

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 18 July 2002

The **SPEAKER (Hon. I.P. Lewis)** took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

### COAST PROTECTION BOARD

The **Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright)**: I move:

That this house calls on the government to amend the charter of the Coast Protection Board to become one of coast preservation and further calls on the government to replenish sand at Hallett Cove to help preserve the coastline.

This is a longstanding issue and it is fair to say that I have represented it to a number of environment ministers across successive governments. I have not gone back through my correspondence to tally up the number of environment ministers but the current minister would be at least the sixth to whom I have represented this issue.

I think it is important to look at the money that is being spent on protecting our coastline. I refer in the first instance to a statement made by my now former colleague, the Hon. David Wotton, in his role as minister for environment and natural resources. On 27 May 1995 the former minister issued a press statement headed, '\$5 million move to protect the state's coastline'. This was a very welcome announcement because he said in part:

The state government announced today that it will embark on a \$5.1 million program to protect the state's deteriorating coastline.

Here we had a minister who understood the issues, who knew what was required and who privately conceded that he would have liked the amount to be much more than \$5.1 million. Members of this place know that jousts with treasurers can often be difficult ones and the minister, I believe, achieved a significant victory in terms of the moneys he was able to expend.

That program included, among other things, \$2.5 million spent on sand replacement for Adelaide beaches by dredging sand from near Port Stanvac and barging it to Brighton, where it was pumped to shore. Indeed, some 200 000 cubic metres of sand was placed on the Brighton beach. This particular protection strategy was one that was used on the Gold Coast, on the east coast of the United States and on the Dutch coastline, so it was one that was used in other parts of the world.

A further \$1.8 million was allocated for coast protection in the Semaphore Park and Tennyson areas of the Hindmarsh/Woodville council area, and a further \$790 000 for a variety of erosion protection works. Regrettably, the budgetary allocation for coast protection has not expanded from there. I was particularly disappointed to note in the current budget papers the very scant contribution in that regard. In fact, the amount of moneys that have been allocated, at least as far as I can discern from the Portfolio Statements Volume 2, Budget Paper 4, is \$5 032 000, which is, in fact, slightly less than the amount allocated in 1995 under minister David Wotton. The dilemma is that the money was not sufficient back then and, therefore, it certainly is not sufficient now. I freely admit that, in referring to that figure, I am also criticising the budget of the outgoing Liberal government. Not enough money was allocated for sand replenishment following David Wotton's achievements in 1995.

It is important to look at some of the problems—and particularly at Hallett Cove—that necessitate greater expenditure. The Hallett Cove beach area has been deteriorating for the best part of 2½ decades. I have had the opportunity to study that beach closely, initially as a student, and I am fortunate to have amongst my qualifications a geomorphology major with specialty in coastal processes and landforms. As a student, I studied the sand deterioration which, even in those days, was starting at Hallett Cove and which, regrettably, has continued at a rapid rate since. I also purchased a block of land and built a home at Hallett Cove some 22 years ago, and I lived in the area for 20 years. I watched the area very closely during that time, and continue to do so, as the member of parliament representing the area. A surf lifesaving club was built by the City of Marion and the community on the coast because the sand, while starting to reduce, was still plentiful enough for it to be a good swimmer's beach, and the presence of a surf lifesaving club was needed—and, indeed, surf lifesaving carnivals were held on the beach in the 1970s. That is not possible today, because the area has deteriorated to the extent that most of the sand has gone.

Importantly, minister Wotton embarked upon a process to identify the reasons for the deterioration of our coast. I refer to a report that was completed in July 1997 entitled 'Report of the review of the management of Adelaide metropolitan beaches'. This report was commissioned in August 1995 by minister Wotton, and he appointed a reference group of independent public inquiry into the management of Adelaide's metropolitan beaches. This reference group was chaired by Malcolm Kinnaird who many members would know was an executive chairman of Kinhill engineers. He is an engineer and, indeed, an honorary fellow of the Institution of Engineers Australia.

The reference group had within its membership some very experienced and knowledgeable personnel from local government. For example, there was Jim Hulleck who, of course, members would know as the Secretary-General of the Local Government Association, and also Mike Nolan, the City Manager of the City of Henley and Grange. That gentleman has extensive experience in coastal management and, indeed, over six years experience with the New South Wales Coastal Engineering Branch of the Department of Public Works, and he coordinated a number of oceanographic surveys in the coastal areas of New South Wales. Also with coastal process experience was Professor Andrew Short from the Coastal Studies Unit at Sydney university. Doctor Short is a Professor in Geography and Marine Science, and was Director of the Coastal Studies Unit at the University of Sydney. He also has qualifications from the United States—in Louisiana and Hawaii—and has extensive coastal management expertise in the United States—including Hawaii and northern Alaska—and he also has worked on coastal problems throughout Australia.

