HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 17 May 2001

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

NATIVE VEGETATION (ORDERS TO ESTABLISH VEGETATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Native Vegetation Act 1991. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

This measure, which I put before the House today, is long overdue. For a long time, I have been concerned about what is happening to our native vegetation, particularly involving a small number of corporate people in the community who are illegally seeking to destroy native vegetation contrary to the wishes of this parliament and the principles and practices of the Native Vegetation Council. What has prompted me to take action at this stage is that I have been contacted by many farmers throughout the state who have become alarmed at what is happening in their area—not just on the Fleurieu Peninsula, but in the South-East and other areas—as a result of corporate cowboys who, for short-term gain, are prepared to act illegally to clear native vegetation.

Our state does not have a good record in respect of conservation of native vegetation. We have cleared more than 60 per cent. We have some large national parks, but they are mainly in dry, low rainfall areas. We have very few wetlands. We never had many in the first place, but we have even fewer now. This bill takes away the economic incentive for clearing illegally.

Members will note that the penalty for breach of the act has been increased from $40 000 to $75 000. Parliamentary Counsel have advised me that, as part of the review of all legislation, penalties are adjusted automatically, but I have asked that the financial penalty be increased over and above what they do as a matter of course to $75 000, which is almost double.

The main point of this bill is not to fine people. That would be a consequence, but when someone comes before the Magistrates Court for breach of the act, there will be a mandatory requirement that the land they cleared illegally be restored. They will have to remove any structures or plantings that are illegal and restore the land under a very tight schedule imposed by the Native Vegetation Council. This requirement has been spelt out in the bill: they will have to restore it to incorporate the sort of species that were there prior to their illegal act. In other words, under this bill we will take away the motivation and the economic benefit that anyone could gain through acting illegally.

I do not dispute that the whole Native Vegetation Act needs review. The South Australian Farmers Federation, with which I have exchanged letters, points that out. I was pleased to receive a prompt response to my letter to the Farmers Federation about this bill from Kent Martin, the Chair of the federation's Natural Resources Committee. In a letter to me dated 2 May this year, he states:

> We are also disappointed with the level of illegal clearance that is occurring in this state. We acknowledge the importance of the issues outlined in the draft bill.

In this letter, the South Australian Farmers Federation is speaking out and highlighting its concerns about what is going on. It argues—and I should point this out in fairness—that the whole act should be reviewed. It supports a major review rather than small changes.

I do not have a problem with that, as I indicated earlier, but I do not believe that we can afford the luxury of waiting for a complete review before we act on this matter. We can still have a major review—and I trust that the government will continue to proceed down that path—but, in the meantime, I believe that this measure which I have introduced today deals with a serious situation of corporate cowboys setting out to clear land illegally and willingly pay the fine because they know that, at the end of the day, they will make a lot more money from carrying out this illegal activity.

The present requirement under the act is that they can be subject to a criminal penalty—we saw one recently—but, as I have indicated, it does not act as a disincentive. The current arrangement allows for the Native Vegetation Council to take civil action against an offender to require some restoration, but that is optional, costly and time consuming. My bill in effect creates a one-stop-shop where the offender gets a penalty and then automatically is required to restore as far as possible what has been damaged. We know that it can never be restored 100 per cent, but it must be done as far as possible.

That is the essence of my bill, which I think is a sensible measure. I have had a lot of support from the farming community, and I must say that I have been very impressed by its commitment to this sort of measure. Many members of my family are engaged in farming activities. They are horrified at what they have seen happening in the areas in which they live, not by farmers but by corporate cowboys who, in the true sense of the term, are acting in a criminal way. They are committing a crime against present and future generations.

One of the ironies is that we have not even studied a lot of this vegetation. As I mentioned before, we are left with our national parks and, in effect, islands of habitat. Apart from the obvious intrinsic worth, we do not know of the medicinal benefits of a lot of these plants. Obviously, if you remove the habitat you will get rid of the insects and other creatures. We have a situation in South Australia where it is illegal to export wildlife; on the other hand, we have people destroying the habitat, and that is a much more destructive way of killing animals and plants. We are outraged when someone exports illegally a parrot or a lizard, and that should be so but, at the same time, these people are removing the habitat and destroying the possibility of those creatures surviving.

It is time that we took action. What I am proposing, I believe, is a commonsense measure. We are talking about illegal clearing—because there will always be a need for some clearing. One can argue about the scope and the extent of that, but for things such as fence lines, building a house, and so on, you will always need some clearing. I am talking here about illegal clearing, where there is no permission; where people are not supposed to clear and have gone ahead and done so illegally without obtaining permission; or, contrary to an instruction or order from the council, they have gone ahead, broken the law, thumbed their noses and, as a result, the community and future generations are being deprived of their natural heritage.

Some of the offenders—but not all—are linked to the wine industry, and I should issue a word of caution to those people, because they want to be very careful that their names, as

grape growers, or as wine producers, do not appear on the internet for an international boycott of their product. The United States several years ago had a very successful campaign against some polluting companies called The Dirty Dozen. With modern technology—the internet—it is very easy to relay throughout the world to the wine consumers that these particular grapes or the products from those grapes should not be purchased, because these people have acted in a criminal way not only against the laws of this state but against the world community and against environmental considerations.

I know who these people are, the community at large knows who they are, and they want to be very careful, because it is not difficult to approach the wine makers and say, 'If you buy any of the grapes from these people, your product will be boycotted.' As a matter of principle, I do not buy certain brands of wine because some of the people, I know, have engaged in the illegal clearance of vegetation, and there is no way that I will ever support their product. I make that statement just to point out to some of these cowboys that wine buyers tend to be fairly sophisticated people who have access to the internet and are aware of their activities.

I ask members to give this matter very serious consideration. I could talk about salinity aspects; I could talk about the importance of the issues that the government is pushing hard at the moment in relation to trying to reduce salinity; and I could talk about the fact that we are preaching to Queensland and New South Wales about their vegetation clearance, so we need to make sure that our own back yard is squeaky clean and that no-one accuses us of a double standard.

I urge members to support my proposal. As I said, I have been heartened by the letter of response from the Farmers Federation and by contact from many people in the farming community and the wider community who have said that something has to happen; it is not good enough. The current legal provisions are not strong enough, and people are literally able to drive, if not a truck, a bulldozer, through the current Native Vegetation Act. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr LEWIS: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted. Does the member wish to continue, and insert the explanation?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I will read it in.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 26—Offence of clearing native vegetation contrary to this Part

This clause amends section 26 to—

- increase the fine referred to in the penalty provisions contained in subsections (1) and (2) to a monetary amount of $75 000, without altering the alternative means of calculating the maximum penalty based on a sum per hectare of land; and
- compel a court convicting a person of an offence involving the clearance of native vegetation without consent to make an order under proposed Division 3 (unless an order has already been made under that Division in civil enforcement proceedings).

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 31—Jurisdiction of the Court

This clause amends section 31 to—

- remove the current provision requiring the Court to order that a respondent who has cleared native vegetation make good the contravention or default and require, instead, that the Court make an order under proposed Division 3 (unless an order has already been made under that Division in criminal proceedings); and
- increase the penalty specified in subclause (9) to a monetary amount of $75 000.

Clause 4: Insertion of Part 5 Division 3

This clause inserts a new Division in the principal Act dealing with orders for the establishment of native vegetation on illegally cleared land. An order under this Division must direct the offender to—

- establish specified types of vegetation in specified numbers on specified parts of the cleared land; and
- nurture, protect and maintain the plants until they are established or for a specified period; and
- remove buildings, structures, works or vegetation (if any) that have been erected, undertaken or planted on the land since the clearance occurred.

The clause also deals with re-vegetation where the land has been sold since being illegally cleared. In such a case—

- the offender is entitled to enter the land (and any other specified land that must be crossed to gain access to the relevant land) to comply with the order;
- it is an offence for the owner or occupier of the land or any other person to hinder or obstruct an offender carrying out an order punishable by a maximum penalty of $75 000;
- if the Court is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the owner or occupier of the cleared land did not know (and could not reasonably have been expected to know) that the land had been illegally cleared and is satisfied that compliance with the order will cause financial loss to that owner or occupier, the Court may order the payment of compensation to the owner or occupier of the land, may refuse to make an order or may make the order in a modified form.

The clause makes it an offence punishable by a maximum penalty of $75 000 to contravene or fail to comply with an order. In addition, if an offender fails to comply with an order within a reasonable period, the Council may, by leave of the Court, carry out the directions of the order and may recover the costs of doing so from the offender.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

DIGNITY IN DYING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 March. Page 1097.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support this bill and I congratulate the member for Fisher on his courage in introducing it into the House. As a society of people we pride ourselves these days that more than ever we are generally tolerant of people's views and wishes. Let us prove this by supporting the passage of this bill through the parliament. It has been a long time coming and there have been other attempts, but it is about time that we bit the bullet on this and started to reflect society's views on this very complex and important issue.

The personal views and wishes of people whether to live or die should be respected, and in my opinion the laws of this state should reflect those views. People should have the legal right to choose. This bill will allow the terminally ill to choose whether to continue to live until death comes naturally or to terminate their life when all quality of life has gone. In

many cases, waiting for death to come naturally can be very lengthy, uncomfortable and terrifying, despite the wonderful and highly commendable palliative care treatment which is now available to people. Pain is not the only factor involved in dying as a result of a terminal illness. There are other factors such as fear, anxiety, discomfort, frustration and loss of dignity.

All people are different, and what would make life unbearable for one person may be quite tolerable for another, and vice versa. This bill is about giving people the right to choose, and I certainly would want that right. I strongly object to people who are opposed to voluntary euthanasia telling me—in fact, forcing me under the current legislation—how and when I can die. I respect their views and their right to choose not to use euthanasia, and I would ask them to respect my and many others' views and our right to choose euthanasia if we so wish. I am offended by being told how I and my loved ones can die, as is the case at the moment under the state's archaic law.

In the context of a terminal illness, there are three options. The first is to treat the terminally ill person, the second is to withdraw or refuse treatment and the third is to bring about a quick, painless and dignified death. The first option of giving treatment is putting off the inevitable. The second option of withdrawing or refusing treatment can be very cruel for some people, for the reasons I have outlined previously. The third option should be legally available to people who wish and have the courage to use it. It does take courage. In my view it takes as much courage as someone who wants to die naturally and go down a long road, sometimes involving suffering. I believe it also takes courage to use the option of voluntary euthanasia, if it is available to people.

I do not know how I would feel or react if I contracted a terminal illness. One does not know that until the time comes, but one thing I do know: I would like a choice in the matter. Presently I do not have a choice, and this is dreadfully unfair. I will quote an example. Over the years in my electorate a woman constituent wrote to me continually about these sorts of conscience issues, and in particular voluntary euthanasia. She was a strongly religious person in putting her point, and I respected her views and responded to her letters on many occasions. I remember that three or four years ago I went to a function and this woman was there. I did not know her, but she introduced herself to me in the car park afterwards, when she tackled me about my stand on voluntary euthanasia. I put to her that it was not about making it mandatory for people to be euthanased: it was about choice. She continued to argue.

I said, 'I respect your views; you have religious views and that is fine. At the moment the law protects and supports your view, but what about the reverse situation, where the law said that if you had contracted a terminal illness you had to be euthanased? Would you not want the choice not to be euthanased?' She said, 'Yes, of course I would.' She seemed to be satisfied with that, and ever since then she has not contacted me at all about euthanasia. I made the point to her that it was not something to be feared or which was to be imposed upon people; it was purely to give people a choice of how and when they die.

I refer to a letter written by the late Hon. Gordon Bruce who, as we all know, was a much respected President of the Legislative Council in this place up to 1993. Gordon died early in 1995 of motor neurone disease. Just before he died, when he changed his views on voluntary euthanasia, he wrote a letter that was published in the *Advertiser*. Being a good friend of Gordon, I maintained contact with him right up until the time he passed away. The letter he wrote was published in the *Advertiser* of 28 February 1995 and was entitled 'A call from the grave'. I will quote that very short letter for the record again:

> No doubt this letter eventually will land on politicians' desks. All I would ask is that you would give further consideration should you have a euthanasia bill to consider. If there is a God, I feel sure that he would not want us to suffer the way we do with terminal illness.

I would also like to quote part of a speech which my very good friend and former colleague the Hon. Frank Blevins gave in this House on the same subject in 1995, during debate on the voluntary euthanasia bill that was introduced by the then member for Playford, John Quirke. I quote Frank's words, as follows:

> As an individual, what still riles me is that the decision on the quality of my remaining life would be made by doctors, other medical professionals and my relatives, friends, and so on, and it is that to which I object. I would have thought that there was no-one better than I to make the decision and to evaluate the quality of my remaining life—no-one. It is my life: it ought to be up to me, not up to anybody else.

I agree entirely with the Hon. Frank Blevins. In the past and even now euthanasia is practised by compassionate doctors who wish to ease a patient's suffering, but they do so illegally and at great personal risk. I believe this bill would give much needed protection and peace of mind to doctors, family and friends of the terminally ill loved one and, most importantly, to the dying patient. There is an argument that suicide is not illegal now but, towards the end of one's life, usually the terminally ill become too weak and do not have the wherewithal to be able to commit suicide, so I believe there should be a choice and an option if the patient so requires to have that performed for them.

While this piece of legislation as introduced by the member for Fisher is not perfect, it is a start and, if passed, can be continuously monitored and updated to cover any problems that may arise. I believe that it is only by this process that legislation can be refined to protect all people in this very complex area of how we depart this life.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to speak against the bill but to commend the member for Fisher for putting it to the House. I speak against the bill after extensive consultation and correspondence with the AMA, the South Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Society, with constituents and a range of other interested parties. I oppose the bill with a heavy heart because I agree with the members for Price and Fisher and with many other members here that it is easy to imagine circumstances where assisted suicide and voluntary euthanasia would seem quite reasonable and logical. It is easy to imagine someone in such pain and in such a tragic situation that they, their family and the medical professionals assisting that family all agree that that poor individual should be put out of their misery and suffering and given the opportunity to engage in voluntary suicide. No doubt many instances will be given. It is a tragic circumstance when one finds oneself in such a terminally ill and painful position that it is almost unbearable to go on.

However, as is always the case when making laws, parliaments must make laws that benefit all the people. Parliaments must make laws that benefit and protect the weak and vulnerable. Parliaments must make laws that are just and fair and sometimes, in so doing, those laws are unable to cover every eventuality or provide for the needs of every individual in the community because in helping the few we can seriously damage, offend, hurt and even kill the many.

This issue of assisted suicide and voluntary euthanasia, dying with dignity—call it what you will—is one of those very complex and difficult issues.

At this point I will put my definition on what it is we are dealing with in this bill. I draw on the declaration of euthanasia adopted at the 39th World Medical Assembly in Madrid, Spain, in October 1987 when it defined euthanasia as:

> . . . the act of deliberately ending the life of a patient, even at the patient's own request or at the request of close relatives. . .

It defined it as unethical. The definition went on:

> This does not prevent the physician from respecting the desire of a patient to allow the natural process of death to follow its course in the terminal phase of sickness.

Again, a definition adopted by the 44th World Medical Assembly in Marbella, Spain, in September 1992 said:

> Physician-assisted suicide, like euthanasia, is unethical and must be condemned by the medical profession. Where the assistance of the physician is intentionally and deliberately directed at enabling an individual to end his or her own life, the physician acts unethically. However, the right to decline medical treatment is a basic right of the patient and the physician does not act unethically even if respecting such a wish results in the death of the patient.

The House of Lords, in its session 1993-94, in the report of the Select Committee on Medical Ethics, Volume 1—Report, page 10, described euthanasia as:

> A deliberate intervention undertaken with the express intention of ending a life to relieve intractable suffering.

The House of Lords also described assisted suicide as:

> . . . the term we use when a competent patient has formed a desire to end his or her life but requires help to perform the act, perhaps because of physical disability. When the help requested is given by a doctor, the act is called physician assisted suicide. A common form of assistance might be providing a lethal dose of a drug for a patient to swallow.

Again, the House of Lords, in describing terminal illness, described it as:

> . . . an illness which is inevitably progressive, the effects of which cannot be reversed by treatment (although treatment may be successful in relieving symptoms temporarily) and which will inevitably result in death within a few months at most.

The Australian Association for Hospice and Palliative Care has described palliative care as:

> . . . a concept of care which proves coordinated medical, nursing and allied services for people who are terminally ill, delivered where possible in the environment of the person's choice and which provides physical, psychological, emotional and spiritual support for patients and for patients' families and friends. The provision of hospice and palliative care services includes grief and bereavement support for the family and other carers during the life of the patient and continuing after death.

Those definitions are important to this address, and I draw to the attention of the House the fact that I have the Daws Road Hospice in my electorate, collocated beside the Daw Park Repatriation General Hospital. It provides an outstanding service to our community.

What we are talking about with this bill is assisted suicide. Why would people in these circumstances wish to commit suicide? I believe there are three reasons. First, as has been pointed out, they are in such extreme pain and are undergoing such extreme suffering with inadequate palliative care and medical relief that they feel they simply cannot go on. My answer is that we need to do more to provide and improve that palliative care and to make it better. I note that the AMA has made enormous advances in this area that more needs to be done.

The second reason why people might want to commit suicide in these circumstances is that they feel alone, they feel unloved, they feel unvalued, and they feel that there is no point in going on. A third reason why they may wish to commit suicide is that they feel depressed clinically; they feel that their family would be better off without them; and they feel that they are putting their loved ones through an unendurable ordeal and that the world and their family would be better off without them.

There are answers to all these reasons why people may wish to commit suicide when they are seriously ill, and they have to do with the way we love our sick, our vulnerable and our elderly and how we relate to them and deal with the issue of death and dying. It also has to do with the effort and resources we put into improving palliative care to alleviate and assist people in these tragic circumstances.

I had a cousin who was terminally ill with cancer at the age of 17 years. It was a form of leukaemia and after a long and protracted illness she came within a day or two of death. She was simply nothing but a shell and all hope had been given up by her family, her doctors and herself. Miraculously she went into remission and survived her leukaemia. Today she is 26 years old and pregnant and has moved outside the danger zone for a relapse, although that is always a risk. My cousin would be dead today probably if the dignity and dying bill had been in force. Everyone, including her doctors, had given up hope. I make that point because it is not always the case that things are beyond help.

We have to pass a bill which is for the benefit of all and which protects the weak and vulnerable. I commend those members who support the bill because they believe in the intrinsic goodness and competence of people to make these decisions. Perhaps I am a little more cynical. Perhaps I feel that people, when terminally ill, and their families may not always make the right decision, and that this bill would result in many terminations and assisted suicides that might not have been justified. Perhaps I am a little more cynical about the ability of this bill to work. I understand the intent. It is easy to imagine circumstances where it would seem necessary. I simply do not think we should put the role of God in into the hands of people, so I oppose the bill.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I oppose the bill. I understand the motives of the honourable member in introducing the measure which has, of course, provoked a great deal of community debate and discussion. However, I am also aware of the great deal of work and public consultation that took place when we introduced into this parliament, and eventually passed, the palliative care legislation—which I believe works very efficiently. It is legislation of which this parliament can feel very proud. It was not a piece of legislation that was rushed in. It was a piece of legislation which took a considerable amount of time and a great deal of effort and work by a lot of people who gave their time and advice to the people who eventually made the recommendations to the select committee.

Having read through this bill, in my view it places a great deal of responsibility on the members of the medical profession and it would appear to me that if they were to make a favourable decision in relation to this legislation, at some future date that decision could be challenged. I believe that they would be placed in a very difficult, if not untenable, situation and I have, therefore, come to the conclusion, after a great deal of thought, that it would not be wise to have this legislation placed on the statute books.

I am aware that in other parts of the world they have gone down a similar track. My answer to that is, did they have on

their statute books prior to their legislation the palliative care legislation that we have enacted in this state? Did they allow that legislation to have an effective trial? We have not yet had the chance to evaluate the results of the most recent legislation which has been passed in Holland. So, I have grave concerns about this particular proposal. I am aware of some very difficult cases, but I believe that there are appropriate provisions in the palliative care legislation to deal with all those particular issues and, therefore, I cannot support the legislation.

I have read carefully the very wide range of material that has been sent to all members in relation to this matter. These sorts of social issues do attract considerable community debate and discussion. I think that that is a good thing in itself; a good thing that healthy debate takes place because that is one of the hallmarks of a democracy, that people are allowed to engage in that sort of full and frank discussion. I think that is wise and I do not object to the honourable member bringing this particular legislation to the parliament, but I do believe that the majority of us have a responsibility to ensure that the laws that we pass are, in the long term, to the benefit of the total community. I think there are too many questions yet to be answered in relation to this proposal for me to lend my support to it and I therefore oppose the bill.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I have spoken on this issue, as many members have, in the past eight years on at least three occasions and I have opposed a measure to introduce voluntary euthanasia legislation. I have also been a member of the Social Development Committee which has looked into this very important issue. I believe that the report tabled in this parliament was quite comprehensive. I also understand that members who have brought this bill before us again are genuine in their belief that voluntary euthanasia legislation is necessary—

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The honourable member interjects and says that it is a different bill; but it has the same effect. I believe that the safeguards talked about in relation to the previous bills (of the former member for Playford and the Hon.Anne Levy) ultimately come down to the same thing: that you have a third person given the right to assist an individual to end his or her life. The legislation is basically the same.

One could argue that there are greater safeguards than there were in the other bills, but I am sure that when members talked about the other bills they thought that their bills had all the safeguards as, indeed, when the legislation was introduced in the Northern Territory, it was thought that that had all the safeguards. But we find later that they did not have all the safeguards, and I would ask the member for Fisher, if he thinks that this bill has all the safeguards, what is his answer to people who say that safeguards have changed in the last decade from the previous legislation and why we cannot in 10 years' time say that the honourable member's bill did not have all the safeguards. In fact, it is in the continuum that that should happen.

The Hon. R.B. Such: No legislation is ever perfect.

Mr SCALZI: That is true, and I agree with that wholeheartedly. In my humble opinion, neither I nor anyone else is qualified to amend such legislation to guarantee the rights of all individuals. That is the basic fact. Voluntary euthanasia is based on two principles: to alleviate pain and suffering (based on compassion for the individual who is suffering); and, secondly, based on autonomy (an individual's choice to do what he or she feels with their body).

The Hon. R.B. Such: The most fundamental principle in our society.

Mr SCALZI: But the problem with taking that fundamental principle to an extreme is that it is flawed. I agree with Voltaire when he said, 'I disagree with what you say but I would defend to the death your right to say it.' I do defend the honourable member's right to introduce legislation, but I also believe that it would be wrong for any society to put at risk the life of one individual who might fall victim to a perceived reform such as the introduction of voluntary euthanasia. We cannot and must not bring in acts that will put at risk the lives of the vulnerable and the isolated, and we know that that is a possibility.

The Hon. R.B. Such: How?

Mr SCALZI: Because the honourable member himself says that there is no perfect legislation.

The Hon. R.B. Such: So what are we doing in here, then?

Mr SCALZI: We are assessing this legislation. What concerns me most about this debate is that somehow the supporters of voluntary euthanasia assume that if a person has a particular belief, a religious belief, somehow their capacity to be objective about social issues is diminished, and I find that offensive. I find it offensive when someone comes up to me and says, 'Well, Joe, I understand you've been brought up as a Catholic, you're a Christian, and therefore you will oppose it.' I can assure members that there are many things about the way I have been brought up with which I do not necessarily agree.

This is not just a matter of faith but a matter of what is best for society. And it is a legislative problem because, as the House of Lords in England found, as the committee in Tasmania found and, as recently as October last year, as the Social Development Committee of this parliament found, there are no clear safeguards to enable us to come up with legislation that will ensure that both the autonomy of the individual and the rights of those who are vulnerable are guaranteed. No legislation has come up with those two safeguards.

My freedom ends where yours begins. We as a society have the right and the responsibility to make sure that those who are more vulnerable and isolated are protected in legislation. This legislation does not do that. You cannot depend on the definition of the hopelessly ill. I would like to come back to those two points that I started with: autonomy and compassion. You have two patients, A and B, both suffering from terminal illness, for instance, spinal cancer. Under this legislation, one is alleviated of his pain and suffering and the other is not, because one is 17 and the other 18. So the compassion stops because of chronological age. Members would say, 'Yes, this should only apply to adults.' The reality is that suffering does not put itself in compartments. No-one here would agree that a minor should have the right to end his or her life.

I certainly would not agree for a minor to have that right, or an adult, but I do agree that an adult has a right to stop the prolonged treatment, the unnecessary treatment and interference with the natural death process. This parliament, as the member for Stuart and many other members have stated, should be proud of the introduction of the most comprehensive palliative care legislation. I would like to finish with a letter from Dr Robert Pollnitz.

Time expired.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I have no time for this bill at all. I am totally opposed to it, and it grieves me that our society

has gone down this track of wanting to voluntarily get rid of people who do not want to be in this world any more. My honourable colleague the member for Hartley was endeavouring to finish his contribution by referring to a letter from Dr Robert Pollnitz, Chairman of the Lutheran Church of Australia's Commission on Social and Bioethical Questions. Since he did not have the opportunity to refer to that letter, I will start my contribution by doing so. In his letter, Dr Pollnitz says:

> In my 30 years as a specialist physician I have encountered four reasons why people with serious illness ask their doctor to kill them. First, if they have inadequate relief of pain or other distressing symptoms, which means they need the help of a good palliative care team. Second, if they have clinical depression, which is very treatable. Third, women often fear being a burden to their families, which means that they need to know that they are loved and valued. Fourth, people who are socially isolated may see no reason to keep on living, which needs a creative and caring response from our community. Which of those four groups are we to believe is best treated with a lethal dose?

I believe Dr Pollnitz has clearly identified the key point, namely, that in this day and age we increasingly seek to say, 'If a person has these problems and does not want to live any more, why not give them the option to go?' It is the easy solution.

The Hon. R.B. Such: It's happening now.

Mr MEIER: As the member who introduced this bill says, it is happening now. Does that mean that we should seek to make it legal? We have speeding on our roads. Should we therefore get rid of the 110 km/h speed limit because it is useless as drivers will continue to exceed that limit? Does it mean that, just because murders are being committed, we should get rid of the offence of murder?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: It is an irrational argument, and the honourable member would recognise it only too well. In this debate we need to look at the situation in the Netherlands, because it has allowed euthanasia in a semi-legal sense for quite some time. It was formally legalised earlier this year. Therefore, we can gain a quite significant amount of information from assessing the situation there.

The Festival of Light recently published an article in its Perspective section, entitled 'Killed without consent'. The article refers to Dr John Keown who addressed a meeting in Adelaide's Parliament House on 12 July on 'Euthanasia in the Netherlands—sliding down the slippery slope?' Dr Keown was invited to Adelaide by Right to Life Australia. As Dr Keown said:

> Some people oppose voluntary youth euthanasia on religious grounds; others may see it is undermining the healing role of doctors.

He did not take either of those two lines at all. He asked:

> Can legal euthanasia ever be safely limited to those who freely ask for it?

Before going into Dr Keown's argument, I indicate that I have strong opposition to voluntary euthanasia or euthanasia full stop on religious grounds, without question. It is clearly stated in the Bible that we have no right to take our own life, nor anyone else's life. That makes it very simple for me. I realise that the simplicity of the Bible cannot necessarily be transferred to those who may not hold to those truths.

