeiture, and such hearings are civil matters and therefore points are proved or rebutted on the balance of probabilities, not beyond reasonable doubt.

The bill stops a person accused of crime from using money restrained under the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act to pay for a legal defence better than that offered by the Legal Services Commission.

The government is right to introduce the bill. Although the Law Society's Criminal Law Committee—faithful to its self-styled vocation of defending the interests of people accused of crime—has opposed the bill, the opposition will be supporting the government on this. Our vocation is different from that of the Law Society's Criminal Law Committee because it is our job to evaluate all the claims on the public purse, not just those seen in the course of a career in the courts.

Property ultimately forfeited under the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act goes to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund, where it is sorely needed. The payouts from that fund are derisory when compared with damages awarded in some civil cases. The government has a legitimate contingent interest in the property restrained under the parent act. That property is not lazy money that would be better used to give an accused the best lawyers.

It seems to me that the most compelling argument against the bill is that it throws a new class of indigent accused upon the Legal Services Commission, but that is not an argument which the Law Society made with any force, and I think in the final analysis it is not an argument that weighs with me. I notice that someone who has difficulty with the difference between 'beyond reasonable doubt' and 'balance of probabilities' has joined the House for the debate. I refer, of course, to the member for Ross Smith.

In South Australia, the question of how much could be withdrawn from restrained property for defence expenses was considered in *Vella*. It was held that the court could authorise payments for defence lawyers out of the assets restrained under the act and that a person accused of crime is entitled to use the restrained assets for legal representation of his choice. *Vella* was decided in 1994, and neither the government nor the parliament could allow this decision to remain law. We intervened swiftly to pass the parent act in 1996, and the key change was section 20(1)(b) which provides:

Property subject to restraining order may only be applied towards legal costs on the following conditions. . . the court may only authorise application of property towards the payment of legal costs on a reasonable basis approved by the court.

The leading case after the passage of the 1996 legislation was the 1998 case of *Petropoulos*. The accused argued that the rate that should be set for the purpose of withdrawing money from the restrained assets was the Supreme Court's scale of costs. The DPP and the Attorney-General argued that it should be the rate set by the Legal Services Commission.

Mr Justice Lander's formulation was that 'payment of legal costs on a reasonable basis' as it appears in section 20(2)(b) of the parent act means 'the charges prevailing in the market place' and 'the scale of costs in the court in which the legal work is to be performed'. In *Pangallo*, decided in 1999, the court said:

It seems obvious that, if the defendant chooses senior counsel to represent him on such serious charges, this court should take note of that and authorise a rate that in the legal marketplace recompenses senior counsel.

So, it is no wonder that the government feels compelled to legislate again. The Law Society's Criminal Law Committee argues that the law should allow an accused access to restrained assets to buy a defence comparable with the one he could buy if private legal representation were arranged in the normal way. Alas, the committee is correct when it writes:

The fact is that in some cases the quality of representation will make the difference between an unjustified conviction and an acquittal.

It goes on to compare the differences in the quality of legal representation with the differences in medical care. The committee draws attention to the Legal Services Commission's cap on funding of individual cases and says that, when the cap is reached, an appeal will not be lodged, no matter the merits. The committee says that this is unsatisfactory for accused people without restrained assets, who are much greater in number than those defendants with restrained assets. So, its indignation is not confined to the minority: it

just happens that this bill raises those kinds of case. As an aside, when a submission begins, as the Law Society's does, 'The bill brings about fundamental and sweeping changes that extend far beyond the matters expatiated upon in the government legislative report,' the reader can be certain from the verb 'expatiate' that the author does not suffer laymen gladly. The committee's submission argues that the lawyers have long been prepared to assist the Legal Services Commission by accepting its briefs at much less than the normal rate, but it does not think that the government or the statutory law of the state should accept that the fees paid by the Legal Services Commission are the normal, correct or going rates.

In the celebrated *Operation Tableau* cases in Queensland, \$1.2 million was restrained under the equivalent act. The entire amount was expended in pretrial litigations, and the defendants pleaded guilty. The Australian Law Reform Commission has studied the topic. The Attorney is swift to quote the parts of the report that justify the bill. I quote:

The proposition that restrained property should be able to be made available to fund a defence to the very court proceedings that would, in the event of a finding against the defendant, lead to the forfeiture or possible forfeiture of that property cannot in the view of the commission be sustained.

The commission continues:

Funds are not infrequently dissipated on unmeritorious proceedings as there is no mechanism to limit the type of proceedings to be funded, and a defendant who is aware that his or her assets may be confiscated is not likely to exercise judgments exercised by ordinary prudent litigators.