Mark Parnell, who members would know from his work, in particular, with the Australian Conservation Foundation and the Wilderness Society, was another member who brought his expertise in legal matters, in particular, to the board. In all, it was a very experienced body of people. I should also mention Brian Caton from the Coast Protection Board. Brian has also been a Senior Lecturer in Environment Studies at Flinders University and has a Master of Arts from London, with a thesis in geomorphology, and a Master of Environmental Studies from Adelaide, his thesis being in coastal management. So, minister Wotton appointed an experienced group of people, and they studied our coast in

detail. It took them almost two years to prepare their report, which is a very considered document. That report made some very significant recommendations in relation to Hallett Cove and also the adjoining area of Christies Beach. I will briefly refer to those recommendations because, although they are significant, they have not been acted upon, which is necessary to change the charter of the Coast Protection Board. Recommendation 2.2.1 reads:

Maintaining beach quality for recreation is at least as valuable to the community as the storm protection it provides, and that this should be given due regard in the provision of funds.

It has not been given due regard in the provision of funds, regrettably, and the Coast Protection Board remains just that—a board that has responsibility for protecting our coast. It sees its charter as being one of protecting property but not of maintaining our beaches. Its members have said to me on numerous occasions in the numerous meetings I have had with them, and also in writing, that they do not see their role as maintaining the recreational value of beaches. So, their work in sand replenishment has been focused on areas such as Tennyson, Semaphore, Brighton and Seacliff—and, naturally, I am grateful that Brighton and Seacliff, which are in my electorate, have received funding—but the funding has been received to ensure that the coast is protected, rather than sand replenished for recreational pursuit.

In my view, parliament is duty-bound to meet the expectations of South Australians and, particularly, the taxpayers. South Australians would have an expectation that we maintain beaches for recreational pursuits, I believe, as well as to conserve the coast. Hallett Cove residents are particularly disturbed by the erosion of their coastline over 2½ decades and the removal of the beach—as, indeed, they are at Christies Beach where similar things are starting to occur. The sand degradation there has been significant. But Hallett Cove and Christies Beach are not part of the sand replenishment program because there is a buffer between the coast and property. For that reason, the sand is allowed to go.

The only way that this can be redressed is if the parliament and the minister agree that it is imperative that the charter of the Coast Protection Board is changed from one of not simply coast protection but, indeed, coast preservation. Agreeing to that change in the charter paves the way for our beaches to be preserved for recreational pursuit also.

Indeed, the report that was commissioned by then minister Wotton resulted in significant recommendations in that way. In fact, in relation to both Christies Beach and Hallett Cove recommendation 2.2.15 states:

Sand levels at Christies Beach could be improved by a combined strategy of beach replenishment and groynes. However, this would be a costly and contentious project and would depend on the availability of suitable sand for replenishment. The group recommends that these aspects should be explored before proceeding further.

Recommendation 2.2.16 states:

The beach at Hallett Cove could also be improved by replenishment. However, the group does not recommend building groynes or other sand containment structures. As for Christies Beach, the main issues are funding and a sand supply.

In relation to Hallett Cove, the report also reads in part on page 33:

The beach at Hallett Cove is especially vulnerable to small changes in the sediment budget because there has always been only a thin layer of sand over the underlying rock. While the notable beach loss over the past 20 years cannot be directly linked to any one event, the Reference Group considers that it has almost certainly been caused by a reduction in the along-shore sand supply. The

supply has been affected by updrift accumulations at the Port Stanvac jetty (built in 1963) and more recently at the O'Sullivan Beach breakwaters.

This issue is important. It affects three government ministers: the Treasurer, who has responsibility for beaches as an elected member of parliament; the Minister for Environment; and the Minister for Recreation and Sport. By a wonderful coincidence, it also affects their portfolios—the Treasurer because of his ability to allocate money, the Minister for Recreation and Sport in his responsibility for surf lifesaving, and the Minister for Environment in his responsibility for the coast. I commend the motion to the house and to those three ministers in their role as members of parliament and also people with the ability to allocate funds to ensure that our beaches are properly protected.

In moving this motion I realise that I am being critical, in part, of the past Liberal government because David Wotton's good work was not continued. Regrettably, he did not continue in the ministry, as he should have. However, I encourage Minister Hill to pick up the good work of David Wotton, which former minister Evans continued. Unfortunately, his reign was cut short by the election. To his credit, he visited the Hallett Cove area twice and was prepared to continue with that important program focusing on Hallett Cove.

**Mr CAICA** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **McKENZIE, DEPUTY POLICE COMMISSIONER NEIL**

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** I move:

That this house congratulates recently retired Deputy Police Commissioner, Neil McKenzie, on his 43 years of diligent service to the South Australian Police and wider community and commends his efforts in supporting a safe community and safe use of roads.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to move this motion in the House of Assembly in the state of South Australia for a great South Australian, namely, Deputy Commissioner Neil McKenzie, who retired in June of this year. He joined the police force in 1959 and he had a distinguished career—a minimum assessment of what was a magnificent policing career. In fact, I often used to smile when I had the privilege of being the police minister to think that Neil McKenzie for all but two years of my life had been a police officer.