I refer again to the article. Allegedly strict guidelines were laid down in the Dutch parliament with respect to the carrying out of any euthanasia. The guidelines were as follows:

> 1. The act of euthanasia must be voluntarily requested by the patient, free from any outside pressure.
>
> 2. The patient must be suffering from unbearable pain—euthanasia must be the last resort.
>
> 3. The doctor must consult at least one other doctor before proceeding with euthanasia, and must report the euthanasia to the authorities who will investigate whether the guidelines have been followed.

When Dr Keown visited Holland for research in 1989, he interviewed some leading practitioners of euthanasia to discover their interpretation of these three important guidelines. He asked one of the practitioners the following question:

> Would you give euthanasia to an old man who is not sick but who has asked for a lethal injection because his family say they want his money now, and he feels he is a burden to them?

The answer from this Rotterdam doctor was that he would not rule out euthanasia for such a man. He said:

> Such family pressures are similar to other pressures on old people, and euthanasia can be valid in such cases.

Here we have a clear and absolute breach of the first guideline. Over the last 15 or more years, the Dutch government has collected much valuable evidence. A commission was established under Attorney-General Remmelink, and it carried out a large-scale survey on the practice of euthanasia by Dutch doctors. The Remmelink report, which dated back to 1991, found that there were 130 000 deaths in Holland in 1990. Of these, about 2 per cent—that is 2 300—were cases of voluntary euthanasia. In other words, 2 300 were legally killed, and 400 were doctor assisted suicides. There were also 1 000 additional cases of involuntary euthanasia where the patient had not requested it. In 250 of these cases, the patient was fully or partly competent but the doctor had not consulted them about their deaths. It is worrying, is it not?

The report also found that 72 per cent of cases of euthanasia in Holland were not reported by the doctor. Instead, they falsely certified that the death was due to natural causes. I realise that, if this move was ever legalised (and heaven forbid that it occurs in this state), you would not have the unreported cases.

I also refer to the second guideline—requiring euthanasia to be used as a cure for unbearable pain. Again, it seems that it is no longer widely followed. Only a minority of Dutch doctors say that unbearable pain is the main reason for euthanasia. Instead, they give reasons such as dependence, loss of dignity and being tired of life. Does not everyone go through a period of being tired of life? Do we want a doctor to be able to say, 'You are tired of life? No worries; I can fix it for you here and now.'? Of course, we realise it will not happen quite that fast, but it can happen.

Mental rather than physical illness is now being used to justify euthanasia. A 50 year old divorced woman who had lost one son to cancer and the other to suicide became so depressed that she asked her psychiatrist to help her to kill herself. He did so. The case was tried in the Dutch Supreme Court, and the court found that the woman's depression justified her euthanasia request.

Is that what we want for South Australia? I say unequivocally no. This bill does not even identify the particular reasons that are to be used. It provides the term 'hopelessly ill'. Lately, I have been pushing for extra mental health services in my electorate. The article clearly states that mental health problems are quite acceptable as a reason for euthanasia occurring.

Without question, we must oppose this bill with all the force we have, because it is the last thing I and society as a whole would want to see in this state. Let us protect and

preserve life. I am a member of a palliative care committee, and certainly that is the way that we have been going and should continue to go to assist people who suffer a huge amount of pain, who need assistance and who may possibly die. However, we heard from the member for Waite that even in that situation people have been turned around.

Mr WILLIAMS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GROUNDWATER RESOURCES IN THE SOUTH-EAST

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

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

Motion carried.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 April. Page 1317.)

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I wish to speak briefly about this matter and to raise some of the concerns that have been put to me by a number of my constituents. Mostly, people have quite genuinely complained about the speed of traffic on our internal suburban roads. Those folk who have complained to me have done so out of concern for the safety of their children and the elderly. Many of our newer developments have very narrow streets. In fact, the streets are much more narrow than we would see in the older and more established suburbs which have a wider streetscape. My constituents feel that the 60 km/h zones through these newer developed areas are simply too fast for traffic, for obvious reasons.

While the residents are mixed in their views about whether a 40 km/h or a 50 km/h zone is better, they believe that we need to take control of our internal suburban streets to slow down the traffic. Whatever the outcome, whether we have 50 km/h or 40 km/h speed limits through those areas, the clear message to me is that people are travelling much too fast within these internal streets. My electorate of Torrens includes a number of areas about which I receive many complaints, namely, Sir Ross Smith Boulevard, Oakden; Karingal Road, Dernancourt; Reids Road, Highbury; Pitman Road, Windsor Gardens; and Flinders Road and Gascoyne Road, Hillcrest. They are just a few areas about which I receive a number of complaints.

I guess that, while they are travelling at 60 km/h through these areas, strictly speaking, people are not breaking the law; though I think that, in some cases, they are probably driving in an incredibly unsafe manner. On behalf of all those people who have raised these issues with me, I take the opportunity to make those few comments on this bill. However, the House has before it two bills relating to the speed of vehicles and, I must say, I believe that the most appropriate way to deal with the issue of vehicle speed is not to tackle individual issues, such as internal speed limits or speed limits on open roads, but to have a really good look at all vehicle speed issues.

It is an issue about which the community is quite genuinely concerned. I think that we do need to have a serious look at the problem but we should look at it as a whole and not just in bits and pieces.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I speak against this particular measure. We have in our community much debate about road speeds but we also have much debate about speed cameras, the revenue-raising effects of speed cameras and associated matters. One serious concern of our community, I believe, is trying to work out exactly the relationship between speeding and revenue raising. Like many members in this place, I have serious concerns about these matters of revenue raising, speed cameras, cameras being hidden and changing speeds. The issue that really concerns me with regard to this particular measure relates to changing speed limits as one traverses towns, the countryside, or wherever.

This measure, I believe, will do nothing other than create immense confusion. There is already considerable confusion but this bill will create immense confusion for the motoring public and also considerable inconvenience. When introducing this bill, the honourable member was concerned—

The Hon. R.B. Such: It does not apply to country towns.

Mr WILLIAMS: The honourable member says that the measure does not apply to country towns. However, the honourable member did indicate that he hoped that, during the time of the debate, some people might be able to take some further evidence or gather further information or advice from people in country towns and, perhaps, the measure could be applied to country towns. I can tell the honourable member that the feedback I have received from the local government authorities in my electorate—all representing country towns—is a request for me to oppose this particular measure.

They do not want anything to do with it. They do not want a bar of it in country towns—in my electorate, at least. In fact, there has been no support for this measure from my electorate whatsoever and, for his benefit, I pass that information on to the honourable member. If this measure were instituted with regard to the metropolitan area of Adelaide we would have the farcical situation of having at least three basic speed limits in built-up areas. We would have, as the honourable member described it in his second reading explanation, the default speed, which would be 50 km/h; we would have those areas that were signposted at 40 km/h; and, in country towns at least and probably on many of the major roads within the metropolitan area, a limit of 60 km/h.

I believe that that situation would introduce nothing but confusion, and I refer to my earlier remarks about speed cameras and the way that speed zones are policed. I believe that it will cause the general public to drive around our streets more intent on trying to avoid being detected because they are confused about what speed they should be doing. That will have a significant influence on safety and the ability of people to drive in a safe manner. For that reason alone, I believe that this measure should be opposed. It is hard enough now to drive and be aware of everything that is going on around in terms of school zones and the various road rules, and to negotiate one's way around our public roads, streets and thoroughfares without compromising the rules and regulations.

I guess that many of us drive around with one eye looking out for the speed camera, a police car, or whatever, which is taking our mind off the job at hand and which, of course, increases the likelihood of our coming to grief on the road,

causing damage or injury. That reason alone suggests that we should oppose this bill.

The other reason that I will be opposing this measure is the inconvenience factor: lowering the speed by 10 km/h right across the metropolitan area will cause much inconvenience to the travelling public. It will take much longer to travel from A to B. Again, that will cause not only inconvenience but also frustration. Again, that affects the ability of people to drive in a safe manner.

I believe that that inconvenience and the slowing down of the traffic will cause a considerable cost to the people of this state, both in a direct cost in terms of time but also there will be an environmental cost. By travelling at that slower speed, the traffic will be on the roads for much longer periods of time. Our cars, in fact, are engineered so that the motors and the gearing allow the efficient conversion of the fuels that we use into energy to propel our vehicles around the roads. Obviously, all the vehicles on the road today are specifically engineered for an average speed of, probably, somewhere between 50 km/h and 60 km/h, which affords the most efficient conversion of fossil fuels. So, there is also an environmental cost that would be a consequence of this measure.

There are quite a few very good reasons for this measure to be opposed. I do understand that some communities believe that a safety issue exists in their local streets. My understanding from surveys that have been done is that the average speed in suburban backstreets is considerably less than the 60 km/h regulated speed and that, when they are in suburban streets, most drivers travel below the speed limit. I understand that there is a problem with some drivers, and I emphasise the word 'some', who exceed the speed by a considerable amount and drive dangerously. This measure will do nothing to solve that problem. The only way that problem will be solved is through policing. Whether the speed limit is 60 km/h, 50 km/h, 40 km/h or 10 km/h, the only way to stop excessive speeds and dangerous driving is through policing and catching the small minority of drivers who perpetrate that sort of behaviour.

Although I am sure this bill is well intended, it will not solve the problem, which is to alleviate the concerns of people who think that drivers cause stress to families in suburban Adelaide, which they think is an unsafe situation. I do not think that this bill will solve that problem. However, it will have an impact on the revenue-raising ability of various governments as time goes on—

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: As the member interjects, and as I said earlier, by having at least three speed zones—and I have been a victim myself of unintentionally breaking the speed limit, missing a sign as I travelled from one speed zone into another—we may create more unsafe driving practices as drivers try to negotiate the changing speed zones. So, for a whole raft of reasons I oppose this bill.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (CULTIVATION OF CANNABIS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 March. Page 1100.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I heard the Police Commissioner say the other day that we were the cannabis capital of Australia. I am not sure whether we are going to get new numberplates, but it is a very serious matter and I believe that one of the problems is the extent to which hydroponics are being misused. It is a very good horticultural technique, when used for the right purpose, and people grow lettuces and other plants using hydroponics, but I do not believe they should be used for cultivating and for assisting in the growing of super hemp plants. I would argue strongly that hydroponics should not be allowed for cultivating marijuana, and I believe the Premier said something along those lines the other day, although it was not widely reported. If it is the intention of the Premier and the government to move down that path, I would commend them for it.

In our community, unfortunately, we have some groups or gangs, whatever we want to call them, and others who are very much into a well-organised activity where they subcontract people to grow marijuana, and I am told that they offer to pay the expiation fine. That is a flourishing industry and, once harvested, the marijuana is sold largely interstate. It has been put to me that, in some cases, helicopters have been used to get marijuana from Kangaroo Island to the mainland. I do not know whether that is James Bond or reality, but it is disturbing to know that we have such a flourishing industry in South Australia. Apparently, South Australia has many more hydroponics shops than Sydney, which is rather surprising, so that suggests in itself that something is wrong.

In relation to the number of plants, I take the view that it would be acceptable to have one plant grown without hydroponic assistance. People who smoke marijuana are doing their health a lot of damage, because it is not better than tobacco. It is a furphy that smoking marijuana is not harmful. It has the same toxic effects in terms of cancer and other illnesses, so that is a nonsense. I know that many members favour total prohibition. I think the answer would be to allow one plant grown under normal, not hydroponic, conditions for those people who, for whatever reason, want to indulge in puffing on the weed.

I have never been attracted to taking drugs of that type, or others, other than medicinal drugs, but perhaps I am a bit of an old fart. I get a lot of pleasure out of all the other wonderful things that are available to us in life, so I have never found the need to smoke marijuana or engage in any other illegal drug-taking activity. This area requires attention. It is a pity that the hydroponic aspect of cultivation was not moved against vigorously many years ago so it would be illegal to use hydroponics to grow substances such as cannabis. It is probably technically legal now, but there has not been a vigorous move against it.

The other aspect to be considered is the number of plants. I believe that one plant grown under normal conditions would be more than enough for someone who, for whatever reason, wishes to smoke marijuana. I do not encourage that, I do not promote it, and I would prefer if people did not smoke it, for the same reason that I encourage people not to take up cigarette smoking.

That is the essence of my views on this issue. I believe that the government is gearing up to take action, and I hope it is sooner rather than later. However, whilst I welcome those vigorous moves, people should be aware that the organised crime element in this industry may resort to nasty tactics against elected members if and when they become aware of their known stance on this matter. I urge members to be very careful with their personal security and their home

security because some of these people play for keeps. That is another good reason why we should get rid of what has become an unsavoury, organised criminal activity, based largely on hydroponics and through an abuse of what was meant to be an enlightened approach but which, over time, has been shown to be drastically flawed.

In essence, get rid of hydroponics in marijuana growing and cut the number of plants that can be grown. I know that it is not legal technically to have any at this time, but I believe people should be able to have one plant for their own use without incurring any penalty whatsoever.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Goyder. It is the member for Hammond's bill.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker—

Mr Meier: If you speak, you'll close the debate.

Mr LEWIS: Yes.

Mr Meier: I'm sorry, but we have other matters to deal with.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond will resume his seat. The member for Goyder has the call.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That the debate be further adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: There being only one vote for the noes, I declare the measure passed in the affirmative.

Motion thus carried.

Mr Lewis: You all ought to be ashamed of yourselves. You take money under false pretences.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Hammond to come to order.

CITY OF ADELAIDE DRY ZONE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this House congratulates the Premier, the Adelaide City Council and the Deputy Lord Mayor and Liberal Party candidate for Adelaide, Mr Michael Harbison, for their action to implement a dry zone within the City of Adelaide.

I move this motion in order to congratulate the Premier and the Deputy Lord Mayor, Mr Michael Harbison, for their action in implementing a dry zone in the city of Adelaide. I think it is a fabulous move forward for South Australia and the city, and I believe it totally exposes the opposition as having no policy of any consequence on the issue of the dry zone and, more broadly, on the issue of law and order generally within the city of Adelaide. I will explain.

First, I remind the House of the decision that was made by Adelaide City Council following encouragement and support given by the Premier. At a recent council meeting, council resolved essentially to instruct the CEO of the council to submit to the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner an application, together with the necessary supporting material, for a dry area declaration covering all city public roads and squares on a 12 months' trial basis. The declaration was, first, to prohibit the consumption of alcohol; secondly, prohibit the possession of alcohol in other than sealed containers; and, thirdly, that the 'above restrictions also apply to persons seated in a motor vehicle within the dry zone area'. It was acknowledged that in certain circumstances approved by council the consumption of alcohol would be permitted in defined outdoor areas within the dry zone in accordance with the conditions agreed to by the council, the South Australian Police Department and the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner. It was also agreed a rigorous evaluation framework would be developed and that a report would be brought to council for its consideration prior to expiry of the trial period.

Council acknowledged the Premier's announcement and the state government's support for the urgent establishment of support services, including a detoxification centre that is necessary to ensure that no member or sector of the community is unfairly disadvantaged or discriminated against by the establishment of a dry zone. Council also requested the state government to ensure that adequate police resources were stationed outside selected licensed premises at closing time; and that the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner required the installation of closed circuit television outside these premises.

Council instructed the CEO to seek a licensing hearing in not less than a month and not more than two months from the time of its decision to allow concerned persons sufficient time to consider the reports and to prepare submissions to the Licensing Court. There was a robust debate and the motion was then put. I remind the House of who supported the motion: it was led by Councillor Harbison, whom I congratulate for his leadership on this issue, and it was supported by Councillor Hayward, Councillor Moran, Councillor Taylor and Councillor Ventura. Sadly, three councillors, namely, Councillor Angove, Councillor Brine and Councillor Mackie, opposed the motion. Of course, the motion was carried.

It shows tremendous leadership by the council, which has been prepared to pick up the initiative and to take action—and I note that during this entire debate the Labor Party has offered very little, if any, encouragement and has been quite silent on the issue of what to do. Frankly, it is confused about what to do.

Straight after the council vote on that Monday evening, the Commissioner for Police went on the public record and said:

Police welcomed the council's decision and...are strongly supportive of a dry zone trial.

I hope the member for Elder (the shadow minister for police) heard the commissioner's statement. He also said that this is not a recent position of the police department. Late last year the police indicated that they supported a dry zone for the whole of Adelaide. Going back even further, almost 10 months ago police were on the public record acknowledging the need for a dry zone to give police officers a clear and more effective way of dealing with drunken behaviour and the crime associated with it.

What has the opposition spokesperson on police had to say about that? As far as I am aware, nothing. What has the Leader of the Opposition had to say about it? As far as I am aware, absolutely nothing. Opposition members talk about law and order and supporting police, but do they listen to the police? Do they come out and actively support what the police are saying they need? No: it is all huff and puff.

I can also inform the House that on top of the ongoing consultation between the police and the council SAPOL made a confidential submission to the council supporting a dry zone trial, and I think the Police Minister alluded to this in the House recently. The police, like the government, support the dry zone for very sensible reasons. First, they are actively aware of the cycle of violence that can result from drunkenness; secondly, they are aware that a dry zone is an important part of the solution in allowing them to deal with criminal behaviour before it starts; and, thirdly, they have seen dry zones work in other parts of South Australia and in other states.

Some time ago I chaired the Select Committee on a Heroin Rehabilitation Trial. We heard evidence from not only the police but a range of community organisations and individuals about the terrible problem of drug and alcohol abuse, particularly drug abuse. I remind the House of, and point members to, our report. We need to be encouraging people with drug and alcohol problems into treatment. Every person with an alcohol and drug abuse problem whom we can get into treatment is one fewer out on the street doing themselves injury, doing the public injury and in many cases committing street crimes that offend us all.

I remind members that the police gave evidence to that select committee, and it is now irrefutable, that the link between drug and alcohol abuse and crime is paramount. Clearly in excess of 70 per cent of street crime, home break-ins, burglaries, bag snatches and assaults are related to the problem of drug abuse and with it the concomitant problem of alcohol abuse. It is irrefutable. All the experts around Australia keep saying it again and again. If we can get these people with drug and alcohol problems into treatment we can help with the problem of law and order.

What does the opposition have to say about it? Absolutely nothing! What is its solution? To leave people with drug and alcohol problems on the streets of Adelaide, lying around, causing public disorder and doing themselves a disservice. Is the opposition committed to getting these people into rehabilitation? No! Who has had to show leadership on it? The Olsen government has and the council has and, not only that, as I mentioned, the government has taken the initiative by offering $500 000 for a stabilisation centre to pick up these very people who we hope will be moved on again and again, and when the police come around and say, 'You cannot loiter here drunk and disorderly,' I hope they keep moving again and again until they find their way to the stabilisation centre, until they find their way to one of the many agencies there are to help them fight their terrible problem, namely, alcohol and drug abuse.

Unfortunately, the only people who do not seem to understand what I am saying today are those in the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Democrats. As we know, they are pretty pally—the Democrats and the Labor Party.

Ms Key: You are joking.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, I am afraid it is a reality. We keep seeing these people turn up as candidates for the Democrats. Guess what? They have been members of the Labor Party and members of the union. Cheryl Kernot decides that she has had enough of the Democrats and decides to become one of the bastards and join the Labor Party. There is a little cross flow. I do not know how long it will be before Natasha Stott Despoja or another Democrat decides to swap camps and go to the Labor Party. It is all very chummy. It is apparent they agree on this issue as well. They do not want to do anything about city dry zones or want to help people with drug and alcohol abuse problems loitering around the streets of Adelaide.

Sorry to tell members this: our government and the city council have decided to take action. We have listened to the police and the community and done something about it. For the last 12 months at least we have had total silence from the Leader of the Opposition on the issue of dry zones, except we have heard from the Labor Party, from the erstwhile candidate for Adelaide, Jane Lomax-Smith. She is against city dry zones. The Labor Party star will roll in here, she says, and will move somebody off the front bench, maybe the member for Hanson or the member for Taylor or one of the other female members of the opposition. She will come in here, take over and do a Cheryl Kernot and bump somebody else off the front bench and she will be the minister or opposition spokesperson for something. Whoopy-do! I hope she is not the opposition spokesperson for law and order, health or the key area of drug and alcohol abuse because she is against city dry zones. She does not want to see people with alcohol and drug abuse problems go into rehabilitation. Apparently she does not want to see these people helped or does not want the state government to spend $500 000 on a stabilisation centre. She wants to leave people with drug and alcohol abuse problems lying around Victoria Square. She wants to leave them lying on North Terrace outside Parliament House where people can trip over them. She does not want to extend the hand of help to these people.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: We are helping them out. Members opposite are interjecting. They are clearly saying that the council and the government are not trying to help these people. I would like to hear members opposite who are interjecting get up when I sit down and offer their contribution to this motion. I want to hear a policy—any policy will do, we are not fussy—from any of you about city dry zones, drug and alcohol abuse and what we are going to do to get these people into treatment. We are doing something; we are not sitting on our hands. You are! Here you are, member for Hanson and member for Reynell, interjecting: please get up as I sit down and make a contribution to this debate. Jane Lomax-Smith has.

Mr De Laine interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Indeed. I commend the member for Price as he is one of the sensible members opposite who would agree with me that law and order is crucial and who would want to help these people. Jane Lomax-Smith says that dry zones are not necessary.

However, the Leader of the Opposition has finally come out and offered some sort of stilted support. After months of silence he has cracked under the weight of public pressure and finally said that he thinks he supports a dry zone. However, he cannot bring himself to fully support the current proposal: he is still trying to be convinced that this is something we really need to do. He is sort of skirting around the issue. He said, 'A dry zone sounds good, but it will not work if it is not linked to a range of other social supports and services and without those social supports, without an infrastructure of support.' Maybe he did not hear the Premier say we will provide $500 000 for a stabilisation centre. Maybe he did not listen during budget estimates to information about the amount of money spent at Warinilla, at the Woolshed and through the Department for Human Services in helping people with drug and alcohol addiction. Maybe he has not been down to the Drug and Alcohol Services Council. That is exactly what we are doing.

However, we have established that the Leader of the Opposition disagrees with Jane Lomax-Smith. This is the second area of disagreement. Not only does he now feel, under the weight of public pressure, that we need a dry zone—and Jane Lomax-Smith says we do not—but apparently he also disagrees with the issue of her candidacy. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition believes that she should be the candidate for Adelaide. We have just heard in this place in the last week that the candidate for Adelaide for the Labor Party apparently does not believe she should be the candidate. She does not want to be the candidate. She is on the record as getting up and saying, 'You know, I do not

really want to be elected: I do not want to be the candidate.' So, not only does she not want a dry zone but also she does not want to be the Labor Party candidate for Adelaide either.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Scalzi): Order! Could the honourable member come back to the motion.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, for your guidance—I must have got a bit carried away. I was simply drawing the parallel that on the issue of the city dry zone, the Labor candidate for Adelaide does not like it. She likes the idea of people drunk and disorderly all around the city and not getting help. It is simply another example of a conflict between the leader and the supposed candidate, who points out that she does not want to be the member either. I sincerely hope that she does not become the member. I hope we get a member for Adelaide who supports city dry zones and rehabilitation for these people.

Councillor Harbison, the Liberal Party candidate for Adelaide, has shown leadership on this. He does not want people with drug and alcohol problems left to fend for themselves. He wants rehabilitation. I commend the Liberal candidate for Adelaide, Councillor Harbison. He has shown leadership. The Labor Party candidate, who does not even want to be the candidate, has shown no leadership whatsoever. This is politically correct nonsense from her and it has been exposed.

Time expired.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): This matter has taken a long time to come to fruition. It is long overdue. The public of South Australia, who have the right to walk freely and without hindrance or harassment on North Terrace or in the centre of their capital city, have been demanding this sort of proposal for a long time. I well recall some years ago when the Hon. Peter Dunn and I waited on the then Lord Mayor, Mr Ninio, and put to him very clearly and precisely the need to deal with these people who have no regard for the rights of other people—citizens who just want to walk along North Terrace or in Victoria Square, or elsewhere. Those citizens do not want to be hindered by drunks or be harassed and assaulted, to see their streets used as public toilets or to see these people being allowed to smash the windows at the front of Parliament House (as they have done repeatedly in the last few weeks) and use the light wells along the building's street frontage as a public toilet. Some years ago, when we complained and wanted the council to bring in dry areas, we got the greatest lot of waffle from the bleeding heart society down there, and others, who have no regard for elderly people or for young people coming from the university.

I well recall also going to a function in the mall, representing the Premier, and Councillor Lomax-Smith was there and addressed herself to me in a most aggressive manner. As members know, I am a rather timid person, particularly in public, and I am not accustomed to this sort of aggressive behaviour. So I was forced to make very clear to her my views on this subject and that I was only attempting to act in the interests of the long-suffering public and the taxpayers. I have to say I was taken aback on that occasion. It was the first occasion on which I had ever met with or spoken to the lady, and it was obvious by the tenor of the conversation that it would not be likely that we would be having many more conversations.

I put it to the shadow minister and to the leader that, surely, the welfare of the long-suffering public ought to be foremost in our consideration. Why should people be petrified to walk down North Terrace? Why should we have to put up with people who have no regard for other people's rights, privacy or property? The answer to the problem is that, of course they should have treatment and of course they should be helped, but that is no excuse for doing nothing. It is no reason why the rest of the community should have to suffer from this unnecessary and anti-social behaviour. It is absolutely appalling.

I am surprised that the member for Reynell would continue to interject on the member who introduced this motion. I would have thought that she would be wholeheartedly in support of this measure, because we have all seen with our own eyes what is taking place out there. I have dry areas in my constituency, and they work very well and they have wide public support. There are dry areas at Ceduna, Coober Pedy and Port Augusta. In fact, the whole of Ceduna was declared dry. It is a good policy and there ought to be more.

I do not believe that anyone should be drinking in the streets: they should not be there. If they want to drink they should drink in licensed premises or in their homes. I do not believe that the rest of the community should be inconvenienced in such an outrageous manner. For example, when you stand outside this place some evenings, you see people coming down the street and they have to run across to the other side, out on the road, because they are absolutely petrified that they will be accosted by some drunken lout. That is absolutely unacceptable and people should not have to put up with it. I am very pleased that the current council has the public's interest at heart. It is not allowing trendy policies to govern its judgment—

Mr Foley: Harbison's a spiv.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, you would not call Jane Lomax-Smith—

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

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Mr Acting, Speaker, the member for Hart described Councillor Harbison as a spiv. Councillor Harbison is not here to defend himself. I find that sort of personal abuse an affront to the House and I ask you, sir, to request the member for Hart to withdraw that remark.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member is responsible for his own words.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will cease interjecting. The member for Stuart.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It is obvious that we are going to have an interesting debate on this subject.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: What about the conflict of interest of Jane Lomax-Smith and her husband? If you want conflict of interest, what about that?

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: What about the parking fines in front of the Supreme Court? We will give you conflict of interest if that is what you want.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, you started this: I did not start it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Stuart to return to the debate.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I was provoked, sir. There is nothing that anyone from the opposition can say to the thin, indefensible policy of not wanting to address this issue and not wanting to do anything about it. This is a good policy and is in the interests of people who want to go about their normal

business free from harassment and being hindered by drugs, and I hope that every member supports it.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): Is the Labor Party so divided and ashamed of its indifference to this problem that it cannot find one person to speak on it? I am amazed that nobody from the other side deigns to chance their arm to put an opinion before the House about a matter that I see as being so important.

