

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 19 February 1998

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. J.C. Irwin)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PARLIAMENT, BELLS

The PRESIDENT: I should warn members that the bells are not effective in the downstairs area today. I am not sure about the Blue Room but certainly they are not working in 'Botany Bay', and the bar area is also suspect.

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: It is being inspected at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: No, I cannot do the inspection myself!

OPEN SPACE

A petition signed by 413 residents of South Australia concerning the sale of community open spaces and praying that this honourable Council will stop the Government selling off our open spaces and instead ensure that a planning system is developed in consultation with the community and local government which ensures the distribution of an adequate minimum standard of active, passive and environmental open spaces which are equitably distributed across our community, was presented by the Hon. M.J. Elliott

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Department of Recreation and Sport—Report, 1996-97.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I bring up the report 1996-97 of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee.

I also bring up the report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee on the establishment of artificial reefs.

CARRICK HILL

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (Minister for Transport and Urban Planning): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement on the subject of Carrick Hill.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In response to inquiries from members, I wish to provide the Council with a progress report on activities at Carrick Hill since the report of the select committee on a proposed sale of land was noted in this place on 5 December.

In May 1997, the new Carrick Hill Trust met for the first time chaired by Mrs Fiona Adler, and the new trust represents a range of skills and interests to lead Carrick Hill in its efforts to become more financially self-sufficient, thus reducing its dependence on Government funding. I attended the first board meeting, and noted with interest Mrs Adler's strong

statement that she would consider that the board had been derelict in its duty if land had to be sold.

At the end of June 1997, the new Director of Carrick Hill, Mr Alan Smith, took up his appointment. Existing commitments with the History Trust meant that Mr Smith was not available at an earlier date. Consequently, work on the corporate plan required by the select committee was not started until July, several months later than had been anticipated.

Given my assessment that the benefits of Mr Smith's appointment justified the delay, I agreed to defer receipt of the corporate plan until the end of this month. The Carrick Hill Trust and Mr Smith have used the last eight months most productively to place Carrick Hill on a more secure financial footing and to reposition the house and grounds as one of the cultural tourism and heritage assets of South Australia.

A draft of the corporate plan has been completed. A new strategic alliance has been forged with other arts organisations and also with community groups, local government and tourist agencies; five more rooms of the house have been opened to the public; and nearly 2 000 objects from the Hayward's collection have been brought out of storage and put on display.

The initiatives to date to increase the marketing effort, to enhance the temporary exhibition program and to improve art museum interpretation has led to Carrick Hill's having its best January visitor numbers since it opened 11 years ago. For February, numbers already exceed last February and they will be boosted again from 23 February 1998, when a three-week season of Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing* commences in the garden at Carrick Hill as part of the Fringe Festival. Further special events are planned with the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra, the State Opera and the Adelaide Philharmonia.

Overall, with encouragement and support from Arts SA and the member for Waite, the board and management are making Carrick Hill a vital focus for arts, tourism and heritage in this State, underpinned by sound economic management.

QUESTION TIME

BAKEWELL BRIDGE

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport a question about Bakewell Bridge.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: As the Minister would be aware, the Bakewell Bridge in the western suburbs has been the scene of a number of fatal road accidents. A number of my colleagues are concerned about this, as I am, and they have highlighted the continuing delay in having the bridge repaired on a permanent basis. I am particularly concerned given the location of a school underneath the bridge. My questions are:

1. What does the Minister consider to be appropriate safety standards for this particular bridge?

2. Will the Minister advise as to the status of the Bakewell Bridge, in particular the safety of the side barriers?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: This same question was asked by the member for Peake last November or December, and I have written back to the honourable member during the Christmas break. I suspect that the answer has already been—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Well, I don't think she reads *Hansard*, but I don't think she is doing much research on new subjects, either.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: They are not talking to each other.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Well, they are not talking to each other. Certainly, we have all the other issues under control in Transport.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The honourable member is getting excited. I am not sure whether photographs can be shown across the Chamber, but I think it is interesting—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: —that the answer—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is on her feet trying to answer a question.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Davis!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As I understand it, the member for Peake was satisfied with the response that I provided because, in answer to his questions, Transport SA officers went down to meet with the member and the school. The outline of the Government's plan was provided to Transport SA—

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Redford!

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Davis!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: However, I will get a copy of the answer that I gave to the honourable member in another place and provide a copy to the Leader in this place.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I direct my question to the Treasurer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot hear the honourable member asking his question.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Further to the then Treasurer's statement on 22 September last during the election campaign that while the budget was under some pressure the planned surpluses for the next four years would be delivered, I ask the Treasurer whether he maintains that the current budget is on track to deliver the targeted \$1 million surplus and also the further surpluses over the following three years, as projected in the budget. Further, will the Treasurer rule out tax and fee increases beyond the CPI or any new taxes in the next budget?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I do not know where the honourable member has been, but I have indicated publicly on a number of occasions that we are on track for reporting a \$1 million surplus for this year. The pressures that are confronting the State budget—wage increases, Federal/State financial relations and a variety of other pressures like that—will place pressure—

The Hon. T.G. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, social infrastructure—and part of the remedy rests in the hands of the Hon. Mr Holloway. Is he going to make the task harder by opposing much needed asset sales? Part of the solution rests in the hands and vote of the Hon. Mr Holloway. If the Hon. Mike Rann and the Hon. Mr Holloway vote against the asset sales,

they will be voting specifically for greater pressure on the revenue side and greater pressure on the expenditure side. They will be voting for greater pressure on budget and expenditure reductions and for greater pressure on revenue increases. So, the power rests with the Hon. Mr Holloway and the Hon. Mike Rann.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The budget will be delivered. The Hon. Mr Holloway refers to a quote about future surpluses or budgets being delivered. Of course they will be delivered, but there will be pressures and we will have to meet those pressures. As I said, part of the solution rests wholly and solely with members of the Labor Party. If they choose to go down a particular path to oppose asset sales and the net benefit to this budget, as well as leaving us exposed to the huge risks that have been identified by the Auditor-General, then it rests fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Hon. Mr Holloway and the Hon. Mike Rann.

PORT ADELAIDE WATERFRONT

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning a question about the Port Adelaide waterfront.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Taking the lead from the Hon. Leigh Davis and quoting from some of the employers and the financial writers in this State's papers, I note in this month's Employers Chamber journal *Business SA* an article on page 28 titled 'Ports Corp Meeting the Challenge'. The article relates to the Ports Corporation operation at Port Adelaide. In this article the writer points to the fact that the Ports Corp has presided over a three-year period which has seen Port Adelaide gain an enviable position as the nation's most efficient and reliable capital city port.

I acknowledge the role of the Minister and her department in the cooperative arrangements that have brought this about. Obviously, she has carried on the good work that was started by the Hon. Barbara Wiese some years ago, and I congratulate her for continuing that work and the cooperative nature in which discussions have proceeded. Further on the writer states:

Between 1990-91, only 42 000 containers moved across this modern container terminal. However, in 1996-97 this had more than doubled as exporters and importers took advantage of the lower charges and the unprecedented expansion in shipping services.

It would appear that the Ports Corp has embarked on an aggressive marketing approach which has seen an increase in the level of efficiency at Port Adelaide. This increase in efficiency has been aided by the hard work of the Ports Corp, employers and the unions. Furthermore, the corporation believes that there will be further substantial growth in both container and bulk cargoes.

Strangely enough, in the same journal in an article entitled 'Options for Waterfront Users', the writer makes clear that the 'efficiency and performance of the Australian waterfront is unsatisfactory'. Furthermore, the writer states:

Better performance and reliability in any industry comes from a rigorous process of continual improvement. The waterfront needs to become more like other sectors of the economy, providing high quality service at least cost, based on productive workplaces and a customer focus.

I note that this was backed up by the National Farmers Federation key man in South Australia, Mr Wayne Cornish,

who said that Adelaide's container terminal was much more efficient than those in the Eastern States and its bulk handling section was even better.

I was pleased to see that the National Farmers Federation's key man in South Australia was prepared to give credence to what is happening and to recognise that our wharves are very efficient and that the Minister, the Ports Corporation, the union and shippers in South Australia have done the job under the enterprise bargaining agreements that operate within the waterfront area.

Therefore, two days after that I was disappointed—after he had obviously been beaten about the head by his Federal associates in the National Farmers Federation—when Mr Cornish recanted and said that the Adelaide waterfront was not operating at the world's best practice. We agree, but we also agree that under an enterprise bargaining system—and history has proved it in South Australia, and I am sure that the Minister agrees with that—we can make, and indeed have made, vast efficiencies. Therefore, my questions to the Minister are:

1. Given the difference in opinion in these two articles, can the Minister confirm if the performance of the Ports Corporation and the waterfront in Port Adelaide has, in fact, increased efficiency to such an extent that this is in fact the nation's most efficient and reliable capital city port? Does the Minister agree with Mr Cornish, the President of the South Australian Farmers Federation, when on Thursday 5 February in the *Stock Journal* he stated that Adelaide's container terminal was much more efficient than those in the Eastern States and its bulk handling section was even better? Also, does she agree that these efficiencies were made in no small part by the active and responsible behaviour of the MUA along with her officers, shippers and employers in South Australia?

2. Will the Minister join with me and condemn Smith Patrick Stevedoring for its disgraceful duplicity and deceit which they displayed and their dishonouring of the legal enterprise bargaining agreements made with the MUA in relation to the scab operators at Webb Dock?

