

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 3 October 2001

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

### TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

A petition signed by 1 023 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House amend legislation to allow the TAB to offer fixed odds betting on races, was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

### HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

The **SPEAKER**: I lay on the table the final report of the Auditor-General on the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium redevelopment project.

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

That the report be published.

Motion carried.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon Dean Brown)—

Optometrists Act—Regulations—Fees

By the Minister for Government Enterprises (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—

South Australian Water Corporation—Charter, August 2001

Forest Property Act—Regulations—Fee

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

Superannuation Act—Regulations—Electricity Industry

By the Minister for Minerals and Energy (Hon. W.A. Matthew)—

Electrical Products—Regulations—Certificates

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. D.C. Kotz)—

Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 2000-2001

District Council By-Laws—Le Hunte—No. 2—Moveable Signs.

### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr **CONDOUS (Colton)**: I bring up the 29th report of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

## QUESTION TIME

### SAMAG PROJECT

The **Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition)**: My question is to the Premier. Does the government accept responsibility for the delay by the commonwealth in giving approval for assistance to the SAMAG magnesium project in Port Pirie, as claimed today by the Premier's colleague and

federal industry minister Nick Minchin? Speaking this morning to the Port Pirie *Recorder*, Senator Minchin claimed that the federal cabinet could only decide how much support to give to SAMAG when it knew how much the South Australian government was prepared to contribute, and as yet the state cabinet had not decided how much to contribute. This is a direct quote. This is from your friend Senator Minchin—

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: He said:

We also need to know what the state government is proposing to provide. We can't make a decision on our commitment until we know what the state government is proposing to contribute to the project.

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier)**: The South Australian government has made a decision in relation to financial support for the magnesium project, and it is a very substantial sum of money. The reason that has not been released publicly is that at this stage it is a matter for negotiation between the South Australian government and the commonwealth government. More importantly, it is a matter where Invest Australia has a series of guidelines it has to satisfy in preparing a recommendation for the federal cabinet committee. We understand that details are being sought by Invest Australia in relation to the magnesium project.

I go on and hasten to add that over the last two years, perhaps two and a quarter years, the government has worked tirelessly to get one of the key components to underpin new commercial and industrial development like a magnesium project in place, and that is a gas pipeline for a fuel source for generating capacity that would underpin a major investment such as the magnesium project. We are now in a position where it would appear that the private sector will be funding the gas pipeline between Melbourne and Adelaide, which will underpin a major substantial new commercial and certainly industrial development within the state.

The cabinet has considered this matter on several occasions and during consideration of the matter we have determined a funding package that we have put to the commonwealth government for the purpose of securing commonwealth financial support also towards this project. Not only have we in writing submitted our support wholeheartedly for the magnesium project but in recent weeks I have personally spoken to the Prime Minister on two occasions. I have also spoken to the federal Minister for Industry, and I know the Deputy Premier has pursued issues with a range of people associated with the project indicating that the government of South Australia has for two years been tireless in its efforts to underpin this project and will continue to be so.

I point out for those who have just come in on the slipstream in the last six to eight weeks, trying to make some political mileage out of it, from the government in South Australia's perspective the hard yards have been done. As a result of the hard yards we have not only the pipeline on the eve of the announcement of private sector commitment to that proposal but also we are negotiating with the commonwealth government to secure its support for this project. Our advice is that the bankability of this project is certainly there. The Thiesscorp take-off agreements that have been put in place underscore the capacity of this project in terms of its bankability.

We will continue to monitor the circumstances. We will continue to ensure that we get the best outcome for South

Australia and, importantly, we will leave no stone unturned, so to speak, to ensure that we are in the best position South Australia to be the destination for this investment and that in fact it is Port Pirie that is the beneficiary of that investment.

### GAMBLING

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Will the Premier please update the House on the government's efforts to control problem gambling in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** This is an important issue for the state and one which the government has invested a lot of time and effort into tackling. We have sought to work in a constructive and cooperative way to bring about meaningful reform, and it must be said that—through the goodwill of a number of parties, I hasten to add—we have managed to deliver. Earlier this year the parliament passed the Statutes Amendment (Gambling Regulation) Act, which continued the freeze on gaming machines for a further two years, taking it out to the year 2003.

More importantly, that act instituted a number of far-reaching reforms to tackle problem gambling. Those substantial parts of the act came into force this week. Critically, we now have the Independent Gambling Authority to oversee all forms of gambling in South Australia. This is a crucial reform that certainly many church and welfare groups have long called for.

The IGA now consists of the former members of the Gaming Supervisory Authority plus two additional members. Tourist operator Lynette Rasheed and Catholic Centre Care Welfare Chief Dale West join the Independent Gambling Authority. This body will now perform a supervisory role over all forms of gambling in the state, but it will also drive the process of ongoing reform. It will commission research, consider submissions and report back to the government on suggested measures to encourage a responsible gambling industry and to minimise problem gambling.

Linked to these reforms is another major move that I announced earlier today, namely, the appointment of a Minister for Gambling. This appointment is also a vital initiative, because it separates responsibility for the supervision of gambling from responsibility for the collection of revenue from gambling. The Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services, Robert Brokenshire, takes on this new role. Again, this is a reform that churches, welfare groups and others have supported. Underlying all these structural—

**Mr Foley:** He's not in your cabinet!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** The member for Hart would be the last person in this House to interject in relation to gambling issues. We know what his track record is. I give him credit—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** No. The member for Hart should hasten slowly. You have at least been consistent in your view; it is about the only point I will give you credit for, but at least you have been consistent in wanting more gambling in South Australia.

Underlying all these structural changes is a raft of practical measures now in force to minimise problem gambling, particularly from gaming machines. These reforms include limits on cash availability in gaming venues; the banning of autoplay buttons; the banning of gambling while intoxicated; the mandatory enforcement of codes of conduct at venues; and, with regard to advertising, increasing the rate

of return from machines from 85 to 87.5 per cent; a barring register of problem gamblers; and the specific banning of note acceptors on gaming machines. This suite of reforms is now in place. This reform package, which will be implemented under the guidance of the new minister and the Independent Gambling Authority, is now leading the nation in terms of how we are tackling problem gambling within the community. Other states are now looking at our reforms and will consider following suit. Again, South Australia is putting in place reforms and leading this nation—and it is interesting that Labor governments in other states are looking at our reform measures with a view to their implementation.

The reaction of key lobby groups demonstrates the value of what we have achieved. Let me share some quotes. The Heads of Christian Churches Gambling Task Force Chairperson, Stephen Richards, said:

The Premier's announcement today foreshadows the most significant and much needed reform to the gambling industry yet seen in South Australia.

The Adelaide Central Mission Senior Policy Officer, Mark Henley, said:

We're very pleased with the government's leadership in this issue.

Centacare's Dale West said:

I describe this as a very large step in the right direction for preventing problem gambling. . .

And the Australian Hotels Association General Manager, John Lewis, said:

. . . we are confident that the formation of the IGA (Independent Gambling Authority) will help the small percentage of people who experience gambling problems.

We are making progress in South Australia, and we are leading the way in tackling problem gambling within the community. There is much work to be done but we have now set up a framework that will ensure the ongoing attention and reform vital in this area. Again, it is a case of Labor governments doing nothing but creating problems and Liberal governments coming behind and fixing and cleaning up the mess.

### HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier seek forthwith the resignation of the Minister for Tourism, or dismiss her, given that the Auditor-General has today found that Mrs Hall had a clear conflict of interest and duty as a minister of the Crown? In his report tabled in this parliament today on the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium scandal, the Auditor-General, Ken MacPherson, has found that the Minister for Tourism had a clear conflict of interest and duty and had departed from proper standards of ministerial conduct.

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Hart!

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest that the member for Hart listen to the chair.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** I was aware that the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium report was to be tabled today, and I have had an opportunity to have only a brief discussion with the Treasurer, who, having commissioned this report from the Auditor-General, received a copy of it, I think, late yesterday (I am not quite sure when). I understand that there are something like 500 or 600 pages in this—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the Leader of the Opposition!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Members of the opposition can feign disgust as they wish today. I am going to—

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will come to order!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Let me go back and pick up what I was saying before I was interrupted by members opposite. The report has just been tabled in the House. Whilst I have had some preliminary discussions with the Treasurer on this matter, I note that there are some 500 or 600 pages. I do not intend, in a knee-jerk reaction, to respond to quoting by the Leader of the Opposition in this House today. I will give—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Mr Speaker, if members of the opposition want to ask a question and then expect the answer, I would ask that they allow me, uninterrupted, to give them that answer. Let me repeat what I said. The report, which has been tabled only in the last 15 to 20 minutes, comprises some three sections, totalling 500 or 600 pages. Due consideration will be given to the report, and I will have the opportunity to read components of it. The opposition has a wont in this place to too often selectively quote and misinterpret circumstances. I intend to read the report, upon which I will then be able to make a judgment and respond to questions from the leader and others.

*The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the Minister for Police!

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Hart! I know that it is a sensitive afternoon but I would suggest that if members want to stay here for another 45 minutes they might remember standing orders. It is not the day to be sent off on an early minute. The member for Stuart.

## MURRAY RIVER

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** Will the Minister for Water Resources advise the House whether he agrees with the claims that South Australia's clean-up of the Murray River has been 'mostly about promotions, campaigns and press conferences with ministers gazing out over the river'? Will the minister clearly indicate to the House the exact position and the involvement of the government?

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources):** I certainly do not agree with the proposition, the claptrap, put forward by the shadow leader of the opposition in whom, I should say, I was most disappointed because, until yesterday, I considered him an intelligent man and unlikely to get sucked in—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** Your shadow minister for the environment whom, until yesterday, I considered an intelligent man and unlikely to get sucked into the low-grade political tactics so often characterised by the Leader of the Opposition. For a decade he has made a glad-fest of half-truths, innuendo and downright untruths but, until yesterday, I thought better of the gentleman sitting opposite. He asked me a question, which he accurately quoted in full in the *Advertiser* this morning. He asked me a question going back five years—not the two years of my tenure but five years—into various government departments. He expects me to clean-up the Murray River and commit tens of thousands of

dollars and hundreds of man hours to researching a very detailed question.

I can give him the top of the head answer, which is that any fool knows that we have been doing a lot to clean-up the Murray, and it is not about the Save the Murray campaign. For the particular fool opposite I will detail just a few of the things that we are doing. This document is a media release by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on 24 August. Fact: \$40 million—

*Mr Hill interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** —is being spent on the Lower Murray irrigation plan to rehabilitate the Lower Murray swamps and to help reduce 80 per cent of the polluted waters from the Murray River. The member for Kaurna, though, overlooks the fact that that was announced on 29 August. Like all of us, the member for Kaurna has a duty to the people of South Australia to make it clear whether his party will commit—in some sort of bipartisan way—to this rehabilitation of the Lower Murray swamps—

*Mr Hill interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** —and not say that, because I am the minister, it is my responsibility. If the honourable member's party is elected to government let him go out and tell the *Advertiser* and all the television cameras whether he would commit to this or whether he is indulging in claptrap or hyperbole. There is a lot of nonsense about a River Murray Act. If the member for Kaurna had opened his statutes he would see that there are already two River Murray Acts—not none, two. So, he will add to the two that are there. He did not even know that there were two existing River Murray Waters Agreements. He will invent a new act. Well, he should first go to his statutes and look. What else are we doing?

*Mr Hill interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** You think this is trouble: you wait if you ever get the chance. What will the honourable member opposite and the leader do about the important issue of the Snowy flows and the environmental flows needed for the Murray River? The shadow minister was a member of the Select Committee on the River Murray. He knows how important environmental flows are for this state. Will he show some leadership over there, or will he follow his leader who, four years ago, said that we should not have a cap in South Australia? Four years ago the Leader of the Opposition said that we did not need a cap on diversions in South Australia because it would be an enormous disincentive to big industries to establishing themselves in South Australia. The government, the people of South Australia, and the members of this parliament have a right to know: is your current position no diversions or is it that which was espoused four years ago by the Leader of the Opposition, who basically said that this river did not warrant protection?