The reason why community safety is so good in South Australia compared to most of the world today is the long-term commitment of many fine men and women in the South Australian Police such as Deputy Commissioner Neil McKenzie. Having spent 43 years as a professional police officer, Mr McKenzie said that those 43 years brought him far more joy than misery and that, in some ways, it had been a lifelong holiday with just one adventure after another. When you get that much satisfaction out of your job, clearly you are going to do very well in your career.

Mr McKenzie was a hands-on police officer right through his career. I have to say that I never heard a really bad word uttered about him from any officer during my time as police minister. When you get into the higher ranks, I must say that that is a little unusual because, clearly, in a large department now and again senior officers will have to disagree with other ranks. Officers used to talk to me affectionately about Mr McKenzie (which was his correct title), and they always said that with a smile, but if he gave an order those officers certainly carried it out.

Mr McKenzie had a broad cross-section policing role over the period of his career, starting obviously as he did on the beat, like any other police officer. However, he moved through a very colourful career. He became a detective at the age of 22, which was quite young to attain that position, and from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s he worked in the dealers and anti-larrikin squads and local CIBs. The anti-larrikin squad is something which I am not opposed to discussing even now because, when one looks at what has happened across the state and across Australia and, indeed, the world, one sees that the general concept of getting in early with some of these small groups is probably not a bad concept.

It was also interesting that for quite a lot of his career, whilst they did not always necessarily agree on industrial relations issues given the difference in their jobs, Mr McKenzie worked closely with then Detective Peter Alexander, who all of us would know now has the Australian Police Medal and is the President of both the South Australian Police Association and the Australian Police Association.

At Deputy Commissioner McKenzie's retirement dinner it was interesting to hear some of the enjoyment that both Peter Alexander and Neil McKenzie got out of their job but also, more importantly, some of the very good policing work they did together during the time when they were working as partners. In 1973 the press praised both Detective Peter Alexander and Neil McKenzie for the way they smashed a housebreaking ring, made 22 arrests and recovered \$50 000 worth of goods. That is just one example of the sort of work that they did. When you look back, things probably never change, but from my observation it is always difficult to get towards the top in a police department anywhere in the world—and it is like that in life, I guess. Neil McKenzie became frustrated at the lack of opportunity to become a sergeant, and that is still the case today for many senior constables who are fully qualified, often with degrees, but who still cannot become a sergeant because of the pyramid structure of the department. He therefore decided that he would bypass sergeant and go for a commissioned rank. He was successful in that, and he won his first position while still a young man of 34 years of age in 1976.

One of Neil McKenzie's very difficult but excellent policing operations during his career was in 1979 when he played a crucial role in the investigation of the Truro murders, a very sad time for South Australia but very good policing, headed up by Neil McKenzie. After Neil McKenzie had been in the police department for 35 years he eventually achieved one of the most senior executive positions in the South Australia Police, namely, Deputy Commissioner, a position to which he was promoted in 1997. Having said that, if you look at his career you see that he rose quite quickly through the ranks, going from Superintendent in 1982 and Chief Superintendent in early 1983.

Deputy Commissioner Neil McKenzie also never lost touch with front-line police work, and that is one of the reasons why he was so well respected by the thousands of officers with whom he served. It is not easy. The way the police are structured today you could argue that the commissioner's role should be a managerial, executive role, with the Deputy Commissioner taking on the management of operations. Whilst our current Commissioner is a very skilful and committed commissioner and a capable operational police officer, Neil McKenzie as Deputy Commissioner was primarily in charge of operations.

We had some interesting times together when he was Acting Commissioner and I was police minister. For some reason during my time as police minister some of the biggest events that occurred in South Australia always seemed to occur when the Commissioner was out of the state and the Deputy Commissioner became the Acting Commissioner. I would get a phone call, and it was always in one of those more serious times. The one I remember most was about the Snowtown murders, a very difficult time for policing, and Neil McKenzie was Acting Commissioner then. Now and again we would have a smile when he took on that role, because I would say, 'I hope you're not going to ring me now, Neil, because we don't want any more of those sorts of issues for South Australia.' He would smile about that, but the point was that he always got on with the job. I must say that he managed those circumstances extremely well. He told me to relax as police minister and he would manage the thing operationally, which indeed he did, and always carried it out with great diligence and commitment and in an exemplary fashion.

Neil McKenzie has been able to retire at the quite early age of 60. Only a couple of weeks ago I went to Football Park; it was no surprise that Neil McKenzie chose Football Park and the Crows Convention Centre for his retirement dinner. He is a man of great intelligence, not only in policing but also in the football team that he follows. He is an avid Crows supporter, and I hope that the Crows aspire to the commitment of people like the deputy commissioner. One thing that the Crows could do for him in his retirement, and hopefully even this year, is to lift their work rate a little and get up there for a grand final with Port Power. As a Crows supporter myself, I would like to see the Crows come ahead of Port in a grand final—that would be fantastic. I also congratulate Port Power, by the way, on the great work they are doing.