Ms Key interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: If you don't want to congratulate the Premier, move an amendment deleting those words. What is the matter with you? Don't ask me to think for you. In any case, I think the Premier has been pretty slack on this, as was the Premier before him and previous Premiers before that, ad infinitum.

It started in the 1980s and has been deliberately encouraged by a certain group of people. I think it is a shame, and if I could find immediately a more appropriate, telling and strong word than 'shame', I would use it. It is a shame that those people are manipulating the circumstances, and disgustingly manipulating the Aborigines in our community, not just in Adelaide, to come into Adelaide, to the capital city, to the metropolitan area, and sit down deliberately in conspicuous places, and encouraging them to engage in outrageous behaviour.

I have recorded the kinds of remarks that have been made out there. If members think my language common and relative only in the vernacular context on occasions, notwithstanding their acceptance of my language and terminology such as I used when the member for Stuart was speaking, to say, 'And they piss on my car, and they do it regularly and deliberately,' the language that is used by the people who are encouraged to come there and encouraged to get themselves drunk is far worse than that. And they would make a bullocky blush.

The Hon. R.B. Such: There's not many of them left.

Mr LEWIS: No, but I am sure members know the meaning of that expression. There is nothing more exasperating on a cold day, if you are a bullocky, than trying to get your team to do what you want them to do, because the bullocks are pretty uncooperative in cold weather. I was with a bullocky when I was a little kid.

The Hon. R.B. Such: Did you blame the bullocks?

Mr LEWIS: No, it was fairly hard work on the part of the bullocks, and it was equally difficult for the bullocky to get them to drag the stringybark logs, or the Mount Nash logs in Victoria, into the sawmill. Notwithstanding that, the important thing about this motion as moved by the member for Waite is that we need to have a dry zone here in the city.

It is not just here at Parliament House where the problem arises: that, as I said, is a deliberate choice of location. It is equally a deliberate choice of location to go to the lawns in front of the Hilton Hotel, and now it is becoming a choice of location to cause problems in the forecourt at the Hyatt and in the area adjacent to the lobbies of the other hotels along North Terrace. The people who go there are still moved on because they have not yet claimed it as their territory, but it is only a matter of time.

The begging behaviour, the threats, the abuse—and the deliberate intoxication so that that can be used as a defence—are disgusting. We as legislators have the responsibility to deal with it. The public expects us to deal with it: they are fed up with it. They are dismayed and frightened by it, and they are appalled by our indifference to it and our inaction in consequence of what is there, what they know is there, what we know is there—and yet we do nothing. It is bad enough that it happens, but it is even worse when those commos deliberately encourage Aboriginal people and use them as victims and pawns in this game of political football that is going on.

Those people who are out here night after night, getting themselves inebriated, cannot support themselves from the efforts of their own labours; those I have spoken to are not employed. Whether they get sufficient funds from their welfare payments to support their drinking, I do not know. The fact remains that they are being given the drink and they are leaving an awful amount of rubbish behind them. And it is not all the packaging material. As I have said before, they are worse than pigeons. They will defecate behind the brick wall, and do so within a matter of feet of the other people in whose company they are to be found.

I am disgusted by it. The whole House should be disgusted by it, and the Labor Party should be disgusted for not taking action. It is not a racist move: the racism is on the part of the people manipulating the Aborigines to come into Adelaide and do this stuff. Those Aborigines admit that they are being encouraged to do it, in the conversations that I have had with them, and it distresses me that they are so abused by those commo lefties who are doing it just for the sake of drawing attention to it and then claiming that people like me, say, are racist. Well, I am not, and I speak out on behalf of the victims, many of whom are innocent of the offence they are causing and the damage they are doing to their own health, and the damage they are doing to their standing as individuals and members of a group of people in the community. Because many of us do not forget faces.

I am equally disgusted that we continue to provide money that encourages the practice, by sending buses around to collect them. All you have to do is tell them they cannot be here, and it will stop. I do not see that those commos about whom I have spoken so disparagingly will give them the money and provide them with the grog to go and get drunk out in the east parklands or out by the cemetery where they are not visible. The practice will stop because that is not a way in which you can get publicity for an element to a cause that I think is nefarious.

The people who are causing the behaviour, who are encouraging it (and that is what is causing it) should be ashamed of themselves. They are doing things that are directly opposed to and very destructive of the efforts being made by agencies such as St Vincent de Paul, Anglicare and the Adelaide Central Mission Incorporated that are trying to help in the situation. They are deliberately destroying the lives of those to whom they give the grog and whom they encourage to consume it.

Another way of dealing with this problem is to enforce the littering laws in the city—or anywhere, for that matter. The amount of garbage that is here every morning when you arrive is atrocious, and it has come from the activities of the night before. It would be very easy to simply stand there, photograph the people who are littering, regardless of their age, origin or capacity to speak English or anything else; they are committing an offence by littering and it should be stopped.

The other thing I want to say is that allowing the practice to continue here next to parliament, in Victoria Square and other places around the city is giving us a bad name. It is as bad as being known as the cannabis capital of Australia. As far as the particular precincts of the parliament by Old

Parliament House are concerned, every morning the place is so fouled with vomit, crap and urine that you have to hose it down. I can tell the House now that, if you continue to hose down those old bricks, in the quoins and the walls of Old Parliament House, they will not be there in five years. I can see the cavitation that is taking place almost on a weekly basis as a result of the need to hose it down and make it hygienic, so that those people can come back and be there again the next night, and so that people will not be so offended as they walk past it.

There is not such a problem of homelessness. There are places for these people to go to. It is not legitimate to argue that, as some of the councillors do in the Adelaide city council. I will not name them, but they know who they are. They are diverting attention from the real problem and the real cause.

The former Lord Mayor should be ashamed of the conflict of interest to which the member for Stuart drew attention between what her husband is doing and what she advocated. That is one thing where she has it wrong, and the public needs to know about it. It is not proper; she should not have made the utterances without declaring that she had an interest. The fact that she did not ought to be a salutary lesson to her. It is not too late to admit it. It has to stop, if only so that it makes it possible for us to use these places here safely.

Time expired.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): What is sad about this debate at present is that it is setting out to make political mileage out of a very sad set of circumstances. In particular, to give recognition to the Deputy Lord Mayor and the Liberal Party candidate for Adelaide, it is a shameful political stunt and has nothing to do with what is a very sad set of circumstances. I want to put on the record that I am appalled that the mover of this motion has used the time and the resources of this place to play such political games—linking a sad set of circumstances to the promotion of a candidate in a state seat. They ought to hang their head in shame, and any others who have stood here to debate the other half of this also should put on the record that they do not tolerate this sort of political stunt. Now let me return to the real issue. The real issue is a sad set of circumstances, and a quick fix will not resolve the matter. We do need a quick fix, but in so doing we must also put in place some long-term strategies to address the underlying issues.

Recently, I had to write to the Speaker because I returned to parliament at approximately 9.15 one Wednesday evening. At first, my passage was blocked to some degree, and I was physically intimidated and verbally abused. I chose to walk through the people and down the steps, and I had to step over a pile of human faeces. I had to wait at the gate while a male completed urinating all over the gate and all over the little box where I needed to put my card and, if I had not stepped back quickly, over me. I waited and then, of course, I was abused as I went through the gate. I do not find that acceptable. We need to put in place some measures to stop that.

I also do not appreciate some of the actions I can observe through my parliamentary office window. Through my office window, I see sex acts, observers to sex acts and people urinating on the wall outside my office. I have also had my office window broken. That is totally unacceptable. However, to simply put in place a dry zone just takes a significant problem of which none of us should be proud and shifts it somewhere else. We need to focus more broadly on what the problem really is. We are talking about people who need significant help for whatever reason. Their problems may involve a sickness, financial circumstances or culture. I do not know what goes together to make this sad set of circumstances, but to simply move the people on is not really the solution.

Let me return now to what I was saying. First, the mover of this motion and those who have supported this motion with those words ought to be damned for playing political games with the issue.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Waffle!

Mr McEWEN: The member for Waite says, 'Waffle!' This is not waffle. The member for Waite knows that he has tried to link a sad set of circumstances to the promotion of a particular candidate in a future state election and he knows that that is no more than a political stunt, and he should hang his head in shame. We should all hang our heads in shame because of the other set of circumstances I have described. We all accept that they are totally unacceptable. We should be spending some time, effort and resources on a genuine solution, instead of just adopting the attitude that, if we move them on, we will not have to suffer the circumstances I just described and, therefore, will no longer put any energy into the issue.

That is what I wrote to the Speaker about. I said to the Speaker that I did not find this set of circumstances acceptable. I said that I believed that he must get the Premier and the leaders of the city council to embrace the more fundamental issue and put in place some long-term corrective action and not just a simple little quick fix. I wish to amend the motion by deleting the words after 'the Adelaide city council' and before 'of their action'. The motion will now read:

> That this House congratulates the Premier and the Adelaide city council on their actions to implement a dry zone in the City of Adelaide.

I have taken out the rest.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I seek your guidance, Mr Acting Speaker. Am I now speaking to the amendment or to the original motion?

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member can speak to both the motion and the amendment.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I do not believe that it is appropriate to use this mechanism to score political points. I agree with the member for Gordon. This is a long-term problem. I acknowledge that—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the member for Fisher.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I acknowledge this has been a longstanding problem and it should have been addressed before. As members would know, I raised this matter when I was a Liberal member. I have raised the matter with the Speaker on many occasions. I agree with the member for Gordon: it is not simply a question of a dry zone. However, that is necessary; we need a dry zone. I would like to put it in context. Some people say that it is a racist move. I point out that the Pitjantjatjara lands are alcohol free. The lands that are controlled by the Aboriginal people are alcohol free. We have other areas in the state where Aboriginal people live, and they do so happily accepting the concept of a dry zone. There are some aspects of this that I do not believe have been highlighted before. The behaviour of some of the sad individuals who congregate in front of Parliament House and in Victoria Square provides great embarrassment for the overwhelming majority of the Aboriginal community, and I

know many of them. They are highly embarrassed and uncomfortable to see a few members of their community act in this way.

Let us not pretend that this is a simple race issue: it is not, and I will highlight why this is a very deep problem. These people who congregate, but not all of them, have serious problems in relation to alcoholism. I have seen some of the living consequences of that because one member of my family currently looks after two young boys who have been affected by alcohol foetal syndrome. Both children have a hare-lip and shortened fingers. They have horrendous medical problems. I do not want to be too specific in identifying or suggesting the connection with their mother, but this is just one instance that has arisen out of the sad situation of these people and their being affected by excessive alcohol consumption.

One of the people involved gave birth to a baby who was so deformed that it lived a matter of hours, again, because it was affected so grossly by alcohol consumption. One of the boys who is fostered by a member of my family was found, just after his birth, in a plastic bucket in a public toilet. I point out those facts just to put a human perspective on this problem. We are talking not only about the sad people who are consuming too much alcohol but also about the children who are born to women who consume far too much alcohol. We know that many of the men are consuming far too much alcohol. There is a long-term human consequence for a problem that needs to be addressed.

It is not simply a question of establishing a dry zone. I believe that we need a dry zone but we need other measures to help these people get off an addiction to alcohol. I have never seen in any other capital city in Australia a similar problem remain unaddressed for so long. I believe that you would not see a similar problem in Darwin, yet in Adelaide we have tolerated it for a long time. We know that it affects not just Aboriginal people, or a small group of people who have problems with alcohol consumption: Europeans are also affected but it is hidden away—it is done on a much more subtle basis. We need to address this problem with a dry zone.

We need to tackle also the underlying causes to help these people get off their addiction, to get proper treatment and help. It is easy to say that but I know that it is not easy to do. I remember that the member for Adelaide (the Minister for Government Enterprises) many years ago was keen to move down this path. But, I guess, we all stand condemned for not having pushed more vigorously and energetically for a total approach to what is a terribly sad situation and a sad commentary on our society.

I return to the original point. This issue is too important a matter on which we should attempt to try to score political points. We are talking about human beings, including children who have been born grossly affected by this excessive alcohol consumption. I believe that we know what needs to be done: the problem needs resources and it needs a commitment. I am pleased that the Premier and the city council are doing something about it, but I regret that people are trying to score points on an issue which is too important and which demeans us all when we engage in that activity.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I support this very important motion not only in terms of its direct intent but also because very big differences exist between the parties in this parliament, and this issue is an example of that. As police minister, I am delighted that, at last, we will see a dry zone in the Adelaide CBD. I am not interested in getting into a debate suggesting, as some members have done, that this motion is directed towards certain members of our community, because I would not support it if that were the case. I want to see safe streets in the CBD, and this is one aspect of establishing safe streets in the CBD. I am not a wowser and I do not have a go at anyone for wanting to have a drink, but it is what you do when you have had a drink that counts.

It is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition has often talked about knives, weapons and disorderly behaviour, yet when we finally get an opportunity—with the City of Adelaide—to introduce some regulation that will address those problems, where is the Leader of the Opposition in this debate? He is silent and absent. We have not heard anything from the Leader of the Opposition except for one small comment right at the end of this debate when he was brought kicking and screaming into the media.

Ms Key interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I am not saying that the Leader of the Opposition is not in the House at the moment: I am saying that the Leader of the Opposition has been silent on this debate until he went to the media at the last moment and, as the member opposite said, he finally had to issue a press release. For more than 12 months the Leader of the Opposition and the Labor Party were absolutely silent yet, when media Mike wants some media, he churns out innuendo and press releases based on absolutely no facts, because he wants a front page on the *Sunday Mail*.

Mr Condous interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: As the member for Colton said, the Leader of the Opposition and the Labor Party do not support this motion. The Leader of the Opposition talks about bipartisanship. Here is an opportunity to have some bona fide bipartisanship and to congratulate Premier Olsen, who did lead this debate for all the right reasons. That is what this is about: bipartisanship, good leadership from the Premier and, at last, a commonsense approach from the City of Adelaide. If one looks at what happens in relation to attacks in the streets of Adelaide, one sees that two key issues are involved.

Ms Key interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will get a chance to contribute if she so wishes.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The first issue is that street attacks are normally drug or alcohol related; and, secondly, when one considers the weapons often involved in these attacks, on many occasions they include broken bottles. If they so wish, people can drink in licensed premises. I am concerned about the fact that we have people exhibiting disorderly behaviour through the streets of Adelaide. People are running around in almost semi-riot situations at times. Broken bottles are being left lying around in the streets of Adelaide, and that worries me, because when people leave night clubs, for instance, and may become involved in an altercation someone can pick up a piece of broken bottle, or a bottle and then break it, and it becomes a weapon. I support this measure for a dry zone because of those issues.

I would not want my own son or daughters walking through Rundle Mall with a stubby in their hand or a stubby in their backpack so that they can sit in the street, drink in Rundle Mall, walk off and leave the bottle there, and it then becomes a potential weapon. If people want to drink, there are places to do that, so let us do it in licensed premises. What

disappoints me is that it has taken so long to get commonsense into the debate.

We have seen great growth in tourism, particularly convention tourism. We are in the top five in the world, and that is not a bad achievement for a small state and a small city like Adelaide, South Australia. However, we do not want visitors walking through the CBD, seeing people who are intoxicated, carrying stubbies around and leaving bottles scattered throughout the streets of Adelaide. That is what it is about.

In my electorate, an interesting debate is occurring about dry zones in reserves. I have already written to the council, saying that I will support every initiative that the City of Onkaparinga puts up with respect to dry zones. I believe that dry zones are the way to go, and there are 68 dry zones in the state. Interestingly enough, a lot of those dry zones began in my area on the Fleurieu Peninsula. I know the problems we had there. Because it is such a great area, particularly in the summertime, we get hordes of people down there, which we encourage, but we do not want them intoxicated in the parks, on the esplanade, etc., as was happening.

So, dry zones were put in place and the whole scene has changed. The conduct of the community has changed and the mums, dads, families and young people who want to walk along the esplanade at Victor Harbor or Port Noarlunga on a hot summer's night, who want to sit on the reserves at Normanville, can do so in a peaceful way without having to put up with drunk and disorderly people and the rubbish that they leave behind.

Members should look at the benefits that have resulted right across the state from dry zones and get the issue into perspective. As far as I am concerned, this is the 69th dry zone, and I would like to see a lot more. I look at it that way. In order to support our police, as their minister, I strongly endorse this dry zone and I strongly recommend that this parliament gives consideration to supporting many more dry zones. Police do have more powers in a dry zone. That is why I support it; it has nothing to do with politics. I support it because it is a good initiative for the community.

I congratulate the Premier and the Lord Mayor on this initiative, because the Lord Mayor and the Premier showed incredible leadership. Let me say in this House and put on the public record that that leadership was not forthcoming from the previous Lord Mayor, and I can say that probably more than anyone else in this House because I sat in meetings with the former Lord Mayor, on one occasion with the most senior police officer in this state, talking commonsense about the reasons why we needed a dry zone. It is not the only answer to the problems, and I acknowledge that, but it is a key part of a comprehensive way of improving safety in the streets. Of course we have to look at putting money into infrastructure for sobriety and the like, but I support this motion and I commend the Premier.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): I also support the motion moved by the member for Waite which gives credit to and congratulates the Premier of South Australia and the Adelaide City Council on their action to declare the city dry. Let us not make this an ethnic issue. We are not talking only about Aboriginals; we are talking about the entire community. We are talking about all colours, all religions and all nationalities.

I was a member of the Adelaide City Council—indeed, I was Lord Mayor—when we declared Rundle Mall a dry area. We did that because numerous young ladies aged between 15 and 25 years complained that young louts in Rundle Mall were drinking cans of beer, becoming intoxicated and making rude and filthy gestures towards them, and even sometimes molesting them. We made a decision to take drinking away from Rundle Mall and, as a result, as one can see today, those problems have gone completely.

In some parks and in the city, this problem is ongoing. Last Saturday evening I was driving past Parliament House at about midnight, and my wife and her friends in the car could not believe the congregation of alcoholically blitzed people out the front of the place causing all sorts of problems. We are an international city. We get a spin-off of the people who go to Melbourne and Sydney and then decide to come to Adelaide. They go to the casino, they stay at the Hyatt Hotel, and they attend conventions here.

That sort of behaviour leaves an impression. I remember going to San Francisco and seeing men with supermarket trolleys in which their entire belongings were piled walking around Union Square. That left an impression on me. San Francisco is one of my favourite American cities; it is a beautiful place. San Francisco Bay rates with Sydney Harbor as one of the most wonderful places in the world. However, it left me with an impression not only of San Francisco but also of the social system in America and how it works.

I do not think it is fair for people who stay at the Hilton Hotel and people who move around the city to have to look in the park and see people sucking wine out of casks, becoming intoxicated and abusing people because they will not give them money. Believe me, I am the first to admit that a great portion of the blame for the demise of the Aboriginal community today must be put fairly and squarely at the feet of white people in trying to change them into something they never were. However, there is just as much hatred of whites within the Aboriginal community as there is vice versa.

My little friend the member for Hartley, who was coming back from the Royal Adelaide Hospital one night after visiting his uncle, walked past the Dame Roma Mitchell statue and was pounced upon by a completely drunk Aboriginal who told him to get back to his bloody country, 'you little dago white bastard'. I have been called the same thing for not giving money. I would be the first to make a donation to a detox centre if a proper program was established, because it is no good just saying that people cannot drink. That is not the problem.

We have to take these people to the proper centres that will give them the counselling and treatment they need to be able to rehabilitate their lives, and they have not gone on the grog for no reason. It is for a specific reason that they are on alcohol. We must ascertain those reasons and put proper programs into place to rehabilitate them. I know that, during my time as an alderman (and I have said this before in the House) there was a huge problem in Whitmore Square. We could not develop that area for residential purposes because nobody deemed it an ideal situation in which to live. I can remember going to the then Attorney-General, the Hon. Chris Sumner, and saying to him—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: I took Councillor Bambacas and Councillor Rowse, who were the two councillors representing the south-west corner, with me and said, 'Attorney-General, 13 out of the 19 members of the Adelaide City Council are prepared to come to the government with a recommendation to declare the city dry.' In those days, it was not intended to declare the city dry, it was only the square that the council wanted declared dry. He said, 'I'm sorry, but while there is

a Labor government and I am Attorney-General that is totally out of the question.'

We did not argue with him. We tried to put it to him but he would not accommodate us. It was a waste of time having a confrontation with the government so we walked away and accepted the fact that it would not be done. But I think it should have been done back in those days. I have studied homelessness and street kids, not only in this country but also in New York. I am astounded when I go to New York to talk about these problems and they say, 'But that person you are talking about is a third generation street kid. His grandmother, then his mother and now he have been living in the same location in the city, in the bowery, in boxes and cartons.'

The longer we leave it, the less chance we have of stopping the children of those people who are drinking in Victoria Square from becoming the same as their parents. What we need to do is manage the Aboriginal community and put programs in place; be responsible members of this House and say that they are the programs which will give that small number of Aboriginal people an expectation that they will have the necessary support to be rehabilitated and to live a meaningful life. I am sure that someone who is absolutely drunk all the time can have no quality of life whatsoever.

The drive by the Adelaide City Council and the Premier to declare the city dry, in the long run will be a good thing for the city. It will return a quality of life to users of the city. However, it will be a lost cause unless it is coupled with a program for rehabilitation. Only then will there be a meaningful value to the decision made by the Adelaide City Council on this issue. I am looking forward with great interest to seeing the outcomes of this proposal, not only the dry zone but also what is coupled with it to try to alleviate those problems. Once again, I congratulate the council.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

FIRST HOME OWNER GRANT (NEW HOMES) AMENDMENT BILL

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

VICTIMS OF CRIME BILL

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

WANGANEEN, Mr G.

A petition signed by one resident of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the government to establish an inquiry into the death of Grant Wanganeen and review police training, deployment and liaison procedures, was presented by Mr De Laine.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: The minister seeks leave. Is leave granted?

Mr Lewis: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: I will call the honourable member at the end of question time. The normal procedure is for this to occur at the end of question time. I can assure the honourable member of that, as she will observe if she goes back to the record.

QUESTION TIME

ELECTRICITY, PRICE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Given the importance to South Australia of the future $400 million expansion of Holden's operations at Elizabeth, will the Premier meet with the Chairman and CEO of Holden Australia, Peter Hanenberger, to seek his personal assurance that the forecast increase of power costs for Holden of up to 100 per cent will not affect the expansion project?

A spokesperson from Holden's head office in Melbourne today confirmed that the Elizabeth plant's power price increases of between 35 and 100 per cent would affect the competitiveness of local operations. The Holden spokesman told the media today, following the Premier's claims this morning that co-generation had become an option for Holden, that this was an expensive idea that had not even been considered. The spokesman for the head office of Holden said:

> It's not an option that we've had on the table to consider, so I'd have to sort of put that one aside for the moment. It's not something we've even given any thought to. I have no expertise to judge how much, but the idea sounds a very expensive one to me.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Once again the Leader of the Opposition is simply behind the eight ball. It is not the public relations officer to whom he referred. I have spoken to the Manager of Operations at General Motors.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I speak to Peter Hanenberger on regular occasions, and it is why we have a $400 million investment on the schedule. It is why there is a supplier park going in, collocating with General Motors, and it is why additional jobs will be created. The Leader of the Opposition might not like it, but within a couple of months there will be a very significant announcement related to General Motors. He might be disappointed, but South Australians will cheer with that announcement.

The General Manager of Operations in South Australia on two occasions today has confirmed with me that they are looking at co-generation as one of the options. I understand that Mr Morrison, the person to whom the leader referred, has rung the ABC to say that in checking it they have been

looking at co-generation options. So the Leader of the Opposition should get the facts right in the first place. I have spoken to Peter Hanenberger more times than has the Leader of the Opposition, obviously, because what we have from Mr Hanenberger, with the support of the Manager of Operations in South Australia, is an expansion in their investment and in their jobs, and the Government of South Australia has been working cooperatively with them in relation to the establishment of supplier park. In relation to supplier park—

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: And the Deputy Leader might also want to cheer when we see a range of automotive component supply firms shift out of Victoria into South Australia, because it will mean jobs in this state. Instead of the Leader of the Opposition trying to put a damp squib on it, trying to whinge, whine, carp and criticise all the time, let him for once say, 'Isn't that investment good for the state; isn't the creation of jobs good for the state?', because that is exactly what they are saying. In fact they have told the media today that those earlier reports are erroneous reports.

DEFENCE SECTOR JOBS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Premier advise the House of the Government's ongoing efforts to attract jobs to South Australia, in particular to the defence sector? Have there been recent developments in regard to major international defence contractor British Aerospace Systems in terms of investment within the state?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Further, it builds on my reply to the Leader of the Opposition's question. BAE, the world's third largest defence contractor, I indicated, would be consolidating its operations in this state out of New South Wales and Victoria. That is to be welcomed. It is coming to South Australia because of a competitive base. It is coming to South Australia because we have a nucleus of defence and electronics industries, built up of the Defence Science and Technology Organisation in our state and the Australian Submarine Corporation. SAAB is another example of an international defence related company establishing its facilities and expanding in South Australia. Not only is BAE consolidating here and closing in New South Wales and in Victoria but also, I am delighted to tell the House, it is closing its head office in Sydney and locating the head office of BAE in South Australia.

The Managing Director of BAE Australia has secured accommodation at Tennyson, overlooking the beach. I am somewhat envious of the accommodation he has secured in South Australia, but it underscores the point that as they strip out their office accommodation in Sydney and relocate to Adelaide it is building on a defence related industry that is going from strength to strength. That is why we went to the United States and to London, Ontario to speak to General Motors Defence. Out of that we have an $80 million defence facility in this state for the production of turrets for tanks. It is shifting its manufacturing operations from London, Ontario, Canada here to South Australia. In addition to that, we have seen the sod turning ceremony for SAAB and its very significant new and expanded defence facility at Mawson Lakes.

Coupled with that are our ongoing discussions with the commonwealth government in relation to the Australian Submarine Corporation. The share ownership of the Submarine Corporation and its longevity in this state are particularly important. The skills base that it has developed over a period of time and the fact that we have one of the most modern ship building facilities in Australia here in South Australia, make it logical that it would be the base upon which you would build. We have spent considerable effort over the last five to six years in the defence and electronics industries to build up a nucleus so that we are the defence and electronics capital of Australia. BAE is coming into this state with its head office, taking the number of its employees from some 900 to over 1000. That, combined with the $400 million Wedgetail project with Boeing—where some four Boeing 737's will be equipped with this new early warning information system—will be the first stage of what one would hope to be a contract for three further 737's, and being able to source contracts elsewhere in the world by manufacturing here in South Australia.

The establishment of this head office is in stark contrast to what happened in the 1980s. In the 1980s, there was a flight of head offices. There is now a return of head offices to the state. Would we want more? Yes we would and we will work towards that outcome. One other aspect about the BAE announcement today is the demand for software engineers, whether it is in the EDS, Motorola, Compaq, SAAB, DSTO, or whether, in fact, it is at BAE. This country has a dearth of software engineers. Several years ago, a CD-ROM was sent out to our schools, giving encouragement to our secondary students to look at software engineering as a career path. Whilst the universities have worked cooperatively to put in place courses to try to produce, from within our own ranks, that is, from South Australia, sufficient software engineers, with the growth that we have had in South Australia, once again, there is still a continuing need for more people to take up that skills base. And whilst skilled migration might meet the short-term needs, what we have to do is look at the long term and how these jobs can radiate out into the community for our young people, young South Australians. The 100-odd jobs which are part of this new early warning system and these Boeing 737's will be high-tech jobs; these are software engineering and skills based jobs that will be required.