But importantly, will the opposition commit, as has the Premier, to a \$100 million salinity strategy and a 20 year plan for the river? It is easy with an election coming up to take this off the political agenda. It is easy for the shadow minister and the leader to go out there and say, 'We are bipartisan on this issue. We all stand up for the river.' That is an easy thing to do, and it is something that the people of South Australia want to know. I refer to some \$100 million on salinity, previously announced, and \$40 million on cleaning up the lower Murray swamps, previously announced. A total of \$60 million—

*Mr Conlon interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Elder!

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** —is to be spent on ongoing programs over the next seven years on pollution control. Most importantly, we have a Premier who has shown national leadership and is acknowledged as a national leader on this issue for the last two years. What I find most insulting is the line in the shadow minister's diatribe where he says that they will show national leadership. They were here for how many decades, and the river was just something to be pumped as much as possible and completely ignored.

When we got into office, we have a Premier who shows leadership, who creates a ministry for water resources, and who puts together water from three disparate departments. He shows leadership, is acknowledged as an Australian leader, gets the Prime Minister to put it number one on the agenda, and the geese opposite say that when they get there they will show national leadership.

If I am a bit over excited, I do apologise to the House. But I do feel a bit passionate about this matter, because I actually think that this matter does not need cheap political stunts. It is a serious matter that deserves the attention of this House, and due care and consideration by members opposite, not the claptrap we are seeing from the shadow minister.

#### TOURISM MINISTER

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. Minister, will you resign today as a minister of this government, given the damning findings of today's Auditor-General's Report, and particularly given that you have been in receipt of draft copies of this report for quite some time? I would like to briefly quote some important parts from the Auditor-General's Report. It says:

Having regard to the nature of her role within the soccer federation, Mrs Hall's failure to resign as ambassador for soccer, immediately upon her appointment as a minister of the Crown on 17 December 1997 was, in my opinion [that is, the Auditor-General's opinion] inappropriate and a departure from proper standards of ministerial conduct.

He goes on to say, in part:

In my opinion, Mrs Hall is open to criticism in the context of her failure in February 1997 to bring to Government notice complaints made by Mr Pickard. I regard this as a failure of her public duty as the minister's representative on the stage 1 redevelopment committee.

Secondly, when Mrs Hall became the Minister for Youth and the Minister for Employment in December 1997, the conflict between Mrs Hall's private interests as ambassador for soccer and her duties as a minister of the Crown became potentially irreconcilable given the emerging divergence in interests between the soccer federation and the government over the financial arrangements for the Hindmarsh stadium, including the suspension of the levy system.

That is a damning report. Will the minister resign today?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism):** I am so surprised at the question by the member for Hart. What has happened today is typical of the member for Hart. Again, there have been a few fairly selective quotes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Hart! The minister has been asked a question. The House will remain silent so that we can hear the reply.

**The Hon. J. HALL:** What the member for Hart has not told the House—but I am sure he will in the interests of fairness—is that the Auditor-General has said that my integrity is not in question. He also has not mentioned that the

Auditor-General said that I submitted that I had acted in good faith and that he has agreed with my submission.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J. HALL:** He has accepted, and I refer the member for Hart to page—

*Mr Foley interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J. HALL:** I refer the member for Hart to page 513, which he may find fairly interesting reading. From my perspective and from what I have read so far in the Auditor-General's Report as it relates to conflict of interest, I believe he is seriously mistaken, his criticism is misdirected and, in my case, it is just plain wrong. The complexities of the Auditor-General's Report and the matters that have been woven into it deserve a full debate, which I assume will take place when the report is considered at some time in the future. I have no doubt that the member for Hart would expect a responsible answer from me. I consider his question to be fairly facetious.

I also note that again he has missed a few things out of his question to me, namely, that the Auditor-General has accepted that we have a wonderful international soccer stadium; it has been widely acclaimed, and we staged a magnificent Olympics tournament. It will be a great asset for this state and the sporting community for the next 30 years or so. The other aspect of this matter that the member for Hart has not mentioned—and, of course, we should not be surprised—is that at the time the decision was made by the government to build this stadium we were dealing with two national league soccer teams and the rugby team and it has also assisted in getting us a number of major events.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the Minister for Police! The member for Stuart has the call.

#### SAMAG PROJECT

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I direct my question to the Minister for Minerals and Energy. Will the minister inform the House of the government's effort to secure additional gas supplies to support the SAMAG project north of Port Pirie, which is on the border of the Deputy Premier's electorate and my own?

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Minerals and Energy):** I thank the member for his question because I know that he was perplexed as many members of the community were after he saw a statement released by the Leader of the Opposition on 17 September. In a rather bizarre move the Leader of the Opposition on that date distributed a press release, entitled 'Labor pledges support for magnesium plant', in which he stated in part:

I am ready to enter into discussions with SAMAG to secure adequate gas supplies.

I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition has been, certainly for the best part of this year and beyond, because clearly he has not been in this chamber listening to statements made by members of the government, be it myself, the Premier, the Deputy Premier or the Treasurer in another place, nor has he been listening to statements in the media or reading them. One might forgive in part the Leader of the Opposition for missing statements made in this chamber for we all know that often he is prone to go walkabout. The Leader of the Opposition regularly vacates his seat and does not listen to the debate that occurs here, but I would have

thought that at least his minders would make him aware of exactly what is occurring in relation to gas supplies.

For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, and obviously for the information of the House, I will detail a broad summary of exactly where the state is at in securing further gas supplies. On 19 May 2000, PIMA Mining and the state government announced a signing of a memorandum of understanding. One of the key elements of that memorandum of understanding was that the government would actively facilitate bids by private sector pipeline owners and operators to build, own and operate a new gas pipeline linking South Australia and Victoria. In signing that agreement, the government is mindful of the opportunities from the Otway Basin and also from other gas fields in Victoria to provide considerable gas volumes for the state's future needs, as well as the benefits to the PIMA Mining/SAMAG project.

Just one month later, on 19 June 2000, our government announced the request submission process and as a result there are now four serious proposals in the marketplace to source gas from not only the Otway Basin in Victoria but also the Timor Sea into South Australia. All that seems to have escaped the attention of the Leader of the Opposition. But that is not surprising. Let us recall the fact that the Leader of the Opposition was a member of the cabinet of the last Labor government. The Leader of the Opposition sat in the cabinet of the last Labor government, a government which did absolutely nothing to secure gas supplies for the future of our state. Now, Mike-come-lately is out there advocating that he is ready to sit down and negotiate about gas opportunities and the future of gas—just a tad of politics involved in that.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** Perhaps led by the nose, indeed, as one of my colleagues interjected. Why is it that as the parliament has continually been advised of this activity before, the leader either was not aware or, if he was, went out of his way to put out such a bizarre statement. It would appear that nothing—not even the truth—will ever get in the way of the leader weaving a good story. Of course, it is well known in relation to the minerals and energy portfolio that the Leader of the Opposition is prone to weaving stories; not only in his present role but also in his past role in the former Labor government. His story is infamy, where he has stamped the word 'confidential' on a report that was put out by Western Mining, trying to make out it was a secret, confidential document. The nickname 'The Fabricator' has flowed to him from there, and to this day he continues to not let the truth get in the way of what he perceives as a good story.

And the reason for the good story: the Labor shadow cabinet decided it would venture into Port Pirie. It took the whole shadow cabinet to venture into Port Pirie and surrounding regions. Is it any wonder they had to send such numbers? In the member for Frome (as the Deputy Premier) and the member for Stuart the government is ably, strongly, consistently represented in our endeavours to continue to better the lot of people's lives in that region. Both are strong members and, clearly, both are members who rankle the opposition because of their parliamentary and outside parliamentary performances.

The simple fact is that our government has strongly supported the SAMAG project since it was announced by PIMA Mining on 9 September 1998. The Leader of the Opposition only needs to look at the statements made by PIMA Mining. He can go to its web site; if he likes, I will give him the internet address; I will even sit down at the computer and help him find the site so he can read through

all the press releases to see what they have said. It matters not which press release they go to in relation to the statements they have made. Their press statements have continually highlighted the strong support of the government, particularly through the Deputy Premier, in helping to move forward their project. Indeed, the Deputy Premier said from the outset that SAMAG was a flagship project which will stimulate regional development. Indeed, it will—no thanks to the political games of the Leader of the Opposition.

As far back as February 1999 the Premier announced the establishment of a minerals task force to report to the state government on strategies to shape the future of mining opportunities, and manufacturing opportunities derived from those, including projects such as the SAMAG project. The Premier stated that at that time.

In addition to all that, as a government we granted mining leases, provided major project status to the development and helped facilitate a wide window to government approach for the SAMAG project and any issues it may have. Further, in his answer to the first question today, the Premier has also detailed that other work is being done, and that will also further enhance the opportunities of this project. As a government, we remain across the board committed to this project moving forward and to its aim to commence by 2004.

We are collectively disappointed by the childish, politically motivated and ill-informed games of the Leader of the Opposition. This project is far too important to play childish political games with, but we welcome the Leader of the Opposition growing up and sensibly supporting this project, and not just becoming a Mike-come-lately.

**INGERSON, Hon. G.A.**

**Mr WRIGHT (Lee):** My question is directed to the Premier. Given the damning indictment of the member for Bragg made by the Auditor-General today in his report on the \$41 million Hindmarsh Stadium fiasco, will the Premier immediately dismiss him as cabinet secretary and, if not, why not? I will now quote fully from the Auditor-General's Report (page 12). In relation to Mr Ingerson, the Auditor-General states:

In my opinion, the disregard shown by Mr Ingerson and his advisers to the concerns of the Public Works Committee, the Crown Solicitor's Office, the Department of Treasury and Finance and Services SA warrants criticism and must be considered to be a contributing factor to the final scope and cost of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium redevelopment project.

That is a full quote.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** I do not know whether the member for Lee was in the chamber when I answered the question from the leader—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I'll start again. I do not know whether the member for Lee was in the chamber when I answered the question from the Leader of the Opposition or whether he was just disinterested—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Lee!

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** If he wasn't listening, let me repeat that which I have already indicated to the House: the report was tabled within the last 40 minutes in this House. Whilst I have had some discussions with the Treasurer about the recommendations contained in the front of the report, I have not had an opportunity to read the entire report of some 500 or 600 pages or three volumes. I do not intend to take a

knee-jerk reaction to this matter. This matter deserves consideration, and it will be given such.

#### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** Will the Premier provide the House with the government's overview of the Auditor-General's Report which was tabled yesterday?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** Yes I can, because the annual report that was tabled yesterday highlights some matters which are worth bringing to the attention of the House, apart from the report, and just compare some track records. I note that the interest costs as a percentage of revenue show major decreases in 2000 and 2001 as a result of the government's asset disposal program. Net debt of \$9.6 billion has now been reduced to just over \$3 billion. Our net debt is projected to steadily decrease in real terms over the period of the 2001-02 budget to 2004-05. Furthermore, debt as a percentage of gross state product will continue to reduce from 7.2 per cent to 6.1 per cent in 2001.

That is a far cry from when members of the opposition were in government, when our debt was 27 per cent of gross state product on an annual basis. We have now reduced that to 6.1 per cent in this financial year. That track record of economic management and performance is unequalled by members opposite, who, in fact, presided over the financial collapse, demise and loss of confidence in South Australia. The Auditor-General also pointed out that the government's move to accrual reporting methods is working well. In fact, he makes that point in several positive references to financial reporting methods the government has undertaken. He states:

The reporting initiatives in the 2001-02 budget are sound and consistent with general practice being adopted in all Australian jurisdictions.

I also note that the Auditor-General has stated:

The new policy for contract disclosure released by the government is a positive development and a significant accountability improvement.

I have made reference to the level of debt and the reduction in debt servicing costs from 27 per cent of gross state product under Labor down to 6.1 per cent currently. Let us not forget that it was not so long ago that the Labor Party in government presided over the Remm Myer Centre which lost taxpayers \$900 million. Just one building in this state—the Remm Myer building—cost taxpayers \$900 million, and it was all their work. In addition to that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** I am glad you have mentioned 333 Collins Street, because 333 Collins Street cost the taxpayers \$560 million. Just to give a bit of diversity, the Collinsville Stud cost \$33 million and Pegasus, a lender—

*The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the Minister for Police!

*The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the Minister for Police! You have been called to order.