I am not sure whether the member for Ross Smith will be contributing to this debate as an ordinarily prudent litigant; I think he maybe contributing in a different, more reckless capacity. However, the bill is not a reflection of the Law Reform Commission's report. The report recommends the state's providing a legally adequate defence to a person unable to defend himself owing to restraint of his property under the act, the adequacy of the defence should be comparable to that which an ordinary self-funded person could afford, and the accused should be able to challenge the adequacy of the defence in court. The Law Society is right to point out that what the government is proposing is not the full implementation of the Law Reform Commission's report. Implementing the report would have tremendous consequences for the state budget. The Law Society says that the Law Reform Commission recommended that an independent person or body regulate defence costs in these kinds of cases, not that the costs of the Legal Services Commission be made the standard.

Turning to another matter, that is, the question of repealing section 360 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, I agree with what the Attorney-General has had to say. I note that Mr Justice Duggan, sitting in the Court of Criminal Appeal, on the case of *R v. Gillard and Preston* made an order under section 360 that taxpayers meet the costs of the appellant's solicitor and counsel, even though the two accused had exhausted their Legal Services Commission funding. I ask the minister: has the government paid in accordance with Mr Justice Duggan's order and, if not, will it?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I thank the member for Spence for his contribution. In relation to his question, I am advised that the matter is still being reviewed.

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

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable Other Motions set down for Thursday 5 April to be taken into consideration forthwith.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Venning): As there is not an absolute majority of members present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

STANDING ORDER 35

Order of the Day, Notices of Motion, No. 3: Mr McEwen to move:

That standing order 35 be amended by adding 'All speeches to the address will be given to the Speaker for incorporation in *Hansard* without reading. The Speaker is to ensure the contents of the speeches are in conformity with Standing Orders.' And standing order 113 be amended by leaving out paragraph (a).

Mr MEIER (Goyder): With the concurrence of the member for Gordon, I move:

That Notice of Motion No. 3 be discharged.

Motion carried.

SYDNEY PARALYMPIC GAMES

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this House congratulates all South Australian and Australian athletes, Olympic and government officials and volunteers who either participated in or helped organise the Sydney Paralympic Games.

It is regrettable that so much time has transpired from the holding of the Paralympic Games until the present, as I would have liked to address this issue earlier. However, such is the way of things. It is appropriate that the House note the outstanding achievement of our Paralympians and of all involved in the organisation of the Paralympic Games which followed the highly successful Olympic Games in Sydney late last year.

South Australia had 26 athletes in the 250 member Australian Paralympic 2000 team which began on 18 October. South Australia also had 13 officials acting in roles, such as coaching and management. We had 21 athletes in the 1996 Atlanta Paralympic team, 17 of whom returned with a medal. In those games, South Australian athletes won nine gold medals, three silver medals and one bronze medal, and the results were equalled during this recent Paralympic Games.

For the 2000 Paralympic Games, Libby Kosmala, in shooting, won selection in her eighth games, and David Gould and Troy Andrews, in wheelchair basketball, competed in their fifth games. These gold medal athletes joined other gold medallists from previous games, namely Neil Fuller and Katrina Webb in athletics, Kieran and Kerry Modra in cycling, Anthony Clarke in judo, and Stan Kosmala in shooting, all of whom were in the Sydney team.

The South Australian Government supported the Paralympic athletes through a range of programs. Some of these included (in 1999) the South Australian Sports Institute's Program for Paralympic Preparation (PPP), which

helped give athletes their best possible opportunity to succeed. The PPP coordinator was appointed and each Paralympic athlete was introduced to the program. All Paralympic athletes in the team accessed components of the program, which made available sports science services, sports psychology, career and education support, personalised fitness and training programs and the use of the gymnasium and recovery centre facilities.

The South Australian Sports Institute (SASI) has a scholarship program open to able and disabled athletes; 22 athletes in the PPP were allocated grants of between \$500 and \$2 000, totalling \$23 500 for the period 1999-2000. Athletes were also entitled to use the resources and facilities of the institute through the scholarship.

In July 2000 the federal government agreed to meet the \$1 085 accommodation costs at the Olympic Village for each athlete and support staff member. The South Australian government matched that amount dollar for dollar for South Australian paralympic athletes and support staff. This amounted to a total of \$42 000. In the 18 months leading up to the games, the state government also provided \$37 000 to the South Australian Paralympic Committee to employ an executive officer and to pay for administration expenses for its fundraising.

There was also, of course, the successful paralympic torch relay, organised exclusively by the Sydney Paralympic Organising Committee. The South Australian Paralympic Committee had very little to do with the event, but Adelaide City Council was the primary South Australian contact. Of course, it proved to be quite a successful event. It began on 5 October with the lighting ceremony at Parliament House in Sydney. The flame was flown to each interstate capital city and returned to New South Wales to begin the 750 kilometre, seven day road journey around the outer Sydney area, after which it was carried into the Olympic stadium to light the cauldron as part of the opening ceremony of the 2000 Paralympic Games on 18 October.