3. In recognition of the good work of the MUA in particular in protecting its members' jobs, members of the Labor Party have donated \$50 per person for the continuation of that struggle. As an indication of the Minister's appreciation of the role played by the MUA in making South Australian ports the best ports in Australia, will the Minister chip in a couple of hundred dollars to assist the maritime union in the pursuit of justice in respect of award conditions, the maintenance of decency in the industrial relations system and the struggle for job security? I am prepared to take a cheque, Mr President!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am bemused if the honourable member does not think that the MUA members in this State think they can either afford to support their mates interstate or if they are not prepared to support their mates interstate and would be seeking money from me. If that is the case, they can ask me: I do not need the message conveyed through the honourable member. I do thank the honourable member for the extraordinarily glowing and strong endorsement of the actions by this Government to reform the waterfront in this State. He may recall, but not wish to state publicly, that the former Minister, Hon. Barbara Wiese, did not have the courage to do what every other State had done. When we came to Government and I became Minister, ours

were the only ports in this country that continued to operate on a bureaucratic structure and on a subsidy basis.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: She smiled a lot but did little. Besides that, we brought in a Bill and, with the support of the Legislative Council and all members of the Parliament, the Ports Corporation was established with a commercial focus. That was an extraordinarily big change in the way in which the ports are to be operated in this State. I acknowledge the role of the new board and the new general manager and the working relationships that have been established with the new container port operator, Sea-Land, and the work force generally, because an amazing amount of work has been done cooperatively to perform at the ports. A lot of work has been done with the farming community, the car industries and other unions as well to make sure that we lifted the productivity rate in this State and started making sure that our ports were competitive. Unlike the situation when we came to Government, ports are no longer subsidised: in fact they are returning a dividend to the taxpayers, and that is excellent.

The honourable member said they are 'very efficient'; I do not accept that statement. They are certainly efficient by comparison with other Australian ports. The Federal Government's own Bureau of Economics Waterfront Report highlights that South Australia's handling rate at the container terminal is certainly the best in Australia. We have lifted our game enormously over the past four years, and I applaud the collective efforts of everyone involved on the waterfront in that regard.

There is no doubt that much more work has to be done. Sea-Land and the MUA and others would all argue the same. Sea-Land's charges are the highest in Australia, and that is a matter that we must and will address, as more ships come to this State. When we have more ships coming we will be able to defray some of those costs and charges.

I know that much work is being done by the Ports Corporation and I commend the General Manager Mr Edmonds and Mr Wayne Parham for doing a lot of work with the board and others to attract more shipping through our ports. It is also because the work force in other places such as Mitsubishi and General Motors have performed superbly that we have so much business going through the ports. The honourable member would know that the maritime union has reached a unique agreement with the vehicle builders—Mr Noack and his members—to make sure that, if difficulties are experienced by the Vehicle Builders Union in one workplace or in other places, the export of vehicles through our ports will not be held up. It is that sort of cooperation and understanding of how we must do business in this State that has seen us come to the forefront as the most efficient operator in Australia. It does not mean there is not more work to do, and the unions and management are well aware of that. I will not comment on the situation in Melbourne, because this area—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: If you stopped interjecting and had heard my answer you would know that I embraced the work force and the work place when I mentioned the changes. I have mentioned the maritime union twice in my answer to your question. Unfortunately the Ports Corporation no longer reports to me and has been transferred to the responsibility of the Minister for Government Enterprises and, on that basis, while I have read general headlines about what has been happening with maritime reform in other States, it has not been a major issue in my mind in terms of

my ministerial responsibilities, because it is no longer my direct ministerial responsibility. But I have been associated with the reforms. I have worked with the unions, Sea-Land, and the Ports Corporation and I can talk about what is happening here. I cannot comment on what is happening elsewhere.

TAXIS

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning a question about taxes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I am sure that all members here would share the view that there has been a substantial improvement in the service provided by the taxi industry and in the presentation of drivers over recent years. I am sure that members opposite do not need to be reminded of the importance of the service that the taxi industry provides to the South Australian public and the substantial investment made by taxi drivers in the purchase of their vehicles, their uniforms and the licence itself, an investment which would be ripped off them if the ALP ever wins Government. Over recent weeks travelling around I have had cause to experience the excellent service provided by the taxi fleet in South Australia. It is always refreshing to sit in a taxi and talk to the drivers, who reflect our multicultural community. Many of them come from overseas and are making a very important contribution to this State. On Tuesday in another place—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: Do you talk about the hundred grand a year you're earning when they are on seven bucks an hour?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The honourable member interjects. I would remind those taxi drivers who earn \$7 an hour and who have paid \$140 000 for a licence that the Hon. Terry Cameron, who is on \$100 000 a year, wants to rip it off them. That is where he is coming from. In any event, the comments that were made by the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.G. Cameron interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Cameron will come to order.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Thank you, Mr President, and I have to say I disagree with the comments of the Minister. The taxi industry is of such a high standard that they would take even the Hon. Terry Cameron. It is interesting that, as the member for Price in another place noted, substantial deregulation was implemented by the Hon. Frank Blevins, whom some would say was well loved and liked in the taxi industry during the time he was Minister. What drew my attention to what the member for Price said in another place was some of his comments about taxis, where he said:

I have been appalled at the drop in standards of both the taxis and the drivers. There have been some exceptions, but the norm is that taxis have been quite dirty, dilapidated and smelly and there has been smoking in them. The taxi drivers are pretty sloppy; they are unshaven, quite grubby people. As I say, I am not pointing the finger at everyone but I have found this with a percentage of them.

In light of those comments by the member for Price in another place, will the Minister answer the following questions?

1. Does the Minister agree with the member for Price's assessment of the quality of the taxi industry?

2. Will the Minister make an inquiry of the Passenger Transport Board to determine whether the member for Price has made any complaints about the standard of service or the quality of driver?

3. Will the Minister write to the honourable member and request specific details, including dates, times, places and taxi numbers to ascertain where this occurred so that the appropriate authority can make the appropriate inquiry?

4. Will the Minister invite the honourable member to make a complaint to the Passenger Transport Authority setting out all those details so that a breach of regulations can be investigated?

5. Does the Minister have any comments about the general standard of taxis in this State in terms of their service and presentation?

The PRESIDENT: Before the Minister answers, I point out that members are lapsing into multiple questions. I understand Question Time is for one question and members have an opportunity to ask another question at another time. One question earlier today had three or four parts and that one had five parts. I make that observation and hope members will come back to asking one question at a time.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Certainly I do not agree with the comments made by the member for Price and I will comment on them in a moment. I will also inquire whether any complaint has been lodged by the member for Price and seek, as the honourable member suggests, dates, times, places and taxi numbers and invite him to make a complaint outside this place, rather than late at night, and where he may feel uncomfortable in doing so. I was alerted yesterday to the comments made by the member for Price and thought they were extremely cheap and unfair. They are also wrong in terms of what the customer seeks from the industry and in terms of improvement of services.

As a Government, through the Passenger Transport Board we have undertaken regular surveys of taxi standards, presentation and performance of drivers. In November-December last year we undertook a further survey, the technical name for which is mystery shopper audits. We engage people with disabilities, older people, tourists, students and people of non-English speaking backgrounds to go out, survey and report back on their impressions on various questions presented by the passenger transport survey. The November-December survey identified that 28 per cent of drivers are now considered to have immaculate presentation, which is up 20 per cent on the previous survey.

The survey also identified that a stunning 92 per cent of vehicle interiors are now being identified as being either good or outstanding, and that is very important. It also identified that 90 per cent of vehicle interiors as being good or outstanding. That evidence undertaken by survey using mystery shoppers certainly is impressive and is quite at odds with Mr De Laine's cheap comments about taxis being grubby, sloppy, dirty and smelly with the drivers unshaven. If I were a taxi driver I would take extraordinary offence and if Mr De Laine, the Labor Party member for Price, does not want to catch a taxi he does not need to. He should stay with his Jaguar. It is interesting that he has just bought a Jaguar—the great Socialist. He would rather stick to his Jaguar than catch a taxi. If that is the way he wishes to do it, he is completely entitled to.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The Government has introduced new regulations. Two years into Government we

dropped the maximum age of taxis from 10 to eight years. That dropped again from 1 February to 6½ years. All drivers, whether or not with a radio taxicab, must all be in uniform. If they are not I would appreciate, as would the taxi companies—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: No, I think that he is trying to keep it a secret—I do not think that he is hiring it out. He would be much happier in his own car than in a taxi in future. All taxis in future are to have white paintwork with a standard design for the roof sign, uniform company badging and signage and advertising restricted to the boot.

All of these recommendations have been determined after consultation with the industry, which also wants to increase the standards and present the taxi industry and Adelaide well in this regard. I was interested in Mr Cameron's interjections earlier. I will never forget the date—12 April—when the Hon. Mr Cameron in this place recommended the immediate release of 100 new taxi licences. So, we had an attack on the numbers of taxi licences from the Labor Party. Now we have an attack on presentation and standards of service and of course we had the big king attack from the Labor Party when Mr Blevins as Minister of Transport deregulated the hire car industry without any regard—

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: We do need more taxis.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: You stand by what you said: you want 100 more taxi licences immediately? Do you only want 100?