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:** Pegasus, a lender to Bloodstock Syndicates, cost \$79 million. We remember the National Safety Council based in Victoria; that was \$45 million. When it had its turn in government the Labor Party presided over the most disastrous collapse of financial institutions and waste of taxpayers' money that this state has ever seen in its history. The annual report tabled yesterday is in stark contrast with their track record and performance in the last decade, necessitating the restructuring and repair that has been

undertaken to the finances and debt of the state as we embark upon this new millennium. The legacy of these past 7½ years so far is that our children have a relatively unencumbered, debt free future compared with that left by Labor.

#### CICCARELLO, Mr S.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** Does the Minister for Tourism accept that she inappropriately influenced the appointment of Mr Sam Ciccarello as a consultant, and how much was Mr Ciccarello actually paid? The Auditor-General found that the basis for selection of Mr Ciccarello as a consultant in March 1997 was inappropriate. In evidence given to the Auditor-General, a former Liberal Minister for Tourism, Scott Ashenden, said that on 1 March 1997 Mrs Hall telephoned him seeking an appointment. In his evidence he said that Mrs Hall came to see him and told him that 'something had to be done' for Mr Ciccarello. She said that Mr Ciccarello had been left in the lurch and that both the Premier and the Deputy Premier agreed that Mr Ciccarello should be appointed as a consultant whatever the procedural requirements were. The Auditor-General said:

In my opinion, Mrs Hall should not have interfered in the appointment of Mr Ciccarello.

**The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism):** The Leader of the Opposition and members opposite know exactly that Sam Ciccarello was the best person to do the great job that he did.

#### RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Minister for Human Services advise the House on the recent improvements to renal dialysis services for South Australians, especially those in outer metropolitan and rural areas?

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** About a year ago, I ordered a clinical review into renal services here in South Australia. It was one of 19 clinical reviews that we have carried out in the Department of Human Services, and it looked at where the incidence of disease was and how to best deliver the services to meet the needs of those people. The full benefit that has come out of those sorts of clinical reviews, I think, is reflected in the one on renal services, and I would like to outline to the House the dramatic reorientation of the delivery of services that has been achieved as a result of the clinical review.

I announced and opened last week at Noarlunga Hospital eight new renal dialysis chairs. As a result of that, 16 patients who previously had to travel farther north to the Flinders Medical Centre are now receiving treatment at Noarlunga three times a week. Equally, from February of next year, we will be providing renal dialysis services three times a week for 40 patients at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Again, that is a significant improvement: in the past, those people have had to travel to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I know people from the Barossa Valley who have had to travel three times a week to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for services will now be able to access those services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth.

Equally, I know people from Gawler who have had to go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will now be able to access those services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. We have taken renal dialysis services that were concentrated in the centre of Adelaide and around the Queen Elizabeth Hospital out to the

far northern suburbs and the far southern suburbs and delivered the services very close, indeed, to the community.

In the country, a very similar sort of reorientation of services has occurred. In fact, if one went back two years, before the clinical review, one would see the only area in the country that delivered renal dialysis services was at Port Augusta. Port Augusta has particular demand because of the high Aboriginal population, and it is well known that the incidence of diabetes and the need for renal dialysis amongst the Aboriginal population is substantially higher than it is for the rest of the Australian population.

We have recently put \$500 000 into renal services in the country. We have recently doubled the services at the Port Augusta Hospital, and that has allowed people to stay in the Port Augusta area rather than being moved to Adelaide for their renal dialysis. We have put in two chairs at the Berri Hospital to service the Riverland; we have put in two chairs at Ceduna to deal with the high incidence of renal dialysis there; and we have put in two chairs at Murray Bridge. We have allocated the funds to put in a self-managed dialysis service at both Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier. The Port Lincoln service (and I am delighted, therefore, that the honourable member has raised this issue) will, in fact, start in December of this year, and we expect the Mount Gambier service to start probably early next year—in fact, money has been allocated by the government to establish a service there.

South Australia also has been a national leader in terms of renal transplants. Of course, for the many people who are on dialysis, the only potential escape from having to sit on a dialysis machine three times a week for about three to four hours at a time and go through a very traumatic process is, in fact, a kidney transplant. Here in South Australia, we have increased the number of kidney transplants per million head of population from 35 to 50 transplants.

That is a very substantial increase from 1994 to 1998. It is interesting to note that, in the same period in the rest of Australia, the national average increased from 25 renal transplants per million to 28. South Australia's renal transplant level is about twice the national average, and I pay a tribute to the member for Adelaide (the former Minister for Health) for the work that he did in fostering the donation of organs that has allowed a much higher level of kidney transplant to take place in South Australia. We have maintained that level and the outcome is extremely good indeed.

As a result of this clinical review, which I announced about 2½ years ago, we have been able to transform the delivery of renal services throughout South Australia. Most importantly, people who need renal dialysis will now get it much closer to their home. We have worked on the basis of trying to allow those people to live as normal a life as possible and, in many cases, to continue their work, wherever their work might be, by putting renal dialysis services close to their home and to their work. I am delighted to see such a significant transformation take place with additional resources by the state government.

#### HINDMARSH SOCCER STADIUM

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is again directed to the Premier. As head of the government, and given that the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium scandal ran across his government, does the Premier accept responsibility for the scandal, which the Auditor-General has discovered involved (and for the benefit of the Premier's reading I will give him the page numbers) withholding

evidence from the parliament and inaccurately describing events leading to the expansion of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium (page 3); that the member for Coles had a clear conflict of interest in her role as ambassador for soccer and that her failure to resign as ambassador for soccer immediately was inappropriate and a departure from proper standards of ministerial conduct (page 30); that the member for Bragg disregarded warnings about the redevelopment which escalated costs (page 12); that the government made financial commitments and entered into legal obligations on the basis of inaccurate and incomplete information in the absence of adequate analysis (page 11); that the increased expenditure was not required by SOCOG; that the budget was increased regardless of cost; that the issue of the ownership of the land should have been resolved before the taxpayers' money was committed; that the Auditor-General could not accept the claims of the member for Bragg about the destruction of documents; and that (and we are talking about page 8), under Minister Ingerson's leadership, that increase was pursued without proper or adequate due diligence (page 3)? Will the Premier now accept his responsibility as Premier—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The leader has asked his question.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —of this state and head of this government?

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

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** As I indicated to the House, I will read volume 3, which covers the detailed findings on the terms of reference. The executive summary, to which the leader has just quoted, also has two other volumes. As it relates to the detailed findings on the terms of reference, that is a volume which I hope to have the opportunity to read shortly. I have indicated to the leader that, until such time as I have a chance to read the three volumes and the 500 pages, I am not going to make off the cuff responses to the report that has come in: I will treat the report with the due regard that it deserves.

#### MENINGOCOCCAL DISEASE

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** Will the Minister for Human Services indicate whether there has been an increase in the incidence of reported cases of meningococcal infection in South Australia in recent times and whether there is any reason for extra concern by the public? There have been media reports of a meningococcal epidemic in New Zealand, as well as reports of a serious outbreak in Tasmania, resulting in several deaths.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services):** In fact, just yesterday a further statement was released of another confirmed case of meningococcal disease that occurred within the community. We went through the usual process of immediately identifying immediate contacts and, where appropriate, making sure that those people took antibiotics as a preventive measure. The number of confirmed cases of meningococcal cases this year is 20.

The honourable member asked whether there had been a substantial increase in the number of cases. I would have to say that I think that 20 would be about the same number as it was for at least the previous two years. There was a substantial increase in the number of cases of meningococcal in South Australia in 1998. I have had the opportunity to look at what has occurred in other developed countries around the world. A great deal is still not known about the disease, but

it would appear that, throughout the developed western world, the number of cases is on the increase, and then it plateaus.

It would appear that it increased back in 1998 and now has relatively plateaued. I am pleased to say that the number of deaths, however, has dropped. I think I am right in saying that so far this year there has been only one death from meningococcal. One death is too many, but certainly several years ago the number of deaths was higher than that.

One of the reasons why I believe the number of deaths has dropped is that we now have much earlier notification, and that is because we have been carrying out a regular education program with general practitioners, so they are able to identify at a very early stage the symptoms of meningococcal disease, because here is a disease where almost every 10 minutes is important in terms of identifying and diagnosing the disease and then making sure that the people with the disease have appropriate treatment. I believe that, by increasing the awareness of meningococcal disease with GPs, we have been able to identify it earlier and, as a result, reduce the number of deaths occurring.

I know that Victoria is going through a very bad period at present, with both an increase in the number of cases and an increase in the number of deaths, and I have suggested that our people pass on some of our experience here to help the people in Victoria. I know equally that they have gone through a bad period in New Zealand. It is one of those issues where about 10 per cent of the population has the bacterium in the back of the throat and in the nose that causes meningococcal. The exact reason why it suddenly flares into a quite vicious attack is not known, but a lot of work is being done.

One issue also being looked at by health authorities throughout the whole of Australia is the possibility of a vaccine. There are different types of meningococcal disease—A, B and C. The vaccine is suitable for only one of those types—I think it is type B—and the majority of the cases in South Australia are type C. As a result of that, a vaccine in South Australia, at least at this stage, would have minimal effect. However, the British government is working on a vaccine for type C, and I expect that over the next couple of years you will see further advances in the vaccine and, therefore, further positive treatment taking place to reduce the death rate in the incidence of meningococcal disease.

#### LEGAL REPRESENTATION COSTS

**Mr CONLON (Elder):** My question is directed to the Premier. Given that the Auditor-General's report into the Hindmarsh stadium is concluded, will the Premier now disclose the amount of taxpayers' money that has been paid for legal representation for the disgraced minister for sport and the Cabinet Secretary before the Auditor-General's inquiry?

**The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier):** I do not have those details available to me, and I will take the question on notice.

#### WATER RESTRICTIONS

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** Is the Minister for Government Enterprises aware of potential water restrictions for Victoria—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The chair did not actually hear to whom the question is directed.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** I will be very pleased to start again. Is the minister aware of the potential water restrictions being considered for Victoria and is there a possibility that similar restrictions may be introduced in South Australia?

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises):** I thank the member for Heysen for his important question. I am pleased to announce to the parliament the significant benefits that will accrue to South Australia because of our recent heavy rains. As everyone would realise, we live in the driest state in the driest inhabited continent and who would have predicted that we would have plentiful supplies when Victoria would be on the brink of water restrictions?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** I am informed by the member for Heysen that Western Australia already has water restrictions. In the driest state in the driest inhabited continent that is a great credit to us. Melburnians have already been warned that they will be required to use less water unless they get rain soon. As it is, they have already implemented in Victoria a 'Save three buckets a day' campaign. The three city water retailers in Melbourne have called on Melburnians to reduce water consumption by 5 per cent through the 'Save three buckets' community awareness campaign. This is because the storages in Melbourne are still extremely low, at approximately 53 per cent. There are a number of ways in which Melburnians are being asked to save the three buckets, such as reducing the length of showers, sweeping the driveways instead of hosing down, using buckets instead of the hose to wash the car, and so on. They are all good measures to preserve water in South Australia also, but it will not be a requirement.

With those restrictions, as an avid Crows supporter my heart goes out to the Vics. In South Australia our water stocks are looking much better. Above average rains, particularly last month, have helped fill our 17 reservoirs to an average of 86 per cent capacity, which is ahead of the 80 per cent reported a year ago and well in front of the 53 per cent as in Victoria. As at the end of September this year Adelaide had received just under 580 millilitres, which is about 100 millilitres more than the average. I have some personal knowledge that Emu Bay and Cape D'Estaing have not had as many millimetres as that. September was extremely wet, as anyone who went to the show would know, with nearly three times the average rain. Whilst we take no credit for the rain, it is pleasing that our reservoirs have been able to store some of this.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE:** It is unusual not to take credit, being in government, but I do not think we will. After last summer it is pleasing that our water stocks are well up. Over the summer months water consumption in Adelaide can more than double from an average of 470 million litres a day to as much as 1 150 million litres a day. The end result of all this is, as I know the Minister for Water Resources and all thinking South Australians would want, that we will have less need to pump water from the Murray and hence we will have the beneficial effect on the whole of our environment. Normally in an average year we pump about 40 per cent of our water from the Murray; in a dry year it can be up to 90 per cent. This is a real bonus and the state of our reservoirs under this government is healthy.



**ELECTRICAL PRODUCTS ACT REGULATIONS**

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Minerals and Energy)** laid on the table regulations under the Electrical Products Act 2000.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: AUSTRALIAN SCIENCE AND MATHS SCHOOL**

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** I bring up the 158th report of the committee, on the Australian Science and Maths School—Final Report, and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

That the report be published.