The South Australian leg of the relay occurred on Sunday 7 October. The flame arrived by plane and was transported to Wigley Reserve, Glenelg. Its journey to the Adelaide city centre began at Glenelg at 10.55 a.m., and 20 torchbearers carried the flame approximately 500 metres each, primarily along Anzac Highway. The lighting ceremony was held in Rundle Mall on the arrival of the torch at 12.30 p.m., and it was an extremely moving event. Torchbearers were selected from community nominations, paralympic athletes, school-children and other community figures. At the conclusion of the ceremony, the torch returned to the airport and was taken to Perth for a similar ceremony.

There was considerable publicity in the national media regarding the financial burden being placed on paralympic athletes and state bodies because of the costs involved in accommodating a team at the Olympic Village, but I am sure that the House will agree that the South Australian government, in concert with the federal government, did all it could to be of assistance. The federal government, of course, as I mentioned earlier, announced that it would meet \$1 085 of that cost for each team member, including staff and, as I mentioned, the South Australian government matched that figure, bringing to a total of \$42 000 the amount that we contributed.

I am sure everyone in the House would agree with me, in supporting this motion, that the Paralympic Games provides a fine example of those values which South Australians, and Australians, hold high. The outstanding commitment and

effort from each and every paralympian set a fine example for all of us to follow in the years ahead and, indeed, provided an outstanding complement to the outcome of the main Olympic Games event. It was, at times, quite touching and quite moving to see what the human spirit can conquer and achieve through sheer guts and determination.

To all those South Australians who were involved in the Paralympic Games, both as competitors and as officials, I say to you: well done. I encourage you to apply yourself again to the task at the next Paralympic Games and to get out there and spread the message within the South Australian community that, if you try hard enough, despite whatever gifts God has or has not given you, you can achieve your dream.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): The motion before us is very commendable, and I acknowledge the member for bringing this item to the House. Certainly, the opposition is in full support of the motion. I think it is appropriate also to acknowledge the wonderful work that was done achieving the great success of the Paralympic Games, which obviously followed straight after the Olympic Games in Sydney.

I think all members would be delighted at the success of our South Australian and Australian athletes at the Paralympic Games. We can certainly be very proud that the success which we enjoyed in the Olympic Games was boosted by the success of our athletes, who received just as much acclaim, in the Sydney Paralympic Games. I think, for some people, the great support which the Paralympic Games were able to generate from a spectator point of view probably came as a pleasant surprise. I think all Australians should be acknowledged for the wonderful, well deserved support which was provided to our athletes at the Sydney Paralympic Games.

It goes without saying that, beyond the athletes, we also need to acknowledge, in a very fulsome way, the support that was provided by officials and by volunteers. Just as we acknowledge that wonderful work done by officials and volunteers at the Olympic Games, it is as important—maybe in some respects even more important—to acknowledge the wonderful contribution that was made by officials and volunteers at the Sydney Paralympic Games.

Needless to say, South Australians certainly played their part in making sure that we had a vital contribution, not only from the point of view of athletes but also from the point of view of volunteers, of officials, of coaches and the various infrastructure that is put in place to make sure that we have such an outstanding contribution in such an important event.

The Sydney Paralympic Games were very successful from a range of viewpoints. I think, first and foremost, we once again showed our great capability of being able to host such an event. We were able once again to display—perhaps on a per capita basis, even more significantly—our great success at having a range of athletes who were able to perform at the very highest level. It might be a bit unfair, so I will not do so, to start highlighting some individuals, but there were many outstanding performances.

My wife, our two daughters and I were lucky enough to be in the Olympic stadium when Louise Sauvage competed. She, of course, followed that great performance in, I think, the 1500 metres, by going on to be successful in a number of events, winning gold, silver and bronze medals as well. South Australia had a full complement of athletes who performed not only at a national level but also at the highest level. Who can forget the heroics of Neil Fuller, one of our own in South

Australia, who, of course, has participated at the institute in South Australia? So, from a parochial point of view, the performances of South Australians were second to none. Of course, going beyond that, the performance of our Australian athletes will stay with us for a long time.

I think we do have an issue that has come out of the Paralympic Games—the member for Waite may well have touched on this—and that is what we have seen post Paralympic Games with the unfortunate consequences of the placement of some of the individuals in certain events. We certainly had the hiccup that occurred with athletes either being in the wrong classification or not being able to compete, and unfortunately some Australians were caught up in that. After the Paralympics we even saw the other component of this, whereby some athletes incorrectly, illegally and perhaps even one could say immorally, (I might add that these athletes were not from Australia) were placed into a classification where they had no right to be. That is a very sad situation. In the men's basketball gold medal winning team, Spain (I think I am right; correct me if I am not), a number of athletes were in the mental disability classification who simply did not have the right to be there. We must ensure that these types of problems never occur again.

After that, we have seen the decision to rub out a whole number of events as a result of the immoral situation that occurred in some events at the Paralympics—not involving Australian athletes, I hasten to add again. There are issues here which need to be cleared up quickly for the sake of all athletes, because we certainly do not want our athletes to be disadvantaged because of the immoral behaviour of some. That was an unfortunate consequence of the Sydney Paralympic Games.