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: We are getting 25, aren't we?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Do you only want 100?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is out of order.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: I didn't put a number on it.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: You said 100 on 12 April. You are wanting more taxis on the road? The honourable member stands by what he said and wants the immediate release of 100 licences. I wonder whether the Hon. Carolyn Pickles as shadow Minister of Transport will immediately dissociate herself from that statement. She is pretty quiet at the moment.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: No, she shook her head.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: She shook her head. Perhaps we will hear at the end of Question Time whether she as spokesperson for the Labor Party will dissociate herself from the remarks just made. She is very quiet. The Hon. Frank Blevins as Minister of Transport—

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: On a point of order, Sir, could we have some relevance in this question and perhaps get on to asking some decent questions that members might have.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Decent questions! The member for Price just slags the whole taxi industry—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The member for Price slags the industry—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: —and we are simply putting it into perspective.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order, Minister! I would appreciate if the Minister did not go on answering questions and interjections when I have had a point of order by a member of the Opposition. There is no point of order. I ask the Minister to be relevant to the question asked and not to answer interjections from the other side.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I apologise for being distracted, Sir. The member for Price made a further attack

on the taxi industry but with a different perspective on presentation. Earlier on 12 April we had an attack by the Hon. Terry Cameron arguing for the immediate release of another 100 licences.

The Hon. T.G. Cameron: It is not an attack.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: If you do not think it is an attack, the taxi industry certainly would. You have confirmed that you stand by that statement. I see that the Hon. Carolyn Pickles is no longer present—she cannot bear what you are saying or she has gone to look for advice. Earlier we had the Hon. Frank Blevins deregulating the hire car industry with no regard for the taxi industry. It is time the Labor Party, in terms of genuine regard for taxis and workers, should respect the industry, those who work hard in the industry and those who are seeking to promote Adelaide by raising their standards. Particularly during the Festival and Fringe when there will be many visitors here, we should be helping the taxi industry present Adelaide and the industry well.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: My supplementary question is to the Minister. To the Minister's knowledge has the Hon. Angus Redford or his firm represented the Passenger Transport Board and, if so, did he declare that interest when you asked him to ask this Dorothy Dix question?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: No Dorothy Dix question was asked. The Hon. Mr Redford is completely able to read *Hansard*. He noted what the member for Price said and he wished to pursue the issues. That is the background to the question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I am waiting for the classroom to come to order.

OIL SPILL

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning a question about the oil spill which occurred at Port Stanvac on 23 September 1996.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: Seventeen months ago on 23 September 1996, oil was spilt near the Port Stanvac Refinery as the *Lofoten* oil tanker was pumping Arabian light crude to the refinery. Initially, Mobil Australia claimed the spill was relatively minor with only 20 litres of oil spilt. Mobil later revised that figure to 100 litres. A joint inquiry by the EPA and the Department of Transport established that more than 10 000 litres of oil had spewed into the sea.

My office has received information which sheds further light on the incident. What actually occurred on that day was not one spill but two. The first spill occurred at 13.30 hours when the hoses were static tested. That test revealed a leak, and as a result the Department of Transport should have been informed. Provided the Department of Transport was informed the steps taken to clean up this leak were according to procedure, but at this time a commercial decision was made that resulted in the second larger oil spill.

After the leak was contained the ship should have been removed from the mooring buoy, the hoses decanted and the oil barged ashore which would have cost approximately \$200 000. Instead, it was decided to water flush the damaged hose using the ship's main cargo pumps. That decision was taken in the hope that any further oil spillage would be relatively small and that after that hose had been flushed of oil pumping could resume through the other undamaged hose.

We now know that that did not occur. I have been told that when water flushing commenced at 16.36 hours oil spurted from the damaged hose as a solid jet reaching approximately eight metres in the air. The ship's forecastle had to be evacuated due to the overspray.

Pumping continued for 14 minutes. In that time, depending on how much oil was in the ship's deck lines, between 40 000 and 140 000 litres of crude oil gushed into the sea. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Was the spill at 13.30 hours reported to the Department of Transport at the time of the spill? If not, what action has been taken as a result of the failure to report the spill?

2. Was the Department of Transport informed of the decision to water flush the damaged hose? If so, did the department approve of the decision to water flush?

3. Was the spill at 16.36 hours reported to the Department of Transport at the time of the spill? If not, what action has been taken as a result of the failure to report the spill?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: There are six or seven detailed questions. I will seek an immediate reply. If the honourable member gives me a copy of the questions, I will see whether I can get a preliminary reply by the end of Parliament today. Otherwise I will have a reply for Parliament next Tuesday.

MIDLAND BUSINESS COLLEGE

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs a question about the closure of the Midland Business College.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: Yesterday, I was contacted by a constituent whose daughter was enrolled in the certificate of business practice and tourism with the Midland Business College. She began her term two weeks ago, and her fees of \$4 200 were paid up front. She arrived yesterday for her course to find that the doors of the Midland Business College had closed and that the college had been placed in liquidation. I understand that a liquidator has been appointed and that an information meeting will be held next week.

This family is in considerable distress. They cannot afford to pay up front another set of fees if their daughter is accepted for another course. I understand that a number of overseas students are enrolled at that college, and their distress would be considerably worse than those who have family in this State. I ask the Minister:

1. Can inquiries be made regarding any protection for these students and their fees?

2. Is there any course that can be taken to ensure that their fees will be refunded?

3. Will eligibility for Austudy be quarantined so that those who are eligible under this course do not have to go through the long and arduous task of applying again?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The issues which arise as a result of the closure of the Midland Business College essentially are covered by the Corporations Law under the administration of the Australian Securities Commission, which is essentially federally administered. I will have those issues examined in that respect. I suspect also that there is an accreditation process, probably under the technical and further education umbrella, which presumably would have taken some interest in both the college and the courses which it conducted. I am not aware of the criteria by which accreditation is given, but I will obtain that information and bring it

back. It may be that a minimum net financial security is required. In that case, one must ask whether that is reviewed on a regular basis, if at all.

In terms of protection for students, I suppose it depends very much on whether the college is in liquidation or receivership. If it is in receivership, it means that the financier has taken action under the security where any finance might be in arrears or have exceeded the limit on the security documents. In that event, it may be that if the business is to be sold by the receiver, some transitional arrangements may be made with whomever may be the purchaser of that business. So far as protection for students is concerned, I do not have much familiarity with that area, but I will have that issue examined by the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs in conjunction with the technical and further education sector of the education portfolio.

Regarding the eligibility for Austudy, Austudy is a Commonwealth benefit which is provided under certain conditions. It may be that some quarantining may occur. All that I can say is that I will endeavour to ascertain the correct position and bring back a reply. It is a very sad position for both students and parents when this sort of a situation arises. Regrettably, there is not much that governments can do about it. However, because the honourable member has raised the issue comprehensively I will undertake to deal with it in the way to which I have referred. I cannot hold out much prospect of joy for the parents or the student, but if there is a way in which that can be given I will want to do that. That is as far as I can take that issue.

WORKCOVER

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (3 December).

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:

1. The question asked refers to information which appeared in the October edition of the WorkCover Corporation's Injury Management Bulletin. This was aimed at treatment providers to encourage greater compliance with professionally established best practice guidelines.

The practice of providers being told that 'workers are not to receive any more treatment after filling the quota deemed appropriate in the back injury guidelines' is not one being adopted by the Corporation itself, nor incorporated in its instructions and advice to the Corporation Agents.

The practice to which the Member possibly refers, is advice via the Bulletin that services that have been provided in excess of the back treatment guidelines may not be paid by the Corporation if they are deemed to be inappropriate or unnecessary. The Corporation believes that services which are not part of an accepted treatment plan, or have no discernible effect on either return to work or the recovery of the worker, should be regarded as inappropriate or unnecessary as described under section 32 (5)(b) of the Act.

2. This practice has not been formally implemented to date, but is planned, with a sample of about 20 test cases of non-specific (sprain and strain) back injury through WorkCover's Provider Services, to seek justification for ongoing services that deviate from the professional standards outlined in the guidelines.

The purpose of running these test cases is to ascertain the amount of information and resources required to make an assessment of appropriateness in individual cases and to identify which type of case should be subject to review of this nature in the future (for example, 'old' vs 'new' claims where excessive treatment is identified).

The legislative authority is based on sections 32(5)(b) and 32(6) of the Workers' Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986.

3. Where a treatment provider involved in the test cases continues to provide services outside the guidelines, and is unable to justify (or is unwilling to modify) ongoing treatment in terms of either recovery and/or return to work, the Claims Agent may then disallow charges for any ongoing services that have been incurred by the worker, issue a notice to the provider setting out the basis of the Corporation's decision to disallow the services, and advise the provider of the right to have this decision reviewed under the Act.

The strategy will also include performance monitoring and management of providers who consistently service in excess of the recommended guidelines.

4. It is not the aim of the strategy to deny services required by workers. The Corporation recognises that many, or most, workers who are receiving services well in excess of the back guidelines are receiving them because they are victims of chronic pain syndromes and associated disorders.

The Corporation also accepts that the guidelines may not be applicable in every case. Where the provision of ongoing services is assessed as contributing to recovery and return to work, accounts for these services will continue to be paid.

This strategy is directed at providers' treatment practices and not workers. In cases where workers incur the direct cost of ongoing services, and then seek reimbursement of these costs, the Corporation and its Agents are required to reimburse the workers for the full costs of the services and then seek recovery of the same from the providers of those services.