I would like to think that Neil McKenzie will use his management skills and experience to get involved with a club like the Crows and help them from a management level. I would hope that an organisation like the Crows, and indeed many others, would capitalise on people's experience like that of Neil's because mentally, in my opinion, a person at 60 is really only just becoming an elite athlete. Some of the greatest leaders and some of the wisest people have been achievers in their 70s and even late 70s. So, we should not overlook mature age expertise. We tend to say to people, 'You're retiring now. Thanks for your contribution. Go and enjoy your retirement.' In South Australia, in particular, we should not be missing out on that expertise. So, I wish Neil all the best when it comes to opportunities in his retirement.

I would like to conclude with a couple of other comments with respect to Deputy Commissioner Neil McKenzie. He said quite a few times, indeed also in an article that appeared just before his retirement, that the only negative thing about being in a policing role was the time that he missed with his family. I guess if you are in the parliament or many other areas, including your own business, you will find that family time is the thing that you miss out on the most. But there was always someone backing him up at home, and I would like to congratulate Pauline McKenzie on her contribution to the partnership and the commitment she gave to Neil during his distinguished career in South Australia Police.

As minister, no matter where I went, Pauline, if required to be there, and often when she was not required to be there, would attend the balls, functions, retirement dinners and also graduation ceremonies at the academy. It will be good for

Pauline to be able to spend more time with her husband Neil. Notwithstanding that he indicated that it was not easy trying to bring up a family and concentrate on a career in South Australia Police, having met his family at the retirement dinner I think that any parent would aspire to the type of family that he has been able to develop and support. It is a very committed and caring family and one that, given the age of the children, I am sure will have the enjoyment of many grandchildren coming their way in the future. They will also now be able to enjoy their retirement holiday home in the best part of South Australia, the Fleurieu Peninsula, at Victor Harbor and make up for all the times that Neil missed out on when he was so busy.

In conclusion, South Australia Police, being the third oldest police force in the world, is also undoubtedly the best in Australia and one of the best internationally—it can benchmark with any of them. That has been proven in recent times with the exchanges between the South Australian police and the Kent police and, even more recently, with the New Zealand police.

As I said at the beginning of these remarks, a man who puts 43 years, a long time, into a department can retire and certainly feel very proud that the reason why South Australian Police has such acceptance and acknowledgment by its benchmarking is that it has people of the calibre of Neil McKenzie, and also the fact that such a large proportion of South Australians support their police here, which is certainly not the case in some other states and definitely not the case internationally, where some countries are having to try to come up with amazingly innovative programs just to get back for policing some sort of empathy and respect from the community. That is certainly not the case here. There is great appreciation of the South Australian police and, as I say, it is the men and women who join the department and take it on as long-term career whom we need to thank for allowing us to have such a great police department.

My final comments concern the newer officers, those I have seen graduating from the academy and the hundreds that I have talked to over the years. My advice to them is to capitalise on the Neil McKenzies of South Australia Police, to model them, and to aspire to the position of deputy commissioner or assistant commissioner. There are ebbs and flows in police promotion, like any other career, but if you stick at it there may be an opportunity. With people like Neil retiring from the senior ranks, there are opportunities, and I encourage young officers to model Deputy Commissioner Neil McKenzie. If they do that, there is a very good chance that one or two of them will rise to that position, and a number of others will become commissioned in their ranks.

My final piece of advice is that, if they do not make the position of sergeant, they should not give up but look to the example of Neil McKenzie, who ended up in charge of operations, second top police officer in South Australia, Deputy Commissioner, and did so having bypassed a sergeant's position and going straight into a commissioned rank. I congratulate Neil McKenzie and I wish him, Pauline and his family a long, healthy and enjoyable retirement, one that is well deserved thanks to his commitment to South Australia.

**Mr SNELLING** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### EAST TIMOR

**Ms BEDFORD (Floreay):** I move:

That this house congratulates the people of East Timor on successfully achieving full independence after a long struggle, commends them as they rebuild their nation and looks forward to receiving the Ambassador from East Timor this year.

I have left my notes in my office, so I wonder whether someone else can speak to the motion.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Florey can speak to the motion as little or for as long as she likes, having moved the motion. The member can then resume her seat at whatever point she wishes and, beyond that, it is in the hands of the house.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I have moved it and I am hoping to close the debate.

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** This is a motion with which all members of the house will agree with very little debate. I understand that the member for Waite, with his knowledge of military history and a few other things, has some detailed remarks on this. I well remember the feeling at the time of the referendum in East Timor and the outbreak of violence and disorder there, when I was challenged (as someone who does not like to see the use of the military in any other than extreme circumstances), suddenly finding myself in the position where I was urging John Howard to get into Indonesia with our troops to provide some protection and peace for the poor struggling people of East Timor.

We all know our Australian history and the relationship between the people of East Timor and the people of Australia, and the support that the people of East Timor gave to so many Australian soldiers during the Second World War. Many of us have been ashamed by what happened in the '70s and have been amazed to see the way the people of East Timor successfully struggled year after year after year to assert their independence. It is very clear just from watching news reports that these people are very different from the majority culture of East Timor. Their religion is different, their history and culture are different, and they sought to preserve their own culture.