This is an opportunity to grow and expand our defence and electronics industries. It is an opportunity, once again, to consolidate greater diversification in the economy of the state and, importantly, this sets us apart and ahead of New South Wales and Victoria. This is about new jobs; this is about new investment and increasing demand within such things as the property market in our state where, for the last couple of years, we have seen residential property, as well as commercial and industrial property, increase in value. That is a benefit to everybody in the community and is in quite stark contrast to the Labor years, when house values were stagnant. They are not any more. There is momentum; there is increased value and everybody is the beneficiary.

ELECTRICITY, PRICE

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again directed to the Premier. Does the Premier support the independent industry regulator's detailed plan for the South Australian government to cap local power prices until the state has sufficient electricity interconnection or local generation to reduce the price of power? The Independent Regulator (Mr Owens) yesterday released a detailed plan by which the state government could cap the wholesale price of power in this state until the market had adequate capacity to deliver competitive power prices and protect industry from

the massive power price increases they face after 1 July—of which the Premier is apparently very proud.

Under Mr Owens' plan, the government could seek what is called a jurisdictional derogation allowing the state to set a maximum price that could be determined by the Regulator on a quarterly basis. The Regulator believes that this is legally achievable and is designed to stand as an interim measure until the other electricity problems facing the state can be fixed.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): As I have indicated to the House on a number of occasions, we are looking at a range of options to lessen the impact of the national electricity market and how this market is rolling out and affecting a number of the states (New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia). As I previously indicated, at the Premiers' Conference on 8 June I listed a series of initiatives that I want to—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The leader needs to understand that we are talking about a national market. In addition to that, we have a task force, of which Mr Owens is a member, which is looking at a range of options. That task force will be giving me a detailed interim report by 31 May. I have indicated, post my discussions with AGL, when we sought and obtained some relief in the increases being proposed by AGL to the marketplace in South Australia, that there is a series of measures; there is no one, single, simple solution. There is a series of initiatives—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —being worked through that will have the outcome that we are working towards, of minimising the impact. The Leader of the Opposition seems to conveniently forget all the time the other benefits that have been put in place—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —in this state. You never hear the Leader of the Opposition talk about the $108 million reduction in WorkCover costs and benefits and retained earnings for business next year. Very selective is the Leader of the Opposition, when most businesses look at a total picture of costs of operating in an environment. I want to reinforce to the House that the manufacturer Electrolux, a consumer of electricity, is consolidating out of New South Wales/Victoria into South Australia. We have had confirmation today that nothing of that nature will interfere with the consolidation, that is, the expansion, of General Motors in South Australia.

So, doom and gloom might be the Leader of the Opposition's way: the simple fact is that these companies are still investing, still expanding in our state, and we will continue to work through a range of issues to ameliorate the effect of the national electricity market.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the leader finished disrupting the House? The honourable member for Heysen.

NURSES, ACUTE CARE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Human Services tell the House what the state government is doing to provide more nurses involved in acute care in our public hospitals in South Australia?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): As we know, the demand for nursing is immense at present throughout the developed world, particularly because of our ageing populations and because of the increasing demand for nurses in a broader range of fields, particularly in aged care. The state government embarked on a planning program to recruit many of the nurses who have been adequately trained in the past but who, for various personal reasons, have dropped out of the work force. I am delighted to say that this week we have started the first of our refresher programs at the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals, in which 33 nurses are participating.

Under this 16 week program, these nurses will get hospital-based training, free of charge, because the costs are being covered by the state government. They will get hospital-based training not only in the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre but also at the Queen Elizabeth and Noarlunga Hospitals, as well as at the Repatriation General Hospital. Very importantly, it will help people who in some cases have had some very good skills and who have been active nurses but who for personal reasons have dropped out of the work force.

I met one such person on Sunday, a Daphne Perry, who was a specialist nurse in cardiac, emergency and intensive care. Due to health problems, Daphne Perry had to drop out of the system. She has been out of the system for four years and is now coming back in, and she is absolutely thrilled. If it were not for this program, she could not afford to go back to university for a year and pay the significant university fees that would otherwise have to be paid. We have 33 in the first course.

I expect to launch next week the first re-entry programs. They are for people who have been out of nursing for a period of five years or more. That is a slightly more intense program to allow those people to return to nursing. The first two programs are for registered nurses. We then intend to run both a refresher program and a re-entry program for enrolled nurses as well. When we went out in March and advertised for people to show an expression of interest, over 300 nurses currently not in the work force expressed the view that they would like to be retrained and have their skills refreshed so that they could come back into the work force. It is a great program. We do not commit the people to have to work in the public sector. I imagine that, after they have completed the course, a number of people will work in private hospitals or in the nursing home sector. We are doing this to make sure that we relieve the pressure on the number of nurses in South Australia. Also, it is part of our program to recruit 200 nurses.

While I am talking about nurses, I would like just to mention a couple of other significant events that occurred last weekend. The first was the inaugural nursing excellence awards for South Australia. This program was launched by my department in conjunction with the private sector. It is a joint venture, and it was an outstanding success. It was encouraging to see the delight amongst the various nurses who had been nominated by their peers as carrying out a standard of excellence within their professional area and to see the extent to which they as a profession were so proud of what they had achieved, particularly hospital by hospital. I want to thank the private groups who came in and backed those excellence awards.

On Friday night I also announced the four premier scholarship winners for nursing this year. Four people will

have the opportunity to travel overseas with a $15 000 scholarship each. It is a program that was initiated by the previous health minister, and 20 nurses have had the opportunity to travel overseas to extend their study and to bring back to South Australia and our health care system practical ideas on how to improve the quality of care for people in the public hospital system.

The third thing I would like to mention is that we had the launch on Friday night of the program to highlight nursing as a career, particularly amongst those still at school. I invite people to look at bus stops around South Australia, particularly in Adelaide, where they will see four pairs of legs. That is part of our practical advertising campaign. A lot of people have commented on the fact that these are the practical, pragmatic footwear worn by nurses within our profession.

I assure members that my legs are not part of it. It is part of a program that we are promoting to encourage school leavers to take up nursing as a career and as a profession, a profession that has enormous growth opportunity. If one looks at what is occurring in health care around the world, and particularly in South Australia and Australia, one can see that, probably, there will be very few areas—except, perhaps, in information technology—where the demand for people to work will be greater. I encourage school leavers to take up that career.

GOVERNMENT RADIO NETWORK

Mr CONLON (Elder): My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services.

Mr McEwen: Be careful; Mum's watching.

Mr CONLON: Thank you.

Members interjecting:

Mr CONLON: Perhaps someone should tell her about the Senate while I am here. My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services.

Members interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I need some protection, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member does.

Mr CONLON: I will try this again. Will the minister guarantee that by the next fire season the Country Fire Service will not be using old radio equipment or faulty new equipment and that the Country Fire Service will be fully hooked into the new government radio network using new pagers and new handsets? Although the minister told parliament in mid-November last year that problems with faulty pagers issued to Country Fire Service volunteers under the $250 million radio network were being fixed, the pagers are still not functional and the problems will take at least a further 12 weeks to fix.

The opposition has now been informed by the Country Fire Service that new radio handsets issued under the contract cannot access radio signals adequately outside the metropolitan area. We have been informed that handsets have been recalled and that volunteers will have to revert to the old VHF system using old equipment indefinitely.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I thank the honourable member for his question, but I particularly thank him because he has today asked a question about emergency services—only the second question about emergency services from someone who purports to want to do my job. Not only is it only the second question about emergency services asked by the shadow spokesperson but I had a look at the honourable member's real interest in emergency services when I read what is called the 'SA Labor platform for government'. I looked through—

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will come back to the substance of the question. The Minister for Emergency Services.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The answer is that we are doing a lot for emergency services. Why are we doing a lot for emergency services? Because for 11 long years of mismanagement, Labor did nothing for emergency services, except for a $13 million debt.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The member for Ross Smith.

Mr CLARKE: Standing order 98, sir; would you like me to repeat it?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order because there was a barb in the tail of the question which allowed the minister to have some latitude. I would ask the minister to have some regard for the question and to try to stick to the question.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: In 11 long years of Labor mess, all that emergency services received was $13 million worth of debt. What are we doing? We are delivering to those 17 400 volunteers who put their life on the line to support this community. Those 17 400 volunteers needed a new radio network a long time ago. We are delivering that radio network. Unfortunately, when the shadow spokesperson occasionally talks about emergency services he likes to confuse the issue and not talk about the facts. I will provide the House with two or three facts: the government radio network is a statewide integrated radio network that will allow—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: It works. The honourable member should listen to the answer. The honourable member asked the question, he should listen to the answer. The statewide government radio network is a fully integrated radio network for the whole state. It has already shown its worth on Kangaroo Island. Just recently, the main telecom cable to Kangaroo Island went down, and the hospital was in dire straits. The only way of getting communication and protecting lives through that hospital on Kangaroo Island was through the SES and the brand new government radio network. That is the sort of thing that the government radio network is doing.

We will also deliver pagers to all members of the CFS. The paging system will be essential for volunteers who look after sections of the Adelaide Hills into which it is very hard to get communications. I know that because on a recent Sunday I went into the Premier's electorate to open with him a new $300 000 CFS fire station at Kersbrook. I was trying to ring some of my constituents on the way through the Adelaide Hills with a Telstra phone and there were times when the connection dropped out.

No mobile phone company can build a network that will work everywhere. We are building a paging system for the CFS so that, if volunteers who work in Adelaide need to get up to the Hills, they will have a pager on which they can receive signal in Adelaide. If volunteers are in an incident strike team in the Mid North, they will have a pager that will work. I acknowledge that there are some difficulties in certain areas in the Adelaide Hills, and a lot of detailed scientific work is going on to ensure we can accommodate the best possible opportunities for a statewide paging system, together with a paging system that will work in those difficult areas.

We are working on that now, lots of energy is going into it, we are delivering for those volunteers and we will continue to do so.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TRAINING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services inform the House how learning and skills outcomes delivered by our secondary schools have brought relevant benefits to South Australian students and their families?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Young people in our schools deserve the very best career education that we can give them and the latest research has shown that they should get that career experience in the marketplace rather than by sitting, reading or studying abstract models in the classroom. Experiences beyond the classroom are absolutely essential and this government has developed vocational education to the stage at which 90 per cent of our high schools are providing vocational education training to our young students. The expansion of these programs has been phenomenal.

Last year, some 15 660 students undertook vocational education training. Of those, 5 000 were in the country and 10 000 were in the metropolitan area. That represents a sixfold increase in just four years, and we are not stopping there. Over the next three years, $13 million has been allocated by this government to vocational education training to ensure that our young people get workplace experience and workplace accreditation for the work they undertake through their vocational education training.

Further, three years ago, only 28 students were undertaking a school-based apprenticeship. Today, 360 students are undertaking training in engineering, commercial cookery, farming, agriculture and retail operations. They are in industries such as Southcorp, British Aerospace, Clipsal and BRL Hardy, some of the top companies in South Australia.

How does that contrast with Labor's record in vocational education training? It is the complete opposite. We all know, as I have mentioned in this place before, that Goodwood Technical High School was closed in 1991. Before then, there was an absolute string of technical high schools throughout our state. When I was farming, my neighbour went to Elizabeth Boys Technical High School at the time and learnt many trades that were suitable for his farm, and he continues to work as a successful farmer.

However, vocation educational training under Labor was zero—zip; it was nowhere to be seen. When those technical high schools were closed, the students' chances were just blown away; they were annihilated. They had no choice; they were left to follow an academic pathway only. There were no choices and no flexibility in the curriculum at all. What is more, that happened at a time when the Leader of the Opposition was minister responsible for TAFE and there was 46 per cent youth unemployment. There was not a single job in sight.

Well, this government is providing plenty of opportunities to the young people in our schools. They include opportunities in viticulture, tourism, agriculture, food and beverage, winery and function centres, printing and graphics, design and forestry at a host of country and metropolitan sites such as the Riverland, Naracoorte, Parndana. Willunga, Smithfield Plains and Urrbrae. Our successful vocational colleges at Windsor Gardens and Christies Beach are giving a lot of flexibility and choice to our young people in secondary schools.

Maintaining that flexibility is absolutely critical because it gives our young people, as they are going through secondary school, the maximum amount of choice, whether they choose a school-based apprenticeship or traineeship or whether they go to TAFE and get accreditation for vocational education training undertaken at secondary school. The system under this government is now much smoother and they can transfer to university and get accreditation at university for TAFE studies, thereby saving time in their university degree. This government is providing flexibility and options for our young people where Labor offered none.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr CONLON (Elder): Can the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services guarantee that the emergency services levy will not be increased or that a new fire fund will not be introduced to deal with forecast budget blow-outs to the Country Fire Service budget for this financial year? The opposition has been supplied with copies of recent Country Fire Service board meeting minutes which confirm that the Country Fire Service will overspend its current budget. The minutes state that the board will approach the Emergency Services Levy Fund manager and ask him to consider establishing a special fire fund for the CFS.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I am delighted to be able to talk about the CFS budgets.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: In fact, the member for Peake might like to listen to this answer. Only yesterday the board had a telephone hook-up to work out what it was going to do with the second lot of capital works spending for this current financial year, because around $7.5 million to $8 million worth of capital works is going into the CFS this year. A $3.5 million capital works program was decided on, and I understand that it is being couriered across to my office, probably today.

I can say a couple of things about the emergency services levy. First, we have done the right thing and had the fortitude to do what successive Liberal and Labor governments in the past never did. I know that if the Labor Party were unfortunately able to fall into office it would keep the levy.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: We will talk afterwards about what it will do with it, because we know what the member for Ross Smith (as part of the Labor Party) said he would do if Labor got into office. He said it would double it. Has that been refuted? The Leader of the Opposition has not refuted it. Labor will support the levy.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Two Labor states at the moment (and the opposition can check this) are considering, very seriously, introducing an ESL, which is interesting.

I will finish with a couple of other things. First, can I guarantee to the shadow spokesperson that the levy will not be increasing in the budget? Yes, on the public record. Secondly, can I guarantee a commitment to the CFS that I will do the very best for them to catch up on a massive backlog of their requirements? Yes. Will there be some increases in the CFS budget next year? I would say: wait until 30 May. You might have a nice surprise.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My question is to the Minister for Employment and Training.

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

Mr Foley interjecting:

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

Mr SCALZI: Will the minister inform the House as to the implications of the recent Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, and whether employment growth remains a top priority in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Employment and Training): I will come to you later. Working towards increasing employment for all South Australians remains the top priority for this government. It is true that last month in trend—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: It is true that last month in trend terms, unemployment in South Australia rose slightly. Such a figure should not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will come back to order. Minister.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Such a figure should not come as a surprise to the House considering the national economic growth in the first quarter of this year—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Hart for the second time for absolutely ignoring the chair.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —which at best could be described as sluggish. The pace has picked up since March and it is important that members do not lose sight of the progress that has been made, especially in South Australia, at 7.2 per cent. I do not blame the Leader of the Opposition for talking, because the Leader of the Opposition in this place steadfastly wants us and South Australians to ignore the record whilst he was Minister for Employment. It was a record of total disaster. I will take 7.2 per cent in South Australia today well and truly in front of the 9.6 per cent that the Leader of the Opposition came into this House and boasted about—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: No, 12 he did not boast about, but 9.6 he boasted about as his great triumph. We are now down to 7.2 which I believe members on this side of the House can be proud of. It is fair to say that the April figures were a mixed bag. The seasonally adjusted figures went up around 0.5 per cent, partly because the ABS revised down South Australia's employment rate for March. That is, we had fewer unemployed that month than we originally thought.

Likewise, if you are a woman in South Australia, it is a most heartening aspect of the April employment figures that female unemployment dropped for the twelfth consecutive month, and is now sitting at just 5.7 per cent. Moreover, an extra 3 700 jobs were created in this state last month, and I believe that the ministers at the table here and in the other place can—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Some 3 700 jobs extra in this state and, incidentally, for the member for Peake, seeing that he is so interested, the participation rate rose, which is largely the reason that unemployment figures in fact went up. So, there is encouraging news for South Australians looking for work, but that does not mean that we should lose focus on what we need to do to find jobs for those who are still without them.

Labor has only one priority, and that priority is for themselves to be in government. Labor will do, in the words of Senator Graham Richardson—

Mr Hanna: For very good reasons.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: 'For very good reasons'. There we have an absolute admission from the member for Mitchell that the only thing they covet is the seats on this side of the parliament. There is no policy, no vision towards the people of South Australia but only greed and self-interest. Senator Richardson summed it up when he said that they 'will do whatever it takes to achieve government'. We see mayhem and chaos from the benches opposite and not constructive policies.

The Leader of the Opposition has one priority and one priority only, namely, to live up to the expectations of whatever audience he is speaking to. If it is teachers he has told them that education is the No.1 priority in South Australia. He wants to be the education Premier. If it is health professionals he wants to be the health Premier. If it is talk-back radio and law and order he is all behind the Minister for Emergency Services; he is the law and order Premier. If he is down in Mitchell—

Mr CLARKE: On a point of order, sir, standing order 98 states that the minister should not be debating the question that he is allegedly answering.

The SPEAKER: I will not uphold the point of order as I do not believe that the minister is debating it as defined in the standing order. The minister.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: If it is the business community he is talking to, he will fix up electricity. He will fix it, not by spending $100 million on jobs in this state but by shovelling it over by truck to his mate Bob Carr to build an interconnector that can be funded privately. In the case of jobs he has a vision—and what a show-stopping vision! It is a jobs summit—something we went past some years ago. In 13 days' time the Treasurer will deliver a budget in which we will prove—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —that on this side of the House we are simply getting on with the job we are paid to do, namely, the job of finding jobs for all South Australians who seek employment. On the opposite side of the House, I draw the attention of the House, by way of policy contrast on jobs—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —to the words of the member for Elder, who on Tuesday informed this House—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: —that 'we have only one Troy to burn'. He boasted to the Premier of his classical illusion. That is very true. The Greeks, having surrounded Troy for many years, could not get in there.

Mr CLARKE: On a point of order, sir, does standing order 98 mean anything?

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I ask the minister to get back to the question.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I will finish by explaining what that illusion has to do with jobs, which was the substance of the question. It is simply this: having gained the city by deceit and deception, they burnt it down. They sacked and pillaged it. That is what Labor is about: gaining office by deception and then sacking and pillaging the state.

AMBULANCE DIVERSIONS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STEVENS: Will the minister confirm that the government has been considering a plan to impose fines on public hospitals that put ambulances on bypass because they cannot guarantee the safety of people requiring emergency treatment? The opposition has been told by senior doctors that public hospitals are fighting a proposal by the minister's department to fine hospitals when emergency departments are forced to put ambulances on bypass. Under the plan public hospitals would be fined $2 000 an hour whenever ambulances are put on bypass for more than two hours.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): It would appear that the member for Elizabeth does not appreciate the fact that something like 80 per cent of the ambulance diversions are from the private hospitals to the public hospitals. That is where the problem lies—about 80 per cent of the diversions are—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth has asked her question. She can remain silent.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In fact, you hear quite often of the fact that hospitals were on diversion. In fact, in the vast majority of cases, it is the private hospitals, once again, diverting to the public hospitals. We have taken out some of the figures—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —and diversions from the public hospitals are relatively low. A figure was quoted before a select committee of this parliament from one of the people down at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital who claimed that for 10 per cent of the time they were on ambulance diversion. We did some checking and found that over about a six-month period I think the figure was 1.5 per cent, and for the worst month it got up to about 3 per cent. So, this myth that has been developed about diversions between public hospitals all the time is no more than largely a myth. Day after day (and it has been occurring this week, and it occurs most weeks), we have one, two or three of the major hospitals which have an emergency department on diversion across to the public hospital system. I can tell members that it is not just for an hour or so. In some of these cases it is for 20 hours a day, and that is putting enormous pressure on the public hospital system. We have been working with the private hospital sector. I have no power to impose a fine on the private hospital sector at all and—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth will remain silent.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And the member for Stuart.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We have been working with the private hospitals, and particularly with the Ashford Group, whereby they will introduce practices which will allow them to maintain more of those emergency cases within those hospitals. Ashford—and I give them credit for it—has now released the Ashford card and, if an older person has been into the Ashford Hospital in the last year, that Ashford card will guarantee them admission as an emergency patient to that hospital.

In terms of the public hospital diversions, we have been working with our hospitals to make sure that they more effectively use the resources available to minimise the number of diversions. As of this month, we have asked each of the major hospitals with emergency departments to set up what we call an extended emergency admission ward so that they will be able more effectively to admit patients from the emergency departments into those wards. I have seen the facility already at Noarlunga and, as I understand it, by the end of May we are expecting all the major hospitals to have this extended emergency ward facility available and operating to ease the pressure for this winter.

There are costs in terms of diversions, and we are working to try to minimise those costs. That is certainly something that we are taking up with the individual hospitals to identify and understand what those costs are and to try to minimise what those costs might be to the broader health sector. I know from my colleague who runs the ambulance service that the ambulance officers have been very co-operative, and I appreciate the tremendous support they have given. We want to make sure that if the usual winter illnesses hit this year the number of diversions, at least between public hospital and public hospital, is kept at a minimum. My one regret—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would like to have the power to fine the member for Elizabeth. I warn the member for the second time.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —is that we cannot apply to the private hospital system the same sort of principles which I am requiring and which must apply to public hospitals. I can understand their point of view. The facts are that they get paid more under Australia's health insurance system if they admit a patient who is an elective surgery patient than they would be paid for exactly the same bed for the same period for an emergency patient.

In other words, the private health system is skewed towards elective surgery and against taking emergency patients. I have asked the federal government to look at how that is done, to look at readjusting the whole of the private health insurance system so that the private hospitals get exactly the same amount for a bed for an emergency patient as they would for an elective surgery patient.

Otherwise, we will find that the public hospital system becomes almost the dumping ground for emergency patients throughout the whole of Australia and, in the meantime, the private hospitals will concentrate on their more profitable area, elective patients. I think that will create a skew within the public and private hospital systems in the whole of Australia.

WORK SAFETY

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister for Government Enterprises advise the House what WorkCover is doing to ensure that the safe work message reaches young South Australians and, as part of that explanation, advise the House how the magnificent savings of WorkCover have been passed on to the community?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I thank the member for Bragg for his question about a matter that is obviously important to present South Australian employers and employees as well as to future employers and employees. The way in which his question addresses the present employers and employees is when he asked how the savings that are being made by WorkCover are being passed on. As the Premier has noted, over the past two years, on 1 July, dramatic savings have been passed back from WorkCover to businesses for them to reinvest in more effective plant, increasing their throughput, increasing employment and so on. That is based—

The Hon. M.R. Buckby interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: And in July this year there will be an $83 million amount of either direct levy not paid or savings made, which is in addition to the $25 million from last year.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The minister must have misheard me: it is not $8.3 million, it is $83 million that is being retained by the businesses of South Australia with the direct intent of employing more South Australians. As the Premier noted recently in the House, there has been a 20 per cent reduction in WorkCover claims, despite the fact that in our time in government there has been a 10 per cent increase in the number of employees. Not only have we increased employment but we have also decreased the number of WorkCover claims, which is an enormous bonus, particularly to those workers who are not injured.

That is a key focus of what we are attempting to do. It is clearly a bonus to the employers if their employees are not being injured so frequently. That is what we have done by passing back the savings to the present employers and employees.

I noted that in answer to a previous question the Minister for Education talked about present students going out into the work force and learning what is going on there, and the focus that we as a government have put on vocational education. WorkCover Corporation is very keen to address not only the workers and employers of today but also those of tomorrow. The member for Bragg has asked a particularly perceptive question—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: As one does, but the member for Bragg does particularly—as the focus of everyone is on the economy and how people will be employed. It is pleasing to be able to detail to the House what WorkCover is doing about future employers and employees, and the initiatives in the workplace the government has put in place to reinforce the importance of safe work to the children and the youth of this state. Workplace safety is an issue for absolutely everybody, but particularly for those who are about to leave school, as well as new employers. The new employee program WorkCover has looked at identified that, in the first nine months of a job, a new worker is three times more likely to be injured at work than at any other time in their employment. That is not surprising, as they are learning new skills, dealing with new machines, under new stresses, and so on. It is a new environment in general. It is quite striking that, in the first nine months of a job, a new employee is three times more likely to be injured at work than at any other time in their employment.

As I said, that is what one would expect. Clearly, in attempting to stop workplace injury, we believe that the best time to change attitudes is before people start to work so that we can prevent the whole problem. WorkCover and the government have instituted a schools awareness campaign, which continues and extends the initiatives of the new worker campaign which was first introduced in 1997, and its direct aim is to—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: Rubbish! The member for Peake says a question about teaching students how to avoid injury at work is wasting time. I am absolutely amazed not only that any member of parliament would be so crass but that a Labor Party would be so negative to an initiative which is clearly designed to help workers. The schools awareness campaign is being developed for students at all levels of schooling from reception through to year 12, but there is a focus on the highest risk group in years 10 to 12, because obviously they are the ones who are about the join the work force. We start earlier. In reception to year 6, the program is aimed at raising students' level of awareness about health and safety at school, at home and in the playground. In other words, the aim is to give them a solid base, and hopefully some of those practices might be inculcated into the family environment. From years 7 to 9, students will be provided with information to increase their knowledge about their responsibilities towards themselves and others in regard protective behaviour and risk management.

Mr CLARKE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The minister has been giving us an answer for over six minutes. I would ask that you rule on that. This time wasting is absolutely disgraceful.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out the House that the standing orders are the property of the chamber. If members do not like the standing orders, it is up to the chamber and members here to alter them. There is nothing that the chair can implement in the standing orders that limits the length of the reply of the minister. It is entirely in the hands of the chamber.

Ms HURLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I move:

That question time be extended by 10 minutes.

A division on the motion was called for.

While the division bells were ringing:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to come back to order.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: On a procedural point of order, sir, as a matter of query for you, sir, if my reading of standing orders is correct, question time is allowed for a period of one hour. Therefore, would it not be necessary to suspend standing orders before such a motion could be considered by the chair?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: We are not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that, while the bells complete ringing, the minister read standing orders and he will find that that is not the case.

The House divided on the motion:

While the division was being held:

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Spence is not assisting the proceedings.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will come to order. I would ask for some cooperation from the House while we deal with this division.