Motion carried.

**GRIEVANCE DEBATE**

**Mr FOLEY (Hart):** The Minister for Tourism and the Cabinet Secretary Graham Ingerson should resign by 5 p.m. today. The Auditor-General's report brought down today demonstrates that this government is rotten to the core; it is a rotten government. It has not simply named the minister and the Cabinet Secretary: there is now serious doubt over the conduct of the Premier. There is a complete breakdown in processes within government.

This report has said that good governance as we know it has gone out the door with this rotten Liberal government. The fact that the Minister for Tourism and the Cabinet Secretary did not have the decency and the commonsense to resign today shows their arrogance for government, contempt for this parliament, and indeed contempt for their Premier.

The question now will be whether over the next 23 hours Premier Olsen will have the strength as a leader and as a Premier to sack his Minister for Tourism and his Cabinet Secretary. Members should make no mistake about it: come question time tomorrow, if the Minister for Tourism is still minister and the Cabinet Secretary is still the Cabinet Secretary, this Premier has thrown out the window any semblance of good governance, good accountability, fair conduct and the appropriate processes of the Westminster system. His ministers have been found guilty by their own actions of a number of serious offences that are simply reprehensible.

The Minister for Tourism had two clear conflicts of interest. She knew it; we knew it on this side; and, sadly, members opposite knew it. Those members who were in the chamber in the last parliament can well recall the tactics employed by the then Olsen forces to undermine then Premier Dean Brown, and the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium featured as a significant issue in that undermining of the then Premier. There are many members in this House who know full well the history of this sordid affair. The sadness here today is that, after in excess of eight years of Liberal government, we find that it is a government rotten to the core. It is a government that threw out all proper process; a government that broke every rule; a government that broke every convention; a government that appointed its mates such as Sam Ciccarello; a government that so recklessly tried to court the soccer community; and a government that so recklessly was

prepared to buy votes from the soccer community that it spent in excess of \$41 million.

The Auditor-General has found today that that money need not have been spent. We still could have had soccer here in South Australia. That is \$41 million less for our hospitals, schools and police. Have members ever seen a greater example of a government with the wrong priorities?

*The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:*

**Mr FOLEY:** The member for Unley should sit quietly, because I remember his role in this affair, going back to his time when he was a lead numbers man for the Olsen forces. The fact of the matter is—

**The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL:** I rise on a point of order, sir. Either the member for Hart has threatened me or he has impugned me with an improper motive. Neither is tolerated by this House and I ask him to withdraw.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**Mr FOLEY:** This is a government that is rotten to the core. Minister Hall has demonstrated not just her incompetence and her negligence but her recklessness. She knew that what she was doing was wrong; she knew that what she was doing was inappropriate, but she did not care. She must resign by 5 p.m. today, as should Graham Ingerson, the Cabinet Secretary. Their failure to do that will mean that the Premier will have to sack them both by tomorrow and, if John Olsen has not got the courage to sack his minister and his Cabinet Secretary, then he should be sacked as the Premier of this state.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister for Police to go into the gallery or return to his seat.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I rise to draw the attention of the House to remarks made this morning by the member for Hart on ABC radio in respect of the Adelaide Festival of Arts. I think it is time that this House and the people of South Australia understood where the Labor Party is coming from in relation to funding of the arts. The member for Hart was savaged this morning on ABC radio when he attempted to criticise the Minister for the Arts in regard to her decisions about reinforcing next year's Adelaide Festival of Arts.

The member for Hart claims that the extra government investment in the Festival of Arts is apparently scandalous. He wants it taken away. This is a predictable knee-jerk reaction, with no regard to the facts or consequences, and it is very typical of what we are hearing from the opposition at the moment. It is carping and whingeing, and it is an indication that the razor will be out for arts funding if the opposition gets control of the Treasury benches, and that the Festival of Arts and other arts events in this state face the razor as they have never seen it before.

There is no budget blow-out. The Festival is still working within the budget parameters signed off by Peter Sellars and approved by the board in July. There will always be some movement, some give and take, within any budget. What the Festival faced was essentially a shortfall in fundraising. It set itself an ambitious target to raise funds from corporate sponsorship. The board has not failed in this task. The Festival's fundraising efforts are in fact ahead of those of previous years, and certainly above the total money raised by either the recent Brisbane or Melbourne festivals.

As I said, from the outset the board set an ambitious fundraising target for 2002. Therefore, the format of the 2002 Festival provides for lower than usual box office, higher than

usual up-front costs and a higher fundraising requirement. I repeat that, essentially, the biggest shortfall is in fundraising.

After doing a reality check this month, following the World Trade Centre tragedy and the Ansett collapse—events that I hope members opposite have not missed—there has been a financial impact projected for the Festival. Even the member for Hart, in radio interviews today, admitted that these events have had an impact. But in the next breath he will not concede that this has had an effect on finances to program the event. If you want to be the Treasurer, you need to be able to add up; and, if you want to be the Treasurer, you need to realise that you need to fund all the responsibilities of government, not just health and police—things on which the Labor Party decided it wanted to run a campaign. You also need to fund the arts. It is vitally important to people's wellbeing and their sense of being Australian and South Australian.

This government, unlike Labor if the member for Hart gets to be the Treasurer, has been supporting all government's responsibilities. It supports health; it supports education; and it supports police. All those expenditures have increased. It is not a case of 'either/or', as the member for Hart claimed on ABC radio this morning. I must say it was quite enjoyable, just before I left to come to work, to hear Phillip Satchel absolutely savage him on the radio.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I haven't heard both—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** It has been some time since I have heard ABC commentators savage opposition members, as occurred this morning. According to the member for Hart, the Adelaide Festival is a disaster waiting to happen. Is this the view shared by the ALP? I have not heard from the Leader of the Opposition or from any other members opposite. Do you all agree that the Festival of Arts is a waste of money and that it is heading for disaster? We on this side of the chamber do not; we think it is a South Australian icon. I ask the leader and other members: do you stand by the member for Hart's comments? We have had an indication of what lies in store for the arts if Labor gets control—slash the festival, slash the arts. We do not agree with that. The Labor Party has abandoned one of its core constituencies. Our minister is standing up for it, and our government will adequately fund it and is happy to make up the shortfall in fundraising that has been forced upon us by events. We will stand up for the Festival of Arts. If the Labor Party will not, South Australia will be the loser.

Time expired.

**Ms BREUER (Giles):** I wish to raise a number of issues today, and I am pleased to see the Minister for Police and Correctional Services is here. Recently in the break, I spent time in the Pitjantjatjara lands, where one of the major issues at present involves violence, much of which is due to the petrol sniffing problem of which we are all aware. In recent months, there have been a number of serious incidents. While I was there I attended a meeting over two days of the Anangu Pitjantjatjara community. One of their major issues is that they want police officers based in Umuwa, which is central to the Pitjantjatjara lands. It is a small community which is the headquarters for Nganampa Health Council and some of the other services that operate in the lands.

The people in the lands are very concerned about this violence issue, and they are concerned particularly about the fact that, if the police are called in, it takes them two to

2½ hours to come into the lands from Marla, where they are currently based. If a police officer were based in Umuwa, it would be much easier to get from there to the surrounding communities. Police aides do operate in the lands, but they do not have the same authority as police officers have. To put police officers into Umuwa, they need two police houses, and this is the big problem. Some \$500 000 is needed to put those two houses there. While it is recognised there is a need for these houses to go in there, nobody in the government seems prepared to commit that money to put the police officers into Umuwa and deal with some of the issues of alcohol, drug trafficking, petrol sniffing and domestic violence, all of which are frightening those communities.

Another issue I have discussed with the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs was that in November those communities will be celebrating their 20 years and are looking for some support for that celebration. It is important for those communities to celebrate their independence at this time, and I urge the minister to look at their requests for funding those celebrations. While I was there, I called into Lamina, which is the new opal mining community north of Marla. It is a growing community, with some 500 people there at this stage, and I was pleasantly surprised at how big the community is and how well it is growing.

One of the major concerns for those people is that, when they stake their claim, there is a three week delay before they can work that claim. Their claims are only for three months, so effectively they are losing nearly a quarter of that time in bureaucracy and red tape before they can start work. If people start work on Monday, they do not have to wait three weeks before they sit in their desk and get paid. This is a real anomaly and unfair to the miners. They have to sit around for three weeks and wait for the claims to be processed and then, effectively, get only some nine weeks or so to work their three month claims. I would like to see that anomaly examined and sorted out.

I have discussed in the House before the issue of mining inspectors. At one stage, there was a mining inspector at Andamooka, Coober Pedy and a couple of others operating around the place. At Lamina it is expected that some people go into Coober Pedy to stake their claims, while others go into Marla to do so, and this involves travelling a distance of some 75 kilometres. If it was possible to have a mining inspector to work at Lamina, it would make life much easier for those miners. The situation now is such that they have to take days off from work and head in to make their claim and, often when they get to Marla, the inspector is not working and it has been a wasted visit.

Because of the size of my electorate, I travel long distances and I am very aware of the problems of distance driving and also the problems of maintenance of country roads. Recently, I was interested to hear of the extension of the freeway to Noarlunga costing some \$147 million. I recognise that there are benefits to the people in the south, but it will save those people 10 minutes on their travel time and will save them going through 15 sets of traffic lights. 'Whoopy-do!' say the people in the country, because a lot of our roads are real problems. The lack of maintenance of some of those roads is incredible; for example, only 4½ kilometres of the Ungarra-Lipson Road is left to be sealed. This is an essential road for the harvest trucks, for school buses and family cars, and it has caused great problems over the years. People in the area acknowledge that money has been put in, and most of the road has been sealed, but nobody has committed to that last 4½ kilometres. The equipment is all

there at present. It is ludicrous that these people are missing out because of a lack of funding for a project that is so important to that community.

Time expired.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** As Tracie McPherson said in the Messenger, tonight the elected representatives of the council of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters will have to make a decision. A proposal to sell the Payneham Civic Centre will be decided one way or the other tonight, Tracie McPherson reports. The decision lies with this local government body's representatives. As members would know, we have three levels of government, and the decision to sell the former Payneham Civic Centre site rests with the councillors, who I believe should decide in the best interests of the community. I, like the member for Norwood, believe that the decision should be made in the best interests of the community.

On 12 September, I gave a commitment to the community to represent their views to both council and government regarding the proposal of the J.P. Morgan project on the former council site. It is my responsibility as a state member, as it is the responsibility of the state member for Norwood, to represent the community's interests at a state level and to listen to the concerns at a local level. I have done so, and I will continue to represent the concerns of my constituents. That is why I have made representation to the local council and presented to it a petition of 1 500 signatures of people opposed to this proposal.

I also wrote and presented a petition to the Hon. Rob Lucas, the Minister for Industry and Trade. As I said in the letter, I was pleased that after putting the concerns of the RSL to J.P. Morgan they responded and adjusted the footprint of the project to enable the memorial garden to stay in the current location. I made further representation on behalf the former councillor, Kevin Duke, and former Payneham Mayors, Ray Williams and John Minney, and on behalf of the 1 500 petitioners, with the expectation of more signatories, as was pointed out at last week's public meeting showing that there is still strong opposition to the proposed construction of the building on the former Payneham council site.

I can understand the concerns of the petitioners, for I have been a resident of that area since childhood. However, the decision about whether or not to go ahead rests with the council. Members opposite would know that as state members we have no power of veto and no right to interfere with a local government decision. I have great concerns about the Cross of Remembrance and the Memorial Gardens. That is the reason why, after the first public meeting, I contacted J.P. Morgan and Industry and Trade and after a week was able to adjust the footprint of the proposed development to enable the RSL's concerns to be addressed. I did that in a week. Like many members, on Anzac Day I attend the dawn service at the Payneham Civic Centre site and I know how important it is to the community. I have continued to voice their concerns. I must commend J.P. Morgan for adjusting the footprint to take that importance into account. That is the reason why I was disappointed that in the Messenger Press of last week it was reported that my claim could not be confirmed.