They did so in the full knowledge that they were going to be challenged on this and that they did not have the resources as a community in terms of the type of education that might be needed to equip themselves to deal with the twenty-first century, nor the riches in the land although, fortunately, they do have oil offshore. It is incumbent on us to work with the people of East Timor to develop their resources in a responsible manner and to support them in growing as a nation, allowing each and every one of their community members to be educated to the level needed to participate in the twenty-first century.

However, the way they have gone about their struggle, the support they have shown for each other and their pride in themselves as a community indicates that they have an excellent chance of surviving as a unique country in this complex world in which we live today. I know that others have much more knowledge of the details of some of the people who need special commendation, and I will leave it to them to raise those matters. In the meantime, I support the motion that we look forward to receiving the ambassador from East Timor later this year. It will be an honour to meet with someone who represents a country that has achieved so much in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I take pleasure in rising to support the motion and I commend the member for putting it to the house. The people of East Timor have indeed

struggled, and it is appropriate to reflect on the history of this event of independence and to go back to consider East Timor as a Portuguese colony and, as a consequence, as a Catholic enclave in what is predominantly an archipelago of Muslim countries with some Hindu states and peoples and Christian peoples but, essentially, an enclave of Catholic, western-cultured, Hispanic and native people, perceived perhaps by some Indonesians as being quite different from the bulk of the Indonesian archipelago.

To those who subscribe, as recent events have shown, to the theory of a resurgent Islam and who would take the view that the crusades are still alive and with us; to those who would subscribe to the thinking that there is still a struggle going on between Christendom and Islam and that that is evidenced by the events of recent times—the Gulf War, the advent of fundamentalist terrorism through the Osama bin Ladens of the world, the World Trade Centre catastrophe, and the struggle presently going on in Afghanistan—to those who take a doctrinally religious view of world events of recent years, the events in Timor form part of that puzzle.

To some Muslims, the events in Timor would be perceived to be very much linked to the Crusades and to the struggle that they perceive to be going on in the world. It is therefore not surprising that there would be problems of an ethnic and religious nature not only in Timor but also in Aceh and other parts of Indonesia. That, of course, is exactly what we are seeing and what we have seen with the whole problem of East Timor. Back in the early 1970s, when the Portuguese abandoned the colony, Indonesia no doubt felt there was a need to annex and occupy Timor to bring it into the greater Indonesian state.

I think we as members of parliament—state and federal—can well reflect on that time in the early 1970s and wonder whether we as a nation made the right decisions. Without getting into the politics of that, because I think all sides of politics have cause to reflect, events may have been different had Australia taken a different stand prior to and during the invasion of East Timor by Indonesia when the Whitlam government was in power.

I do not fully hold the Whitlam government responsible for perhaps not taking a different stand at that time. As I have said, I think that all sides of politics can reflect on whether we could have done better at that point. That being the case, many years of persecution followed for the people of East Timor. It is quite obvious, when you go to East Timor as I have, that there are significant cultural, ethnic, religious, language, social and economic differences between the people of East Timor and the remainder of Indonesia.

The persecution and the almost ethnic cleansing that went on during the period of the Indonesian occupation was quite frightening. There was, of course, another dimension. Indonesia also invested enormously, both financially and in terms of human capital, in the development and growth of East Timor. It is interesting to find when you go there that there is still a sense of fondness and a sense of family, to a degree, between many of the people of East Timor—be they of Portuguese or Bahasa origin—and the mainland people of Indonesia. I believe there is a glimmer of hope that, in the fullness of time, the relationship between that country and its people and the people of Indonesia will blossom more fully and that together they will be able to put the past behind them and get on with the future.

As I have said, I had the pleasure of going to Indonesia for the first anniversary of the famous vote on whether or not there should be independence in the country. I travelled with

the foreign minister, Alexander Downer, and, during those late August celebrations in 2000, I was able to be part of the experience—to enjoy some of the celebrations and festivities surrounding that first anniversary and, of course, to see the UN and UNTIET in full force doing what the UN does so well, that is, to assist in maintaining the peace and to assist in the transition from chaos or subjection into freedom and democracy. It was quite moving.

It was quite interesting to meet and talk with the now President, Xanana Gusmao, and attend as his guest the function for the first anniversary of the East Timorese referendum held on 30 August in the GNT building (which is, in fact, a big gymnasium and one of the biggest constructions in East Timor not destroyed by the Indonesians as they departed). It was pleasing to visit the cemetery where, of course, the terrible massacre occurred and to be part of the very moving family celebrations that commemorated the deaths at that place and all that followed.