AYES (25)

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

NOES (21)

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

Majority of 4 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister for Government Enterprises.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I have got another 10 minutes to go! As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted, it is an innovative campaign which involves a number of separate initiatives aimed specifically at teaching the youth of today who are about to go out into the workplace ways of looking after themselves and their work mates and colleagues to help the diminution of the amount of workplace injury to continue.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I can understand why the government wanted to shut down question time. My question is to the minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: It is still a secret government. My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services. Given that the minister has let slip today that there will be a welcome surprise announcement on 30 May in the state budget concerning the emergency services levy, will he now reveal to the House the nature and extent of the massive cut which is to be the keynote announcement in the state budget in two weeks time?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): It is a very hypothetical question, but for two reasons I want to repeat what I said earlier. Opposition members run out innuendo after innuendo and they misrepresent the facts to the volunteers. I do not want volunteers being misled, so I want to make the position very clear. In the next two weeks, the shadow spokesperson wants to run around the state telling CFS volunteers that they will have a smaller budget next year than they had this year. That is what he wants to do. He wants to send the wrong message to the volunteers. All I said was: wait until 30 May. But, with respect to the CFS budget, I will be in there fighting for its best opportunity.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I would also like to say that, if the shadow spokesperson is going to run rumour and innuendo—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have said that the budget for the CFS will be looked after.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I would like the shadow spokesperson to confirm to the CFS two things. What is the opposition going to do about developing a policy to properly fund the CFS, because its track record is atrocious?

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order. To help the minister, I point out that we ask the questions and it is his job to answer them.

The SPEAKER: Order! There no point of order.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The final point is that I would like the shadow spokesperson to confirm to the CFS whether or not his policy is a single fire service for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

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

ABORIGINAL EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I direct my question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the leader for the third time and the member for Elder for the second time. I remind the leader of the consequence of automatic naming if he interjects once more. The member for Stuart.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Can the minister outline to the House the latest initiatives being undertaken to further generate and promote employment opportunities for Aboriginal people within this state?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs): I thank the honourable member for this important question, and I know he has a great deal of background and experience in supporting Aboriginal communities that look to take on economic development as a way in which to increase the standard of living in Aboriginal communities in the future.

The federal Liberal government has recently announced that some 26 indigenous groups around this country will receive over $1 million in funding for projects that will generate and promote employment opportunities to indigenous people. The funding is from the Indigenous Small Business Fund. This will enable these organisations to manage projects that develop business, and indeed business

skills, and others that build on skills acquired through the community development employment project (CDEP), which has been a very successful project throughout Aboriginal communities in South Australia.

I am pleased to advise the House that two organisations in South Australia are receiving funding under this project to develop business skills within their local communities. The Burrandies Aboriginal Corporation at Mount Gambier has received some $27 720 to provide accredited business training to a group of Aboriginal people who have both identified and researched a number of small business opportunities in their own communities. This course will run for 16 weeks.

The second community involved is the Port Lincoln Aboriginal Community Council (PLACC), which has received $44 000 from this federal Liberal government scheme. That will enable this community to pursue an opportunity to enter original industry as a joint venture with an existing operator. The funding will be used to undertake detailed business planning, which will include investigations into the various options for entering industry, including the very important components that are necessary when looking at a business venture of this type such as financial analysis, detailed production, operation and human resource strategies.

The same community council is also involved in the South Australian Aboriginal Fishing Aquaculture and Sea Management Forum Incorporated which, I am sure members of this House realise, is a peak organisation for Aboriginal aquaculture issues in South Australia. This council last year also attracted state funding to the tune of some $10 000 from Community Benefits SA. This scheme is administered through the Department of Human Services and it looks to upgrade this amount of money acquired by the council and to put it toward the upgrading and expanding of a youth facility based at Port Lincoln to provide a far healthier and safer meeting place for young Aboriginal people.

The emphasis placed on providing practical assistance for Aboriginal people to gain meaningful employment is a key aim of this Liberal government. Initiatives such as the state-funded Aboriginal building project, which is conducted through the Spencer Institute of TAFE at Port Pirie, provides tremendous opportunities for Aboriginal people to learn business skills in a working environment. The Port Pirie project, which builds on trade and business skills and improves employment prospects for participants, all means that this Liberal Government is again supporting the key reconciliation processes towards economic development for Aboriginal people.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. How many jobs have been brokered and people brought home under the Premier's 'Bringing them Back Home' scheme since its launch in April last year, and what has been the total cost of the scheme, including advertising in interstate media? Can the Premier tell us exactly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —how many jobs you have brokered and how many people have been brought home?

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will resume his seat.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I know, whilst the opposition sought an extension of question time, that we are now filling in question time. If the Leader of the Opposition would like me to, I will go through BHP shared services centre, Electrolux at Email, BAE and SAAB. Mr Speaker, I could go through a series of other initiatives—

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On a point of order, sir, the question related to his bringing them back home—involving South Australians who had left being encouraged to register on the internet and come back.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Bionomics is another example, Mr Speaker—skilled areas where we need young South Australians who have gone interstate and have upgraded their skill level to come back home to South Australia, because now they have something to come back home to. That is in stark contrast to the Leader of the Opposition. Further initiatives will be announced in relation to that strategy. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition have just a little bit of patience. The budget is but two weeks away.

MINISTER'S COMMENTS

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Ms WHITE: Yesterday during question time, in response to a question from the member for MacKillop, the Minister for Water Resources made extraordinary allegations about me, two of my constituents and, by implication, a fair swag of my constituency. I wish to put the facts to this House.

First, the minister talked of a member on this side of the House who 'will rename nameless at present'. He called my attention by stating that the member for Taylor might be interested in this answer, because it touched on matters relevant to her electorate. He then identified the nameless member in question as a woman. Then he identified the constituents as being from the Northern Adelaide Plains.

I confirm that I am indeed the member who wrote to the minister representing my constituents. The minister stated that I had come to him 'on behalf of two constituents who she believes have been wrongly treated because they have overused their water'. The minister's statement is not an accurate representation of the complaints lodged, and this is borne out by my correspondence to him in July last year.

The substance of both those complaints was not that my constituents had been charged for excess water but that his department had acted in a heavy-handed and unreasonable manner; that the accounts were sent out two years after his department had allegedly recorded the water meter readings; and that these first notifications of very large debt—in one case exceeding $24 000—were accompanied by demand for payment within one month, and accompanied also by a demand to sign an acknowledgment of debt form that, if not signed, would trigger additional interest charges. The letters also referred to the fact that one of my constituents was told that he would be very soon receiving another bill for the 1998-99 financial year in excess of $70 000. My letters asked the minister to investigate and to bring about a reasonable outcome for my constituents.

I advise that this matter was referred to the Ombudsman. In a letter dated 27 October 2000, the Ombudsman advised me that he had launched a full investigation into the complaints against the minister's department in the matter. In his letter to me of 6 December 2000, the Ombudsman advised me that he had instructed the department to take no further action in recovery of moneys from my constituents until his investigation had been finalised. I spoke with the Ombudsman yesterday and he confirmed that his investigation had not been completed and that there remained questions and issues of concern.

While I am not privy to the details of the Ombudsman's investigations, the Ombudsman's letter to me of 6 March 2001 included the department's response to the Ombudsman's question concerning the legality of the department's collection of excess water charges from any northern Adelaide Plains grower. The correspondence said that this matter was still the subject of investigation. I have taken advice. That advice is that since the Ombudsman's investigation concerns possible maladministration and/or possible illegal activity by the minister's department and/or the minister, my constituents, as complainants in that investigation, are whistleblowers and are protected by the Whistleblowers Protection Act 1993, as is any potential complainant in the northern Adelaide Plains. Clause 9 of that act includes provisions for protection against victimisation, including intimidation or harassment. These provisions also apply to ministers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Tourism.

HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. HALL: In question time yesterday the member for Lee accused me of a lack of cooperation and delays in evidence and responses in relation to the Auditor-General's inquiry into the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. I, along with all other witnesses, was required to sign a binding undertaking that I would not discuss or make public any details or matters relating to the draft report which had been sent to me for comment.

The member for Lee must have contacts of a subversive nature with the inquiry and I reject his allegations absolutely and without qualification. Let me put on the public record the facts in relation to the Auditor-General's draft report. On 26 February this year I received a portion of the draft report and within two weeks—on 9 March, to be precise—my response had been forwarded to the Auditor-General. Subsequently I have written to the Auditor-General on several occasions on matters of detail relating to the inquiry and its conduct. So far there has been no response to the issues raised and my legal advisers have made it clear that I will respond promptly to the specific matters identified by the Auditor-General. It is wrong, it is false and it is patently mischievous for the member for Lee to claim that I have deliberately held up the inquiry and I trust the allegations from unnamed sources will be recognised and treated as a blatant attempt at political interference.

MEMBER'S LEAVE

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

That the member for Hammond be granted leave for the sitting week embracing the days 5, 6 and 7 June for him to attend a trade mission to Korea.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

Ms BREUER (Giles): A couple of weeks ago I spent time in Roxby Downs and Andamooka and met with some of the miners in Andamooka, who expressed concerns about a proposal to shift the mining inspector position from Andamooka and centralise it in Coober Pedy. I suppose this will be done on the grounds of rationalisation, in the guise of savings costs and so on, but the miners are extremely concerned about this proposal. It is a rather ridiculous proposal. The difficulties involved in travelling between the two communities, which are quite some distance apart—despite being the next town, there is a distance of some 400 or 500 kilometres between the two communities—including the time taken in travelling between them, the cost of fuel and the time wasted in travelling should be considered. In most of those areas there is no communication with mobile phones and, unless they have satellite phones, which are extremely expensive, they are not able to communicate and use that travel time for working. It is a matter of a lot of driving, which increases the risks for the mining inspector because while driving you constantly take on kangaroos, cattle and sheep, and you also take on eagles which attack prey on the side of the road. So it is quite dangerous and people should not be driving unless there is an absolute necessity for it.

I ask that the minister seriously look at this proposal. The people in Andamooka are extremely concerned about losing their mining inspector. Because of the implications of that the inspector will not be around at all times or be available at weekends. If there is an incident he will not be available because he is some five hours away from the community. It is like fishing inspectors. If you do not have a fishing inspector on site in your fishing community, it is a waste of time having a fishing inspector. The people in Andamooka feel the same way about their mining inspector: if he is not on hand there is no point in having him. It will be a reduced service and rather a waste of a service.

I will also speak today about concerns expressed to me by the anti-poverty forum in Whyalla, a group that meets and represents many of the voluntary, government and government funded organisations in Whyalla such as the migrant and ethnic community centre, women's shelter, counselling service, St Vincent de Paul, community health and so on. They have a number of concerns about health issues in Whyalla and I share those concerns. The public health system is becoming more of a problem and seems to be collapsing. Most people are finding it difficult to cope; most people cannot afford private health cover, especially in my community where the rate of unemployment is very high. They have to rely on the public health system.

One of those problems is with the public dental service. We are not alone in this in Whyalla, but it has become more of an issue in recent times. Presently they are seeing patients who registered to use the public dental service in November 1997, so there is effectively a 3½ year waiting list. There is a saying there that you can tell the financial status of people

by their teeth. People wait for fillings and non-urgent treatment and people are now tending to have teeth removed instead of having remedial work done because they have to wait too long. There is a major problem with our dental service.

There are also a lot of problems with hearing services in the country, particularly in Whyalla. This is evident in many other areas as well. One has to wait to have hearing tests, which is not so much a fault of the actual services available but more a fault with Australian Hearing Services. When people fill in applications to have hearing tests they send the applications to Canberra to have them assessed and if they are accepted a voucher is issued. People are given an option of several service providers to go to. However, there are often major delays and it is often a six-week or greater turn around before the forms are sent back from Canberra. It used to be only three to four weeks, but it has now gone up to about six weeks and people are finding it very unsatisfactory.

Our child mental health services in Whyalla have been a problem for many years but are particularly acute at the moment. There is a waiting list of about 23 to 24 people, which is a wait of a couple of months. If you have a child with a serious problem they are assessed and prioritised and the really serious ones, such as the ones at risk of suicide, can be seen, but the others have to wait six to eight weeks.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Today I will raise with the House the tremendous and positive effect the wine industry is having on our state's economy. In 1999, 940 000 visitors to South Australia went to a winery, spending $342 million in the process. More than 33 per cent of our international guests visit a winery during their stay in South Australia—well above the national average of 11 per cent, or three times the national average. Over half of these visit our most famous wine region—the Barossa Valley in my electorate. I note the minister is here and I was hoping to ask her a question in question time and I did not quite get it in there, but I am making up for it now.

More than 20 per cent of all interstate holiday visits to South Australia include a winery, compared with a national average of only 4 per cent—a huge difference. The South Australian Tourism Commission has fiercely promoted the state's wine and food competitive advantages in interstate and international marketing campaigns, and these figures illustrate how successful the strategy has been. South Australia's wine industry remains at the forefront of most Australian wine production indicators. We have the largest area of vineyards, accounting for 42 per cent of the national total. We produce 43 per cent of the nation's wine grapes and 70 per cent of the country's wine exports by volume. Our annual wine exports have broken the $1 billion barrier, and we are well on track to reach our goal of $2.2 billion by 2010, in a little over eight years' time.

The state has very strong foundations for wine tourism. Of the 275 wineries spread across our 13 wine regions, 70 per cent provide cellar door tastings and sales. South Australia is undoubtedly Australia's premier wine tourism destination, with the Barossa playing a key role in this. Our regional communities, stretching from Coonawarra in the South-East to the Southern Vales through the Barossa to the Clare Valley, benefit from the tourism dollars that flow from this booming sector—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: —and the Adelaide Hills—I admit my mistake. I also include the West Coast, near Port Lincoln, and, of course, the Riverland—how could I forget? The main challenge now lies in further developing and enhancing this strong reputation and ensuring that we stay ahead of the other states that are looking to claim the wine tourism mantle and draw tourism dollars from South Australia. We are winning because, when huge companies from the Hunter Valley are wanting to come into South Australia, like McGuigans—which is just one—it shows where the wine is flowing and where the success is.

Our state has a very strong and vibrant tourism market with huge growth potential. An appropriate mix of research, targeted marketing campaigns, new product development initiatives and support infrastructure will encourage more visitors to stay longer and spend valuable tourism dollars in our regional communities. We are seeing an ever-increasing expansion of vineyards in the Barossa, and South Australia wears the crown in Australia's wine industry. The local economy of the Valley is buoyant indeed. Government services are being upgraded, but the problem is—and it is a good problem—that the development continues to outstrip the government upgrades.

We are even seeing tourism operators asking that a public airstrip be constructed in or near the Barossa. People who have very strict time limits are wanting to include the Barossa in their tours to the Outback, either on their way there or on their return. We need to address that matter, because valuable time can be lost getting to and from the Barossa. Yes, every day another success, another new challenge. I only hope that we can keep up the momentum in the Barossa. It is doing today what the Kapunda copper mine did for South Australia in the 1860s. It is great to be involved with this success story and it is, indeed, an honour to be their member and to be associated with probably the most unprecedented success in our state for many years. The state economy is good, but the cream on the cake is our wine industry and the tourism that goes with it. I congratulate the Tourism Minister and thank her for her co-operation, all the efforts her department has made and the magnificent productions that it puts out.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): In relation to my personal explanation, I want to explain why this situation has arisen. I took my complaint to the Minister for Water Resources on behalf of two constituents. That is my responsibility in representing my constituency. The complaint was not that they had been billed for excess water but that the department had been particularly heavy-handed and unreasonable in its collection of that money. I stated that in my personal explanation.

From there, the matter was referred to the Ombudsman and escalated to the extent that not only had the Ombudsman launched a full investigation into the matter of possible maladministration of the minister's department but had also to the point where the investigation also considered the point of legality as to whether the minister could in fact legally collect, in the manner that he did, penalties for excess water in the Northern Adelaide Plains.

That affects more than the two constituents that I brought to him with the original complaint: that has implications for the hundreds of water users in my electorate alone, and I am not sure of the wider implications. This minister's department, through its own actions, has escalated this matter. What did the minister do about it? The minister came in here and had the cheek to attack me for making a complaint on behalf of my constituents, as it is my role to do; attacked my constituents by implying all sorts of things about them; and

then made a sweeping attack on my whole constituency and the nature of activity within it. That is completely outrageous.

I do not condone illegal activity by my constituents—or by this or any other minister. I have outlined that the complainants in this Ombudsman's investigation are defined as whistleblowers, as is any potential complainant. For the minister to come in here, launch a broadside, basically warning that there is a Star Force-assisted search and seizure provision that can come down on anyone who makes a complaint is outrageous.

Yesterday in question time, in relation to a Northern Adelaide Plains irrigator, the minister described a Star Force-assisted search and seizure of evidence that the minister claims 'strongly indicates alleged illegal irrigation on a large-scale, commercial vegetable crop'. He went on to say that I might well consider my position, criticised the fact that I had written to him representing my constituents, and said, 'I want to describe to the House these two hard-done-by constituents of the Northern Adelaide Plains.'

He then stated that my constituents had illegally used the water; that they should not be allowed to get away with it; that I aided and abetted this; and that I was seeking to excuse the illegal actions of my constituents. Then he used the words 'theft' and 'dishonest'. The minister clearly linked his description of the search and seizure in relation to a Northern Adelaide Plains irrigator with my constituents.

I advise the House that my office phoned my constituents yesterday, and they advised that they were unaware of such a search. I take that to mean that it was not either of them. This action by this minister is outrageous. It is not the first time that the minister has come out and taken a shot at all irrigators in the Northern Adelaide Plains area and cast slurs on them. To this minister, having an excess water bill means illegal activity and an illegitimate use of water. We never went around saying to householders that if they had an excess water bill they were criminals. This is outrageous.

I will not accept the intimidation of this minister either of me or of my constituency. I will continue to represent my constituents, no matter what dirty, filthy tactics this minister comes into this House with. I have not previously heard a minister come in and criticise a member for writing on behalf of her constituents. Given the legitimate complaint, the fact that this is a full investigation by the Ombudsman and that this minister is still being investigated on issues of concern, it is outrageous that he has taken this approach. I will stand up for my constituents and he had better just get back in his box.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I would like to use my time today to bring to the attention of the House a very good news story, where a partnership between the three levels of government (local, state and federal) has brought cheaper and more accessible telecommunications facilities to a part of my electorate. I am talking about the Coorong Communications Network, which is the brainchild of the Coorong District Council and which has grown into something even greater and better than the council first envisaged.

The Coorong District Council covers the district south-east of Adelaide, an area of some 8 800 square kilometres. I understand that in geographic terms it is the largest council in the state and has a population of some 6 000 people. The major towns in the Coorong council district are Meningie and Tailem Bend, with smaller towns being Coonalpyn and Tintinara, those two towns having a population of only 266 and 317 people respectively.

Following an amalgamation several years ago, the council is now operating three offices in its district: at Meningie, at Tintinara and at Tailem Bend. In the first instance, the council, wishing both to reduce its own costs and to increase its accessibility to ratepayers when they were trying to contact council offices and access council services, looked to provide a network between its three offices and hired consultants to come up with a plan as to how best they could do this. In the process, they took the opportunity to access funds from the Networking the Nation program.

As members would know, the Networking the Nation funds arose out of the partial sale of Telstra. This is not unique, in that these funds have been able to help rural and isolated communities access modern technology, but I understand that the solution that has been found in the Coorong district is one that is, at this stage at least, unique in Australia.

The region stretches from 100 to 300 kilometres from Adelaide, and much of the telephone and data traffic is to and from the city of Adelaide and incurs STD charges to the people living in that region. The solution to overcoming the problems between the three council offices and the ratepayers accessing services grew to encompass a system that would provide cheaper telephone and data calls to all the people within that district to and from Adelaide. Indeed, in the not too distant future the solution will give access to the whole nation at a much reduced cost. The people in that district have for a long time had the use of STD calls to make calls outside the district, but now they will be utilising the council-owned (at this stage) network, built in conjunction with the South Australian-based telecommunications company Agile Communications, which will after three years (when the Networking the Nation funding runs out) take over ownership of the infrastructure.

That infrastructure consists of a series of towers with microwave links on them to allow signals to be sent between those three principal towns (Tintinara, Meningie and Tailem Bend) but also to Murray Bridge (the solution also involved Murray Bridge to give a population basis to add to the viability of the project), and thence into Adelaide. People within that district, both for data services and telecommunications services, merely by using their existing equipment and dialling special numbers, can go onto this council-owned network.

It is envisaged that call costs to and from Adelaide to that area will be reduced by 50 per cent. I reiterate the point about calls to and from Adelaide, and this will allow businesses in Adelaide to call people in the Coorong district and will allow business houses to set up offices in the Coorong district, and they can be contacted by dialling an Adelaide number, which will appear on their phone in the Coorong district—another point that will aid businesses that want to operate in that area.

Time expired.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake): Today I rise in my grievance to discuss a patriot and hero, Herbert Henry Burnard, a First World War veteran who was born in Adelaide on 30 September 1897 and died in Adelaide on 9 May aged 103 years. Jonathan King is a heritage writer for the *Australian* and has written a wonderful obituary about this brave South Australian who left Broken Hill where he worked in a zinc mining company to volunteer to fight overseas in the First World War. The article states:

Herbert Burnard joined the troops at the Western Front just in time to be part of the victory wave that ended World War I. Having

enlisted as a metallurgical apprentice in October 1917 'to fight for king and country' the 20-year old volunteer soldier arrived at the Somme in 1918 when Australia's General John Monash was taking control of Australia's first army. After four years of fighting under British control, the five divisions of the Australian Imperial Force were at last united into one army and put under the control of Monash, who had been an exemplary officer since the landing at Gallipoli.

And it was into the ready-made, top-class fighting machine that Private Burnard stepped. After only two months' training, Burnard had embarked on HMAS *Ulysses* for England arriving at Southampton in February, 1918. In April that year he was posted to France with the 14th Reinforcements, for the 32nd battalion in time to hear the good news that Australia achieved their first major victory—capturing Villers-Brettoneux that month. As they had been fighting since Gallipoli, Australian soldiers were by then considered the best among the allied forces, especially as they were the only all-volunteer army. Their pivotal victories in the year Burnard joined were recorded by Monash in his war text *Australian Victories in France 1918*.

An apprentice Burnard may have been in civilian life, but in war there were no apprenticeships and he was charging enemy trenches within days of arriving in the Somme and proving himself in the process.

Having worked in the bush during his apprenticeship with a zinc mining company in the remote Broken Hill mines, he was used to roughing it and took well to living in the trenches. Initially, he fought with the 32nd Battalion, distinguishing himself before being transferred in May to the famous 50th Battalion which fought the great battle of Etinehem as part of a series of offensives aimed at breaking through the infamous German defence. During these battles, despite his inexperience, Burnard took his place among Australia's most experienced and bravest World War One soldiers.

As part of the grand strategy devised by Monash, Burnard's elite 50th Battalion then fought the hand-to-hand struggle that smashed through the notorious Hindenberg Line on the Western Front to turn the tide of war in September 1918—forcing Germany to retreat. Following this battle, Burnard, who by now was well known for his bravery and fighting skills, was promoted to lance-corporal in October.

Monash's five divisions then defeated the remaining Germans in Australia's best performance in battles. Although only constituting 9.5 per cent of the 53 allied divisions they nevertheless occupied 21.5 per cent of the German-held territory, captured 23 per cent of German prisoners of war and 23.5 per cent of German arms and ammunition—helping end the war six months ahead of Britain's original schedule. Despite their small numbers, Australia's volunteer soldiers also won 63 of the 577 Victoria Crosses awarded during the war.

In these finals battles of the Somme, the seasoned Burnard was promoted to sergeant. The French government subsequently recognised the courage of Burnard and other remaining veterans in 1998, presenting them with the coveted French Legion of Honour on the 80th anniversary [of] the war's end.

When the Germans finally surrendered on 11 November, the allies threw their helmets into the air and celebrated. Burnard said he spent that 'wonderful evening of the Armistice' with the corps at what had been a German transport base, dining on fried mushrooms enjoying 'the best celebration of my life'.

Having got a taste for army life, Burnard served in the Australian Army Pay Corps from January 1919 helping bring the Australian soldiers back home. He then worked on the Tramways Trust. His wife, Ivy, predeceased him. He leaves two children, two grandchildren and one great grandchild. His death now leaves only 23 surviving First World War veterans. This great South Australian should have been recognised in the South Australian paper, the *Advertiser*. Hopefully he will be on the weekend. I congratulate Jonathan King for the excellent obituary he has written in the *Australian*. I express my deepest sympathies at his passing and express my thanks for the service Mr Burnard gave to our country.

Time expired.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Yesterday I highlighted the fact that this weekend the Cornish festival, the Kernewek Lowender, is being held in the northern Yorke Peninsula area. I urge any member here who wishes to come that they are most welcome. Since giving that speech in the House, I have been asked by one or two members about the pronunciation of the name. Although it is spelt 'Kernewek Lowender' it is pronounced 'Kernuwik Lowender'. The best way of thinking of how to use the 'uick' is by thinking of the car Buick, for those members who can remember the Buick. If members think of Buick, it will be easy for them to say 'Kernuwik'. I note that even on regional radio they have been saying 'Kernewek'. I felt like telephoning them and saying, 'It is "Kernuwik"'. Nevertheless, time will help there. In fact, that was brought to the attention of festival organisers themselves some 10 years ago when some Cornish people came out and corrected those of us in Australia who were saying it the wrong way.

I would like to acknowledge the fact that this year and over a period of years the Australian Major Events Board has sponsored the Cornish festival. This year it has been a sponsorship of some $15 000. I want to thank the minister and the government very sincerely for their generous sponsorship. It should be pointed out that in the last year events sponsored and managed by the Australian Major Events Board have generated an estimated $110 million in economic benefit to the state, and we have attracted tens of thousands of interstate and overseas tourists as a result. Too often we forget about the economic benefits from these festivals. We certainly enjoy the activities on a day-to-day basis, but we forget about the benefits.

In 1999-2000, some 74 regional events and festivals were supported through Major Events funding. That is really incredible. Yorke Peninsula has benefited through a few of those grants. I simply say to other event organisers, both in my electorate and throughout the state, please take advantage of applying for the funding. I would like to thank the minister, the Hon. Joan Hall, for recently getting out a brand new book *Marketing South Australia—An Operator's Guide*. On page 11, there is a clear section entitled 'Regional events and festivals'. It says:

> The regional events and festival program aims to provide financial and marketing support to events and festivals that are capable of generating tourism visitation and activity in regional South Australia. The program is designed to encourage regions to use events as a marketing tool and to give consumers a reason to visit. There is an emphasis on financial viability, support from regional stakeholders and longer term development prospects. To be considered for funding, all events must have the support of the relevant regional tourism marketing committee and local government. Detailed funding guidelines are available from Hanna Kilmore, with applications closing on 31 March each year.

So, it is important to bring that to the attention of regional communities. We are putting a lot of money into the regional communities through helping with the regional events, but we can only do so much. It up to the local regions to apply. Certainly, if you have not applied for this year, it is too late. Think ahead, and preferably by the end of the year or at the very latest by 31 March next year, it would be most opportune to apply for your festival.

It needs to be highlighted that the more we and local communities can promote through festivals it gives an excuse to people throughout this state and interstate, and from overseas to come and visit the regional areas. We have seen an enormous turnaround in the economic activity in regional areas in the last few years. That is continuing, and people not only come for the festival but also usually stay a night or two. Often they want to come back and experience more in the

particular area. In some cases—with my constituents, anyway—it has lead them to buy a home there and retire in the area.

Time expired.

ADELAIDE CEMETERIES AUTHORITY BILL

Received from the Legislative Council with a message drawing the attention of the House of Assembly to clause 5, printed in erased type, which clause, being a money clause, cannot originate in the Legislative Council but which is deemed necessary to the bill. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The ongoing provision of funeral and cemetery related services in Adelaide is important in order to ensure—

- appropriate memorialisation of the deceased;
- that the needs of the bereaved are met;
- that the maintenance and amenity requirements of cemeteries are met; and
- that heritage and historical components of cemeteries are maintained and enhanced.