In response to concerns expressed to the Corporation by the UTLC on this issue, the Corporation will ensure that both providers and workers are informed of the worker's right of review and that case managers implement a proper process for assessing the appropriateness of services in excess of the recommended guidelines.

5. The 'guidelines for the management of back-injured employees' were developed in 1993 by a committee composed of employee and employer representatives, and representatives from all treatment specialities with an involvement in the treatment of back disabilities. Consensus was achieved on best-practice guidelines, and these were published and distributed through an official launch in early 1994.

It is estimated that ineffective back treatments for common sprains and strains of the back are costing the WorkCover Scheme in excess of \$2 million per year. Poor management of these cases by service providers generates further costs in terms of ongoing income maintenance, unnecessary back surgery and other costs associated with chronic disability and illness behaviour.

In reviewing the level of compliance with the guidelines since 1994, it has been found, for example, that in excess of 40 per cent of all physiotherapy services for back injury have been provided outside the best practice guidelines. Hence, the Corporation is keen to develop strategies which ensure treatment providers adhere more closely to the guidelines.

This strategy is designed to ensure that only the most effective treatments are employed in the treatment of non-specific back injury. There is nothing in this strategy which would deny required and appropriate treatment to any injured worker. More appropriate treatment can only reduce the longevity of disability and the incidence of hard to treat illness behaviour, thus promoting better return to work outcomes.

INTELLECTUALLY DISABLED

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Disability Services a question about the Moving On initiative for intellectually disabled young people.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: The Opposition has received representations from parents of intellectually disabled young people concerning a funding shortage that has left families struggling to find and pay for care arrangements for their young children. These young people are involved in the Government initiative called Moving On, which has been designed to provide day options that would see them cared for and occupied during the day in a range of activities. The program concerned is overseen by Take 5, which is part of the Adelaide Central Mission.

While the Opposition applauds the aims of this program there is concern that funding is insufficient to cover the full allocation of days, and instead of a program covering 48 weeks some young people have had their program cut back by as much as 15 weeks. For example, a letter to the parents of one young person states:

As we discussed at the information day, there is insufficient money from your IDSC allocation to purchase a full year's service.

The letter then went on to set out the term dates covering just 34 weeks. Can the Minister explain why this program is unable to meet the needs of the participating young people? Can he indicate whether additional funds will be made available to provide services to young people on a full year basis, as was the undertaking given to parents?

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The Moving On program is a magnificent initiative of the current Government. It is a program designed to provide day options for persons with an intellectual disability leaving school. The program was introduced in 1996. Prior to that time and under the previous Government there was no program of this kind. Funding for the program this year is \$2.2 million, a substantial increase over last year.

The main beneficiaries of this program are 175 young people with an intellectual disability. This year the method by which the funds are allocated to this day program has been changed. Previously organisations providing the programs were separately funded. This year, as an initiative of Government in order to give parents and families additional choice, funding allocations have been made to individual families. Late last year there was an expo at which those who were to participate in the program had the opportunity to select programs for their child with intellectual disabilities. This included sporting, leisure and many other different programs, and there were different hours and different transport services. Each family was given an allocation of funds so that they could make a selection of the type of programs which were suitable.

The idea of the program was to give families the opportunity to make choices over a number of programs. Some programs were more expensive than others and some were less expensive. Some programs included matters such as transport and others did not. But families were given a generous allocation: between \$9 000 and \$22 500 per year was the range of the allocations.

The Hon. Carmel Zollo interjecting:

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The honourable member interjects, 'They have been cut.' They have not been cut. This year they have been increased and the availability of choice is greater. This Government has made additional funds available to the Moving On program this year. There has been no decrease in funds: this year there has been an increase in funds. Families have been given the choice to select programs, some of which more expensive than others. Some have chosen the excellent program offered by Take 5, run by the Adelaide Central Mission. That program, which as I say is a very good one, is rather more expensive than some other programs in the Moving On arrangements.

I was recently informed that some families have found that the number of weeks' care they can obtain out of their allocation is less this year than last year. When I heard that I immediately put in train inquiries to ensure that no families were unduly disadvantaged by the change in the arrangements. Officers of the Intellectual Disabilities Services Council have been meeting this week with officers of the Adelaide Central Mission to endeavour to make arrangements to ensure that no families suffer any detriment by reason of the change.

I am extremely proud—and I think all should be extremely proud—of the great initiative, Moving On, which has provided families who are in a very difficult and unfortunate

situation with services that were not previously available. The honourable member asked whether additional funds would be made available to the program. On the information available to me at present it is not a question of additional funds, it is a question of making appropriate variations to arrangements. I assure the honourable member that the Government is committed to ensuring that individual families do not suffer in consequence of appropriate changes to arrangements.

COOPER PEDY SCHOOL

In reply to **Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO** (9 December 1997).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Minister for Education, Children's Services and Training has provided the following information.

Although there are no immediate plans to replace general learning areas within timber classroom accommodation into solid construction, Cooper Pedy Area School has been successful in receiving the following Capital funding:

1984-85	Provision of toilet/showers	\$136 000
1986-87	Upgrade Resource Room	\$50 000
1991-92	Redevelop Administration Library Resource Centre	
	Exclusive site works to provide adequate recreational facilities and effluent disposal system	\$1.1m
	Gymnasium and swimming pool	\$1.126m
1997-98	Science Laboratory Upgrade	\$600 000

Officers from Facilities Management Services, Department of Education, Training and Employment, are working with the local site manager to determine cyclic maintenance needs in addressing internal and external painting, and recarpeting of the timber transportable buildings within funding which has been provided through the Back to School Grant Program and the 1997 External Repair and Paint Program.

Under these programs Cooper Pedy Area School has received the following allocations:

Back to School Grant Program	1995-96	\$44 970
	1996-97	\$36 730
1997 External Repair and Paint Program		\$9 420

It is envisaged that the funding provided will enhance the general condition of the timber transportable accommodation. The condition of the buildings will be closely monitored in the future to determine the need for replacement.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

In reply to **Hon. T. CROTHERS** (4 December 1997).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Minister for Government Enterprises has provided the following response:

1. Redemptions under section 42 of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 have no limit.

Following the introduction of redemptions in 1995, the WorkCover Corporation, after extensive consultation with all interested parties including worker and employer associations, issued a policy.

The policy required claims agents to seek the approval of the WorkCover Corporation for redemptions over \$50 000 or under two years of incapacity. By October 1996, WorkCover Corporation observed that many of the redemptions made by the claims agents were being made at \$49 999 with little consistency between age, weekly payment liability and nature and extent of disability.

In response to this observation the WorkCover Corporation wrote to all claims agents indicating the actuarial assessment of liability, based on age and level of payments, taking into account the discontinuance rate and the net present value of the lump sum. Further, the memorandum indicated that if the number of redemptions being agreed at \$49 999 did not decline then the Corporation may change policy to require approval for all redemptions over \$35 000.

At no stage has the Corporation set a maximum limit of \$35 000 on redemptions. The policy on requiring the WorkCover Corporation's approval remains for amounts over \$50 000. The highest redemption paid to date is \$1.8 million.

Unlike the repealed Act to which the honourable member refers, weekly payments are not discontinued when they reach a certain level, they continue until legally reduced or discontinued in accordance with the Act. If either the worker or the claims agent/

corporation does not agree with the level of the redemption, the worker continues to receive his/her entitlements of weekly payments and medical costs.

2. The issue of multiple employers for itinerant, seasonal and contract workers has existed since the commencement of the scheme in 1987, because, unlike the repealed Act where the liability was the employer's liability under subsection 46(1) of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986 for a work related injury is the WorkCover Corporation's.

The introduction of claims agents has not been responsible for the identification of the issue.

In one of the matters referred to in the article raised by the honourable member, the claimant chose to lodge the claim with a previous employer, rather than the employer in whose employment the injury arose.

It is oversimplifying the situation to suggest that where it is agreed that the claimant has an injury, it is automatically compensable. Rather, compensation flows from an injury 'arising out of or in the course of employment'. The contract of employment is pivotal to determining compensability of the injury.

The WorkCover Corporation attempts to resolve these issues when they are brought to its attention. However, because of the need to identify the existence of a contract of employment and any bonus/penalty scheme implications, there is a potential to delay the resolution of the issue.

It would be financially irresponsible to admit liability on the basis that the injury happened somewhere sometime and later find that the claimant was not working under a 'contract of service' at the time the injury occurred.

In summary the WorkCover Corporation is aware of the potential delay and litigation that multiple employers/claims agents can have, and it assists in the resolution of the issue where possible.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Hon. R.R. ROBERTS** (11 December 1997).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism has provided the following information:

The current Federal Government did not renew the Regional Development Program because of the duplication and administrative wastage but ensured that all contractual agreements (both for Regional Economic Development Organisations (REDO) administration and projects) were honoured. A number of Regional Development Boards have taken over the full administration of the REDO projects and will complete them well within the timelines.

The Minister has not been able to find a REDO project that will be prematurely disbanded or cut from funding. If the honourable member could specify the projects that he thinks are at risk of running out of time to be completed, I will then ask Minister Ingerson to request that the Department for Industry and Trade look into the matter.