Let us remember the good, positive things and the outstanding performance of a whole range of South Australian and other Australian athletes, many of whom were able to win gold, silver and bronze. Let us also not forget all those other athletes who competed as well at the very highest level, many of whom may not have won the highest accolade but who were able to achieve personal best, which is a great achievement in its own right. We should recognise all athletes who competed and participated and those athletes who did Australia very proud. In addition, very appropriately we note in this motion all those other people who were so vital in putting on a successful Paralympic Games. It was another major event of which all Australians can be proud, which followed on the back of the Olympic Games and which was universally supported by the public.

We should all recognise and be very proud that not only did Australians get out to support the Olympic Games in droves but that they butted up and made sure that the Paralympic Games received the due recognition that those athletes deserved, and we would all have felt very proud of that. Beyond that we offer our genuine thanks to the officials, administrators and coaches who obviously all played such a vital role in making sure that the Sydney Paralympic Games were so successful, for a wonderful event of which we can be very proud and which I am sure we will remember for a long time to come.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I rise to support the motion. I will not delay the House for long; the other speakers have covered the topic well. As minister for sport I place on record my congratulations and thanks to all those who participated in or helped organise the Sydney Paralympics. I had the opportunity of

going to the Sydney Paralympics for a day and observing not only the excellent quality of the athleticism of the competitors but also the excellent commitment of the volunteers and the superb organisation by all those involved. I take the opportunity to place on record my sincere congratulations to all those involved in participating, organising or volunteering at the Sydney Paralympics.

The member for Lee raised the issue of the decision by the international group to disallow the intellectually disabled to participate in future Paralympics. As I have advised the House previously in question time, the government has taken up that matter at the most senior levels with the international sporting organisations seeking to have that ruling overturned. We think it is grossly unfair that all the intellectually disabled athletes are being coloured with the same brush for the actions of a certain group of athletes from one country. We have been in discussions as recently as this week with Australian officials who are travelling to international fora, trying to have this decision overturned. We will continue to seek to have the decision overturned, because we think that the credibility of all athletes is being damaged by the decision made by the international body. They certainly do not deserve that response from the international body. I will take the opportunity to update the House in future debates. Again, I offer my sincere congratulations to all those involved in the Paralympics.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I wish to put on the record my congratulations to the South Australian athletes, the government officials and especially the volunteers. Although the Olympic Games were held last year, this is the International Year of the Volunteer, so it is appropriate that they be given greater recognition today. So, I congratulate all those who participated in and helped to organise the very successful Paralympic Games. There is no question that the Sydney Olympics were one of the most successful Olympic Games, and that also goes for the Paralympic Games. In many ways I believe that, more than the general Olympic Games, the Paralympic Games hold the true spirit of the Olympics as they were originally held in ancient Greece, because often there is criticism of how commercialised the Olympic Games have become, in contrast to the ancient Greek spirit of rivalry between competing groups at a time of peace and friendly rivalry when each acknowledged the other's abilities and successes.

I think that spirit is demonstrated more in Paralympic competition, where against all the odds individuals come to compete and succeed. I think that sort of determination is an example to many in society who face obstacles which in many cases are unimaginable to the average person. The success of individuals in Paralympic Games gives hope to individuals. I believe that that is really the spirit of the Olympic Games. I believe that in many ways the general Olympics can be criticised of being over commercialised, where countries compete against each other and at times the spirit of the Olympics is lost in the competition bids and, sadly, in the way the bids are carried out, but no-one can doubt the sincerity and spirit of the Paralympics. I believe that, for that reason, those involved should be commended and congratulated, because they are doing something for the human spirit which is not touched by commercialisation as it is in the general Olympics.

In reflecting on the Olympics, I would also like to reflect on the competition between countries on where they should be held. Maybe in the future there should be some thought to

staging them permanently in Greece. In that way, the tradition of the Greek Olympics would be reignited and there would not be that competition. We would know it would be there and, for example, we could provide funds to the less economically developed countries. We would not have that competition and everybody would be able to compete in the spirit of the Olympics as intended.

No matter what happens to the future of the Olympics, I believe there is no doubt that the spirit of the Olympics is very evident in the Paralympics. I am not going to list the gold medals, the silver medals and so on, because in some ways that would be contrary to what the Olympics are about. They are about participation and about people doing their best, to the point where they excel and give hope to others who are not in the position to excel. So, congratulations to all those who were involved in the organisation of a most successful Paralympic Games in Sydney.

Motion carried.

VOLUNTEERS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this House commends the outstanding achievements of all State Emergency Services, Country Fire Service, Police and other volunteer personnel who responded to the wave of storms and tempest which swept through the state during the week 16 to 20 October.