Could I take a moment to commend foreign minister Alexander Downer and the federal government on the way they have so boldly helped the people of East Timor achieve their independence. The policy of appeasement of former Labor governments was shown to be unsuccessful. I think it is a great credit to the federal government that it had the courage to commit not only the Australian people's moral force but also the Australian people's military defence force to help broker the creation of this new democracy. It is a great credit to General Cosgrove, with whom I served in the ADF, and the men and women under his command who were able, through their professionalism, to see a successful exit of the Indonesian defence force from Timor and the effective creation of systems and structures to enable the East Timorese to look to their own defence and governance for their society and community.

Australians can all be proud of what we as a nation have achieved in East Timor in helping it to realise its independence. I note with great interest the negotiations that have followed with respect to providing financial and other support to East Timor to ensure that its birth leads to adolescence and adulthood as a fellow nation amongst nations on the international stage. I look forward to seeing that growth.

When I have spoken to this matter before, I have pointed to the opportunities for Australian and South Australian companies to do business in East Timor. I know that South Australia's doing business with Asia and countries to our north is a matter of interest to you, Mr Speaker, and there are opportunities in East Timor with the reconstruction of that country for that to occur. There are opportunities also for governments and government departments to help East Timorese local governments, schools and hospitals, and to help with emergency services and policing, and we ought to embrace those opportunities. It would be a great experience for young South Australians to go up there, and I encourage people to do that.

It was a great pleasure to meet South Australia Police officers and South Australian members of the ADF while I was there in 2000 and to see them doing such a splendid job for both South Australia and East Timor. This is an excellent motion, to congratulate the people of East Timor on successfully achieving their independence. I, too, look forward to receiving the Ambassador of East Timor later this year. I think South Australia can look forward to a fruitful and ongoing relationship with East Timor and I wish the people of East Timor, its government and its nation a bright and prosperous future in the years ahead.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** I also rise briefly to support this motion to congratulate the people of East Timor on achieving full independence. It certainly has been a very long struggle for them. Most Australians, even members of this chamber, apart from those who have been there or who have studied and watched it over the years, would not understand what a struggle it has been and how painful and demoralising it was for such a long time for the East Timorese people and their families. We debate in this place about our future and the future for our families and our young people, but our future is very well assured compared to the difficulties experienced by the families in East Timor.

It is a great occasion to see them have independence. I congratulate the United Nations, the commonwealth and, in particular, the Prime Minister, who was criticised by certain sectors of the community for becoming so heavily involved. I do not think that the people concerned saw the strength, the vision and the wisdom of the Prime Minister and the federal government in their decision to be such a strong supporter of East Timor and to address the problems with the Indonesians and East Timorese.

In fact, I think it is now evident that, as most Australians would understand, the Prime Minister's decision at that time, in the mid-term, and certainly for the long-term future for Australia and East Timor, was the right one. The Prime Minister will go down in history as being a person of great vision and one of the greatest Prime Ministers in Australian history. I congratulate him on his commitment. In fact, I congratulate the whole commonwealth government, especially someone who is a friend of mine and who is a very good foreign affairs minister—Alexander Downer. He has become an extremely accomplished minister in that portfolio who has a great grasp of what is happening around the world, particularly in Asia. As my colleague has already said, Alexander Downer certainly was a very strong steering influence in this regard.

I congratulate the United Nations and also our Australian Defence Forces, especially initially. The Australian Defence Forces are, and always have been, one of the great defence forces of the world, even though we are only a small nation. Despite the Australian Defence Forces' size, their tenacity, their training and, these days, their equipment stand them in good stead for the purpose of looking after us and our neighbours.

I also congratulate people who have not been necessarily congratulated much at all, particularly in this parliament, namely, the volunteers from South Australia Police and also the South Australian Ambulance Service. I was well aware of the efforts of those people and have had the chance to discuss with them what they saw over there on occasions. I want to thank them—and their families for supporting them—for going over not only in a peacekeeping role but also, to the extent that the ambulance officers were involved, in administering first-aid. What they did over there was tremendous.

I understand that the general road conditions are very tough, something that we probably cannot appreciate. Even some of the most rugged and remote parts of Australia do not equate to the conditions these people had to endure. They are also to be congratulated on the relationships they established and the empathy they displayed with the local East Timorese—and scenes of this which we saw on television were fantastic.

I am also pleased to congratulate the South Australian Ambulance Service and those who sponsored the equipment and its good maintenance before it went to East Timor, in

addition to the shipment to Darwin of a South Australian ambulance which, no longer being suitable for our service, was taken by the Navy to East Timor. I hope that that sort of equipment—and I know that other equipment is also needed—will help the people of East Timor. I commend the church groups and the volunteers within those groups who have been giving support to the East Timorese by way of supplies and different equipment required. Those people should also be congratulated in considering this motion.

Finally, I join with the member for Waite in saying that, now that this cycle has started to turn, now that East Timor has independence, I would like to think that in time East Timor will become a strong, affluent and influential nation and neighbour, although those of us in the parliament at present will ourselves probably be old before we start to see the benefits. I am sure that the work and commitment we have shown as Australians in helping the East Timorese achieve independence will not be overlooked. It has to be a two-way street, if we are to look after our neighbours, if we are to look after countries in need. I am confident that those countries will support us when it comes to building their nations. It will be a win-win situation and a fantastic result.