SCHOOL ZONES

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Transport questions concerning school speed zone fines and demerit points.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: On Tuesday in a ministerial statement to the Parliament the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning stated that 4 000 drivers who have already paid their speeding fines would not be given refunds and that any demerit points incurred would not be withdrawn. At the same time the Government has chosen not to pursue the 1 350 tardy motorists who have failed to pay their outstanding fines. Up to \$1 million has been collected by the Government from the 4 000 motorists who paid their fines in good faith. The Minister's decision is nothing more than a disgrace. In her statement on Tuesday she said:

I appreciate that motorists who have expiated their offences may feel a sense of injustice that their fees will not be refunded. However, these cases have been finalised by the expiation of the offence and motorists have waived their right to contest the decision.

'May feel a sense of injustice'—that has to be the understatement of the year.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I'm not the Minister, you are. You fix up this mess. My office has been swamped with phone calls, faxes and letters from people who are outraged at the Minister's decision not to refund their fines or restore their demerit points. They believe that this is nothing more than a million dollar rip-off by the Government. The Minister is sending a dangerously erroneous message to the community: if you are prompt in paying your fines you are a mug.

In this case not only are 4 000 motorists out of pocket financially but they have lost demerit points. Some may have even lost their licences and as a result possibly their jobs. However, those who were slow to pay their fines are getting away without penalty. By the Minister's short-sighted and mean-fisted action she may well be encouraging many South Australian motorists to consider delaying paying their fines until the last possible moment just in case the Government once again gets its legislation wrong and is caught out. Even Mike Duffy from the *Sunday Mail* has said that it is laughable for the Government to do anything other than treat all motorists as equals.

Minister, your actions can only be compared to the robber barons of the last century. I am inclined to accuse the Government of petty thievery; however, I understand the proper term is 'grand larceny'. Our office has recently been advised of a number of other matters, and this particular fiasco may just be the tip of the iceberg. My questions are:

1. In the interests of justice and fair play, will the Minister now reconsider her earlier decision and ensure that the 4 000 motorists who have either lost demerit points, lost their drivers' licences or paid their fines will have them restored or refunded, or will the RAA be forced to mount another costly legal case against the Government?

2. What advice does the Minister have for those motorists who have partly paid their fines? Will they be required to pay the rest or not?

3. What about those people who are serving or are about to commence community service orders as a result of their fines? Will they still be required to turn up or will they have their offences commuted?

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am intrigued to see that a guy who lost the shadow ministry of transport would now be championing speedsters, drivers who have exceeded the speed limit and who have indicated by paying the fine that they did speed in school zones. It is interesting that this honourable member who could not even hold his job would be championing people speeding in speed zones where children are present, at hours when the concentration of children are present on school days.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: We did not determine that there would not be an appeal because the Government did not believe that there were not grounds for appeal but, rather, because it would have been a lengthy and costly process. Questions about the law would have remained, and the police would have been uncertain about the focus of attention at school zones. It was unfair and unreasonable in all those circumstances not to act immediately—as we will be acting with the law—to tidy up the issues where there is uncertainty in terms of the role of police at school zones.

I highlight, as I said in my statement, that these cases have

been finalised by the expiation of the offence and motorists have waived their right to contest that decision. That is the standard which is always applied when anybody for any offence expiates that notice. It is no different in speeding from any other situation. I will not suggest that people who have sped, who have admitted the offence and who have paid the fine should be made an exception in this case.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (Minister for Justice) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In 1995 the Government introduced the Criminal Law Consolidation (Appeals) Amendment Bill to give the Director of Public Prosecutions a right of appeal against a decision by a judge to acquit a person charged with a serious offence. The reform was aimed at ensuring that serious errors by a judge do not allow an alleged offender to escape justice. It was a blow to victims of serious offences when the Opposition and the Australian Democrats refused to pass the legislation.

There is increasing concern about judgments made and directions given by courts. The fact that a judge has made a mistake does not mean that the mistake should not be rectified. Accordingly, in its community safety policy the Government, once again, promised to introduce legislation to give the Director of Public Prosecutions the right of appeal against a decision by a judge to acquit a person charged with a serious offence.

In magistrates courts where the decision to acquit is made by one person, the magistrate, the Crown has the right of appeal. Where a person elects to be tried by judge alone, no matter how wrong an acquittal may be on the evidence, a decision by one person means that an accused person goes free. To provide the Crown with a right of appeal against a decision by a judge to acquit an offender will provide an important check on the judge's decision. There were seven acquittals by a judge sitting alone in the 1995 calendar year and six in the 1996 calendar year. These are the latest figures that the Office of Crime Statistics has.

The Bill provides that the court on hearing an appeal against an acquittal by judge alone can dismiss the appeal, or allow the appeal and order a new trial. The new provisions will only apply to proceedings in relation to an offence allegedly committed after the amendments have come into operation. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 352—Right of appeal in criminal cases

This clause proposes to amend section 352 of the principal Act to allow the DPP (with the leave of the Full Court of the Supreme Court) to appeal against the acquittal of a person tried on information by a judge sitting alone.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 353—Determination of appeals in ordinary cases

This clause amends section 353 of the principal Act to deal with an appeal against acquittal.

Proposed subsection (2a) provides that, on an appeal against acquittal, the Full Court may dismiss the appeal or allow the appeal

and direct a new trial and may make any consequential or ancillary orders.

Clause 4: Transitional provision

This clause provides that the proposed amendments only apply to proceedings relating to offences committed after the commencement of the measure.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 17 February. Page 273.)

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I support this motion, and congratulate and thank his Excellency for his address to both Houses of Parliament. Today, I want to pay a tribute to the former member for Chaffey, Kent Andrew, for the contribution he made to this Parliament, his electorate and, ultimately, to this State in the four years that he was the member for Chaffey. All members who were here in the last Parliament would have been impressed by the energy and sincerity of the member for Chaffey and the diligence with which he applied his responsibilities as a member of Parliament to his electorate.

When one looks at his record, one might come to the conclusion that there is no justice in the political process, and I am sure members opposite from time to time would agree with that statement. Kent Andrew served Chaffey over a period where a Government, in fact, for the first time in a very long time, invested significant sums of money for the improvement of previously neglected infrastructure for the Chaffey community. I will list some of them.

The first, and the most notable, of the achievements was the \$17 million Berri bridge. Whilst some may have said that it was overdue, the Government spent a significant sum of money to improve the transport infrastructure of the community of Berri. I know that the former member, Kent Andrew, spent a significant amount of his time in the short period he was here to ensure, first, that the bridge was delivered and, secondly, that it was an appropriate bridge for the community.

The second matter with which the former member had a lot to do was the installation of water filtration plants in the Riverland. Indeed, the previous Government spent \$50 million in the Riverland and, as Mr Andrew commented at the declaration of the poll, his children and their families will continue to benefit from the important improvement to household water in the Riverland for many years to come.

During the period that Mr Andrew was a member the Liberal Government, encouraged by him—and I was present on many occasions when he expressed his viewpoint strongly on behalf of his constituents in the Liberal parliamentary Party room—delivered around \$150 million worth of assets in top condition to irrigators. In the last five to six years—for four of which Kent Andrew was the local member—there was a 25 per cent increase in irrigated area in the Riverland. That was an extraordinary achievement and reflects well on the Riverland community. This was facilitated by the Liberal Government in making possible the transferability of irrigation water. It assisted with new export incentives and helped to train and educate the people to take up this challenging growth. My recollection is that the former member made a very strong contribution on that issue.

On another issue, I know that the Hon. Rob Lucas would remember a number of conversations and discussions in the

Party room relating to the Glossop High School redevelopment, which cost about \$6 million and ensured that quality education was delivered in the Riverland. Education in rural areas is an important issue, and I know from personal experience that it can have substantial effects on families and communities if the infrastructure or the quality of education is not kept up to the best level and at least the level enjoyed by people in the metropolitan area.

Another initiative that Mr Andrew was prominent in advancing was the Riverland community transport system which, I understand, is expected to be up and away in the near future. Indeed, I can recall at one Murray Bridge Party conference Mr Andrew's speaking on improvements to the River Murray. I refer to his contribution in making submissions regarding the Murray-Darling 2001 project which became a Centenary of Federation project. That enabled some \$164 million to be secured from the Federal Government over the next four years for the restoration of the River Murray.

I also reflect on a time when the former member made a significant contribution to the debate on the carp problem in the River Murray. He appeared on *Landline* on a couple of occasions and certainly, when I raised the topic with him, I was always impressed with the level manner in which he approached that difficult issue.

Over the four years of the Brown-Olsen Government the Riverland received record spending for health and education. Health services and facilities in that region are envied by many other regions around the State. I must say that that is a consequence not just of the State Government but also of the role of local health providers and teachers in that area.

The Government also provided funding for oval lights, recreation centre improvements in Renmark, sporting facility improvements at Barmera, with a tennis club and golf club, and special regional sporting facilities, and funding for the installation of a new synthetic hockey field at Berri for the region.

One of the issues dealt with by Kent Andrew was the Teletrak issue. Throughout the whole issue Mr Andrew's position was clear: 'If it stacks up, let's go for it.' He then expressed some reservations and indicated that Teletrak should put its money and its whole proposal on the table so that everyone could properly analyse it. Unfortunately for Mr Andrew the issue was exploited and exploited well, but that is the way of politics. Certainly, he urged some caution, and I suspect that the need for some of that caution in areas other than the Riverland might well come to pass, given that a number of local councils throughout Australia have, for reasons that escape my attention, paid significant deposits to Teletrak.