I rise to support the motion standing in my name and to commend our State Emergency Services for their outstanding achievement during the storms that struck Adelaide during the period 17 to 19 October 2000. I will relate to the House the sequence of events and the actions carried out by our fantastic SES during the course of those few days. It was on Tuesday 17 October, in the late afternoon, that strong winds, accompanied by very heavy falls of rain, affected the greater Adelaide metropolitan area and surrounding country districts. During this initial storm, as it approached, SES units were tasked to five incidents involving damaged or fallen trees in the central metropolitan area.

I can personally account for the effect of this storm in the area of my constituency in Mitcham, where flooding was almost immediate, outages of just about everything were instantaneous, traffic slowed to a virtual standstill, and the entire district was plunged into almost total darkness. It was quite horrific, particularly considering that children were going home from school, people were going home from work, and there was a lot of traffic on Belair Road, and on other streets all around the metropolitan area. It was quite a tenuous situation; quite a dangerous situation.

On Wednesday, 18 October 2000, commencing just after midnight, and continuing through the early hours of Wednesday morning, a further five requests for assistance were received by the state duty officer for operational tasks in the metropolitan area. These tasks were primarily in the northern suburbs, with three properties at Parafield Gardens suffering minor roof damage and water intrusion. Just after midday, following a five hour period of relative quiet, the Bureau of Meteorology alerted the SES state duty officer with a severe wind warning for the southern Yorke Peninsula and Kangaroo Island, with a high potential for severe winds impacting the Adelaide area in the late afternoon.

The warning included a time frame through the night of the 18 October and extending to Thursday 19 October. By mid-afternoon, reports had been received of SES taskings to damaged trees in Port Lincoln and Port Pirie, and of the

sandbagging of one house at Port Lincoln to prevent storm-water entry. At about 1800 hours, the main force of the storm impacted the Adelaide area, and all metropolitan SES units commenced operations, and that was the period to which I alluded earlier—quite an horrific impact. The specially trained state headquarters unit volunteers activated the SES control centre, and that team took over the management and coordination of the operation under the direction of the State Duty Officer.

At the height of the storm, during the evening of 18 October and extending through to 0300 hours on Thursday 19 October, 22 SES units and some 300 volunteers had been committed to mitigating the effects of wind and rain. In the greater Adelaide metropolitan area, all 11 SES units were fully committed and tasks were reported from Whyalla, Port Lincoln and Port Pirie units, from the Riverland and the Murray divisions, from Clare, Snowtown, the South Coast and Kangaroo Island. This was truly a statewide effort by the SES. By far the majority of tasks were those involving damaged or fallen trees, with a significant amount of damage caused to premises, garages and sheds and to motor vehicles.

The second highest form of damage was that of wind damage to roofs and light structures, and a minority of tasks involved the entry of stormwater into domestic premises. On Thursday 19 October, there was further work to be carried out. Following a period of relative inactivity, from about 0300 hours, the State Control Centre was again activated at 1030 hours to manage the finalisation and clean-up phase of the operation. Two state headquarters unit volunteers supported the State Duty Officer in this duty period, handling taskings for the Adelaide area until the centre was closed at around 1900 hours. Following the closure of the centre, control reverted to the State Duty Officer, and only two minor tasks were reported as the storm cleared through the state.

In summary, at the height of the storm, 11 metropolitan, 11 country SES units and some 300 volunteers had been committed to operations. In total, 346 individual tasks were reported through the State Control Centre, with 258 tasks in the metropolitan area and 88 in rural South Australia. The storm affected most of the settled areas of the state, with only the Far North and the South-East escaping relatively unscathed.

The efforts of our emergency services during these few days testify to the outstanding dedication, commitment and capabilities of this group of volunteers. These people give up their own time and may be called upon to risk their own lives and wellbeing in order to make our community a better place at time of crisis. I think all members of the House would join me in commending them for their outstanding effort at this time.

Clearly, this is our emergency services levy at work, with better resources and better capabilities. As the levy and the revenues from it develop in the years ahead, we hope to see continued outstanding efforts from this fine body of people. I am sure that all members of the House and the citizens of South Australia feel more confident as a consequence of the outstanding passage of this test by our SES work force.

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support this motion, which refers to the outstanding achievements of the SES, CFS, police and other volunteers. In fact, it is true that the work they did was outstanding, as outlined by the member for Waite, but we must remember that these are fairly routine achievements for this group of people. They

do this sort of stuff all the time; they do it outstandingly well and for the great benefit of the community.

Certainly, the SES and CFS volunteers do a great job. Those of us who live in peri-urban communities and country areas know just how reliant those communities are on the good works done by the SES and CFS volunteers. They put in a great deal of time and commitment, and the communities would not be the places they are without that volunteer work. During that particular period of storms these volunteers did their work as usual with a great deal of competence and ability.

The police, of course, are professionals, and we are all very proud of our police force in South Australia. It is an outstanding police force and routinely do activities above and beyond the call of their strict duties. The opposition is therefore very pleased to support this motion. The SES and the CFS, in particular, need a great deal of support in this the year of the volunteer.