Even though I was quite young at the time when independence was granted to New Guinea, my personal opinion was that it was given too soon. I am not saying that is the case with East Timor because, to a degree, vastly different circumstances apply. However, when you have a situation such as we have in East Timor, I hope that the United Nations, the Australian government and other governments (and I am sure the Australian government will not do this) do not forget about East Timor in a couple of years. It will need assistance and support for a decade or more.

We should learn from the mistakes made in relation to the New Guinea situation where I do not believe enough support was given. You can debate all day about whether or not New Guinea should have been given that independence at that time, but if you are going to give independence—and, in this case, East Timor certainly needed and deserved it—then nations that are stronger and financially better off need to be able to support East Timor for a long time into the future. It is one thing to get to this stage, it is another to achieve the prosperity and opportunity we all desire for East Timor and its people. I certainly support this motion.

**Mr SNELLING (Playford):** The member for Mawson has reminded me about the officers of the South Australia police who were seconded—I think through the Federal Police—to work in East Timor. One of my constituents, Joseph O'Connell, served 12 months in East Timor, and I just wish to add my thanks on behalf of the house to those officers of the South Australia police who gave their time. They spent 12 months away from their family, friends and loved ones in order to assist in the rebuilding of East Timor and, in doing so, I support wholeheartedly the motion of the member for Florey.

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** I want to speak briefly on this motion. Obviously, it is a marvellous thing to see the people of East Timor finally having the opportunity to independently determine their future. For centuries, one way or another, they have been under the yolk of various forms of colonial rule, and it is entirely appropriate that this house and all its members join in congratulating them. I do think it is important, though, before we get too carried away with our congratulations today, to recall the history of the matter. In

particular, let us not forget that successive Australian governments were content from 1975 onwards to treat the illegal incorporation of Timor into the Indonesian republic as being both a *fait accompli* and something that we were not prepared, for various reasons, to agitate.

It is a great shame on governments in this country that it was only recently, when events were forced, that the Australian government was reluctantly dragged into the position of accepting that the people of Timor were entitled to self-determination. Of course, even then it is arguable that the lack of enthusiasm the Australian government had for the Timor independence struggle, and its failure to act on intelligence reports that were available to it earlier on, resulted in the unnecessary murder of tens of thousands of civilians in Timor by militias. This is a very unsavoury aspect of this whole affair.

I hope that, ultimately, when the 30-year rule releases documentation in relation to this, the truth finally does come out. The other matter that I think we need to consider in the context of this resolution is the position in relation to Irian Jaya. Members would be aware that in 1961 the Australian government supported what was euphemistically described as an act of self-determination. A group of people who were not informed of an act of so-called self-determination would deem to have incorporated themselves into Indonesia. Those people are now very much in the same position as the people of East Timor were, and those people are also agitating to have some degree of autonomy and opportunity to determine their own future. I fully realise that, if they were to become autonomous, it would result in serious problems for the Indonesian republic, and instability to our north is not good for Australia's future.

Let us not forget that this resolution that now congratulates the people of East Timor is one that two, three or five years ago would have been considered contentious and would have been howled down universally on all sides of politics as being irresponsible, just as a few years ago people who said that the Baltic states should not continue to be part of the Soviet Union were described as lunatics or in some way irresponsible and yet we now see that the Baltic states are independent and making their own way, as always should have been the case.

I am trying to draw to the attention of the house that, whilst I warmly endorse this resolution, let us not forget some of the hypocrisy that has been part of the Australian relationship with the people of Timor in the past and let us acknowledge that hypocrisy; let us apologise as well as congratulate in this resolution the people of Timor for the hypocrisy that various Australian governments have shown towards their position, and let us now move forward in a genuine way, give support to this new country and show a little more honesty and sincerity in our future dealings with the people of East Timor.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** I thank all members for their contributions this morning in welcoming the independence of East Timor and acknowledging the courage of the East Timorese and their willingness to help Australia during war times and their struggle to maintain their own land and self-determination—it has truly been breathtaking. As the member for Enfield so rightly says, the tragic history of massacre and repression in East Timor, and the courage and dignity of the people, such as Jose Ramos Horta and Xanana Gusmao, are legendary, as is the courage of activists in Australia who stood shoulder to shoulder with those minorities in what for

some time was not a popular or supported cause. I refer to the people who weathered the storms and vagaries of politics to anchor the resistance to terror and human rights abuses here in Australia—people like our own heroes such as Andy Alcock and the members of the campaign for an Independent East Timor and of the Australian Peace Committee.

History will not be kind, I fear, to Australia's slow recognition of its role in East Timor. We came late with the recent courageous efforts of Peter Cosgrove and his deployment and our role in peacekeeping in the region, and in our support for independence. Better late than never, of course, and our recent role has been pivotal. My own side of politics must acknowledge our belated change of policy heart. It was people like Peter Duncan and John Scott from South Australia, Tom Uren and Lionel Bowen who always castigated our party for its slowness on East Timor.