In discussing the campaign, Mr Andrew, with others, reflected on the nature of the campaign, particularly in the local area, and I must say, to the credit of the former member, that he has not reacted personally or vitriolically and he has endeavoured to maintain a dignity and decorum. He has also tried to debate issues rather than personalities.

The most disappointing aspect of speaking with Mr Andrew is that the Liberal State Government went to the last election with a full range of policies, with a continuing vision of plan and strategy to improve the economy and to provide better facilities and services for the State and, in Mr Andrew's case, the Riverland region. We presented these over a whole range of portfolios and we developed a specific regional development policy.

In comparison, the minor Parties did not do this and it is disappointing that they did not. One can ask the rhetorical

question: why is it that a person or Party without any policies can be successful at an election campaign? It is also important to note that Mr Andrew did receive far and away the most votes in the election but, as a consequence of the way in which our preferential system operates, he was unsuccessful.

The other matter I wish to raise in paying tribute to Mr Andrew concerns the way in which he operated at a parliamentary level. He always operated with dignity, and his contribution in the Party room and at backbench committee level was strong. In his speech at the declaration of the poll he said:

The transport backbench committee with Minister Laidlaw has been a fine example. I have found it not only enjoyable but productive. As a small group we met with the Minister almost weekly and worked through a range of issues, whether it be for legislation, changes for administration or policy for future planning in the transport portfolio.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: I miss him.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: As do the rest of us. Not many people in the community would understand the significant amount of work done by all members of Parliament behind closed doors. I suppose some of us do not present as well in the public eye as others, but certainly at the end of the day we are judged by our performance in those forums, and Mr Andrew was a great performer in those forums. On behalf of all my colleagues, I must say that Mr Andrew is a loss to this Parliament.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: He is a significant loss to Chaffey.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: As the Hon. Mr Dawkins interjects, he is a significant loss to Chaffey. I am pleased that occasionally I bump into him at Liberal Party functions, and he maintains a very positive outlook. At Party forums he has maintained his record of maintaining his record of making positive contributions.

I wish to raise one other issue in this speech, and that is the report I noticed in the most recent issue of *Hotels SA* by one of South Australia's leading business people, Peter Hurley, who is the current Australian Hotels Association President. He decries the current attitude of many people within this State and in particular refers to 'the ongoing negative and destructive attitude to development in this State'. He uses the example of the Glenelg/West Beach development, and we have seen some people make an extraordinary effort to block that development. He indicates in his article that, if it does not change its attitude, South Australia will become a backwater. Indeed, he states:

Continual denial of reasonable development opportunities and placing so many hurdles that the effort is not worth it may well suit those entrenched in their 'comfort zone'. But it does little to ensure Adelaide remains a pleasant place to live AND work, and a viable place to do business.

He goes on to refer to the way in which pressure groups operate and present their arguments, and states that at the end of the day when looking at development decisions we must put emotion to one side and we must base our decisions on factual research, legitimate case studies and experience. In relation to politicians, he states:

This way politicians in particular can make decisions which affect our industry based on facts, not emotions or simplistic arguments put up by some who, in many cases, have moral objections to our industry.

I must say that some of these anti-development groups have moral objections to anything that might provide a better environment for our community and, most importantly, jobs for our children. I agree wholeheartedly with him when he

goes on to state that interest groups should not have a disproportionate influence in this State and should not hinder development unreasonably, and he uses the Glenelg/West Beach development as an example.

I also agree with him wholeheartedly when he goes on to state:

Unless we get growth in this State, those in the 'comfort zone' with jobs will continue to enjoy their lifestyle, but the gap between them and the unemployed will continue to widen. If we don't want to become a backwater, jobs must be generated in the tourism, hospitality and leisure industry. If a proactive development lobby does not speak out, we'll have diabolical problems in a relatively short space of time.

I congratulate Mr Hurley on making those statements and I would encourage other people in the business community to make similar statements.

Not everybody has the opportunity to travel interstate, but I can ensure the people who read this speech that in most other places in Australia, and the capital cities in particular, you see more development, and more recently generated, than in this State. That is not for want of trying on the part of this Government or the previous Brown-Olsen Government: it is a reflection on the attitude of small minority groups in this State. If we allow them to continue to dominate this agenda then Mr Hurley's prediction that this State will become a backwater must come to pass. That is not why I am here, nor why my children are at school and have an ambition to obtain tertiary education and remain in this State. Mr President, that is a recipe for sending your, my and everyone else's children and grandchildren to another State.

It is about time that we as a community—and I am not saying this in a Party political sense, because many members opposite share this view—put aside some of these small interest groups and allowed people who want to get on to develop this State the opportunity to do so. I do not have any instant suggestions as to how to change the attitude of certain elements of our community, but the fact is that if we do not do it soon South Australia will become a backwater; we will not generate the interest that we all enjoyed and loved particularly during the Grand Prix period; we will not be able to support a world class Festival of Arts or produce quality people in quality pursuits; and at the end of the day it will not just be our children leaving the State: it will be our parents, brothers, sisters, wives and ultimately ourselves. I would hope that leading into the next century and during this term of Government we can make some significant advances in the people's attitudes so that those who are interested in growth and future employment can get on and do the job that they so dearly want to do.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I, too, thank His Excellency the Governor for the speech with which he opened this session of Parliament and I record my personal appreciation to both His Excellency and Lady Neal for the excellent manner in which they are discharging their vice-regal functions. Yesterday I had the honour to be present at the Minda garden party, graciously hosted by His Excellency the Governor and Lady Neal at Government House to celebrate the centenary of Minda Incorporated, an institution which has served South Australia well and about which I will speak more later. The manner in which His Excellency and Lady Neal hosted the garden party yesterday is a good indication of the splendid way in which they have served and are serving our community.

On this occasion it is appropriate to acknowledge the contribution made to this Parliament by certain members who are no longer here. I want to mention first the Hon. Peter Dunn, who was a member of the Legislative Council from November 1982 until the last election in 1997 at which he retired. Peter Dunn served the Parliament for almost 15 years and was President of the Legislative Council in the last Parliament, an office which he filled with great distinction, good humour and commonsense; qualities which he brought to all his political and other activities. I certainly wish the Hon. Peter Dunn well in his retirement. Valedictory remarks were made on the occasion of the last day of the last session of the previous Parliament, but it is worth recording his service once again.

The Hon. Dr Bernice Pfitzner was unsuccessful in her bid to be re-elected to the Legislative Council at the last election. She had been a member of this Chamber since 1990 and it was only the vagaries of the political process which prevented her returning. Dr Bernice Pfitzner made a unique contribution to the Parliament. As members would know, she was born in Singapore and was a medical graduate of the University of Adelaide. Amongst other positions she filled in the Parliament was the Presiding Member of the Social Development Committee. Bernice Pfitzner made unique contributions to this Parliament, and her presence will be missed. The Hon. Paolo Nocella, who sat briefly with the Opposition in the previous Parliament, should also be acknowledged as somebody who made a distinct contribution, albeit a somewhat short one.

It is also appropriate to mention some members of the House of Assembly who are no longer sitting. The Hon. Harold Allison was a member of the other place from 1975 until 1997, at which time he retired. The seat held by him on his retirement was the seat of Gordon. As members will know, he was Minister for Education and Aboriginal Affairs in the Tonkin Government and held various other positions in the Parliament including, during the last Parliament, that of Chairman of Committees. Harold Allison was a most delightful and effective member who represented his south-eastern constituency with great distinction. He single-handedly converted what was once a Labor seat or at least a marginal seat into a seat with a strong personal following and one which the Labor Party has very little prospect of wresting away.

The member for Peake in the last Parliament, Heini Becker, was a member of this Parliament from 1970 to 1997, almost 27 years. He was a hard working and colourful member of Parliament. He was Chairman of the Economic and Finance Committee, an office that he filled with great energy and distinction. He was a member of many parliamentary committees over the years and was particularly effective and successful as a local member of Parliament representing a number of electorates in the western suburbs of Adelaide. Heini Becker made a significant contribution to the good government of the State of South Australia.

It is worth mentioning a number of other members of Parliament who were not re-elected. Neither Messrs Allison nor Becker stood at the last election. However, I should mention a number of Liberal members who were unsuccessful at the election. Most of those I propose to refer to served only one term in this Parliament. It is not my intention to single them out for special mention because the contributions made by all of them were distinct. All of them without exception were most diligent and conscientious in the representation of their electorates.

Mr Kent Andrew was member for Chaffey, and the Hon. Angus Redford has already made particular reference to the contribution of Kent Andrew. All of his remarks I endorse. The Hon. Scott Ashenden, who was a Minister in the previous Government and whose seat was made less safe for the Liberal Party as a result of the last electoral redistribution, made a significant contribution not only to the previous Parliament in which he was a Minister but also in previous Parliaments when he served as a backbencher. Mr Sam Bass, the member for Florey, a former Secretary of the Police Association and Deputy Whip of the Liberal Party, made a distinctive and colourful contribution to the Parliament.

Mr Colin Caudell was member for Mitchell. I worked with Colin Caudell in the 1993 election and he brought a small business perspective to the Parliament. He was particularly active in relation to some of the activities of oil companies. It is a great pity that Mr Caudell will not be serving the Government. He was a member with a distinct contribution. Mr John Cummins was member for Norwood, a legal colleague of mine. Mr Cummins worked extremely hard in that electorate, which had not been held by the Liberal Party for many years. He was defeated by only a few votes. John Cummins served on the Legislative Review Committee, of which I was Presiding Member, and he was a most energetic and effective parliamentarian. Julie Greig was member for Reynell, a member who won a seat which the Liberal Party was never expected to win and who was one of the most effective of the new members in the previous Parliament. Julie had strong connections with the local community, having been a member of the local council in her area and I am glad to see continues her very strong community involvement. It is of significance that Mrs Greig managed to secure a result which, in terms of swing, was substantially better than many others.