Time expired.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** I rise today to speak about the public education system in South Australia and to bring to the attention of the House the concerns of my constituents, who are becoming increasingly distressed by the direction the

government is taking in relation to funding for public schools. I want to put on the record my commitment to the public education system, as both my sisters and their husbands are teachers, and the father of my children is a teacher in the public system, so I can talk at first hand about the system and the wonderful results it achieves. I acknowledge the dedicated teachers who have been responsible educators, despite the trying circumstances in which they have been placed and within which they continue to operate.

I understand full well the trials of being a teacher, having been acquainted with many through my family associations and in both my public and professional life. I also understand how much harder the job is when the government is not philosophically or fiscally supportive of the important role of the schools. I acknowledge the longstanding commitment of the teachers of this state and the parents who support the system, and I also support the work of the Australian Education Union in representing its members in the ongoing struggle for the government to recognise the important position that teachers have in our communities.

Of course, parents can never resist telling their children that their school days are the best days of their life and that they should value the time they have at school. We tell them it is an opportunity to be free of adult responsibility, to question and to learn, to make friends and to set goals for the future. How can we really expect our children to value their educational experience as much as we want or need them to if we cannot prove to them that we value the system by supporting their schools, teachers and curriculum? Public education has been cut every year since 1993, and the public is sick of it. Our teachers are our state education system's greatest asset. I believe we all have the responsibility to ensure that their jobs are respected and supported.

Now, three months into this financial year, the education budget is in deep trouble and schools may not get some of the maintenance works they have been so desperately seeking. Last week in parliament the education minister confirmed that the Olsen government is looking for a further 2 per cent cut in the education budget this year on top of the \$181 million in cuts that have been imposed over the three year period to 2001. However, a 2 per cent cut represents millions of dollars—

**Ms White:** Thirty million!

**Ms BEDFORD:** It represents \$30 million, which appears to be being shuffled into a gaping hole in the state budget. Further to that, budget papers show that the cash reserves of the education budget have been whittled away over the past two years from \$144 million in 1999-2000 to \$64 million at the beginning of this financial year and that these reserves are also fast drying up. It gets worse. Added to this crisis is the necessity to budget for the pending and deserved pay rise for teachers which the budget papers say will cost the education area an extra \$27 million this financial year. At a conference at the Adelaide Town Hall last weekend we also saw that teacher shortages have again been highlighted as crucial. The minister must guarantee that money is earmarked for school repairs and maintenance and teacher training, and that it is not being used to prop up other departmental expenditure or being syphoned off into other budget areas.

Today in the release of the Auditor-General's report into the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium and yesterday in his annual reports we have seen many areas of overspending by this government, including the Wine Centre, the Holdfast Shores development and the Convention Centre. This waste is

costing us dearly in the important areas of education and health, and these must be our priorities.

Primary years are perhaps the most vital, and I would like to speak about the Hands Up for Primary campaign, which highlights the eight priority areas of need in primary education. It talks about the general disappointment following the introduction of Partnerships 21, as principals have indicated that the expected benefits and flexibility promised by the government have not been delivered and that the workload in schools has been increased. In August 2000 our leader, Mike Rann, released Labor's direction statement for education and announced that education would be a top priority for a new Labor government.

I also take the opportunity to tell the House about a recent visit from one of my schools, the wonderful Modbury South Primary School, which came to visit parliament and held one of its class meetings here. It was a 6-7 composite class led by two exceptional teachers, Deb McMahon and Vicki Moir. The children were very well behaved, and one of the other members who came into the chamber was extremely impressed with the outstanding way they ran their meeting.

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** Let me state at the outset—where I left off yesterday—that I wonder what the hell the senior policy adviser to the Minister for Primary Industries and Resources and Deputy Premier has been doing all these years, when we have seen an epidemic of broomrape spread yet again this year. The policy the government is pursuing is entirely inappropriate. Mr Barry Featherston must accept some of the responsibility for that, yet he seeks to represent those people whom he substantially disadvantaged—not all of them, because now some of them live in Schubert. I learnt today that the outbreak has spread across the boundaries of my electorate and has now been found in the electorate of Schubert. Let me say to the House and I will say no more about that on this occasion: if allowed to establish itself in southern Australia, that weed will cost this nation \$15 billion a year in lost income or higher cost in producing broad leaved broadacre crops, legumes, and all horticultural crops almost without exception, where they are annuals. That means mostly vegetables, but some fruit, depending on how you define it.

Let me now turn to an even more sinister kind of incompetence that we have seen from this government. Let me quote what the Auditor-General put in his report today about the Hindmarsh stadium, when he quotes the Supreme Court of South Australia, as follows:

It is trite to say that, in *Briginshaw v. Briginshaw*, the High Court made the point that, where the civil onus of proof on the balance of probabilities is applicable, nevertheless, as Dixon J put it, the weight of evidentiary material which will bring a court to accept that the onus is discharged in a particular case will necessarily need to take into account the seriousness of an allegation made, the inherent unlikelihood of an occurrence or a given description or the gravity of the consequences flowing from a particular finding.

As he so forcefully pointed out, reasonable satisfaction is not a state of mind that is attained or established independently of the nature and consequence of the fact or facts to be proved.

He goes on and, relying on that sort of approach, tells us in the summary (and I have not had time to look at all this; I have only just got back from Pinnaroo):

In light of the evidence I have obtained, I do not accept Mr Ingerson's submission that I cannot legitimately rely on the documents produced to me as presenting a full chronology of the relevant events because documents were shredded.

Earlier he had pointed out that Mr Ingerson alleged that documents were shredded by Minister Ashenden in or after October 1997 and that it was not possible for him to vindicate himself.

**An honourable member:** A likely story!

**Mr LEWIS:** Yes; a likely story. I called this whole charade of my own volition and without conversation with anyone, least of all anyone in the Auditor-General's office. It was crooked and corrupt and, in my judgment, the ministers involved in it—those people still remaining in this parliament, the members for Morphet, Bragg and Coles—deserved condemnation. The Auditor-General has had some fairly scathing things to say and he has the opportunity—indeed, he has responsibility—to look at everything, which I was not able to look at even though I sought to do so. As Chairman of the Public Works Committee, I and other responsible members of that committee—the members for Elizabeth, Reynell and MacKillop—at the time sought information in the documents. They denied that such documents existed or refused to give us access to them and gave us a stack of completely irrelevant papers.

The total cost that the Auditor-General has found is not \$8 million, as it was intended to be, or another \$18 million or \$20 million, or even \$35 million or \$36 million, as government ministers have said, and it did not come in on cost, on time or under budget or any such nonsense as Minister Ingerson has said from time to time, or as, I understand, Minister Hall has said, but it cost \$41 million—the whole charade. That is what it has cost South Australians for that. It should never have been allowed to go ahead. The Auditor-General points out:

What was built was entirely the decision of cabinet, based on recommendations put forward from time to time by the proponent ministers, Mr Ingerson and Mr Ashenden.

And they were doing so on the compromised advice, position and representations being made to them (and these are my words, not his) by the Minister for Tourism, Mrs Hall. He further states:

... Mrs Hall weakened her constitutional obligation of due watchfulness and placed herself in a position whereby she was not able to effectively discharge her public responsibilities on behalf of the community. Having regard to the influence that was sought to be exercised by the soccer federation, this situation, in my opinion, compromised the operation of the internal controls within government.

What could be more damning? I say again: they should be ashamed of themselves. But they do not know what crime they have committed. They just do not understand what being a member of parliament and committing to honesty and integrity of information provided really means.

Time expired.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON ADELAIDE PARK LANDS PROTECTION

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services):** I move:

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

Motion carried.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: OLD NOARLUNGA SCHEME PROJECT**

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I move:

That the 157th report of the committee, on the Old Noarlunga Scheme Project—Final Report, be noted.

The Public Works Committee has examined the proposal to apply \$7.5 million of taxpayers' funds to construct the Old Noarlunga sewerage scheme project. Old Noarlunga, located on the Onkaparinga River, is one of the last developed areas within metropolitan Adelaide not yet provided with sewerage facilities. The total population of Old Noarlunga is 1 145, and the average household size is 2.7 people.

At present, the waste water of the township of Old Noarlunga is largely serviced by septic tanks. The operation of a septic tank depends on the draining properties of the adjacent soil. The clay-type soils encountered at Old Noarlunga township hindered the soakage of effluent, thereby allowing some effluent to reach the waters of the Onkaparinga River by ground surface flow and seepage. That is not acceptable. In December 1999, cabinet endorsed in principle the construction of the Old Noarlunga township sewerage scheme due to the risk to public health and the environment and the support of the local residents for the scheme. The minister announced that approval has been given to proceeding to the next stage of project development. Subsequently, a concept plan for the project was completed in June 2000. SA Water proposes to construct approximately 10 500 metres of 150 millimetre sewer main; approximately 500 metres of 225 millimetre sewer main; approximately 550 sewer connections to private properties; approximately 1 100 metres of pumping main; three new waste water pumping stations; and purchase of land for three pumping stations (including a site history review of each site) and easement acquisitions through approximately 40 allotments.

The committee was told that the total capital cost of the project is estimated to be \$7.5 million, including GST. In addition, construction of the scheme will result in total additional operating costs of about \$22 000 per annum. It is also expected that there will be costs of approximately \$27 000 every 10 years for replacement of pumping station telemetry and approximately \$50 000 about every 15 years for replacement of submersible pumps. However, the precise timing and level of expenditure is difficult to predict and is dependent on factors which include operating history and technological change.

A financial analysis, which assesses the impact of the project on SA Water alone, indicates a net present value loss of about \$4.3 million to SA Water and a benefit cost ratio of 0.27. The corresponding economic evaluation indicates a net present value to the state of about \$20 000 and a benefit cost ratio of 1.0.

The committee was told that SA Water has considered numerous alternative options for the project and concluded that a conventional sewerage scheme is the only solution that provides an acceptable medium to long-term outcome, with minimal risks from an environmental and public health perspective. The project has been factored into SA Water's forward estimates for 2001-02 to 2004-05. Accordingly, the project will not impact target contribution levels and borrowings. The entire project is scheduled for completion by December 2003. Construction is being staged over three financial years to minimise the financial impact of the project on SA Water's capital works program.

The committee has been told that there is not universal support for the installation of the proposed sewerage system. The committee is told that many residents are concerned about the costs they expect to bear in order to meet the contribution costs and the extra expense of having their houses connected to the system. The committee shares their concerns in relation to some home owners. The committee accepts that the proposed sewerage scheme will provide a safer, more reliable form of effluent disposal. The committee notes that a STED scheme could have provided a similar benefit at significantly lower cost, and that the Old Noarlunga community will receive considerable public subsidy.

The committee understands that the community of Old Noarlunga has had an expectation that their township would be sewered and that government statements to this effect over the past decade or more have supported this belief. Nevertheless, the committee is aware that several communities across the state are waiting for funding to install STED schemes—a list that has seen waiting times as long as 33 years. Although funding from the most recent state budget has ameliorated this waiting list to an extent, these communities will still face delays. The committee feels that these communities deserve adequate sewerage facilities as much as does the population of Old Noarlunga. Pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee recommends the proposed public work.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services):** I rise to support the Public Works Committee report, having noted the report and bearing in mind that it involves my current electorate. Of course, Mr Deputy Speaker, I was privileged enough to have had you there before me, and you are still held in the highest esteem by the residents of Old Noarlunga: they often talk about their fine times with you. I have had a lot of fine times with the community of Old Noarlunga, and I am saddened that, due to electoral redistribution and redrawing of the boundaries, Old Noarlunga will not be in my electorate at the next election. I felt that it was an area that should have stayed within Mawson: it had common interests with McLaren Vale and the Willunga Basin and the Fleurieu Peninsula. Nevertheless, that decision was made.

However, it is business as usual when it comes to my commitment to the Old Noarlunga township. It has been a very long, drawn out and difficult process to obtain approval to implement this sewerage scheme in Old Noarlunga. I want to commend the commitment of the traders' association, the residents' association, the Neighbourhood Watch association and the institute committee and thank them for all their lobbying and their support (with me as their local member) to have this project approved. As I said, I am delighted to see that the Public Works Committee has supported the government's initiative and commitment to this scheme.