What I think they do not need is to be muzzled by their minister and the bureaucrats in charge of the SES and CFS. If they want to complain about lack of equipment, support and efficiency on the part of ESAU, then I think that, as volunteers and people who contribute their time and whose work is very important, they should be able to speak their mind on these issues. The minister should support that, rather than their being threatened that if they do not shut up and behave they might not get the funding they require. That is the way in which the government could show its appreciation for the work of these volunteer forces, rather than by a simple motion in the House.

The opposition will look carefully at the way that those volunteer workers are administered. It will also continue the Labor tradition of giving people freedom of speech rather than muzzling them. That was the way in which we will show our appreciation for the work that—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Ms HURLEY: You expelled the member for Hammond, I believe.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HURLEY: I conclude by reiterating the opposition's appreciation of the work done by both the professionals and the volunteers in this particular circumstance, recognising that they do that sort of work on a daily and weekly basis for which they do not always get the praise that they deserve.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HILL (Kaurna): I am pleased that the Minister for the Environment and Heritage is in the chamber this evening because I want to spend tonight's 10 minutes reflecting on his term as minister. It is now just over a year since he was made Minister for the Environment, so I thought that it was a good opportunity to reflect on what he has brought to the portfolio and what his successes and failures have been.

I suppose it would be fair to say that one could sum up the minister's approach to his portfolio by calling him the Minister for Good News. If there is a good news story, if it is furry, if it is a green-tinged project, the minister will be out the front announcing it. He was very quick off the mark to

take Labor's policy initiative and announce that the leafy sea dragon would become the state's fish emblem, and we applaud him for doing that. He came in and stopped mining in Gammon Ranges and we applauded him on that. On those issues he is no doubt doing the right thing. But he is also trying to—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

Mr HILL:—show his Democrat credentials, as the member for Ross Smith said. He was trying to appeal to the electorate on which he hangs by the thinnest of margins, as my colleague said.

Let us look at some of the other decisions that the minister has not made. When you look at the hard decisions in the portfolio, one must say that the minister has been out to lunch. It is my pleasure tonight to go through some of the hard issues still to be resolved in the portfolio. I am not saying these are issues that have just been brought to the fore in his term as minister: a lot of the credit, if that is the word, belongs to his predecessor, the former minister for the environment, the member for Newland.

Over the past 12 months we have had a series of reviews, consultations and issues being put on the backburner. What is clear is that the difficult decisions are being moved away from the parliament and put into a consultation process to get them past March next year so that they are not decided until after the next election. I think it is clear that the minister and his colleagues are now in caretaker mode. It is particularly true of this minister. This minister is in caretaker mode. All the hard decisions are being deferred.

I will go through some examples I have before me. Last week the minister announced a review of coastal issues—a \$4 million review to be done by CSIRO which well and truly puts all the issues to do with sand management and seagrass dieback right back towards the end of the next term of government—not even the beginning of that term of government. I have said things about that and I will not go into detail about it today. The minister might be aware that about four years ago the EPA started a contaminated lands environment protection policy review. That has been in the review process for four years now. It has gone nowhere; we do not know where it is, and I invite the minister to let us know what is happening with it.

In relation to waste management, the government went to the election in 1993 with a promise of 50 per cent reduction by 2000 but dropped that in the following years. When this minister was appointed, a new report came out and the minister upped the anti; he now has 100 per cent reduction total in mind, but no timeline. The waste management committee, which is supposedly looking after all the issues to do with waste management, is still an interim matter. We do not know what is happening with that. We have been told that KESAB is being looked at as a possible manager for it, but this is the third waste management process we have had since the last election. Recycle 2000 was an interim body which was scrapped. Another waste management system was brought into place and that has been abolished. We now have a waste management committee, which is an interim body. We do not know what is happening with this vital issue.

The EPA itself has been subject to review for some years now. The Environment, Resources and Development Committee of this parliament went through a review process and reported back in October 2000. The minister's department produced a report in response to that. I asked the minister the other day a question about what is happening with that. It is still being considered by the department—no

doubt, not to be heard of again until during the election campaign. A number of promises will be made, but no action will be taken until well after the next election.

We have also had the integrated natural resource management legislation finally brought to this parliament after half a decade of discussion and consultation. It is still out there for consultation. I believe it is a very weak document; it certainly has nothing to do with biodiversity which one would think would be the centre of a document to do with natural resource management. We have no wetlands section in the Department of Environment and Heritage. As of this month, we have no wetlands program, as funding has run out. The state of environment report most recently showed that we have lost about 50 per cent of the wetlands in South Australia and the rest are very degraded. Given the importance of wetlands to the landscape, this is a major gap in performance.