I mention also Lorraine Rosenberg, who was member for Kurna, another southern seat which it might be said that the Liberal Party could not on ordinary demographics expect to have won. Lorraine Rosenberg showed herself to be an extremely thorough, hard-headed and effective member. Her loss is a significant one. David Wade was the member for Elder, the Hon. Paul Holloway's former seat. He filled with great energy. He brought a distinct perspective to the Parliament. He was truly a lateral thinker and one whose contribution will stand very good comparison with that of the current member for Elder. Finally, Mr Joe Rossi was member for Lee and he was a most colourful member who managed to attract the attention of the media on many occasions. Notwithstanding that some chose to paint him as less than sensitive, he was a member who represented his constituency with colourful effectiveness.

I wish to use this occasion to mention some of the issues for which I have been given portfolio responsibility. I mentioned that His Excellency the Governor had hosted the centenary celebration for Minda Incorporated. When dealing with the subject of disability services, it is appropriate to mention that fine South Australian institution which epitomises disability services and illustrates their importance and significance in the community. Minda (originally known as Minda Home) was established in 1898 to provide residential care for people with an intellectual disability. It is a highly respected South Australian institution, and its reputation extends beyond this State throughout Australia and overseas as one of the most innovative and progressive institutions in the intellectual disability field.

Minda has changed over the years. The number of persons in accommodation has decreased. There was a time when many of those at Minda were children, but I am happy to say that in South Australia at present there is no child with an intellectual disability in an institution. The policy has been to ensure that those with an intellectual disability, especially children, are accommodated in the community where it is believed that their development and well being is better served than through institutional care.

Minda has residential accommodation for up to 650 clients (as I have said, all adults) on its campus at Brighton and in community homes, most of which are located in the south-west area of Adelaide. It supports employment options for 500 clients and provides sporting and recreational choices. It has a community outreach team which offers a variety of support services including respite care for families that look after their sons and daughters at home. Each year, Minda provides approximately 4 500 respite bed nights for both children and adults with an intellectual disability. That not only provides much needed breaks for clients but also for their families.

Minda has recently completed the construction of a 48-bed aged care facility on its Brighton campus. This facility is named the Pat Kaufmann Centre after Pat Kaufmann who is the Chair of Minda and who for a number of years was the Principal of the special school which was conducted at Minda. It is a great tribute to the efforts of Pat Kaufmann that she has been acknowledged in this way—and rightly so. The Pat Kaufmann Centre provides accommodation for aged frail clients with Alzheimer's, dementia and other physically debilitating medical problems. I am told that this is a first for Australia. I was fortunate to attend the opening of the Pat Kaufmann Centre last November. At that opening it was announced that some of the sections of the new centre were to be named after longstanding residents of Minda. The first, whose name I regret to say I forget, was a gentleman who had been a resident of Minda for over 70 years and another, who was also acknowledged by the naming of a section, had been a resident of Minda for almost the same length of time. That is great illustration of the differing approaches to the care of those with intellectual disabilities. As I said before, there are no longer any children in institutional care in South Australia.

Minda is an outstanding organisation, one of many outstanding non-government organisations in the field of disabilities in this State. Another of these is the Alzheimer's Association. I am proud today to wear a sprig of rosemary given to me to commemorate the launch this day of the Rosemary Foundation, which has been created to help establish a fund to combat the problem and the tragedy of dementia in our society. This is a problem of significant proportions. Alzheimer's disease and other related forms of dementia will impact on at least one in every four people in this State. About 1 000 older people are likely to be diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease each year, and many more are affected because they have to take on the role of caring for someone who has dementia.

For a number of years the Alzheimer's Association has been providing a wonderful service for those affected—a counselling service, an information service and a training service—and it has played an educational role. The Rosemary Foundation is an outgrowth of the Alzheimer's Association. It is important that I mention that rosemary has been chosen as the symbol for the new foundation because it is the traditional emblem of remembrance. It is a herb that has been esteemed by ancients for its aromatic qualities and medicinal

uses, which have included the treatment of disorders of the mind. Rosemary oil has been attributed with the property of relieving muscular discomfort. It is appropriate that as it carries with it associations of memory from ancient times through to today rosemary be chosen as the name of and symbol for this new initiative in the field of memory support.

There are many institutions in our State which address issues of disability. A large number of South Australians suffer from disabilities. The prevalence of disability in the South Australian community is not widely appreciated. The national average for people with a disability in the total population is about 18 per cent. In this State surveys have shown that slightly over 20 per cent of the population suffer from a disability—the somewhat higher percentage rate arising here because of our somewhat higher age profile. Many thousands of South Australians are provided with specialist services through not only the non-Government organisations such as Minda which I have mentioned but also many fine Government agencies.

The Disability Services Office expends about \$145 million a year on services to this sector, and I mention a couple of the major ones. The Intellectually Disabled Services Council has an annual budget exceeding \$61 million and maintains many services and supports many individual organisations in the field of intellectual disabilities.

Julia Farr Services (once called the Julia Farr Centre) will receive in this current budget in excess of \$23 million. Julia Farr Services conducts a substantial facility at Fullarton (previously known as the Home for Incurables). The changes to institutional care and the devolution of residential services has seen the number of admissions to the Julia Farr Centre steadily decline in recent years. The number of admissions in 1993-94 was about 950; it was slightly more than that in 1994-95; but is estimated to decline to some 260 in this current year. Many of the people who were previously accommodated at Julia Farr Services are now in supported accommodation within the non-government sector but supported through Julia Farr Services and, as I say, by substantial funding from the Government.

I have already mentioned Minda Incorporated, whose budget from the Government is some \$16.5 million in this current year. The Crippled Children's Association is yet another non-government organisation which has served this community very well over a long period of time. The Government funding to that association, which participates strongly in the options coordination scheme (to which I will refer shortly) is in excess of \$6.5 million.

The Independent Living Equipment Contractor receives some \$3 million, and there are a number of equipment schemes which are supported through the Domiciliary Care Services and which receive in all about \$4.7 million of funds through the disability sector. So there are a very large number of organisations in this State doing wonderful work in relation to people with disabilities.

It is worth mentioning that there are a number of misapprehensions about the concept of disability. Some people have tended to think of disability in terms of illness, ill-health or disease, but in this context we are speaking not of those with illness or disease which is very often curable but of conditions which are likely to be life long and permanent. We are speaking of disabilities that are attributable not only to intellectual disability but also to psychiatric, cognitive, neurological, sensory—for example, what was previously referred to as blindness or deafness, hearing impairment or sight impairment—and physical impairment or any combina-

tion of these. The result of a person suffering with a disability of this kind is a reduced capacity for social interaction, communication, learning, mobility, decision making or self-care and also the need for continuing support services.

Disability services themselves cover a very wide spectrum from accommodation, home care, family support services, independent living training services, information, print disability services and recreation services. It is frequently overlooked that those with disabilities have not, until fairly recently, been recognised as requiring recreational or sporting services. Respite care services are important for those with disabilities and their carers. Education and training services for those with disabilities have hitherto been rudimentary. It is acknowledged that there is a need for therapy and equipment services, counselling, support and transport services, and advocacy services, because without advocates for those who have disabilities it is likely, as has happened in the past, that the needs of those with disabilities will be overlooked.

The Disability Services Act was enacted by this Parliament in 1993. It provides for the funding and provision of disability services in accordance with a number of principles and objectives. This significant piece of legislation was introduced by the previous Labor Government but supported strongly by the then Liberal Opposition. The Disability Services Act requires that certain principles and objectives be applied and sought. The principles include a recognition of the fact—and this is a fact that is often overlooked—that those with disabilities, whatever the origin, nature or degree of those disabilities, are people who have an inherent right to respect for their human worth and dignity.

It should also be recognised as a principle that people with disabilities have the same fundamental human rights and responsibilities as do other members of our community. They have similar rights to realise their potential for intellectual, physical, emotional, sexual and spiritual development and they have the same right as other members of our community to choose their own lifestyle and generally to control their own lives. They have a right, as do the rest of us, to protection from neglect, abuse, intimidation and exploitation. That is a right of people with disabilities, and there is an obligation on those of us who are fortunate enough not to suffer from a disability to ensure that those rights are protected and upheld.

It is also a principle that those with disabilities have the right to choose between services and the options available to them within particular services. There was a time when people with disabilities would, as it were, sign up with a particular agency which would provide all their needs, take them over as a client and provide whatever services the particular institution happened to provide rather than tailor solutions to the problems of individuals. It is appropriate that people with disabilities have the right to nominate whether they will take particular services from particular institutions or agencies.

Those who are responsible for ensuring the delivery of services for persons with disabilities should acknowledge this right of choice and that the services will be provided in a manner which involves the least restriction of rights and opportunities and takes into account individual needs, ages, and personal and other circumstances such as financial, ethnic origin, gender or the like.