We live in a very fragile world today, with respect to not only terrorism but also our environment. We cannot any longer afford to see sewage not treated to a tertiary capacity being pumped out on roadways and vacant blocks, particularly in an area such as Old Noarlunga, where the water table is so close to the surface and is subject to flooding. Much good work is being done by our government—and I acknowledge also some work done by the former federal Labor government in developing the wetlands and improving the environment in the lower estuary of the Onkaparinga River. Certainly, many times when doorknocking in that area (especially early in the morning on a weekend) I have seen septic tanks being

pumped out onto the roadway or onto vacant blocks. This is grossly unsatisfactory. I was always very concerned that there may have been an outbreak of meningitis or a similar disease that could have been very detrimental to the community, particularly the precious young people of that community. So, there is a good outcome here, after a lot of hard work.

I know that some people in the triangle, in the higher area there, were not so pleased to see this sewerage system introduced, because they felt that their septic systems were working properly. However, I do not believe that very many of the base septic systems do work properly after they have been in place for some time. Whilst there is some cost, all of us have costs—even those of us who are farmers who do not have mains water and do not have sewerage systems have costs to maintain our bores, water systems and our septic systems. But, at the end of the day, all of us have a responsibility to our community, to our environment, to the long-term future of generations to come and to South Australia to ensure that we do not pollute.

I was very pleased to see that the government, through Minister Armitage and SA Water, has made a substantial contribution—in fact, I think this contribution is above the norm—and I know that good loan facilities at quite low interest rates were also provided. Of course, if pensioners were finding it difficult, they did not have to pay for this scheme at all; it could become a small mortgage on their property that only had to be paid out, if required, once they sold their property. Everyone has been accommodated in this initiative as best as is possible. We have very good work going on, by and large, by water catchment management boards—and, again, Mr Deputy Speaker, I know that, sadly, you are retiring: we would love to have had you here in government with us next term; you have made a magnificent contribution with respect to the environment.

I think that you, sir, have the longest standing record as environment minister of any minister in the South Australian parliamentary system. I think that you were the minister for the environment for about seven years. You have left a very positive legacy for future generations. One of those legacies was the development of the new Water Resources Act, as well as the development of the water catchment management boards. Again, whilst people do not like paying (I do not like taking money out of my pocket), we have a responsibility, and if collectively we contribute we will achieve good outcomes. We must stop untreated effluent or effluent that is not in a tertiary form flowing into the catchment areas.

We must stop it and this is a positive step in the right direction. Yes, as the member for Hammond has said, a lot more can be done, and I acknowledge that. Many more towns need to have STED and sewerage schemes put in place. We have gone a long way in a short time. As we become more financial, clearly, this will be one of the priority areas. The community of Old Noarlunga, and all those people who live in the southern area, enjoy the pristine beaches at Southport with its great surf-life saving club, ably led by a fantastic committee. Many young people and families in that area surf at that beach and canoe and row along the River Onkaparinga.

I often see people early in the morning fishing on the estuary. All those people deserve the best possible water quality in the Onkaparinga River. I cannot wait now to see the excavators move in and, once and for all, establish a proper sewerage system for the community of Old Noarlunga. I am very proud to support and work with them and I congratulate each and every person in the community for their efforts to

ensure that, together with the government, this project is now coming to fruition.

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** I support the committee's majority report and emphasise that the committee did have some reservations about this scheme. Again, we heard from the minister about his rose-coloured view of the world. It is nice to be optimistic and it is nice to see things in a positive way, but it is not nice to deny facts again and again, as the minister does. The minister was the only member of the Public Works Committee who thought that the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium was properly managed; who thought that the processes of inquiry into the soccer stadium were adequate and appropriate; and who accused other people of being political when they kept asking questions about it.

If the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, and other things, bothers to read the report, he will find that taking the realistic view of what was happening in relation to the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium was the accurate way to go. That was the way to go in the best interests of the people of South Australia. It would, in fact, have been the best way to go in the interests of his government. His government is now in a very unenviable position, because it would not allow the Public Works Committee to pursue its inquiries properly. The only member of the Public Works Committee who did not want to wholeheartedly pursue those inquiries was the member for Mawson, who was then a member of the Public Works Committee.

In relation to the Noarlunga sewerage scheme, my comments have relevance. The main reason I supported the majority report was that the uncertainty imposed upon the people of Old Noarlunga by the member for Mawson and various other Liberal candidates over the past 10 years or so has led to the situation where action was required.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** I rise on a point of order, sir. When Labor was in office it refused to establish this scheme—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order.

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE:** —as the community of Old Noarlunga knows.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The member for Reynell.

**Ms THOMPSON:** Thank you, sir; I am sure that the minister knew that there was no point of order. My point is that various members of the Liberal Party travelled around Old Noarlunga and the area promising people a sewerage scheme without looking at the evidence. Again and again, that mob opposite fails to look at the evidence. The result of these promises to the people was disunity in the town and problems for the City of Onkaparinga. Ultimately, I felt that we had no option but to support the sewerage scheme because, understandably, the situation had been allowed to drift by many residents to the point where a sewerage scheme was required.

These people had been told—over the time of the last two elections—that they would get a scheme. Naturally, they did not undertake expensive repairs to their septic tanks, nor the required pumping out and maintenance. When the matter was put to the community at a meeting to discuss the matter, there was not majority support—certainly there was not the two-thirds support required. So, what happened? Members opposite continued to have meetings until the town's community reached the stage where enough of them had to agree. However, there is still division in the town.

I was contacted only two weeks ago by someone complaining about the amount of money they will have to find out of their pockets to pay not only for the sewerage to go past their door but also for the connection to their home. Yes, I acknowledge that, for the very poorest, there is a scheme whereby they will be able to have their charges put against the transfer of the property, and I am very pleased that this has happened. But for many others—who are on low incomes but not at that level—they will find themselves severely stretched in order to meet those costs that are imposed on them.

The City of Onkaparinga has spent probably tens of thousands of hours trying to find a way around the situation in an effort to meet the needs of residents, to try to assist them in minimising the costs that will be incurred but with no ultimate agreement as to what was to happen. People will be facing costs that they did not want, all because certain people were busy running around promising things before they had looked at the evidence in terms of what was required. We will hear later from the member for Hammond about how a STED scheme could have met the needs.

I believe that, in the end, this was not possible. However, 10, five or four years ago a STED scheme may very well have met and probably did meet the needs of the people of Old Noarlunga and would not have imposed the costs on either them or the state that will now be imposed as a result of various members of the Liberal Party and Liberal candidates promising a sewerage scheme. People wanted safe and secure disposal of their sewage: they did not necessarily want a sewerage scheme. I do contend that we have now reached the stage where that was the answer.

These are members of the metropolitan community and they have a right to expect that they would have their sewage disposed of cleanly, safely and quickly without facing ongoing problems and difficulties. However, this has all been compounded by people who run around with rose-coloured glasses, making promises without researching what is really going on. On this basis, I do support the majority report. In fact, I had a large hand in writing some of the recommendations. However, this is a matter which, again, has been poorly handled by this government. People will face costs and they are costs that result from the actions of this government.

As I have said, the City of Onkaparinga has done an excellent job working with the community and the government in an effort to reach a resolution of this situation, and my sympathies and support go to them. That is sufficient, really. It is a very sad situation in which we find ourselves where people have to pay more than they should as a result of poor handling of this matter by the government.

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** Whilst the other members of the committee may choose to state that the proposed scheme will provide a safe, more reliable form of effluent disposal, we know—all of us on that committee—that the contrary is true. In evidence provided to the committee, it was stated that the alternative STED scheme would be equally safe and no less reliable as a form of effluent disposal. Let me emphasise, with every possible muscle in my political being, that I hold the view, based on evidence given to the committee, that a STED scheme would have provided a similar benefit at a significantly lower cost to government, that is, to taxpayers.

I do not dispute the benefits that come. I simply say that it would have been at a much lower cost that we achieved the same outcome. The other four members of the committee, two of them Liberal and two of them Labor, acknowledged

my view that the old Noarlunga community will therefore now receive a considerable public subsidy, which is considered unnecessary and has therefore delayed the access of other South Australian communities around the state which are on a waiting list for their STED schemes to get access to those STED schemes and have them installed.

All members of the committee know that an examination of the projected costs of the proposed system indicates that a subsidy of more than \$6 500 per person is being given to the population of Old Noarlunga, whereas the proposing agency's submission to us as a committee shows that under a STED scheme the cost would be only \$3.5 million. That means that there is an additional subsidy of \$3 000 a head for the people who live there to have the old Noarlunga township seweraged, which is quite unnecessary—every one of those \$3 000 for every one of the several hundred people who live there. The figures therefore reflect the extent of the premium being paid for this sewage reticulation scheme, where a STED scheme could have been used.

I accept the substance of the information contained in the report and the first three parts of section 3, up to and including paragraph 3.7. It is at paragraph 3.8 in the major report that I depart from my colleagues on the committee. I note that the committee has been told that the capital cost of providing sewerage to other parts of the metropolitan area has been met as part of the capital cost in developing raw land for urban occupation. It is all built into the cost of that land. Moreover, we are told by the proponent agency that certain land-holders in Old Noarlunga who are concession card holders and/or who could not or will not meet the expense of their share of the cost of the property have been advised (and this was given in evidence to the committee, and not some announcement made recently) that they may in law make arrangements to defer the costs until such time as the land title changes hands. So, there is no reason why it should not go ahead.

I feel that the other residents of South Australia are no less deserving of adequate septic effluent disposal or sewerage facilities than are the people who live in Old Noarlunga. Accordingly, I believe that the selection and recommendation relating to sewerage, which was option 2, has resulted in an unnecessarily large expenditure of taxpayers' dollars for no additional health benefits or environmental benefits that could not otherwise have been provided by a STED scheme such as has been provided to people who live in other communities in the metropolitan area in South Australia, near Gawler, for instance, on the Para River and outside the metropolitan area in towns and settlements along the Murray River. They use STED schemes.

Both major political parties, if we look at the reasons for this, over the past decade or so had MPs and ministers going into Old Noarlunga and candidates attempting to win political favour with the voters of Old Noarlunga and create the expectation that their township will be 'sewered' when in fact the idiots should have been telling them, 'We'll get rid of all your effluent' and connected their septic disposal systems to a STED scheme, as is happening everywhere else in the state. But it will take over 33 years, even at the increased rate of contribution from the government. It is my strong opinion that to adopt the sewerage project option is a blatant political pork-barrelling exercise intended to avoid embarrassment of both the ALP and the Liberal Party. It is then to the detriment of the public interest across the rest of the state.

The other residents of South Australia are no less deserving of adequate septic effluent disposal or sewerage facilities than are the people who live in Old Noarlunga. There is no

doubt that it will result in a unnecessarily large expenditure of taxpayers' funds, and the result could have been obtained through a STED scheme. Other members of the committee are mistaken in their belief that this higher cost option will not cost the taxpayers of South Australia more and/or will not result in a greater level of borrowings and/or will not result in a higher level of taxation than would otherwise have been necessary. It must, by definition, because it does cost more.

Another thing about which I have concerns in the majority report is a simple error of fact. The committee was told that the project has been factored into South Australian Water's forward estimates for the financial year 2001 through 2005, that is, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 into the end of that financial year to 30 June 2005. Yet I note that in the submission we received the entire project, we were told, was scheduled for completion by 2003. The committee was told that a significant number, albeit a minority of the residents in Noarlunga, do not support the installation. That is sad because they are not going to have to meet the cost of it if they do not want to or cannot until they sell their land—until it changes hands. They can live there for the rest of their life as far as that goes, so they have an additional benefit over and above people elsewhere who have to pay up front as part of the cost of developing their raw land.

In the final analysis, I remain concerned that other members of the committee are mistaken in their belief that the cause of the high water table in Old Noarlunga, as they say in the majority report, is what they have chosen to describe as clay soil. It is not. The soil is in fact loam. The shallow depth of the water table under the township is not related to the soil texture at all. It is primarily determined by the mean water level in the river channel. The enormous amount of additional water added to the shallow water table in the soil upon which Old Noarlunga sits arises from the more recent higher volume use practices of householders who have installed greater numbers of automatic washing machines and dishwashers and who engage in other domestic ablution practices in their homes than was the case when the sites were first occupied in the township over 150 years ago. This has created the health risks, the subsidising pavement and the increased salt damp problems in their township, as well as creating the environmental pollution in the adjacent waters of the Onkaparinga, all of which must now be addressed.