The state government still has not finished the federally funded Coongie Lakes Ramsar management plan. That has been in train now for three to four years yet it still has not got past the draft stage. In fact, I believe that Senator Hill sent the draft back to the Department of Environment and Heritage last year because it was so poorly done and officers were told to start again. They are now moving on it, but, rather than working on it, they are developing a case study for changing the Coongie Lakes Ramsar boundaries. I understand they will not meet the deadline set by Senator Hill for June this year.

Wilderness protection itself is an absolute shambles. Since 1998 there have been nine places on the wilderness advisory committee's list for consideration. No action has been taken in relation to any of these. In some cases the assessment has not even started. It is of particular concern for Coongie Lakes, where petroleum and grazing activities continue to have an impact. In addition, there is no support for implementing this part of the act. I understand that the wilderness advisory committee's membership term expired in November and that no new committee has in fact been reappointed.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Don't mislead the House.

Mr HILL: I understand this; the minister can correct it if I have it wrong.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mr HILL: I understand this to be the case, minister, but you can speak later. In relation to marine protected areas, a strategy, or a comprehensive system, was supposed to have been in place by the year 2003. That was part of the government's 'Our coast and seas—marine and estuarine strategy'. We now know that this will not happen in this time. I understand that cabinet is currently considering how to progress this area. It is a contentious issue which has difficulties for the government, particularly in its rural seats. I know that it will not happen by that time because the minister is quoted in the South-East newspaper as saying that 'it will be five years or so before MPAs are introduced into that area'.

Gulf St Vincent is another issue. There was a statement before the last election to put on record an agenda for reform of the management of Gulf St Vincent. There has been no material progress there; there is no integrated management; there is no legislative reform. In the area of greenhouse, we are suffering from lack of leadership by this government. Three ministers are involved—the Minister for Minerals and Energy, the Minister for Environment and Heritage and the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning. None of them seem to take the lead. There is a need for total overhaul of the South Australian government's approach to this. There is currently no strategy, no targets and no timeline.

In terms of threatened species, there seems to be no strategy despite one developed by Kym Mayes in 1992-93. That was dropped by Minister Wotton when he came into office and has not yet resurfaced. Such a strategy would drive the much needed catch-up on things such as the lack of any adequate biodiversity legislation—which is another issue. The national parks act gives no over-protection for threatened species or threatened ecological communities. There is not even a formal list of ecological communities on the schedule of protection.

The Native Vegetation Act is another issue reviewed for all the government's current term and some of the term of the previous government. A number of processes of consultation have been brought forward. In 1999, in answer to a question from me, Minister Kotz (the then minister) said that she had set up a three person review to look at the Native Vegetation Act. We still have not seen that report; we do not know where the government is going. No new regulations or acts have been introduced. In relation to our national parks, many parks still have no management plan and for those which have plans they are in draft form—and have been, in some cases, for many decades. They have never been ratified. There is lack of an overall vision for park management. I particularly draw the House's attention to the contradictory decisions made last year in relation to Yumburra and the Gammon Ranges. Yumburra had absolute protection as a national park and no mining could occur. Yet the government pushed through changes in the other place to allow mining to occur in that park.

In relation to the Gammon Ranges, where mining could have occurred, the government went in the other direction. It is trying to send different messages to different parts of the constituency because it is worried about the election. I would say that in all these areas plenty of action should happen. These are all contentious issues. The environment community is crying out for some leadership. We have a minister who has been in the job for 12 months; he may have made some progress, but we are not aware of it. I look forward to his coming in here to correct the record. The fact is that we have a government that is in caretaker mode. We have a minister who is worried about his own electorate. He is coming out with all the positive, good news stories he can to help him in his electorate and his colleagues in other electorates in the hills, but when it comes to the hard decisions there is no action whatsoever.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Ross Smith!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise on the matter of the recently declared city dry zone, in particular, to commend the Adelaide council for the action it has taken to help clean up our city. This debate has been most intriguing. We actually have some people out there actively arguing for the right for people to continue drinking in public places, to fall down drunk, and basically to sit under park benches and trees with casks of red and white wine and be a public menace and a public eyesore. We actually have some people out there arguing for that. I think it is time for those who are opposed to the Adelaide City Council's decision to apply a little bit of good old commonsense to the situation.

I particularly want to congratulate Councillor Harbison, Deputy Lord Mayor, for the leadership he has shown on this, and the Lord Mayor—although he was not required to vote—for his leadership on the issue. Those councillors have shown the people living in Adelaide real, firm and sensible leader-

ship. They have sent a clear signal that they want Adelaide to be a pleasant living environment, not only for those residing within the city precinct but for those visiting it. I commend them for that. To those councillors who have allowed themselves to be caught up in this misty-eyed nonsense that implies that people, irrespective of race, colour or creed, should be encouraged to sit around in the parklands drunk, I say: take counsel from your residents, because I do not think that is what people really want to see.