There is also an acknowledgment that one of the principles is that those with disabilities should be entitled to pursue any grievances that they might have in relation to their services without fear of discontinuance of services, recrimination or retribution. It would be naive of anyone to believe that in the

past many of those responsible for the care of people with disabilities, especially those with intellectual disabilities, have been less than sensitive to some of the principles that have been outlined, and that is why it was appropriate that they be outlined in legislation. It is worth also mentioning the objectives which are pursued in the field of disability services. Those objectives are set out in the Act and they require that disability services be designed and administered so as to achieve positive outcomes for people with disabilities. In other words, the community is not simply minding or looking after people with disabilities, watching the days go by, but is actually seeking to achieve positive outcomes. Those outcomes can include matters such as an enhanced self image for people, enhanced level of competence, increased independence, increased education, training and employment opportunities, and integration and participation into the life of the community to the extent that is possible. It is an objective to ensure that the services are designed and administered so that the conditions of day-to-day life for a person with disabilities are as close as possible to those of other members of the community.

It is an objective of the Act, and one which is actively pursued in the system, to ensure that no single service provider exercises control over all or most of the aspects of the life of a person with a disability. Services should meet individual needs and goals of persons to whom those services are provided, and account should be taken of age, personal circumstances and any disadvantage from which the people suffer.

Disability services should also be designed and administered to render the service provider accountable to all persons who use the service: accountable to the carers, to the advocates of persons with disabilities who use the service, to the Government which funds services, and to all other persons who are interested either through the provision of information relating to the services or information relating to the administration of those services. Another important objective is to ensure that services respect the right to privacy and confidentiality of the clients of the services. Another objective is to ensure that persons with disabilities who wish to use the services have easy access to advocacy support and to facilitate their use of those services. It is yet another objective to ensure that appropriate avenues exist for grievances and the resolution of complaints and the like.

The final stated objective of disability services is to allow, to the extent that is practicable, the persons who use the services the opportunity for informed participation in the design, development, management and evaluation of the services. The Act also provides an important reminder to those who provide services by setting out the matters which should be taken into account in determining eligibility for and priority of access to services and in assessing the needs of a person with a disability who is accorded access to a service.

There are six of these matters. The person's wishes are, of course, a fundamental consideration. The level of the disability and its impact upon the person is, of course, a consideration. The needs and capabilities of any carer is an important consideration. The extent and support of assistance provided or available from other sources is a relevant consideration. The implications of any decision for carers and members of the person's family is something which should not be overlooked. In many other cases there will be additional factors which are specific to individuals.

One of the messages of the Disability Services Act is that individual consideration is to be given to individual cases and

that social policy should not be developed in isolation from the rights and aspirations of people with disabilities or their carers and families.

The Brown-Olsen Governments of the previous Parliament had significant achievements in the field of disability services. On this occasion it is worth recognising the significance of some of those achievements. Those Governments provided \$16.8 million more than had previously been provided for services such as accommodation, personal care, respite and day support, alternative community services and therapy services.

The independent living equipment program was provided with an additional \$1 million of funding. An additional \$2 million in education for support of people with disabilities was provided during the last Government. My colleague, the Hon. Dr Michael Armitage, was South Australia's first Minister for Disability Services—recognition of the importance that those Governments placed on disability services.

The previous Government developed protocols to assist people with disability to access housing. There were a number of transport initiatives which greatly benefited those with disabilities. Of course, it might be said that the provision of buses for those with disabilities was the result of an intervention by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. But, although that intervention must be acknowledged, it is the fact that the Government did agree to provide transport facilities for those with disabilities without any formal order of the commission being made. This State is still a national leader in the field.

The other transport initiatives included the provision of the disability friendly bus stops within the city of Adelaide, an expanded Access Cab fleet and, of course, the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning has just this week announced additional measures in relation to that access scheme, which has been extremely successful and which is widely applauded.

The Government is proud of its achievement in funding access to local community facilities such as lifters for swimming pools. The Disability Advisory Council was formed as a renewed consultative mechanism for consumers, carers, advocates and service providers. As Minister, I can say that it is a council on which I will rely.

The previous Government developed a whole of Government disability strategy with action plans to meet the needs of people with disabilities. So our achievements in the field have been considerable and are achievements of which the Government can be proud.

I mentioned options in this context, and I think it is appropriate to mention more specifically the development of options coordination, which is a mechanism whereby the delivery and provision of services to those with disabilities has been improved and made more equitable. The underlying scheme of options coordination was to provide fewer entry points for people with disabilities. Previously, there were a large and confusing number of organisations and entry points into the disability services sector. Those with disabilities found difficulty in accessing appropriate services because of the bedazzling array of services provided.

There were also many different funding mechanisms and many inequalities in the system. Often people were on a number of waiting lists, for example, for the provision of particular services. They might not know to which particular services to go. Because a large number of agencies had different eligibility criteria, a number of assessments might have to be undertaken by particular clients.

So, the system cried out for an element of coordination and standardisation, and a number of options coordination agencies were established. In the field of intellectual disability the options coordinator is the Intellectual Disabilities Services Council. In the field of Adult Physiological and Neurological Services and the field of brain injury there is specialised recognition. The field of sensory options, that is, the provision of services to those with sensory disabilities, is a separate service. And the fifth options co-ordination agency is the Crippled Childrens' Association. Options coordinators have been appointed and the options system has been operating since 1995.

I have recently released an interim report on the evaluation of options coordination. This is a new system and it was known when it was established that an evaluation and review would be required on an ongoing basis. It was estimated, I think, that five years would be required before a full evaluation of the system could be made. I am glad to release the report from the committee chaired by Professor Roy Brown of the Flinders University on options coordination which, as I mentioned, is still in its developmental stage.

The mechanisms for the delivery of services in the disability area are being constantly improved and upgraded to ensure that the principles and objectives to which I have referred are achieved. I believe that the disability services sector in South Australia has been extremely well developed by dedicated people, not only in the private but also in the public sector, delivering to the community services which are appropriate and most needed. I commend all who in work in this sector for their efforts.

I have also been given portfolio responsibility in relation to ageing, and it is appropriate that I mention a couple of issues in relation to this important area. The Government has made some considerable achievements in the field of ageing, and the previous Minister (Hon. David Wotton) made a substantial contribution which ought to be acknowledged in relation to the ageing sector.

The Office for the Ageing, which was established by the previous Government under the Office for the Ageing Act, is charged with responsibility for achieving the Government's objectives. Those objectives and some of the problems and challenges were outlined in 'Ageing—A 10-Year Plan for South Australia' which was released by the previous Minister. That plan centres around, as it says in its introduction:

The right and expectation of every South Australian to enjoy full citizenship from birth until death, irrespective of age or frailty.

It is worth quoting also from this landmark report the following statement, which I think underlines the principles:

There is a risk that as people age they will increasingly lose their opportunities to be citizens. Retirement from paid work is often associated with withdrawal from other activities and friendships. Old age, particularly if frailty increases, carries with it a further risk that those positive functions and involvements which people have enjoyed will be replaced by negative and demeaning roles. Negative stereotypes about older people have often prevented full participation in the community, forcing a premature end to the potential contribution and fulfilment of older people. These images and limitations can eventually lead to physical and social isolation.

The plan also states that the major goal for the next 10 years must be to extend the duties and rewards of citizenship to all members of the South Australian community and to replace what the report describes as the 'season ticket approach to citizenship' with 'genuine life membership'. Our objective in ageing policy is to ensure that all our citizens have what

is termed 'genuine life membership': full participation as citizens for the whole of their lives.

The 10-Year Plan is constantly being reviewed. A ministerial advisory board on ageing was established to monitor the implementation of the plan. That advisory board is chaired by Dame Roma Mitchell. Late last year the board produced an interim report and only within the past couple of days I have received what appears to be and what I am sure is a very helpful and constructive report, which is presently being examined.

The Government is committed to achieving the objectives of ensuring that older people live in the community and have access to a range and style of services and accommodation which support their independence and dignity. We are committed to ensuring that older people participate in the community and take their place as citizens with the fullest possible range of activities and obligations and, as well, that older people have opportunities and information about opportunities which will enable them to maintain their independence—in other words, to live as full citizens with 'life membership'.

The Office for the Ageing administers the grants for the Seniors Program. It is heavily involved in Seniors' Week and oversees the seniors' card, a service which has been welcomed by members of the community as filling a need. The Office for the Ageing also administers the Home And Community Care program, a joint Commonwealth/State initiative, and in the current year in excess of \$70 million will be distributed through that program to a large number of State and local government and private organisations, institutions and programs. The diversity of HACC programs is impres-

sive and is widespread, not only in the range of services offered but also in the areas in which services are offered. Many district and municipal councils are participating in the HACC program by developing tailored services for their communities. Many different cultural organisations and indigenous organisations are involved in the provision of HACC services to particular constituencies.

The range of programs includes not only direct services to those with disabilities but also programs for respite, for the training of carers and for transport services. The HACC program has been very successful, and the South Australian Government has been committed to upholding, maintaining and improving the delivery of HACC services to the South Australian community. So, the Office for the Ageing has been of great assistance in this Government's achieving the objectives laid out in Ageing, the 10 year plan for this State.

I commend the motion.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

TOURISM CORPORATE PLAN

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I seek leave to table a copy of a ministerial statement made earlier today by the Deputy Premier and Minister for Industry, Trade and Tourism on the subject of a new corporate plan for tourism.

Leave granted.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.43 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 24 February at 2.15 p.m.