The Enfield General Cemetery Trust is a body corporate established under the *Enfield General Cemetery Act 1944*. It was established by the State Government in 1944 to maintain and administer Enfield Memorial Park, Australia's first lawn cemetery. In 1997, the Enfield General Cemetery Trust took over the responsibility of administering both the West Terrace Cemetery and Cheltenham Cemetery, thus making the Trust a significant provider of funeral and cemetery related services in South Australia.

As part of the State Government's National Competition Policy obligations, the Enfield General Cemetery Trust was subject to legislative and competitive neutrality reviews in 1998.

As a result of these reviews, a steering committee was established in May 1999 to examine the means by which the recommendations of these reviews could be implemented. The committee was chaired by the Chief Executive of the Department for Transport, Urban Planning and the Arts, Mr Rod Payze, and consisted of representatives of—

- the Enfield General Cemetery Trust;
- Department of Treasury and Finance;
- Crown Solicitor's Office;
- the Office for Government Enterprises; and
- Planning SA.

This Bill has been drafted as a result of the recommendations of the committee and sets out a consolidated legislative framework for the operations of the Trust (which will become the *Adelaide Cemeteries Authority* under the new legislation), ensuring that the Authority continues to provide appropriate funeral and cemetery related services to the community and setting in place an appropriate commercial management structure.

The benefits of the proposed rationalised legislation include the following:

- A clear statement of the role of the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority with emphasis on a full range of funeral and cemetery services to the community, rather than being restricted to the administration and management of cemeteries (as currently stipulated by the *Enfield General Cemetery Act 1944*).
- A clear statement of the services to be delivered by the Authority through a Charter and Performance Statement, with greater flexibility being provided to the Authority to achieve these agreed targets.
- A requirement for the board of the Authority to prepare a Strategic Plan and a Business Plan to enable the Authority to plan with confidence for the future (to be approved by the Minister and Treasurer).
- A requirement for plans of management to be prepared for each cemetery (not just the West Terrace Cemetery) taking into account—
  - — the heritage and historical significance of the cemetery;
  - — the scale and character of new memorials or monuments; and
  - — planting and vegetation in the cemetery.

  The plans must be released for public consultation for 30 business days rather than the 2 weeks currently stipulated in the *Enfield General Cemetery Act 1944*.
- The retention of existing protective measures relating to designated grave areas for religious faiths and military service personnel, as well as the right for 'ministers' of religion to undertake religious services.
- A board consisting of people with experience pertinent to the roles, functions and performance agreements set out in the Bill.
- The establishment of a single up-to-date Act to replace the existing *Enfield General Cemetery Act* and *West Terrace Cemetery Act*, established in 1944 and 1976 respectively.

Following the Second Reading Speech of the Bill on 12 October 2000, the President of the other place ruled that the Bill was a 'hybrid' and must be referred to a Select Committee pursuant to standing order 268.

The Select Committee met in December 2000 to hear representations on the Bill, following a call for submissions. The Steering Committee met again through April and May to finalise its report.

As a result of public input and the considerations of the Committee, the Committee's report proposed a number of amendments to the Bill. The report was unanimously adopted by the Select Committee.

The recommendations of the Select Committee were accepted in the other place and have now been incorporated into the Bill.

The major provisions of the Bill are discussed below.

Functions of the Authority

In addition to the Authority's existing functions of the administration and maintenance of Enfield Memorial Park and Cheltenham and West Terrace cemeteries as public cemeteries, and for the interment or inurnment of the deceased in those cemeteries, it is proposed that the Authority's functions be broadened to enable it to provide the full range of services to the community. These functions include:

- the administration and maintenance of other cemeteries acquired by the Authority;
- activities associated with the heritage or historical significance of cemeteries;
- activities or services relating to the burial or other disposal of human remains;
- other activities utilising the Authority's property or buildings;
- other functions assigned to the Authority by the Minister.

Application of the Public Corporations Act 1993

It is proposed that the Authority be made subject to the provisions of the *Public Corporations Act 1993*, in order to develop an accountability framework for the board where both commercial efficiency and community service requirements are clearly set out.

The application of the *Public Corporations Act 1993* will require the Authority to prepare a Charter and Performance Statement. After adoption by the Minister responsible for the Act and the Treasurer, the Charter is required to be tabled before both Houses of Parliament and presented to the Economic and Finance Committee of the Parliament. To ensure that the Authority does not use its control of the cemeteries to restrict competition, the Bill requires that specific limitations on the Authority's activities designed to prevent such restrictive practices are to be written into its Charter.

The Strategic Plan and Business Plan are also to be approved by the Minister responsible for the Act and the Treasurer.

Board Membership

The Bill contains board membership provisions which provide for appropriate relevant professional experience on the board of the Authority. Required experience/expertise on the board is—

- three members with business/management experience;
- one with historical/heritage experience;
- one with local government experience;
- one with religious/community experience; and
- one with government (other than local government) management experience.

Other membership provisions of the Bill to note are—

- all members will be appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister;
- the nominee with Local Government experience will be selected from a panel of 3 names provided by the Local Government Association;
- all appointments will be for a period of up to 4 years;

- the total number of members is to be reduced from 10 to 7 (comprising at least 2 women and 2 men) and the quorum will be reduced from 6 to 4 members;
- the Bill includes transitional provisions allowing for the disbanding of the existing membership on a gazetted date and the formation of a new board on the same date.

Proposed Transactions of the Authority

To ensure that Parliament has a role if there is a proposal to significantly change the way in which an Authority cemetery is to be managed, the Bill contains a clause requiring the Minister to:

- publish a gazette and newspaper notice of a proposal to sell an Authority cemetery or any part of an Authority cemetery, or to enter into a management agreement for an Authority cemetery/part of a cemetery, or to enter into any partnership, joint venture or profit sharing arrangement;
- publish such notices at least 2 months before the proposed transaction is entered into; and
- provide a written report on the proposed transaction to the Economic and Finance Committee of the Parliament.

Heritage and Monument Committee

The Bill recognises the importance of developing and implementing appropriate heritage policies, particularly in relation to the West Terrace Cemetery, and therefore contains a clause which:

- requires the Minister to establish the *Adelaide Cemeteries Authority Heritage and Monument Committee* (the Committee) to assist in the preparation and implementation of policies relating to heritage and historical matters; and
- provides for the inclusion in each Annual Report of the Authority of a separate section, prepared (and thus ratified) by the Committee, which reports on the operations of the Committee during the financial year to which the report of the Committee relates. This report must be included in the relevant Annual Report of the Authority in unaltered form.

Plans of management for all cemeteries

The Bill includes the requirement that a plan of management be prepared for all cemeteries under the Authority's control and not just the West Terrace Cemetery (as is currently the case). Plans of management must take into account the heritage and historical significance of the cemeteries and establish policies relating to—

- retention or removal of existing headstones; and
- re-use of burial sites; and
- the scale and character of new memorials or monuments; and
- planting and nurturing of vegetation in the cemetery.

The plans must be released for public consultation for 30 business days, rather than 2 weeks as is specified in the *Enfield General Cemetery Act 1944*.

Protection of existing burial rights and services

The Bill maintains the Authority's obligation to ensure that Jewish graves are not to be disturbed without the approval of the appropriate community body. In addition, any part of one of its cemeteries set aside for the interment of members of a particular religious denomination or military service is to be maintained for that purpose.

West Terrace Cemetery

In addition to the requirements of the Authority to maintain the existing burial rights associated with West Terrace Cemetery and to prepare a plan of management for West Terrace Cemetery (and all other cemeteries under its control), the existing definition of West Terrace Cemetery is to be maintained and the Cemetery is to be vested in the Authority. In the event that the Authority wishes to dispose of any part of West Terrace Cemetery as being surplus to its requirements, the Authority may only do so with the written approval of the Minister and by surrendering the fee simple in the land to the Crown. On surrender, the land will form part of the Adelaide Park Lands and come under the care, control and management of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide.

Conclusion

I commend the Bill to all Members and ask that it receive their prompt attention. Not only does the Bill introduce important improvements to the accountability of the Authority, but it also ensures that the Authority will continue to provide funeral and cemetery related services to the community in a sensitive and appropriate manner.

Explanation of clauses

PART 1—PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause contains the definitions of words and phrases for the purposes of the Bill. An Authority cemetery is a cemetery administered by the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority established under Part 2 of the Bill. The definition of burial of human remains is broad to include, in addition to its normal meaning of an earth burial, the placement of the remains in a tomb, mausoleum or vault.

PART 2—ADELAIDE CEMETERIES AUTHORITY

DIVISION 1—ESTABLISHMENT OF AUTHORITY

Clause 4: Establishment of Adelaide Cemeteries Authority

The Authority is established as a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal, capable of suing and being sued in its corporate name, with the powers and functions assigned or conferred by or under the Bill. The Authority is the same body corporate as the Enfield General Cemetery Trust (*see clause 2(1) of Schedule 2*).

Clause 5: Application of Public Corporations Act 1993

The Authority is a statutory corporation to which the provisions of the *Public Corporations Act 1993* apply.

Clause 6: Functions

The Authority's primary functions are—

- to administer and maintain as public cemeteries Cheltenham Cemetery, Enfield Memorial Park and West Terrace Cemetery; and
- to administer and maintain any other cemetery established or acquired by the Authority; and
- the burial or other disposal of human remains in an Authority cemetery; and
- to carry out activities associated with the heritage or historical significance of an Authority cemetery; and
- any other function assigned to the Authority under legislation or by the Minister.

The Authority's functions may extend to the following as the Authority thinks fit:

- activities or services relating to the burial or other disposal of human remains;
- other activities or services utilising Authority property and buildings.

Clause 7: Powers

The Authority has all the powers of a natural person together with the powers conferred on it under this Bill or any other Act.

Clause 8: Special provisions relating to Authority's powers

This clause sets some limitations on the Authority's powers, a number of which have been carried over from the *Enfield General Cemetery Act 1944* and the *West Terrace Cemetery Act 1976* (to be repealed by this Bill—*see clause 1 of Schedule 2*).

The Authority may not acquire or establish a cemetery without the written approval of the Minister.

The Authority may not grant a right for burial purposes for a term longer than 99 years but may, from time to time, renew a burial right for any lesser period.

The Authority must not disturb or interfere with a grave within the area delineated and marked *Jewish Granted MEM. No. 443 Bk. 42* on the plan of West Terrace Cemetery without the written approval of the Board, the Trustees, or the Chief Minister, of the Adelaide Hebrew Congregation Inc.

The Authority must not, without the approval of the Minister, use for any other purpose a portion of an Authority cemetery set apart for the burial or other disposal of persons of particular religious denominations or of members (or former members) of an arm of the Defence Forces of Australia or of the naval, military or air force of some other country.

The Authority must not prevent or interfere with the performance of a ceremony according to the usage of a person's religion in connection with the burial or other disposal of the person's remains.

The Authority must allow a minister of a religious denomination for which a portion of an Authority cemetery is set apart to have free access and admission to that portion of the cemetery at all times in order to exercise his or her functions as a minister.

The Authority's charter under the *Public Corporations Act 1993* must contain specific limitations on the Authority's activities designed to prevent the Authority, through its control of access to Authority cemeteries, from unduly restricting competition in the provision of funeral, floral, monument making or other services, or the supply of goods.

Clause 9: Minister must give notice of certain proposed transactions of Authority

The Authority must not—

- sell an Authority cemetery or part of an Authority cemetery; or

- grant a lease or licence in respect of an Authority cemetery, or part of an Authority cemetery, in order to enable the Authority's primary functions, or a substantial part of the Authority's primary functions, with respect to the cemetery to be performed otherwise than directly by the Authority and its staff; or
- enter into any partnership, joint venture or other profit sharing arrangement,

unless the Minister has approved a proposal for the transaction and has, at least 2 months before the proposed transaction is entered into given notice of the proposed transaction in the Government Gazette and a daily newspaper and provided a written report on the proposed transaction to the Economic and Finance Committee of the Parliament.

This does not apply to the disposal of land comprising or forming part of West Terrace Cemetery that is surplus to the requirements of the Authority.

Clause 10: Surplus West Terrace Cemetery land to form part of Adelaide Park Lands

The Authority may only dispose of land comprising or forming part of West Terrace Cemetery that is surplus to the requirements of the Authority with the written approval of the Minister and by surrender of the fee simple in the land to the Crown. On surrender, the land will form part of the Adelaide Park Lands and come under the care, control and management of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide.

Clause 11: Common seal and execution of documents

This clause provides for the use by the Authority of the Authority's common seal and the manner in which documents of the Authority are to be properly executed. It is in the usual terms.

DIVISION 2—BOARD

Clause 12: Establishment of board

A board of not more than 7 directors (to be appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister) is established as the governing body of the Authority. The Minister must, in nominating persons for appointment to the board, have regard to particular fields of experience required for the effective functioning of the Authority and for the need for the Authority, in carrying out its functions, to be sensitive to the cultural diversity of the State. One of the directors will, on the nomination of the Minister, be appointed by the Governor to chair meetings of the board.

Clause 13: Conditions of membership

A director will be appointed for a term, not exceeding 4 years, specified in the instrument of appointment and will, at the expiration of a term of appointment, be eligible for reappointment, although the term of office of a retiring director continues until he or she is reappointed or a successor is appointed (as the case may be). The office of a director becomes vacant on certain occurrences.

Clause 14: Vacancies or defects in appointment of directors

An act of the board is not invalid by reason only of a vacancy in its membership or a defect in the appointment of a director.

Clause 15: Remuneration

A director is entitled to be paid from the funds of the Authority such remuneration, allowances and expenses as may be determined by the Governor.

Clause 16: Board proceedings

This clause sets out requirements for the proceedings of the board of directors, including the quorum of the board (4 members).

Clause 17: Committees

The board may establish such committees (including advisory or subcommittees) as the board thinks fit, the membership of which is to be determined by the board.

DIVISION 3—STAFF

Clause 18: Staff

The Authority may employ such staff as it thinks necessary or desirable on terms and conditions determined by the Authority.

PART 3—MISCELLANEOUS

Clause 19: Adelaide Cemeteries Authority Heritage and Monument Committee

The Minister will establish the *Adelaide Cemeteries Authority Heritage and Monument Committee* to consist of not less than 3 nor more than 5 members appointed by the Minister, of whom one must be a director and the remainder must include persons who together have the abilities and experience required for the effective performance of the Committee's functions.

The Committee has the following functions:

- to advise the Authority on heritage and historical matters relating to Authority cemeteries;
- to advise the Authority on activities associated with the heritage or historical significance of Authority cemeteries;
- to advise the Authority on the establishment and implementation of policies relating to monuments, headstones and memorials;
- any other function assigned to the Committee by or under this measure, or by the Minister or the Authority.

The Committee must submit to the Authority for inclusion in each annual report of the Authority a report (which must be included in unaltered form) prepared by the Committee on its operations during the financial year to which the report relates.

Clause 20: Plans of management for Authority cemeteries

The Authority must prepare plans of management for each Authority cemetery and present those plans at public meetings convened by the Authority.

A plan of management for a cemetery must take into account the heritage and historical significance of the cemetery and establish policies relating to the following matters:

- retention or removal of existing headstones;
- re-use of burial sites;
- the scale and character of new memorials or monuments;
- planting and nurturing of vegetation in the cemetery.

In preparing a plan of management for a cemetery, the Authority must consult with the relevant local government council, the administrative unit of the Public Service responsible for State heritage matters and other persons who, in the opinion of the Authority, have a particular interest in the management of the cemetery.

The Authority must, at least 30 business days before the date of a public meeting, publish a newspaper notice advising the public—

- of the date, time, place and purpose of the meeting; and
- of the place (determined by the Minister) where the plan of management may be inspected, without charge and during normal office hours, during the period leading up to the meeting.

A plan of management for an Authority cemetery must, if the cemetery is, or includes, a State heritage place (within the meaning of the *Development Act 1993*), be approved by the Minister before it takes effect.

The Authority may amend a plan of management at any time during the course of the period covered by the plan (and, in that event, the amendment must be presented at public meetings convened by the Authority and the relevant provisions of this clause will apply to the amendment process in the same way as to the initial preparation of a plan of management).

The Authority must keep a copy of each current plan of management available for inspection by members of the public, without charge and during normal office hours, at a place determined by the Minister.

Clause 21: Non-application of s. 586 of Local Government Act 1934

Section 586 of the *Local Government Act 1934* does not apply to an Authority cemetery.

Clause 22: Ministerial approvals

An approval given under this Bill may be specific or general and conditional or unconditional and may be varied or revoked.

Clause 23: Regulations

The Governor may make regulations for the purposes of the Bill and those regulations may apply other specified regulations (with or without modifications) to an Authority cemetery.

SCHEDULE 1: Plan of West Terrace Cemetery

Schedule 1 contains a plan of West Terrace Cemetery.

SCHEDULE 2: Repeal and Transitional Provisions

Schedule 2 contains provisions repealing the *Enfield General Cemetery Act 1944* and the *West Terrace Cemetery Act 1976* and dealing with transitional issues arising from the repeal of those Acts and the enactment of the Bill.

Clause 2(1) of Schedule 2 provides that the Authority is the same body corporate as the Enfield General Cemetery Trust established under the *Enfield General Cemetery Act 1944*.

Clause 2(2) of Schedule 2 provides that the offices of the members of the Enfield General Cemetery Trust are vacated on the commencement of this clause.

Clause 3 of Schedule 2 provides that West Terrace Cemetery is vested in the Authority for an estate in fee simple with the Authority holding the land so vested subject to any rights or interests granted and in force in respect of the land immediately before the commencement of this clause.

Ms KEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 2002. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This year the government will introduce the 2001-02 budget on 31 May 2001. A Supply Bill will be necessary for the first few months of the 2001-02 financial year until the budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and received assent.

In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. Due to the early conclusion of the parliamentary budget session in July, it is possible that assent may not be received until parliament resumes in September. The amount being sought under the bill is $1 400 million.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides relevant definitions. Clause 3 provides for the appropriation of up to $1 400 million.

Ms KEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COOPERATIVE AND COMMUNITY HOUSING (ASSOCIATED LAND OWNERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 May. Page 1429.)

Ms KEY (Hanson): Before I talk about this bill I want to pay tribute to the work of the many volunteers and paid workers in the community housing and cooperative arena, as well as the wonderful work done by Shelter and the Federal Community Housing Association. Since having responsibility for the housing portfolio for the Labor Party, these organisations have gone out of their way to ensure that I have been educated in terms of understanding their point of view with regard to community housing. They have also given me the inspiration to read about what is happening in the housing sector, particularly in the provision of what we quaintly call 'social housing' not only in Australia but also internationally.

I note that the whole debate that has been occurring for some time with regard to social capital and sustainability is now being promoted by the Community Housing Federation of Australia. I have benefited from not only meeting with representatives of that group but also having access to some of the publications it has put forward with regard to the debate that is occurring under the auspices of the commonwealth government. I would like to refer to some of the relevant information in my contribution today. In my view, housing is a fundamental issue, and I believe that the bill before us today, assuming that it is successful, facilitates a good mix of housing. One point I wanted to make about social capital was—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister for Water Resources be good enough to move into the gallery.

Ms KEY: A document from the Community Housing Federation of Australia entitled, 'Social capital and sustainability' states:

> Other theorists have defined social capital as a relatively underdeveloped policy resource, highlighting 'the enhancement of social capital as a key to improving the quality of life in low income neighbourhoods'.

That quote is from a brilliant publication entitled 'What is the social capital and why is it important to public policy?' written by R.E. Lang and S.P Hornburg, and this is part of a document looking at the housing policy debate. That publication further states:

> Within this context, housing is seen as a major foundation for building social capital and it is argued there is a need to understand social capital by exploring the links between people and places. In this respect the community housing sector can readily tap into the notion of social capital to both measure and argue the case for its impact. Without [a good understanding] of social capital, housing policies can oversight the value and opportunity that such connection provides. Without an awareness of social capital both governments and the sector can continue to build spaces that are alienating, or to destroy the social capital that once existed.

Obviously, this article and certainly the comments made by the Community Housing Federation talk about the importance of housing and where it fits, particularly with respect to welfare reform. From a reading of the recommendations of the McLure Report on welfare reform, and also some of the initiatives that the commonwealth government is investigating, I note that the issue of housing is very much identified as a significant part of welfare reform. Community housing also receives some recognition in that the report states:

> It is also important to recognise that community housing providers draw from a pool of tenants that are often people who are 'victims' of multiple policy failures often over the generations. Any policy response must be equally as comprehensive, as the previous policy failures and inappropriate actions can lead to an exacerbation of the negative situation for clients with high needs. In many ways community housing fits neatly as a fine example of 'self-help' and 'community participation' principles that underpin the aspirations of the welfare reform agenda. We can all point to numerous illustrations of positive outcomes for individuals and the broader community arising from involvement of one model or the other of community housing.

As members would well know, I was fortunate enough to represent the community on the board of the South Australian Housing Trust for some 12 years. As I have said in this place previously, I remember with great affection the time when you, sir, were the minister with responsibility for that area. I remember the interest that you had not only in public housing but also in the housing industry in general.

I guess I am still caught to a certain extent from that time on the board and lament the passing of the excellent South Australian public housing system that was heralded not only in Australia but also internationally. So, although I am very positive and support the initiatives that the minister has put forward in this bill, I must voice some concerns about the cutbacks with regard to public housing.

I also understand and agree with the points made by the community housing sector, both on a federal and state level, that both community housing and cooperative housing are ways of ensuring some input by the tenants into the sort of housing they have and the sorts of ways in which the housing product is delivered. Many people would argue that it is a very democratic way of making sure that you have a user or consumer input into the future of that particular housing development.

A number of comments have been made about cooperative housing. I remember when I was first appointed to the

Housing Trust board in the early 1980s that one of the first reports board members were given related to the evils of cooperative housing. I remember feeling very uncomfortable about the report because of what it contained. It stated that the typical person who would be attracted to cooperative housing would be a university educated middle-class trendy. Also, there were some implications about their being drug-takers and basically hedonistic in their behaviour. I am pleased to say that there seems to have been some transition over the past 10 or so years about the sort of people involved in cooperative housing. But certainly in the early 1980s this was considered to be quite a radical proposition.

An article headed, 'Measuring Social Capital in Five Communities', written by J. Onyz and P. Bullen, refers to the credibility of the cooperative housing sector. It states:

> The need for innovative housing models forms a part of a broader framework for achieving community renewal and regeneration. Local and international research in a range of contexts has shown that social capital may be mobilised to generate long-term social, economic and ecologically sustainable solutions to local problems. Social capital is generated when people participate actively in their community and society, and is most likely to be achieved when it is initiated from the bottom up rather than the top down.

As a political philosophy, I support that way of operating and am pleased to see that that seems to be the underlying philosophy with regard to cooperative housing. The article continues:

> According to some international research, the success of housing cooperatives overseas has depended on the influence of institutional and political frameworks and conditions of support, created over time, resulting in the 'consistent build-up of social credibility, professional efficiency and solid finances by cooperative organisations themselves, as well as substantially contributing towards a favourable environment of mutually reinforcing processes'.

I am quoting only part of what I think is a very good article, but it goes on to refer to the capacity to use local government in joint venturing approaches, to play a key role in the renewal of public estates, and the fact that the social housing policy has been critical to the credibility of the sector and its capacity to reach a critical mass. Examples are given of Sweden and Holland, and it states that these are examples that we in Australia should certainly look at.

At the moment, the community housing sector provides some 28 000 dwellings funded through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and around 14 000 dwellings not funded through that agreement, but over 20 000 housing units are recorded as being provided for indigenous community groups. These housing products include around 4 000 units of crisis accommodation.

These 66 000 community housing dwellings represent around 20 per cent of all social housing provision in Australia. However, this represents only 1 per cent of the total housing stock. That is a small percentage by international comparison; for example, community housing in the UK represents 5 per cent of stock and Canada has over 200 000 housing dwellings. We are certainly behind in international comparisons.

The Community Housing Federation of Australia (CHFA) states that there are three broad categories of housing. There are housing associations, which are based on a community group or church that harnesses local community action to provide and/or manage community housing, and tenant participation is an integral part of this model. There are also housing cooperatives, as I have already mentioned, that are run by the tenants and the tenants directly manage the community housing. The third group is local government, which may directly provide and/or manage community housing as a service to the local community.

I mention the different categories because I was concerned to learn from the groups involved in this sector that they have not been consulted on this bill by the minister. The minister may disagree with that, but that is the information that I have had from conversations and in correspondence. It would be interesting to see whether that is the case, but I hope it is not. Consultation may have been going on for quite some time and the people to whom I spoke recently may not have been aware of that history.

I would like to make a couple of points about a meeting I had with the Community Housing Federation of Australia with respect to federal and state housing policy. The federation states that the framework needs to address:

· a clearly defined role for all levels of government in long-term planning for housing (and I presume that the reference to all levels of government includes local government);
· incorporation of the notion of choice and empowerment;
· community housing's contribution to social capital, social cohesion and strengthening communities, which needs to be identified;
· the role of community housing in achieving positive individual outcomes as well as broader community outcomes;
· sustainability and viability of community housing as an affordable housing option; and
· housing organisations as lead agencies for local development and integrated public investment.

The CHFA believes that its involvement is critical in the growth and positioning of community housing as an integral part of the housing market, and that a number of issues must be addressed if community housing is to continue and flourish. In summary, it states that these include:

· accommodating high needs tenants while maintaining a good tenant mix;
· promoting integrated service delivery models to facilitate housing agencies taking on broader local development roles;
· promoting and enhancing the diversity of community housing models within the sector; and
· improving access by housing organisations to title and equity in their properties.

In the briefings and meetings that I have had with the community housing sector, the role of rent assistance has been acknowledged and, in this state in July last year, if I remember correctly, the minister decided to get rid of the state based rent relief system. Some real concerns were raised, particularly by young people who availed themselves of that system and by rural students who had come to the city to study. I am not sure whether they receive rent relief now, but concerns were raised at the time that the scheme had finished.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

Ms KEY: The minister has just said that schemes are still in place, and I am sure that he can provide illumination on those details when he makes his contribution. Another issue is negative gearing, which at this stage is generally not available to community housing organisations. There are some advantages through GST rebates, and some tax breaks could be considered to try to assist the community housing sector. I am not sure whether our shadow Treasurer would necessarily agree with my investigating those aspects, but it needs to be addressed.

The Labor Party is certainly interested in looking at different models for community housing and we are also interested in developing and looking at private financing

models as well as non-government, charity and not-for-profit organisations. I am currently holding discussions on this issue to get in place as many different models as possible so we can maximise the amount of affordable housing that is available in South Australia. We are also quite keen to talk to local government and other agencies to see whether we can improve some of the affordable housing that is available in rural and remote areas, where appropriate.

Overall, Labor supports the bill. We understand that it is to facilitate the agreement to which some publicity was given a few months ago with regard to the inter-church groups that wanted to negotiate the provision of housing in that sector. Although there were some concerns about what the memorandum of understanding looked like and what the views were, and I will certainly ask the minister some questions in committee, the assurances that I have received are that people will not be discriminated against in accessing that housing, and I have discussed this matter with the minister in the past.