I have no quarrel with the rest of the committee or the minister at the bench (the member for Mawson, the Minister for Emergency Services). I have no quarrel with the need for the environment to be cleaned up, but it has cost us \$3 500 per head more to do it with a sewerage scheme than with a STED scheme. I know that several communities in the rest of rural and regional South Australia are waiting for funding to install STED schemes, and they are on a list which it is known will take 33 years to complete at the current increased \$4 million a year level of funding which was recently announced earlier this year by the Premier.

In all the circumstances and in all conscience, I could not, in the light of those facts, cover up what the Liberal Party and Labor party ministers, MPs and candidates over the years have wanted to bury under the carpet, namely, the unnecessary extra expense so that it does not embarrass any of their members. They have simply decided to pork-barrel the deal and get themselves off the hook. That is sad. I thought we could do better than that.

Motion carried.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That the 156th report of the committee, on the Adelaide Festival Centre Redevelopment Stage 2, Phase 2—Status Report, be noted.

(Continued from 26 September. Page 2257.)

**Mr LEWIS (Hammond):** The remarks that I was making on this project commended it, as far as it goes, and drew attention to the benefits that it will provide in the precinct in which it is occurring, it being the Adelaide Festival Redevelopment, stage 2, phase 2, status report. Sadly, the notes on my speech which I have loaned have not reappeared for me, and I do not know where they are. I do not ascribe responsibility to anyone else but myself for coming in here without those notes.

I could speculate about where they might have gone or where they might be, but I will not. I again point out that it is sad that, because two of the Minister for Transport's portfolios—the other one being the Arts—did not talk to each other, we now have a botch of the way in which traffic will get into Festival Drive from King William Road, especially that traffic travelling southwards up King William Road towards the city. Also, we have missed an outstanding opportunity to do away with the pedestrian crossing on King William Road in front of the Festival Theatre.

We could have built underneath the road a tunnel that would enable pedestrians who come from further along the terrace and maybe from the railway station—and a large percentage of those are students of the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia who study in the campus areas further east, and their lecturers, I guess, too—quite safely and in complete shelter to pass from the Festival Centre precinct without disrupting the flow of the traffic southwards and out of the city northwards.

The levels of Festival Drive inside the Festival Centre are compatible with the levels of the carriageway heading south if that carriageway were to be sunk under the pavement of King William Road and would allow a right-hand turn to be made into the tunnel. It would be such an easy job to have done it at this time rather than in the next year or so. However, I realise that what I have suggested and what the committee heard about is not going to happen.

I will stand in here and continue to complain about this problem that ministers have—and it is not only restricted to this minister: they do not sit down with their policy advisers across portfolio areas where there ought to be an interface of consultation and obtain the best outcome for the public dollars they appropriate in the public interest when dealing with these kinds of projects or any other policy area.

There is absolutely no reason, except for incompetence and ineptitude in the consultative process, why we cannot put the traffic in a tunnel—both the vehicular and the pedestrian traffic. It would have been less expensive and inconvenient—in other words, more convenient—for all South Australians and it would have been a hell of a lot safer than currently is the case and will continue to be the case until we invest that additional money.

I commend the committee for its work and the people who appeared before it as witnesses and who provided us with the evidence of the proposed redevelopment and the benefits that it will produce. It is a pity that the committee could not be told how the dosido arrangements would be made for traffic



around the traffic island that is to be created at the Festival Drive level to enable pedestrians and vehicles to avoid knocking each other around as they attempt to get into and out of the car park and the Festival Centre. I guess we will have to wait and see what turns up, because when the matter came before the committee we did not know. So, with that rider, I commend the report to the House and note that, pursuant to the provisions of the legislation, the committee has recommended its approval.

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** The opposition supports the findings of the committee in relation to this project. A couple of months ago as part of this reference, the committee was taken on an extensive site tour of the proposed plaza demolition. We saw the plans and walked over the site with the proponents and were able to see exactly how the project was to proceed. We were pleased that \$300 000 in savings could be achieved during the demolition of the Adelaide Festival Centre plaza. We were also pleased that, by combining the two projects, the public would be inconvenienced only once in terms of reduced access to this amenity during demolition.

I noted the comments of the member for Hammond in relation to the entrance to the centre and his concern about the tunnel not proceeding. He also said that the existing pedestrian crossing is in the wrong place. I point out that the project director of the Adelaide Festival Centre noted that the committee's lobbying had led to the placement of the pedestrian crossing on King William Road being re-examined by the Adelaide City Council. I hope that that leads to some remedying of the traffic problems in that area. As a traveller from the northern suburbs coming south on that road, I understand the congestion that is caused around that crossing.

When this project is completed we will see a much improved Adelaide Festival Centre frontage cutting back the plaza to expose the entrance of the Adelaide Festival Centre. I was pleased to hear about the change in the grade of the road from King William Road down to Festival Drive to provide disabled access. Even though the committee was very supportive of the change to the plaza we did have some concerns about the lack of shade and shelter on the plaza for patrons. We were told that there would be landscaping and outdoor dining facilities that were not finalised at the time of our report.

It was suggested to us that these things could make a difference to the plaza. We lodged our concern with the proponents of the project, and they assured us that they will notify us once those plans become available. As the committee is very committed to following up on our reports and ensuring that projects, undertakings and issues raised by us are followed through, we will be watching that one.

We were told that the main demolition work would be completed by the beginning of the Adelaide Festival of Arts next year, but that the redevelopment itself would not be completed by this time. We asked about the effect this might have on the Adelaide Festival of Arts itself and we were told that the festival was aware of the situation and had made arrangements to accommodate it.

We were told that all the art works which are currently on display in the centre and on the plaza and which are to be moved as part of the redevelopment will be re-incorporated into the new site, which is a good thing. We were also assured that the new plaza would have improved lighting facilities to inhibit vandalism and to make the place safe—and certainly to make it feel safe—for pedestrians.

The Public Works Committee takes its role very seriously. It goes into detail because it is our role to ensure that the public interest is upheld and met in the expenditure of public funds on capital works programs.

I will just refer to the Auditor-General's Report which we heard about today in question time. It was just so extensive and breathtaking in its revelations of incompetence, derogation of responsibility and duty of care, conflict of interest, sloppy administration and sheer arrogance by people who hold ministerial portfolios in this parliament and who displayed an attitude of sheer arrogance in that they could and would do anything they liked, regardless of probity and due process. If any member of this House takes the time to read that material—and I have not read it in detail—they will find that it is just breathtaking in the comments and descriptions of how a governmental process that involved millions of dollars of expenditure was so poorly and disgracefully carried out.

In reading it, I believe that the report also vindicated the strong stand that the majority of members of the Public Works Committee took throughout that whole process. I remember very clearly being abused, along with the member for Reynell, both in this House and in the media, by the member for Bragg, the Premier and the member for Mawson for being Labor stooges—that was one term that was used—and we were castigated for using this stadium and holding the project up for political purposes. After people have read what the Auditor-General has said, they will see that the actions of the majority of members of this committee and our strong stand and refusal to be bullied and bludgeoned into giving way and stopping our pursuit of fact and evidence, according to our terms of reference, have been vindicated entirely.

In conclusion, I have had an opportunity to scan the two minority reports that were appended to Public Works Committee reports on the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium by the member for Mawson, now the Minister for Police. They are quite illuminating. I cannot help putting a couple of points on the record today. In his minority report—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The chair questions the matters that the member for Elizabeth is starting to address at this stage in regard to the report that is before the House at this time.

**Ms STEVENS:** The reason I am doing this is simply to say to the House that this committee is a very efficient committee, one that takes its role very seriously. What we have done in relation to the Festival Centre and the concentrated effort we have put into this report also applied to the other reports, and we have been vindicated today in this House. The member for Mawson mentioned a couple of things. First, he said that Minister Ingerson was 'a victim of circumstances with respect to the inadequacies in assessing the initial development of this project'. That is a very interesting description of Minister Ingerson, and it varies substantially from that of the Auditor-General.

Motion carried.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON DETE FUNDED SCHOOLS

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Wednesday 28 November.

Motion carried.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON PETROL, DIESEL AND LPG PRICING

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Wednesday 28 November.

Motion carried.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES

Adjourned debate on the motion—that the interim report be noted.

(Continued from 25 July. Page 2115.)

Motion carried.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES: FINAL REPORT

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Wednesday 28 November.

Motion carried.

### SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE FUNDING OF THE PUBLIC HOSPITAL SYSTEM

**Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Wednesday 28 November.

Motion carried.

### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That the 138th report of the committee, on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Redevelopment—Final Report, be noted.

(Continued from 4 July. Page 1982.)

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** I rise today to speak in support of the motion. In doing so, I want to raise a couple of issues and talk briefly about the comments that have been made by some of the other contributors to this debate. I have taken the opportunity to go through the *Hansard* record of the contributions of other members, particularly those of members opposite. As we know, the QEH is often in the media as being in a so-called crisis and experiencing so-called problems. Every time a series of colds, flu or whatever goes around the western suburbs, it is again headline news that unfortunately an ambulance has had to by-pass the hospital because the A&E section or whatever has filled up or overflowed. In acknowledging and supporting the report, I believe it is important to note that the government is spending huge sums of money to redevelop the QEH. After visiting the QEH, I do not think that anybody would argue that the QEH is not badly in need of redevelopment. The report highlights that, along with what will occur at the QEH.

I want to raise this nonsense about Adelaide having major teaching hospitals dotted five minutes' drive across the city. I represent a large rural electorate. In some respects, it is the largest electorate in the state: geographically, it is the fourth largest electorate in the state. However, given the population centres and the way the population is distributed through my

electorate, it is a huge electorate which has unique problems, particularly in terms of delivery of services such as health. The constituents in my electorate do not have the benefit of a hospital—or, indeed, an ambulance service—within five or 10 minutes. Indeed, in some cases, it is hours before they can get to a hospital. If you are in need of a hospital that provides obstetric services and you travel from the metropolitan area in Adelaide and head towards the South-East, once you have gone past Murray Bridge you will not find one, if you go along the coast road, until you get to Millicent, some three to 3½ hours drive from Murray Bridge. If you go along the inland road, the Dukes Highway, you will not find a hospital that can provide obstetric services until you get to Naracoorte—probably a similar distance, about three hours from Murray Bridge.

It somewhat rankles me when I hear of members from the western suburbs complaining about a 10 minute drive from the QEH to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I lament for the people of Adelaide: because of the politics being played with the health of the citizens of Adelaide, we are unfortunately locked into the situation where, instead of having one or two major and very efficient hospitals in Adelaide, we will be stuck for time immemorial, I guess, with a series of much smaller, more modest hospitals trying to deliver world's best practice and world's best service to the communities across Adelaide. I believe that that is not in the best interests of the citizens of this city.

The interests of the citizens of Adelaide would be best served if we had the Flinders Medical Centre and the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and possibly to a lesser extent the Lyell McEwin, set up as world scale hospitals—best practice, best equipped large hospitals—which were able to carry out a huge variety of specialist functions. Instead, what we are lumbered with in Adelaide is a series of smaller hospitals. We have the Modbury Hospital, the Adelaide Women's and Children's Hospital, the QEH, the Lyell McEwin, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Daws Road hospital, the Flinders Medical Centre, the Noarlunga Hospital and a whole host of other private hospitals in between those all trying to deliver the same function and none of them being able to achieve the economies of scale which would benefit the people of Adelaide greatly. What I am arguing is that this is all as a result of the sort of politicking that we see constantly with regard to the QEH. It never ceases to fascinate me that we have huge problems every five minutes at the QEH but we do not have them in any other hospitals across Adelaide.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** 'We do,' says the shadow minister, but we do not hear about them and they are not reported in the papers every other day. I would argue that that is more to do with the political climate in the western suburbs in and around the QEH than it is to do with the reality of the sort of services offered. The people who operate out of that hospital—the nurses and the medical staff—are working out of a hospital which has long passed its use-by date, as I have already said, and I applaud the government for coming to the party and redeveloping the hospital. Those people do a wonderful job delivering a fantastic level of service to the people in the western suburbs, but I would argue that the delivery of health services across Adelaide is being seriously compromised by the petty politics which is being played in this city not just at the moment but over 30 years or more and which has resulted in our having this legacy of a series of relatively small hospitals all trying to be all things to the

communities that reside around them. That is not the way modern medicine should go.