I would like to make the point that the *Advertiser* has been beating both the council and the government around the ears on this issue, saying 'do something' for months now, and a degree of hysteria has been whipped up over the issue. However, I note that the response from the media, now that the decision has been made finally, has been a little muted. I was surprised that there was not an editorial in the *Advertiser* yesterday, but I note there is one today, and I commend it for that. I note that the Editor has said:

Today we have action instead of talk. Hopefully we also will have rational assessment of its consequence and, in the meantime, the same order of decision making brought to making the fabric of Victoria Square better and brighter rather than yet another series of plans and sketches.

I commend the *Advertiser* for that. However, the media is certainly not out there with bells and whistles. It is very interesting to note them waiting to see the reaction, waiting to see which way the mood is going, before they decide what they will write in the paper and what they will say about it. Generally, the flow from both the media and the public is soundly in support of the decision.

I want to make a couple of points about some of the woolly thinking and nonsense that has been going on in this debate and, in particular, those people who are jumping up and down accusing the Adelaide City Council of somehow being racist because it has made this decision. I see nothing in the decision that has been made that discriminates on the basis of race, sex or religion. I see nothing in the decision taken by the council that singles out the Aboriginal community or any other community for special attention. I simply see a decision that says, regardless of who you are, if you want to sit around in the City of Adelaide, drunk and disorderly in a public place, we do not want you there: we want you moved on.

The whole argument that there is something somehow racist about this is petty nonsense, and everyone in this House knows it. It is about cleaning up the City of Adelaide and it is about helping people to live a better life. It has nothing to do with beating the Aboriginal community around the ears on this, and people need to keep that in mind.

The term 'racist' and the accusation of being a racist is thrown around too liberally in this place and outside. I noted even today in the grievance debate that the member for Giles attempted to accuse the Minister for Education of being racist because some Aboriginal schools in her electorate required some repairs. I have news for her. I have schools in my electorate that also need repairs, and some of them have Aboriginal children in them. But I do not go to bat and say that the minister is being racist because my school is not being fixed. It is absolute nonsense. To think that someone could come in here and throw around an accusation like that degrades the standards within the parliament and earns no respect for the member concerned. I make that point to everyone in regard to this debate about the city dry zone.

Having chaired the Select Committee on a Heroin Rehabilitation Trial, I make the point that we need to do more

in this state to help people who have problems with drugs and alcohol. The way in which to help people who have problems with drugs or alcohol is to get them into treatment. One formula will not work for all. You need to approach every person who is abusing drugs and alcohol differently. However, the object is the same: to get them into help, to take action, to sort out their life, to realise that they have a problem and that they need to do something about it.

Those people who are opposed to this city dry zone are basically saying to the alcohol abusers sitting around Adelaide drinking alcohol, 'We want you to stay there; retain your alcohol addiction; and continue to be a public nuisance. The community endorses that. We would like you to stay there with your flagons, drunk and disorderly in the street with no hope of rehabilitation.' What a load of nonsense!

Irrespective of race, religion or gender, these people need to be moved into a treatment situation. If that involves moving them on, declaring a dry zone, fining them, and continually disrupting them from their alcoholic state until they finally go to a rehabilitation centre and seek help, I say, 'Good stuff! Let's have more of it.' The state government and the Premier have acted promptly to contribute a substantial amount of money to provide a stabilisation centre in Adelaide to pick up some of those people who will now find themselves being moved on.

I note that the Salvation Army—that fantastic organisation—is also taking steps to help those people. If a consequence of this decision is that it saves a handful of alcoholics or gets them into treatment, then I say, 'Well done!' Where has the Labor Party been on this? As far as I am aware, we have not had a single comment on this matter from the Labor Party in the House. Where are members contributing to the

grievance debates? Where are the private members getting up and saying that they support or oppose the decision? Michael Harbison, the Liberal candidate for Adelaide, has done it. Where is Jane Lomax-Smith on this—the former Lord Mayor who for years did nothing? What is her view on this? Could someone please relate her view on this to us, because the people of Adelaide have a right to know where the Labor Party stands on this issue? Do members opposite support a dry zone? Do they support getting these people into rehabilitation, or are they with those people who are arguing that the drunks of Adelaide should be allowed to remain in the parks, drunk and disorderly ad infinitum? Where are they on this?

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I hear some interjections. I would be delighted if, tomorrow during the grievance debate, one of the members opposite would get up and congratulate the Adelaide City Council on this issue.

I would like now to refer to the continual knocking of our police. If this action gives our police a little more authority to help stabilise the city of Adelaide and to improve the living environment by moving alcoholics on, I say, 'Fair enough,' because they have not been able to do so until now. They have been hamstrung. In state and local government we have to give the police clear and decisive laws so that they can do their job and do it well. That is what the Adelaide City Council's decision is doing.

In conclusion, I commend the council. It has made a fantastic decision. I hope that all councillors get behind the decision; it will make Adelaide a better place.

Motion carried.

At 5.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 5 April at 10.30 a.m.