Some of the initial criticism of the agreement was that, if a person was not a Catholic, for example, they would not be able to get into Catholic community housing, or, if a person was not a Freemason, that person would not be able to get into housing for which the land was provided by the Freemasons, just to use two different examples.

When I was being briefed on this bill, I asked what the situation would be with regard to organisations that have land on which there are already dwellings or where there are housing facilities that need to be renovated, upgraded or increased. I wanted to know how this bill would enable such a project to go ahead.

Labor is interested to follow up as many different models as possible because we believe that, with the loss of public housing as we used to know it, and the emphasis on social housing, the cooperative and community housing sector may be a way of providing not only social housing but housing generally, and this seems to be something that needs to be investigated and supported.

I would like to make a couple of other comments in closing. First, Shelter SA has written to me and, as a result, there will be questions I will ask the minister in the committee stage. Shelter SA asks whether the proposed definition of 'associated land owner' means 'the registered proprietor of land that is leased by the registered housing association for the purposes of providing housing'. The letter states:

> This current definition can be read as including private for-profit proprietors who would then enjoy all the tax remissions and not just the charitable/not-for-profit institutions.

The Labor Party is looking at a mix of housing, but I do understand Shelter SA's question and I would appreciate the minister's response. Further, the letter states:

> . . . whether other clauses in the principal act prescribe the meaning of the term to only church, charitable and/or not-for-profit organisations needs to be investigated by, perhaps, Parliamentary Counsel.

So, Shelter SA is asking for clarification, and I sought that clarification in a briefing yesterday. Shelter SA also raises the problem—and certainly I am concerned—that the proposed regulations are not available. This is not an unusual practice, but the regulations are not available, so the sector and the local community housing association have no idea about how this situation will actually operate. I will also ask some questions about what the minister actually envisages will be covered in the regulations.

I have had the benefit of seeing the terms and conditions raised in the ICHU agreement and the memorandum of understanding but, again, questions arise in relation to access to the stock and a reassurance from the minister—because we have not seen the regulations or a template agreement—that there will not be discrimination against people who do not fit into the category of the particular community organisation about which we are talking. Shelter SA has raised the issue of equity and fairness for the whole community housing sector. These questions can probably be answered quite easily by the minister, but I think that, as a result of the community organisations' having raised these concerns with me, it is important that they have an answer.

I also received a letter from C.D. Whitford from Noarlunga Downs. The letter states:

> We are also members of a community housing cooperative for people over 50. . . The policies of both the state and federal governments have resulted in community housing being downgraded and forced to accept redundant and often run-down Housing Trust houses in areas which are not the preferred choice of community housing members, especially the elderly. The decision of the SA Liberal government was a shrewd, two-fold move, enabling it to reduce trust stock and avoid having to bear the cost of maintenance, which then became the responsibility of housing cooperatives. The Olsen government is also embarking on a wholesale sell-off of trust homes. There is also an urgent need for a future state government—

in this case they are talking about a Labor government—

> to consider the provision of additional funding to address the critical shortage of aged independent living rental accommodation which is clearly demonstrated by the long waiting lists with all aged housing providers, which the Housing Trust cannot meet.

So, direct comments have been made not just by the organisations in the area but, as a local member and also the shadow minister, a number of concerns have been raised with me about the future of community housing and the housing cooperative sector. I think it would be useful for the minister to respond to some of those criticisms, particularly with regard to maintenance of existing community and cooperative housing stock.

Finally, in relation to how this might work, I have real concerns about the alleged lack of consultation. I would have thought that, because of the important role that community and cooperative housing plays in the supply of housing in South Australia, the associations representing this area could have had a larger role in the drafting of this legislation. If the minister has not already drafted regulations that are identifiable, I ask that he ensure that these organisations are at least involved with or consulted about the preparation of those associated regulations.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I support the bill and I commend the minister and his staff for the level of cooperation and the thoroughness evident in its preparation. As a member of the relevant backbench committee, I found dealing with the matter to be quite interesting. I think it shows a degree of innovation on the part of the government in respect of the way in which it is prepared to approach community housing. I draw to the attention of the House that community housing is something that affects the whole community. In my electorate, for example, there is community housing and Housing Trust accommodation. From time to time members opposite might think the area I represent might be a little leafy and a little wealthy. I assure them that is not the case. There are people very much in need in my electorate—as I know there are in every electorate. This bill provides another new and innovative way in which to meet the urgent needs of those who, for one reason or another, must be provided for.

I enjoyed the member for Hanson's contribution. It shows a level of agreement and cooperation which is commendable. The honourable member foreshadowed some interesting and innovative ideas as to how we could go even further—and I am sure the government will think of them before the honourable member gets to make them reality. I commend the member for her thoroughly researched and appropriate comments on the bill.

My understanding is that the purpose of the bill is to enable the implementation of a partnership between the Minister for Human Services on behalf of the government and the Interchurch Housing Unit on behalf of the Council of Churches so that we can provide better facilities to those in our community who are in need. The initiative of bringing the churches and the government together in the provision of these sorts of things is very worth while and is on the uptake around the country. The human services portfolio has been working to enhance the capacity of the community to better respond to those in need of assistance to a diverse range of activities. This is just one of them.

There is a partnership agreement between the minister on behalf of the government and the Interchurch Housing Unit on behalf of the Council of Churches to provide land, free of cost and unencumbered, and the government of course will provide the capital for housing development. It is a win/win situation. The agreement allows for the transfer of ownership of joint venture developments, including all improvements, to the church following an agreed time, which I think is mooted to be around 30 years.

It is interesting that in my electorate, too, the Meals on Wheels capability in Unley and Mitcham services community housing in my electorate and adjacent electorates. There are many groups, including local churches and other community groups in the electorate of Waite, which are very interested in this subject and very interested in lifting the quality of the service we are providing. I am sure they would stand with me in supporting this bill and commending it to the House.

Property management, including tenant selection, in accordance with this bill as I read it, is the responsibility of community housing organisations, which are accountable to the South Australian Community Housing Authority (SACHA) for all administrative and financial procedures for the duration of the lease agreement between the church and the community housing organisation. Government through SACHA will retain control over allocation and pricing policy. Churches will be responsible for the provision of appropriate support to the tenant households. That is a terrific win/win situation. Each partnership proposal will be evaluated on its own merits before being accepted and implemented.

In addition, the bill does not restrict the minister from forming similar partnerships with community organisations at his discretion. The member for Hanson pointed in that direction during her address. Following an agreed period of 30 years, the church or community organisation will be the sole owner of the land, including all dwellings and other improvements. The government and any other party will relinquish all rights and interests associated with the dwellings established through the joint venture. The land and household support component of the program comprises a considerable percentage of the value of the complete house and package to target high need households.

Consultations have been held by SACHA with the South Australian Council of Churches and the Inter-Church Housing Unit and the commonwealth Minister for Family and Community Churches who, as the minister has indicated, are all in agreement with the initiative. The level of consultation that has been evident in the development of this bill is to be commended.

The main features of the bill as I read them are that the bill allows for land to be owned by a body other than a registered housing association, but funds are still provided to the community housing organisation for the provision of housing for population groups with high needs. The bill is primarily targeted at churches as associated landholders, but does not restrict the minister from forming such agreements with other organisations.

One of the reasons I am so pleased with the way this has evolved is that from my experience out in my own community there is often a need for forms of support that go beyond simply accommodation when you look at the target population that will pick up the benefits of this bill's policy. That is where it is a particular strength: the churches and the department are working together. The net result will be that we will provide a basket of capabilities and assistance to these families that goes beyond simply housing. It makes and facilitates interesting and worthwhile connections for families in community housing should they need any other form of assistance. That is a great strength.

Another strength in this bill is the way it has dealt with the financial aspects of the arrangement. My understanding from reading it is that transactions between SACHA and a registered community housing organisation, which involve a church or other community organisation in the development of housing programs, may be subject to an agreement between all parties and that such agreement will cover, amongst other things, provisions about the expiry of the charge after 30 years. The statutory charge there to enable the enforcement of such an agreement is such that SACHA may impose a statutory charge on the land of an associated landholder or landowner that restricts any other use of that property. That is a strength.

As to enforcement of the statutory charge, clearly if the conditions of the agreement are to be breached the community housing organisation or association and the church or community organisation will be given one month to remedy the breach. Should the breach not be remedied within this time, SACHA in accordance with the act, must appoint an independent investigator to report on the matter. Should it be necessary, SACHA will apply to the minister for an order in relation to the property subject to the charge, which would see the property transferred to an appropriate alternative body for management. In this case the agreement would be rescinded. The interests of the tenants and creditors of the affected community housing organisation are to be protected in such an event.

The bill also creates an option of statutory charges over properties and includes SACHA's right to purchase such properties should they be the subject of proposed sales. So, there is protection for the taxpayer in respect of its investment in this undertaking.

In regard to appeals, as I read it, associated landowners have the right to appeal should SACHA apply to the minister for an order to enforce the charge.

As to the remission of taxes, again the bill proposes to extend to the community housing organisation, housing associations and associated landowners the taxation remissions currently enjoyed by housing cooperatives. So, it provides a continuum of support to families in need of housing.

In summary, it is an excellent bit of work by the minister and the department, and no doubt it has involved a great deal of work by the staff and the professional officers of the department. The result will be to the benefit of all South Australians.

It also should be noted that the Inter-Church Housing Unit and the churches involved in this undertaking are also to be commended for the spirit of cooperation and the focus they have shown. This is an example of good government at work and I commend the bill to the House and look forward to seeing it coming into being.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I thank the two honourable members for their contributions to the debate on this bill. I will reiterate how the bill developed. The churches in South Australia have come together to form an Inter-Church Housing Unit, and a number of proposals have been put up and ventures developed between the South Australian Community Housing Authority and the churches through the Inter-Church Housing Unit to provide community housing, with the government providing the funding for the housing on land provided by the church.

One of the issues was that invariably the church land is in areas where a high cost, potential cost or market value is attributed to the church land. Over a 30 year period, if one looked at it, one would see that there would be a rising cost in the value of the church land and an appreciation, whereas the housing was likely to depreciate in real terms over that period. Therefore, if at the end of 30, 35 or 40 years an attempt was made to then say that the church wished to use the land for purposes other than housing, it would have to recompense on the same proportion—taken on the market value at the time—to the proportion between the land and the houses when the project was first established. They pointed out—and quite rightly so—that that proportion was quite unrealistic. This became somewhat of a barrier to a number of churches therefore deciding to participate in this type of venture.

I saw particular value in churches participating in community housing because they were not only providing the land, as is often done with councils, but were also making a commitment to provide ongoing pastoral care to the people in the housing. Therefore, there was a greater input than might perhaps occur in some other cases where we have community housing and where simply the land was contributed but without any ongoing care and support for the people in the housing. After all, the housing is there for people with high needs, and invariably they need that ongoing additional support and care.

I had some discussions with the then federal minister, Senator Jocelyn Newman, who is a very strong supporter of community housing (although she is no longer the federal minister), and it was her enthusiasm that inspired me to take this further to solve what seemed to be a problem around the whole of Australia and to break some ground. I discussed it with the then federal minister, and although there were some reservations initially at a departmental level, the federal minister agreed with the principle and became a strong supporter of making sure that something was done to resolve this issue. As a result of that, we negotiated with the churches over an extended period of time to reach an agreement, which was signed last year. That agreement meant that there was a resolution of the disparity in terms of proportion of contribution, and at the end of 30 years the commonwealth government was quite happy to pass the value of the housing and land fully across to the church. The churches and the inter-church housing unit were very happy with that proposal.

I stress that I see this applying because of the additional input of the pastoral care. If that was not there then I would have significant reservations in agreeing to any proposal because I think that is the thing that makes it different—that commitment, over a 30 year period, to have ongoing support for the people in the housing on a day-to-day, week by week basis. Having reached that agreement with the heads of the churches and the inter-church housing unit, I felt it was inappropriate to discriminate against other groups and that this principle should apply widely if there are other groups outside the churches who are supplying land on exactly the same basis. So, I agreed to extend it and you now have the bill that is before the House. I appreciate the support from the two members of parliament who have supported this. I know that it has the support of other members of parliament as well.

There are a couple of issues that were raised in the second reading speeches and I would like to touch on those. First, the honourable member opposite raised the issue about the for-profit organisations. I cannot envisage a situation where we would be providing money for for-profit organisations through the public housing sector. I do not imagine that I have seen every alternative that has been put up to me but I do not envisage the use of public housing money for that purpose. I certainly see this as the case in the SACHA area. I do not even see, at this stage, SACHA—that is, community housing—applying to the for-profit sector, therefore I have even greater difficulty seeing any concept that would apply this particular part of the bill, when it is passed, to a for-profit sector. I do not see the act applying so, therefore, I do not see that the for-profit sector is relevant in the SACHA Act and I do not see that the for-profit sector is relevant to this particular provision that we are applying here.

The next point that was raised was a general accusation that there has been a substantial run down in public housing under this Liberal government. Let me invite the members to look at the facts, because the facts indicate just the opposite. The claim is made that this government is selling off houses wholesale. I hear figures quoted that we have reduced the number of Housing Trust homes from 61 000 down to 53 000. These are the sorts of figures that I have heard recently from a number of housing organisations and people who are out there criticising and making these sorts of claims—that we have reduced the number of public houses to that extent. When I ask them where they get their figures from, they say, 'Oh, we've got them out of the annual report of the Housing Trust'. Well, they probably have got their figures out of the annual report of the Housing Trust. What they do not acknowledge, though, is that there has been a change in organisations and the creation of new organisations, where money for public housing and where public houses themselves have been created.

Let me give some examples. When we came into government I think the number of public houses was around the 59 000 to 60 000 mark. The previous (Labor) government had sold off a number of the houses. I know from personal negotiation that the federal Labor government had approved the sale of a restricted number—and I put in the word 'restricted'—a figure of up to 1 000 houses a year was suggested. So, we inherited about 60 000 or 61 000 but we also inherited a commercial debt of $370 million or thereabouts in the Housing Trust.

We saw that debt as being a millstone around the neck of the Housing Trust and the public housing sector, because

money was going towards the payment of the commercial interest on that debt and therefore diminishing the ability to build new public houses here in South Australia. Our objective was to eliminate that debt, and we have eliminated that commercial debt within the public housing sector.

Now, instead of the commonwealth-state housing moneys going towards paying interest and principal on the repayment of that debt, all the moneys can go towards either the refurbishment and renovation of homes or the building of new homes. As a result of that, we have been able to substantially increase the number of homes being built in the Housing Trust, in SACHA and in the Aboriginal Housing Authority.

Mr Clarke: How many houses do you have now?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am about to come to that. Pretty well all the houses were in the name of the Housing Trust when we came into government. Since then, SACHA has considerably increased its number of houses to the point where it now has 3 200 houses, and we are increasing that by about 370 a year. Just under half of those are new houses and the others are houses transferred from the Housing Trust.

The other new body that has been formed as a statutory authority is the Aboriginal Housing Authority, which I understand has about 1 800 houses (these are approximate figures). If you put these figures together we have 58 000 public houses in South Australia at present—and I am rounding this off—about 53 000 in the Housing Trust, about 3 200 in SACHA and about 1 800 in the Aboriginal Housing Authority. There could be some variations, but I am using fairly recent figures.

There are still about 58 000 public houses in South Australia, so this claim that we have ravaged public housing in South Australia by selling off a number of houses is just not correct. A significant number of Housing Trust homes have been transferred across to SACHA and a very significant number have been transferred across to the Aboriginal Housing Authority, which was established by this government. In the past there was an Aboriginal housing unit within the trust: they administered it but it was in the name of the trust.

Now, because it is the policy of this government (we believe it is a better outcome for the indigenous people) and because the federal government equally has required it, we have established this new body, transferred over the ownership of the houses, and they now sit in the name of the Aboriginal Housing Authority. At the same time I do not deny the fact that we have encouraged tenants in a Housing Trust home who have been there for a fair time, if they are able to afford a new home, to buy the home. In fact, we have used the first home owners buying scheme.

I have gone out and actively promoted that, as I did with the $5 000 HomeStart program I put in place as Premier in 1996. We have used those schemes to encourage owners to buy their own home, because if they buy their own home, first, the value of the sale of the home goes back to the trust and can be used for redevelopments, renovations and new homes; and, secondly, the inherent subsidy we are giving to someone who can now buy their own home is removed. That subsidy is $2 000-plus per home per year.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In the Housing Trust I think the figure is 180 to 200 new home starts expected this year.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This year.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No, I think that in the Housing Trust it is about 180 to 200; then you have some in SACHA and some in the Aboriginal Housing Authority. I think that the figure in SACHA might be about 120, although I am only going by memory there, but I think that is a fairly accurate figure.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The opportunity will be there for questions to be asked of the minister during the committee stage.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I highlight the fact that, because we got rid of the interest and the debt on that commercial loan, we have been able to substantially increase the number. In fact, we have gone from about 25 or 30 new homes a year to 180 to 200 in the Housing Trust alone. We have encouraged people to buy their own homes, although there have been some other sales, especially in those areas where there is less demand for those houses.

We have a differential demand for Housing Trust homes in some country areas versus others and in some areas of the metropolitan area versus others. We have also had the very substantial redevelopment of areas such as Hillcrest, Salisbury North, The Parks, Mitchell Park and a range of others, programs that I think have been absolutely outstanding in the Housing Trust. You only have to go and look at places like Salisbury North and The Parks to see how we have produced more than a generational change.

We have gone from very traditional twin or dual Housing Trust homes built immediately after the war on a minimal basis, in terms of the materials used, etc., to modern homes that would stand up as some of the better housing you would find anywhere. Therefore, that claim just is not substantiated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: This claim that we are running down public housing is not correct: we are in fact making a huge commitment to public housing. There is less money under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement but we have very substantially increased the number of houses being built.

The issue of rent relief for rural students was raised. A month or so ago I announced a new scheme for rent relief for rural students. People coming from country areas, particularly as students, where it is vital that they have some assistance in getting accommodation here in Adelaide, are able to apply for rent relief. I invite the member for Hanson to have a look: she will find it in the library, otherwise we will make available a copy of the release I made at the time outlining that scheme. The other key issue that I would raise is that of consultation.

Originally there was very extensive consultation over about a two year period with the churches over this, and that is where the principles come from. They have agreed to this. They signed a formal agreement with me. I was involved very extensively in those consultations personally, as were both the Department of Human Services and SACHA. Now that it has been widened, in terms of the preparation of the regulations, I give an undertaking to consult widely with the

various groups, including Shelter SA, in the preparation of the regulations. I appreciate the support of honourable members and I now seek their support in ensuring that the bill passes through the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Ms KEY: I am using this clause to seek some clarification from the minister with regard to access to and equity of the stock that would be made available through the ICHU agreement.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I think the honourable member is wanting an assurance that people who would have access to this housing first have to meet the eligibility criteria. There are about four criteria put down, and the same principles apply for this housing as apply for any SACHA housing and any public housing in South Australia. I put down a policy, and it applies to the trust, the Aboriginal Housing Authority and SACHA. I can assure the honourable member that those same principles apply.

Ms KEY: What sort of auditing or monitoring practices will be put in place with regard to the pastoral care that the minister mentioned in his second reading explanation with regard to that being an associated advantage for this type of housing product?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can indicate that under the agreement I have reached with the Inter-Church Housing Unit there is a requirement for that unit to report to me on the pastoral and social support annually provided by the churches. I am able to monitor that through that annual report. In answer to the previous question, I refer to clause 1.5 of the agreement, which states:

> The government will retain the right to determine the eligibility criteria and waiting time and rent policy to apply to community housing facilities for the duration of each agreement.

Ms KEY: In the debate we have had thus far, there has been discussion about the provision of land. What would be the circumstances where not just land but actually existing developments on the land are provided, or where there is perhaps even accommodation on the land that needs to be renovated, expanded or upgraded in some way? Would that change the potential for an agreement?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member would appreciate that SACHA and community housing is about a joint effort and a partnership, sometimes with local government, sometimes with churches and sometimes with other organisations, particularly community welfare organisations, or MACHA, for instance, in the city. We have a number of ventures with MACHA that are specifically set up in this area.

It is hard to give an all-embracing answer here, because there are occasions where the land contributed might have a house on it. I can give one example where I know the land contributed by a council has a house on it. Part of the finances from SACHA will go towards renovating that house, which is an older home, and building 11 or 12 new units on the land. It is assessed on a case-by-case basis, and SACHA puts down a number of standards for assessing how this should be done. I can assure the honourable member that there are examples where we are renovating or using an existing building. However, it is invariably part of a bigger development or it may be a substantial upgrade of facilities. We have some general guidelines that say that the other partner needs to contribute around 20 per cent of the value of the final product, with SACHA providing about 80 per cent.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Ms KEY: The minister has already given an assurance that he will include and consult with Shelter with regard to the development of regulations. Will he also make sure that the Community Housing Association is also consulted and involved in some way with the development of those regulations?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I can give an assurance that it is our intention to have consultation with a range of organisations.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FOOD BILL

In committee.

(Continued from 16 May. Page 1581.)

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Ms STEVENS: With regard to clause 3, one of the objects of the act is 'to ensure food for sale is both safe and suitable for human consumption'. In her second reading contribution, the member for Taylor raised the issue of food given away for a charitable purpose; for example, someone might give food to a local charity to use in its day centre. Will the act cover that, or does it cover only food for sale?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, it applies only to food for sale. I may give some food to someone but there can be no guarantee about it. Who will know about my giving food to my neighbour? No-one. There can be no way of checking it. We have to be realistic here. I refer the committee to the following definition, in part:

'Sell' includes—
(a) barter, offer or attempt to sell; or
(b) receive for sale; or
(c) have in possession for sale; or
(d) display for sale; or
(e) cause or permit to be sold or offered for sale; or
(f) send, forward or deliver for sale. . .

I understand what the honourable member is trying to ensure and protect, and I can understand her point: there are other areas of law such as negligence that could pick up if someone deliberately gave away something that they knew was likely to cause harm to another person. However, it does not come under the Food Bill, and I do not believe it can. The sorts of procedures we are talking about just are not applicable under this bill. Other areas of the law, including common law, would apply.

Ms KEY: I just want to amplify on the question that the member for Elizabeth has raised. I have been involved in a number of circumstances—and I am sure other members of this House have, too—where food, whether it be fruit or other sorts of catered food, has been donated to charities such as St Vincent De Paul or some of the other charities where homeless people go to eat. I have also been involved for a number of years with a service that provided soup to young homeless people in the city. In the course of that, we would often receive donations of homemade soup that we could hand out to those homeless people. The question is whether those circumstances are covered by the food bill. It is my understanding that those donations are made with all the

goodwill that one can imagine. Are they covered by the food bill?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Many of the organisations to which you are referring still charge a nominal amount for a meal; it might be a couple of dollars, or something like that. Certainly, Meals on Wheels charges.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I know a group in the city that hands out meals and generally asks for a dollar or a couple of dollars—although that is not absolutely the case—therefore, it would be caught. The one area where it does not involve the sale is the supply of food in the course of providing services to patients or inmates in public institutions. This was a point raised by the member for Waite. For instance, in a kindergarten, if you are buying a service from the kindergarten and it includes the provision of food, then you are caught by this bill. If you are paying for accommodation in a nursing home, you are caught by this bill. But I cannot see that we can be in there trying to regulate the giving of food. It is a task so vast and uncontrolled that it would concern me. Will we have to check on what food one household might give to a neighbour? The answer is 'No.'

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I understand you are looking at the specific area of homeless people but the principle might be the same. Therefore, the task is too difficult to try to regulate that. As I have said, there are other areas of the law, including some areas of common law, where clearly there is still an obligation on the person doing the giving in terms of harm to other people. It is not as though it is an area unprotected by the law.

Mr McEWEN: It is probably an appropriate time for me to ask a question that I first foreshadowed yesterday in my second reading contribution because, under the objects of the act, the provision of the application in this jurisdiction of the Food Standards Code is really the genesis of my question. I have tried to work through the whole architecture of this and I just cannot picture in my mind how it works. Really, my question to the minister is: if I could go tomorrow and open a small food business at Henley Beach, will the minister tell me what then happens if I notify the council and, if I do not, what happens and, more importantly, what happens if I start to do something wrong?

Who finds out that I am doing something wrong and, if I am doing something wrong, what then happens? I need someone to work through with me, as a simple soul who has just opened his little food shop, what the hell all this means to me.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am assuming that, when the honourable member says that he opens a shop tomorrow, he is doing that under the new act. Let us say that the new act is, in effect, operating today and that the honourable member did this immediately. As I pointed out to the House last night, currently the only sections that would apply would be standards 3.1.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3, which relate to food premises and equipment, food safety practices in general and interpretation and application. I presume, though, that the member for Gordon is really saying, 'Let's go forward, after the implementation of the food safety program standards are applied.'

The honourable member decides to open up a food business. I was not sure whether the honourable member said open a corner store, deli or something like that for the first time or whether he was buying an existing shop. However, in either case, the responsibility would be on the honourable member to notify the council without having to pay a fee. You notify the council that you are now operating a food business within that council area. There would be an obligation, obviously, for you to understand your requirements under the act. That is an obligation that applies now.

You would immediately assess whether you are a high, medium or low risk, and there are people who can give you help with that. You are going into business and you would therefore set up a food plan. You would ensure that the staff employed in your premises understood and were appropriately trained in the food plan. Say that your premises is a corner deli, because I think that is what the honourable member was suggesting: that is a low or medium risk, and either four or six years hence, after the bill becomes operative, you would have your premises audited once a year.

When you decide to get it audited you have a choice: you can either notify your public environmental officer at the council that you wish to have your business audited by the council and they could make a time to come and do the auditing with you, or you could engage a private auditor who is suitably qualified and who has a licence to operate, and that person would come and do the auditing. If you engaged the council it would simply do the auditing and, assuming that you had passed, record the fact that, in this particular year, the business had been audited and had passed.

If you engaged a private auditor, the details of the audit would be passed through to the council. We must work out whether the details are passed to the council or to the department, and I have told the Local Government Association that I want to work through that issue. The private auditor would therefore eventually notify the council, in effect, 'This particular business that operates in your area has been audited and has passed that audit.' Either way, the council would have recorded, 'This business operates and it has passed an audit for this year.'

Mr McEWEN: That is the half if everything goes according to Hoyle. As soon as something does not go according to Hoyle, I want to know what then happens. A number of things can happen: either I failed to notify or I did notify and, through a complaint, a trace-back or something, does someone come and have a look at me? What happens if the auditor raises major concerns and says that I have been breaking the law? Does this auditor I have paid for now dob me in and, if so, to whom and what happens?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, there is an obligation under clause 6 for notification and there is a penalty and expiation fee for failure to notify. If it is a corporate body the penalty is $1 500 and if it is an individual person, $300. A penalty also applies if it is a more serious offence. How would someone find out that a person had failed to notify? Clearly, someone might lodge a complaint against the business. No doubt councils in their routine business approvals for various businesses would pick it up, or by other means, for instance, in the same way that unlicensed cars are detected within our state at present.

A penalty applies if there is failure to notify. In fact, that same issue would arise whether it was notification or registration. There is no greater way of success of guaranteeing a registration than there is by notification. It is a simpler process and therefore I believe that, as a result, you will find a higher level of compliance under notification than you would under registration, because there is not the fee and not the same level of bureaucracy is involved. With respect to a problem with the vehicle in which the food was being transported or if the premises were unfit, that might arise because a complaint was lodged.