We have seen a huge shift in the delivery of medical services in comparison with 20 and 30 years ago, when people went into hospital with medical or surgical conditions and spend many days there, at great expense, largely, today the majority of the hospital population is being treated under day surgery procedures. We have a steady flow of people through our hospitals. We have millions and millions of dollars tied up in very modern equipment and we have millions of dollars tied up in the intellectual property of the specialists who utilise the equipment and their own skills to deliver high class, world class day surgery.

But I do not think we can afford to continue to do that. In fact, we cannot afford to do that, let alone continue to do it, in all these hospitals across the metropolitan area. Whilst I applaud the redevelopment of the QEH and hope that the people down there are happy with it, I think they have allowed themselves to be sold short by exercising their political right, playing petty politics with their health system and ending up with a health system that is nowhere near what we could potentially have in Adelaide. That is the point I want to make, and one that is not reflected in the Public Works Committee's report to the House. I commend the Public Works Committee's report. The government and members on both sides of the House have made the decision that that is the way they want medical services delivered in metropolitan Adelaide, and I guess the communities have pressured them to do that. I think it is unfortunate, because I think Adelaide deserves and could do a lot better, but unfortunately politics does not always deliver us the perfect system. I commend the report to the House.

Motion carried.

#### TRADE MEASUREMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 27 September. Page 2316.)

**Mr ATKINSON (Spence):** This bill is the outcome of a 1995 review of uniform trade measurement legislation by the Standing Committee of Officials of Consumer Affairs. The bill has 19 clauses, none of which appears to make any changes of interest to the public. Clause 4 provides that any packaging that is not part of an article is to be disregarded in determining the physical quantity of the article. I understand that that was already law. Many of the clauses appear to recast the order of the sections in the parent act. Clause 5 gives an inspector appointed under the act discretion to issue a notice granting an owner of a measuring instrument that contravenes the act a maximum of 28 days to remedy the contravention. Clause 13 allows two or more persons who are business partners to hold a single public weighbridge licence. Clause 17 provides that batch numbers on prepared articles are evidence of the matters indicated by the number, such as the date of packaging and where it was packaged. The opposition supports the bill.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier):** I thank the member for Spence for his enlightening address to the House and for his support, enabling the bill to go through without any delay.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** The issue I raise concerns how the impact of cuts through our public sector has been felt by many people in our community, causing them a great deal of difficulty, embarrassment and distress on a number of occasions, particularly when created by staff shortages. A constituent of mine was sent a letter from the vehicle testing centre at Regency Park, as follows:

The Approval in Principle, sent to the previous owner, for modifications to be undertaken to the above vehicle, namely, the fitting of Isuzu 1471 cc turbocharged engine has expired. However, records held by this office indicate that the vehicle has been modified, but has not yet passed an inspection.

You are advised that the use of a modified vehicle which is not covered by a Certificate of Dispensation contravenes the requirements of the Road Traffic Act and regulations. This may result in the vehicle being defected, the driver being liable to a substantial penalty, and in addition it may affect the insurance cover in the event of an accident.

If I have not received advice from you within 14 days I will have no alternative other than to request the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to withhold further registrations until the vehicle has been inspected and a Certificate of Dispensation has been issued by this office.

That is a very strong letter for my constituent or anyone to receive and is certainly a message to be heeded by any motorist who replaces the engine in their vehicle. However, in this case the facts are that the turbo engine was put in the vehicle three years ago, and the vehicle has had two owners prior to the constituent's owning it. So, the vehicle has had three owners and three years has elapsed since the engine was put in. When my constituent made inquiries about it he was told that the inspection would cost \$61. Naturally he objected quite strongly to that and, rightly, the fee was waived. He had been informed, however, that his vehicle will receive 'a stringent test' and that if any faults are found he will have to pay. The vehicle, a Holden Gemini, has been insured and fully registered since the new turbo engine was fitted so, if there was any doubt about its roadworthiness, why was this vehicle not tested over three years ago? Why is Transport SA now showing so much concern about the roadworthiness of this vehicle after it has been on the road for three years and its ownership has been transferred three times?

My constituent has a right to feel that he has been disadvantaged in this matter. He did not fit the engine to the vehicle, yet he has to wear the cost and related mechanical problems so, if the vehicle or the engine performance shows some problems, he will be responsible. Naturally he asked—as anyone would—why Transport SA's vehicle inspection centre has taken so long to request an inspection of this vehicle. The answer given to him was that Transport SA simply did not have the staff to keep abreast of the paperwork. Naturally, this has caused him a great deal of distress and anger and may very well disadvantage him if, for some reason, his car is deregistered.

The letter arrived some three years too late and went to the third owner, not the person who fitted the engine and requested the inspection. The fellow who fitted the engine to the vehicle lodged all the appropriate paperwork requesting that an inspection take place. So, he did all the right things and went through the proper channels but, in the 18 months that he owned the vehicle, he was never contacted; he was never sent a letter asking him to bring in the vehicle for an

inspection. And, I suppose, after a time, one would simply forget about those things.

This can only be called a bungle and, clearly, was caused (as has been said today) by the lack of staff to keep up with the paperwork. This problem should not be laid at the door of Dave—who, as I said, is the third owner. If there ever was a question about the roadworthiness of the vehicle, it should not have been registered for the three years that it was. I think the important thing about it (and certainly Dave and the previous owner, and perhaps even the fellow who fitted the engine, would not have been aware of this) is that, in the event of a road accident, the insurance cover for that car may not have been valid.

While we are quite pleased that the \$61 fee will be waived (as it should have been), there is still the difficulty that Dave will have with the engine—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** It cost \$61 to have it inspected. So, he had absolutely no way of knowing that modifications had taken place to the vehicle, because the department simply did not do its job. It did not keep up with its paperwork, and Dave is now greatly disadvantaged. I have to ask (as has Dave): how many other people would be in the same position as he is in? Surely his is not the only piece of paperwork that went missing. We certainly feel that this issue needs to be looked at. The department cannot, three years later, send out a very forceful letter (and, certainly, I would consider it marginally threatening, if this letter had been sent to me) and expect an owner, who may be the third or fourth owner of a vehicle, to be responsible for something that most likely they would know nothing about. I certainly hope that the department will check its records and that the minister will consider the fact that, obviously, there are not enough staff to keep up with the paperwork, and I hope that she will have a serious look at making sure that other people in this position are not disadvantaged. If there are other people out there who have received these letters and who have been asked to pay the inspection fee, quite clearly, that fee should be waived. People cannot continue to be disadvantaged over and over.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I want to continue with a series of grievance debates that I have undertaken regarding the tragic events in New York on 11 September and the weeks that have followed. In one of my earlier grievance speeches, I made the point that one of the great dangers in how we respond to this crisis is if we allow it to be portrayed as a new crusade by Christendom against Islam. I made the point that, in fact, to do this would be to play into the hands of the extremists who have perpetrated the tragic attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon, in which so many innocent people were killed. I therefore express considerable concern (and I note that many world leaders have done so) at the comments of Italian President Berlusconi, who took it upon himself, in remarks that he made in recent weeks when referring to these events, to describe western culture and western civilisation as somehow inherently superior to the Islamic civilisation. I think that that was a silly blunder and, apart from being totally untrue from a historic viewpoint, it runs the risk of incensing Muslims around the world and falling into the trap of playing the terrorists' game of trying to define the world in terms of western and eastern civilisation. I note that Prime Minister Blair, a number of other European leaders and the Bush administration have distanced themselves from the Italian President's remarks, and I

commend them for that, because they are very dangerous remarks.

It is Osama bin Laden and the Muslim extremists who perpetrated these events who are talking about jihads and holy wars. We must not talk in that language, because this is not a battle between civilisations. It is a conflict between the democracies and the freedom loving people of the world and the extremists—from wherever they might come, from whatever religious conviction they might be drawn, and whatever racial or political extremist viewpoint they may be positioned within. It is a battle between those of us who love freedom and those who seek to destroy democracy and the freedoms that come with it, and replace it with some far more unpleasant, dictatorial and unreasonable regime. I think that the Bush administration and the Blair prime ministership in Britain are correct in the ways in which they have pointed this out to people, and I commend their views to the people of South Australia.

We should remember that, as I said earlier, the Crusades are leached into the memories of every young Muslim as a great blight against Christendom. I explained earlier that they perceive the Crusades as having been about wiping out Islam. They remember that, when the Crusaders finally took Jerusalem by storm on 15 July 1099 AD, they massacred virtually every inhabitant—man, woman and child. In the Crusaders' view, they purified the city with the blood of the defeated Muslim infidels. In the Muslim view, it was nothing but a savage massacre. To in any way parallel the west's response to this crisis as a new crusade conjures up that sort of imagery in the minds of young Muslims all around the world and must be avoided, particularly here in Australia. The many wonderful Australian Muslims within our community who join us in condemning these events would agree with me, I am sure, that we must unite as a consequence of these events and not allow the perpetrators of them to divide us. I think it is most important to make that point.

We have seen this sort of fanaticism before in the concentration camps of Nazi Germany; in the ethnic cleansing of Bosnia; in the massacres of Rwanda; and during the Armenian genocide in the early 19th century in the gulags of the Soviet archipelago. This is not new. The Osama bin Laden al-Qaida movement can dress it up in rhetoric about jihads and holy wars. It is nothing more than a brutal attempt by a brutal group of people to attack innocent civilians. Just think for a moment about the children in those aircraft who were told that they were to die, and the parents and children who died in those buildings. An act against humanity of that magnitude, no matter what cloak you dress it up in, is nothing but an act of inhumanity. To talk of jihads and holy wars is nothing more than a smoke screen. These people need to be hunted out and dealt with.

In that respect, as I have said in earlier grievance debates in the past week and a half, we need to fight an guerilla war: we need to wield a scalpel and not a sledgehammer. I think that this is bringing home to people that the Australian defence force has been run down. In the 1970s and 1980s it was miserably run down—and I know that because I was a member of it. The army I joined in 1972 had 44 000 people in it: today, it barely conjures up 25 000 people. Our own Education Department has 32 000 people. It was run down, I must say, by successive governments. In this respect, Kim Beazley should not necessarily boast too loudly about his tenure as defence minister, because it was largely during that period that the Australian defence force was run down. I think it is a credit to this government that it has built it up since

1996 to the best it can. We have gone from one effective brigade to two effective brigades, and a third brigade far more ready than it has ever been.

The recent commitment by the present Government to further bolster our ability to use the defence force to fight terrorism should be commended, and I note that now those initiatives are fully supported by the federal opposition and I commend it for that and for the bipartisanship they have shown. But let us not forget that we Australians allowed our defence force to run down so miserably.

Our fast jets are not combatable with the US Air Force, particularly identify friend and foe avionics, and various other necessary avionics render them not fully interoperable with the allies with whom we may find ourselves engaged. That is a serious cause for concern, and we may need to address that. Our ships in the RAN are interoperable. We need to work on improving that interoperability. Our special forces are, the government has announced, to be reinforced with further investment to be made, and they will be a valued asset—I suspect one of the most valued assets—within the context of this new type of war in which we will be involved.

I have serious concerns about the Intelligence Services Bill passed last week in the federal parliament relating to our intelligence services. It specifically states that ‘ASIS must not plan or undertake paramilitary activities or activities involving violence against persons or the use of weapons’. Given this new type of conflict, events may well have surpassed this bill and it may unnecessarily constrain our intelligence

services. However, that is a matter for the federal parliament—I just express it as a personal view. I think that much of this conflict will be fought in the shadows. We need to leave no stone unturned as to how we tackle these people.

For those Australians who have taken it upon themselves to scoff at the Americans in the way they have responded to this event, almost to complain about their nationalism, their pride and the way they have bound together, I say that these are a very proud people. This is a country that fought a bloody revolution for its freedom and a bloody civil war to keep its constitution intact. We Australians were given ours for free. Before you knock Americans, try to image a world without that wonderful democratic presence for freedom. Try to imagine what sort of world we would be living in today and try to imagine what sort of Australia we would be living in had they not helped us during World War II and had we in turn not helped them. They are not a nation to be scoffed at. They are a beacon for freedom and democracy and I commend them for the way in which they have come together over this incident. It is a lesson for all Australians: before we knock our own institutions, politicians, parliaments and institutions, we should look at the example they have given us and say that perhaps we should hold up these things and value them more because in times like this you really need to do so.

Motion carried.

At 5.03 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 3 October at 10.30 a.m.