If someone went into a restaurant, sat down, suffered from food poisoning or found that there were unsatisfactory standards, they would lodge a complaint with the appropriate authorised officer in the council. Someone from the council, clearly, would come around and do a number of things. They would first check whether the premises had a food plan and whether the place had been audited. In fact, before someone came around they would know whether the place had been appropriately audited and whether it had been appropriately notified. Equally, clause 43 provides a number of steps that the authorised officer can take—which is very similar to the present situation—if, in fact, the standards are inadequate or the place is unclean or unfit to serve food.

I would refer the honourable member to clause 43. Without reading through that clause, members can see clearly what action could be taken.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Gordon. This is the honourable member's third question.

Mr McEWEN: Thank you, sir, for your coaching in terms of my ability to count. I now understand the notification or registration process, the food plan and the auditing bit. I am beginning to come to grips with how the enforcement will work. I am not sure yet whether all the parties involved in that have even agreed to it. But the other issue I then raised is this apparent conflict between the two roles that a council might be performing, and I talked yesterday about whether we needed a Chinese wall, some subsidiaries, or whatever. But how can the council that is responsible for auditing also be responsible for enforcement? Is there not a necessary separation of powers there?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: With respect to the auditing and the approval of the safety standards, I refer the honourable member to clause 73, which provides that the relevant authority may approve a natural person to be a food safety auditor. I do not see any conflict at all. In fact, there are huge problems under the present act, and that partly arises because there is no guaranteed inspection every year, and we know that on quite a few occasions it does not occur. At present, there is no guaranteed regular requirement for an inspection and there are no guaranteed safety plans or anything else, so if ever there was an ad hoc arrangement the present act is it. I have been very critical of those ad hoc arrangements.

Equally, for local government, there is no recompense and no source of income. I see absolutely no difficulty between local government acting as an auditor and local government also being an authorised officer under the provisions in clause 43, to which I referred earlier. There is no difficulty at all, and nor should there be.

Mr CLARKE: In his second reading speech last night, the minister said that, by regulation, the turnover figure will be $25 000 for businesses that are caught by all three stages. Everyone is caught by at least two stages but the smaller businesses under $25 000 are not caught by stage 1, which requires them to have a food plan. A number of hotels, to which sporting bodies are not necessarily connected in a formal way, may permit the local football club to raffle meat trays and the like. The hotel has nothing to do with the packing of those meat trays, but is food safety the responsibility of the hotelier or of the sporting club involved?

Some of those sporting clubs may have a turnover in excess of $25 000 per annum, not necessarily in food but in their overall businesses. If the overall turnover of the operations of those sporting bodies exceeds $25 000, are such clubs caught by all three stages, and if hoteliers allow their premises to be used for the sale of goods, meat trays, and the like, who is responsible?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They are caught by the legislation. As I explained last night, this is a very comprehensive act with a number of different sections, and the definition of 'sell' in paragraph (k) includes to 'dispose of by way of raffle, lottery or other game of chance'. The chicken being raffled down at the pub by a football club would be caught by the general provisions of the bill. In terms of whether they must have a food plan, that would depend on whether their total turnover through the raffle was greater than $25 000.

Mr Clarke: Total turnover?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Total turnover. That is what I said last night. Football clubs would be pretty big operations if they were collecting from their raffle of the chicken more than $25 000 a year.

Mr CLARKE: I accept the minister's view, and, from that point of view, it would be very old chicken and very old meat by the time it had made $25 000 worth of sales, although I think the same old chook is going round the Labor Party's raffles! I am not sure whether it is a $25 000 turnover with respect to the sale of foodstuffs as against a $25 000 turnover that might include bar sales and income from membership fees, sponsorships and those sorts of things. Is it purely the $25 000 that relates to the sale of foodstuffs caught within the definition of this bill?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Bar sales means selling food, so that would have to be included. It is total sales and, if there are bar sales for the football club, that is caught in it as well, because that is a food. We are talking about total sales.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Will this bill make it illegal to continue the doggie bag practice? We know that is a euphemism because I do not think the dog always gets the doggie bag. I understand that in New South Wales the doggie bag practice is illegal. Under this proposal, will people be able to take home something for the dog, the cat or whomever?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The answer is no, the doggie bag is not illegal. A lot of restaurants and food outlets, though, have stopped providing doggie bags because, invariably with a doggie bag, perhaps on a hot day, people walk out of restaurant, throw the bag in the back of the car, get home three hours later after doing some shopping, put it into the fridge and then try to feed the dog or eat it themselves, and the risk of food poisoning in that case is increased very substantially. I know of places that refuse to issue doggie bags because it ultimately will reflect back onto the restaurant whence that food came, and they want to remove the risk of that occurring.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: My next question follows one that was asked by a member on the other side in relation to surplus food going to charity. Last year when visiting New South Wales, I went to the workers' club in Newcastle, which had an enormous amount of food that was not consumed. I asked whether there was any chance of that being made available to people who could benefit from it, and the answer was no, that it would be thrown out. I am aware that in South Australia, supermarkets that want to be generous with bread, for example, which is in sealed packets, cannot give it away. However, some of the new hot bread kitchens give away a lot of bread to charity. What is the situation in respect of this bill in terms of preventing people with good intentions from being able to give that food to people who would otherwise not get a decent meal?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: They can certainly do that. There is nothing stopping a bakery giving away bread at the end of the day. Of course, they have to be careful because there are other areas of law that would apply to them if there was something fundamentally wrong with that bread. This measure will not discourage a bakery (and I know this occurs with a lot of charities) from giving bread to a range of charitable groups, who then give the bread to people on low incomes.

I know some of the groups who do that on a weekly and sometimes almost a nightly basis, and they distribute that bread. That becomes a significant part of the charitable effort. Also, we have set up a food bank in South Australia, and that would be caught because there is a nominal fee for buying food through the food bank. I stress that would be caught. Of course, the facilities where most of the food for the food bank comes from are providing commercial food, therefore, they would be caught anyway under the commercial food area. This will not impact on charities in terms of being able to get access to existing food that might be given away.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I appreciate that a national approach is emerging in respect of the labelling of many food products. I understand that that does not cover all the takeaway food areas. I realise that the focus of this bill is primarily on hygiene and safe handling. Has any thought been given to making clear to customers in those establishments what is in the food they are consuming that is not covered by the national food labelling laws? If it is covered by the national laws, I am happy about that, but I understand there is a loophole in that people buying, say, a hamburger will not be told, unless they ask the manager, what is in the food they are getting from the fast food outlet.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: If a person asks what is in the food, the takeaway food place must be able to specify what is in the food. There is no labelling requirement. The ministerial council is in the process of amending the law across Australia on labelling packaged foods. It does not apply to takeaway places or restaurants where you would consume the food. If you ask at a takeaway place, the staff are required to tell you what is in the food.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Subclause (a) provides that food for sale must be both safe and suitable for human consumption. I raise the issue I foreshadowed last night in respect of the application of the new act to child-care centres, both private and government owned or operated or community based, and aged care facilities. In child care, a standard for hygiene and food already exists in the form of the National Child Care Accreditation Council's quality improvement scheme, which is a federally driven, quality assurance program administered under federal arrangements to ensure that food is hygienically prepared and nutritious. If that is in place and the business concerned has complied successfully with it and, if the same child-care centre operation has also complied with the provisions of the Children's Services Act 1972, which requires certain standards of performance in respect of hygiene, nutrition and food preparation, if those two regulatory arrangements (one federal and one state) have already been met and complied with, how will this new bill and regulatory regime be superimposed onto the compliance framework for that small business or enterprise? How will it physically work? Will there be a third visit from a third group of officials to inspect to ensure compliance?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, the bill when it becomes an act will apply to child-care centres and nursing homes if, as part of their standard service, they are providing food. If the children bring their own food in a bag or box, it will not apply. If, as part of the service, they are receiving a meal, then it will apply. The same of course applies in nursing homes because they receive a meal.

In the development of the food plans, we want to ensure there is recognition under existing accreditation programs. Those accreditation programs are much broader. We would plan to ensure that there is not duplication in that area but, clearly, because this is national legislation, I think you will find the broader accreditation plans are in fact modified to take account of the national legislation. The two will fit together; and we want to ensure that they fit together and do not require a duplication of effort. There will need to be, as part of the broader accreditation, accreditation on the food side.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I make the observation that it would be unfortunate if child-care centres responded to this new impost by going to a system, such as applies in Queensland, of encouraging parents to bring their own food to the centre, rather than the centre providing that food, as a way of escaping the regulatory regime. There is a problem in that parents will send along a different quality of food depending on the circumstances of that particular family. A situation will arise where a more affluent family may come with a wonderful lunch and a less affluent family will come along with something far more simple. That creates issues in child care for the administration of meals. I make the point that businesses may seek to escape the regime by going to that arrangement, but I accept the minister's reply and understand the issue.

To ensure that the regulatory burden is not too great, how will it actually work in respect of ensuring compliance with this act? Will the regulations that follow accept that if a child-care centre is accredited for three years and has a licence under the Children's Services Act 1972, indicating therefore that it has met both the federal and state regulatory regimes, including visits from officials at both state and federal levels endorsing that the food preparation arrangements are safe and appropriate, how will it physically work in respect of ensuring compliance?

Will it be enough for a child-care centre to show its licence and its accreditation certificate, therefore deeming it to be complaint, or will there need to be a separate visit, a separate set of forms, possibly a separate set of training procedures and possibly compliance with certain codes or requirements set down in regulation in regard to the size and shape of stoves, or size and shape of refrigerators, or the way in which cooking utensils are stored and maintained and which may require re-engineering of kitchens or the purchase of new capital items of plant and equipment, and so on? If the requirements of the new act go beyond what is already in the National Accreditation Council and child-care regulations, could the minister at this early point explain how it will physically work on the ground for the proprietor or the management committee of the particular kindergarten, child-care service or small business concerned?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Let us first recognise that there are a number of national accreditations, including accreditations for hospitals, nursing homes, kindergartens, child-care centres and others. At present, those bodies do have duplication. They have to comply with the state food law and they have to comply with the different national accreditation standard. The two invariably are not compatible and require some duplication.

The big advantage will be that for the first time we will have a national food law and, as part of those national food laws, you will find the accreditation process will change. The national accreditation for nursing homes, hospitals, child care and everything else will be that, as part of this, you have to comply with the national food laws. Therefore, this will simplify that quite dramatically and stop what is currently duplication and inconsistency in that area.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I understand that communication will occur between the various levels of government—federal, state and local—and there may be changes to the accreditation process and licensing regime. Does the minister envisage any scope for the requirements of this act, the Children's Services Act and the national accreditation scheme to be brought under one level of government or one regulatory regime, so that the business or kindergarten concerned has to have only one visit from one group of people and comply with one requirement—one size meets all, if you like—rather than having the three separate visits and three separate compliance regimes in place?

I take the point that all three regimes may be modified, but there is still a red tape issue from the small business point of view and scope for divergent practices and details and minutia to evolve under each regime. In answering, could the minister comment on the likely outcome if, for instance, a child-care centre or kindergarten found itself to be compliant with, say, two of these regimes but out of order in respect of one of them?

In other words, could we have a situation where a centre was told that it was not complying with this new bill but it retained its licence to operate under the Children's Services Act, it was still accredited having met that act's hygiene requirements, and the likelihood existed of some legal engagement where the defence was, 'I was already compliant with the federal legislation and other state legislation, but not compliant with this particular one'?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The member for Waite has raised three different areas of where they have to comply. One is the state Children's Services Act, another is the Food Act and the other is national accreditation. I am not the minister responsible for the Children's Services Act, so I cannot comment on that in terms of any conflict between that act and national accreditation. What I can say, as I indicated earlier, is that national accreditation schemes will now take account of the new food hygiene laws, because for the first time we will have some uniform national food hygiene laws. As part of meeting national accreditation, you will comply and meet the standards as required under the Food Act. In terms of the state act, equally, any inconsistency will be removed because there will be a requirement there. Again, this will remove the duplication that currently exists potentially, especially between federal accreditation and a state act. That conflict and duplication exist at present under the current act. So, for the first time, under this act that process can be simplified merely through national accreditation.

Ms STEVENS: I want to raise for the first time the issue of adequate resourcing to make this whole legislation work. To set the scene, a paragraph from the submission that the Australian Institute of Environmental Health provided to the minister's department in response to the draft bill states:

> To enable effective promotion, coordination, implementation and monitoring of food safety reforms, adequate resources are required at state and local government level. Despite the findings of the Garibaldi inquest 1995, no noticeable improvement to food safety resources in South Australia has occurred. Members felt that parliament was misinformed when questions were asked and reported in the *Advertiser* of 29 October 1998 regarding action by the government after prominent food poisoning outbreaks.
>
> In response to these questions the Hon. Dean Brown is quoted as saying, 'Forty-five councils had since appointed 109 inspectors.' In fact, no extra officers have been employed in South Australia as a result of food poisoning outbreaks. Some councils actually reduced staff numbers in this area. South Australia still has approximately the same number of food safety officers as before the incident—approximately 109 employed by local government. The majority of these officers also have additional legislative responsibilities to fulfil.

The point being made is that they do things other than this task. This question has been consistently raised about getting the result we want, bearing in mind that we have issues of resourcing both at the local and state government levels to cover.

I also had comments made to me in relation to the minister's own department's resources. I have received a number of criticisms related to the run-down of resources in the unit of the minister's department responsible for food matters. I would be interested to hear the minister's comments. It has been suggested that at the time of the enactment of the current Food Act in 1985 the department had some 42 officers with environmental qualifications working in the food area. I understand that the current figure is in the order of eight or 10.

The minister would have noted in my references from the Auditor-General's Report of 1997-98 that he said in that and in his two following reports that the department does not have information regarding what councils are doing in terms of enforcement of the current act. It seems that there have been problems at both levels of government in relation to effectively enforcing and doing the job they are suppose to be doing. Now we have a whole new scheme and it will require both levels of government to play their part. The issue of how it will be resourced is a major one.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am pleased that the honourable member has raised this issue and put the argument that she has, because that is the very reason and argument why we should be adopting this new bill. Under the present Food Act, there is nowhere near the same obligations as under the new act in terms of making sure that the resources are there. Under the new act the resources in this area will include those people working for the state government, those working for local government and the private auditors. There will be a substantial increase in the resources available because there will be much more checking and much greater priority given to training, food plans and food hygiene than in the past. That is the very justification. We want to make sure that those organisations serving food make the commitment in this area to hygiene to start with and then to ensure that those standards are maintained. The resources under the new act will be substantially greater than those under the present act.

I point out a couple of things. The member for Elizabeth said that there had been a run-down of resources in the Department of Human Services since the Garibaldi affair: that is not correct at all. There are extra positions within the department.

Ms STEVENS: On a point of order, sir, I said that there had been a run-down in resources since the 1985—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The number of positions in the department has been increased. We have just taken on a new food technologist and that significant additional resources are to be allocated for the implementation of the

new Food Act by the Department of Human Services at the state level, and we will see, with the introduction of this, the most significant increase in resources that has ever occurred in the food area in South Australia.

Not only have there been extra positions in the food section of the Department of Human Services but also there have been extra positions in the CDC area, one of the areas picked up by the Coroner as part of the coronial inquiry. Procedures in that area have changed dramatically as a result of the Garibaldi affair. That is why South Australia is now seen as the envy and standard across Australia in picking up food poisoning cases.

I can give examples of where South Australia has been the body identifying a food poisoning outbreak largely in and emanating from Victoria that has spread across into South Australia, and equally in Queensland. We were the state that picked up the Kraft food poisoning problem. We are picking them up ahead of other states because of the excellent standards and procedures that we have adopted and the extra staff that we have engaged. I assure the honourable member that resources under the new act, once it applies, will be substantially greater than the resources available under the present act.

Ms STEVENS: I am pleased to hear that there will be a substantial increases in resources. I wonder whether they might come from the fines for the ambulance diversions, as with the number of those occurring it could involve a lot of money. The minister misheard what I said. I said in my original question that there had been a run-down of resources in relation to the 42 officers available in 1985—and not just since Garibaldi—and I suggested that the current figure of your officers in your department is now eight to 10. Will the minister confirm the number of officers involved?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will answer the honourable member's questions when we next consider this bill. There is no fine on hospitals' diversion: the claim the honourable member made in the House today was not correct. I suggest that progress be reported.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 29 May at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 15 May 2001

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

VICTOR HARBOR LAUNCHING FACILITY

49. **Mr HILL:** What effect will the proposed Victor Harbor boat launching facility have on the local marine environment and in particular, the leafy sea dragon and its habitat?

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

Leafy seadragons are commonly sighted in the area around Granite Island and on other local reefs. Seadragons feed on invertebrates associated with seagrass and algal communities. In addition, juvenile leafy seadragons are thought to utilise shallow near-shore seagrass habitats.

The extent to which algal and seagrass communities may be affected by this boat ramp development will depend on:

- the effects of the dispersed sediment plumes during the construction of the boat ramp;
- the timing of dredging;
- changes in the hydrology of the site;
- the volume of boat traffic through the area; and
- the degree to which seagrass is lost.

Observations of seagrass communities in the vicinity of Whalers Wharf launching ramp indicate that that they are relatively resilient to impacts from boating traffic, dependent upon the depth of the channel and whether there is ongoing damage as a result of propellers.

Algal and invertebrate species associated with patches of hard substrate in the area are less susceptible to the construction process. They are generally robust communities that will readily re-establish.

GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

53. **Mr HILL:**

1. What is the number, make and state or country of manufacture of motor vehicles owned or leased by the government and its agencies?

2. What is the government policy in relation to the purchase of cars manufactured overseas?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Minister for Administrative and Information Services has advised that:

1. Passenger Vehicles (as at December 2000).

Make	Number	Manufactured
Ford	590	Victoria
Ford	5	Korea
Holden	2 886	South Australia
Holden	4	Japan
Mitsubishi	1 525	South Australia
Mitsubishi	1	Japan
Nissan	19	Japan
Subaru	1	Japan
Suzuki	9	Japan
Toyota	653	Victoria
Toyota	21	Japan
Total	5 714	

Commercial Vehicles (as at December 2000)

Make	Number	Manufactured
Chrysler	1	Austria
Ford	33	Japan
Ford	61	Belgium
Holden	53	Japan
Holden		189Thailand
Landrover	14	UK
Mercedes	1	Germany
Mitsubishi	98	Japan
Mitsubishi	23	Thailand
Nissan	149	Japan
Subaru	42	Japan
Toyota	636	Japan
Toyota	786	Thailand/Japan
Volkswagen	2	Germany
Total	1 452	

The data represents all the passenger and light commercial vehicles (under 3.5 tonne gross vehicle mass) that the State Government currently leases from the commonwealth bank and includes 407 vehicles leased by Transport SA from AH Plant for a period of five years to May 2002. It does not include vehicles provided under sponsorship agreements.

The information relates to the vehicles that are currently in the fleet on long or short term hire. It does not include the vehicles that are in the sale process (i.e., being prepared for auction).

2. Passenger vehicles

The SA Government currently has a buy Australia policy, albeit that in the past a small number of small size non-Australian made vehicles were leased. However, there is an ongoing demand in government for small vehicles and, as none are made in Australia, the issue of small cars is being examined as to future purchases.

Light commercial vehicles (up to a GVM of 3.5 tonne)

There are no light commercial vehicles made in Australia (apart from vehicles such as the Falcon and Commodore Utilities, which come under the passenger vehicle policy). The purchasing of commercial vehicles is undertaken on a whole of life costing and needs analysis basis and, where possible, purchases are aligned to the Australian manufacturers.

EMERGENCY SERVICES FUND GRANTS

75. **Mr HILL:** Which agencies have received Emergency Services Fund Grants and in each case, what was the amount and purpose?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have been advised of the following information on which agencies have received Emergency Services Fund Grants and in each case, the amount and the purpose the grant.

The Emergency Services Fund Grants Program has provided $1.5 million to various government and non-government organisations over the past 18 months. Grants are awarded by the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services upon the recommendation of an independent grants advisory panel which assesses each application.

The list of successful grant recipients for each funding round has been available to the public since the inception of the grants program and may be viewed on the Emergency Services Levy website at www.esl.sa.gov.au.

The total value of grants that have been awarded to government agencies is as follows:

Country Fire Service—$941 449. This amount represents approximately 60 per cent of all grants awarded and reflects the fact that approximately 60 per cent of all applications have been submitted by CFS brigades.

State Emergency Service—$142 504.

Metropolitan Fire Service—$60 530.

SA Police Department—$5 000.

INDUSTRIAL AWARDS

81. **Mr CLARKE:**

1. Has the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission any plans to review and update any of its awards and agreements that provide for wages less than the state minimum Wage, or for hours of ordinary work in excess of 38 per week and for a casual loading of less than 20 per cent and if so, when?

2. How many commission awards or agreements provide for wages less than the state minimum wage, hours of work equal to or greater than 40 per week, and casual loading less than 20 per cent, respectively, and what are the titles, the names of the parties concerned and the estimated number of employees bound by such awards or agreements?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: The Minister for Workplace Relations has advised that:

1. The Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia advises that it is an independent tribunal. Whether it plans of its own initiative, pursuant to Section 196 of the Industrial and Employee Relations Act 1994, to review or update any awards or agreements providing for wages less than State Minimum Wage or for hours of ordinary work in excess of 38 per week and for a casual loading of 20 per cent, is a matter for it to determine.

2. On 18 May 2000, the Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia adjusted the state minimum wage for full time adult employees to $400.40. At present, the following 17 South Australian Awards provide for wages less than this amount:

1. Actors Feature Film (SA) Award
2. Biscuit and Confectionary Award
3. Blind Welfare Association Lottery Award
4. Boot and Shoe Award
5. Building and Construction Workers (State)(Mixed Industry) Award
6. Canteens, Dine-Ins and Buffets (In theatres) Award
7. Cement Brick and Roofing Tile Award
8. Clothing Trades Award
9. Dry Cleaners Award
10. Horticulture Industry (Nurses and Landscape) Award
11. Manufacturing, Jewellers, Watchmakers, Badge Makers and Precious Metals Industry Award
12. Meat Industry (SA) Award
13. Plaster Industries Award
14. SACRA Employees Interim Award
15. Spastic Centres of SA Incorporated Access Workers Award
16. The Smiths Snack Food Company Ltd (SA) Award
17. Theatrical, Entertainment Etc. (South Australian) Award

Currently the following eight South Australian Awards provide for hours of work equal to or greater than 40 hours:

1. Actors Feature Film (SA) Award
2. Actors Theatrical (SA) Award
3. Aerated Waters Manufacturing Award
4. Cement Brick and Roofing Tile Award
5. Pastoral Industry (SA) Award
6. Plaster Industries Award
7. Port Stanvac Marine Award
8. Transport Workers (Passenger Vehicles) Award

Three Awards provide for casual loading of less than 20 per cent, viz:

1. Cement Brick and Roofing Tile Award
2. Draughtspersons Planners Technical Officers (Consolidated) Award
3. Pastoral Industry (SA) Award

It is not within the role of Workplace Services nor the Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia to keep estimates of the number of employees bound by various awards.

COUNTRY BUS CONCESSION CARDS

85. **Mr SNELLING:** How much recompense for concession card holders have the private bus companies operating on country routes been paid and are there any inspectors currently policing the use of concession cards on these routes?

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

The table below shows the amounts paid to the country bus service operators under the prescribed concessional categories for the year 2000.

Tertiary Student Passes	Primary/Secondary Passes	Pensioner Tickets	Seniors Tickets	Daily Student Concession Travel	Total Paid to Operators for 2000
$20 452.13	$726 093.04	$1 327 549.55	$140 238.97	$1 057 471.19	$3 271 804.88

The Passenger Transport Board inspectors do not check the use of concession cards on Country Bus Services. It is the responsibility of each country bus operator to check the use of concession cards on their own routes. Indeed, it is in each operator's interest to do so because of the significant fare discounts provided to concession card holders. The State Government provides varying rates of reimbursement to operators for providing concession fares.

Regulation 7 of the Passenger Transport Regulations 1994 (Regular Passenger Services; Conduct of Passengers) states:

(1) A student must not travel on a passenger vehicle using a concessional ticket unless he or she is in possession of a valid student identification card.

(2) Any other person must not travel on a passenger vehicle using a concessional ticket unless he or she is in possession of a valid travel concession card.

Private buses operated outside the metropolitan area do not use the 'Metroticket' ticketing system and all fares are set, and tickets issued, by the individual operator. Tickets are required to be purchased 'off board' and a proof of entitlement produced before a concessional ticket is issued.

PRISONERS, TRANSFER

88. **Mr ATKINSON:** How many prisoners have entered South Australia pursuant to the International Transfer of Prisoners (South Australia) Act 1998 and how many have left to serve sentences overseas?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Attorney-General has provided the following response:

Whilst legislation relating to the International Transfer of Prisoners (South Australia) Act 1998 has automatically come into operation, the commonwealth legislation has not been finalised. The commonwealth government is still in the process of negotiating with states/territories on the form of arrangements under the legislation and it is not known at this time when this process will be finalised.

To date no applications for international transfer to or from South Australia have been received.

JURORS' TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

89. **Mr ATKINSON:** What is the current travel allowance per kilometre for jurors, when was it last updated and does the government intend reviewing it in the near future?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Attorney-General has provided the following information:

The Sheriff has responsibility for juror management in South Australia and has informed that:

- The travel allowance for jurors is 20 cents per kilometre with a minimum payment of $2 per day;
- These rates have been in place since 1982;
- The Sheriff has commenced a review of the Jury System which will conclude by the end of 2001 and will involve a review of all fees paid to jurors including the travel allowance.

A South Australian Plan has been prepared and has been forwarded to the commonwealth.

Commonwealth endorsement of this Plan is required before funding can be drawn from the Fund. However, the South Australian Plan proposes the expenditure of $21 million over this and the next two financial years, ie prior to the end of the current Health Care Agreement.

The commonwealth have at this stage not advised of any conditions other than the general criteria developed in relation to the Fund and applied to proposals from all jurisdictions.

MEDICARE NATIONAL HEALTH DEVELOPMENT FUND

95. **Ms STEVENS:** Has an approved strategic plan to access the $21 million set aside for South Australia under the Medicare National Health Development Fund been submitted, what amounts have been paid and when were they received, what conditions applied to the allocations and what were their purposes?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: A South Australian Plan has been prepared and has been forwarded to the Commonwealth.

Commonwealth endorsement of this Plan is required before funding can be drawn from the Fund. However, the South Australian Plan proposes the expenditure of $21 million over this and the next two financial years, ie prior to the end of the current Health Care Agreement.

The commonwealth have at this stage not advised of any conditions other than the general criteria developed in relation to the Fund and applied to proposals from all jurisdictions.

POLICE VEHICLES

99. **Ms RANKINE:** How many police vehicles have been withdrawn from service during 1999-2000 and 2000-01 to date, respectively, and from what stations or patrol bases were they withdrawn?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have been advised by the Commissioner of Police of the following information:

During the years 1999-2000 and 2000-01 to date, there has been no withdrawal of vehicles from the police service. During this period, SAPOL has continually monitored the utilisation of the vehicle fleet and has taken the opportunity to reallocate some vehicles between areas as a responsible management practice.