Frankly, Australia's intervention in East Timor was both important but also slow. The Howard government was basically dragged along by circumstance. I note, for instance, that as late as 1999 Prime Minister Howard was still trying to throw up the image that there were very few options, just as he does today with human rights issues like asylum seekers and indigenous rights.

Whilst 20/20 hindsight is not always a popular view, we must acknowledge that those who have long fought for the human rights and independence struggles for East Timor, in the face of being unpopular during those tough times, are the heroes. I refer to the men and women who became activists here in South Australia and who refused to capitulate and would not give up hope for a free Timor. They kept chipping away at conscience and campaigned against the vagaries of politics in the mainstream.

I acknowledge the influence of people like John Birch; Bob Hanney; the state-based East Timor support groups; Tim Rowfe; John Pilger; Scott Burchell; Shirley Shackleton; Michael Sullivan of the politics department at Flinders University; Vaughan Green and Debbie O'Donnell, who have all done excellent grassroots community work; the Graham F. Smith Peace Trust; Leonie Ebert; Sister Janet Mead and the Romero community, who are patrons of the Campaign for an Independent East Timor, which is now named the Australian-East Timor Friendship Association.

Sister Janet Mead and the Romero Community played a most significant role in the celebrations for Jose Ramos Horta when he visited Adelaide. I mention also Bernice Pfitzner of the Liberty Party, who believed in true liberal values and supported the East Timor cause—and this contributed to her sacrificing her political career; as well as Terry Roberts and Peter Duncan of the ALP. Also, Ian Gilfillan and Sandra Kanck formed strong support for the East Timor campaign in South Australia over many years, and I acknowledge their contributions. I refer also to the Campaign for an Independent East Timor, Chris White and, particularly, the South Australian trade union movement, and the many comrades and friends for commitment to East Timor and human rights.

Especially, I would like to mention Andy Alcock of the Campaign for Independent East Timor for his tireless and committed work on human rights. Andy joined the movement for an independent East Timor in 1975, so his contribution and leadership in this area is an extraordinary demonstration of solidarity and struggle—27 years of heartbreak, struggle and, finally, the success of their independence—and Andy remains committed to the journey of healing. I am sure all sides of the house will salute this South Australian human rights campaigner. Andy says that he was only the face at the

microphone, and acknowledges the many people who represented the groundswell of concern in Australia and, more specifically, in the campaign itself. I believe extraordinary times require extraordinary people to take the microphone in a difficult and unpopular cause.

Our own former state attorney-general, Peter Duncan, argued strongly in his ministerial and caucus roles in federal parliament that the United Nations and Australia must maintain a very assertive role in telling the Indonesian military, in particular its militia thugs, that violence in East Timor would not be tolerated. His advice was not taken in as timely a fashion as it might have been by the Australian government, and when Peter went on to relay a message in the House of Representatives, at the request of the then Fretilin resistance leader Xanana Gusmao, a message which comprised a plea for compassion and support which no humane Australian could have ignored, but, unfortunately they did. The message spoke of the suffering, anxiety and struggle of a people against the unjust and repressive war, as follows:

The people of East Timor were being exterminated in the face of the international community's indifference, especially Australia's, which valued its economic interests above the rights of the East Timorese.

If we stand looking out from Darwin Harbor, East Timor is only some 300 miles away, whilst Adelaide is many times the distance in the opposite direction. Yet this tiny country, so near to us, was invaded by a giant neighbour and we stood largely silent, averting our eyes and waiting until quite recently to speak out.

Time expired.

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** Before moving to the next item of business, I tell the house that I, too, share the views that have been expressed by all members and, without going into the detail of it, I point out that I believe there is an excellent opportunity for this parliament, indeed this house, and this state, given the level of support there is to assist the people in East Timor, at the same time as securing better business opportunities and better international awareness of the high standard of practices that we have within our legislature, bureaucracy and business community in South Australia, to do good things and derive great benefit from it. I propose then that, if members are interested, early next year we should take a delegation from South Australia, from this parliament in company with other South Australians, to East Timor to advance those causes.

## RURAL YOUTH

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I move:

That this house notes the 50th anniversary of the South Australian Rural Youth Movement this week and recognises the significant contribution made by the organisation, particularly to the training and encouragement of rural leaders for half a century, and expresses its good wishes to those 800 or more people who will assemble this weekend in Clare to recognise and celebrate this milestone.

It is very fitting and appropriate that this parliament recognises the 50th anniversary of an organisation that has a long history of success in South Australia. Fifty years ago, the South Australian Rural Youth Movement was set up to solve a problem and achieve a goal. The goal was to create an organisation that enabled young country people to fraternise and socialise, with programs of mutual interest and to train

these young people in leadership and industry skills, and actually have fun while doing it.

I attended my first Rural Youth meeting after I left secondary school at the age of 17 at Crystal Brook. The age limits in those days were from 16 to 25. I rolled up to have fun and to learn a bit about farming. It was not long before I was conned into a job—the branch publicity officer—and suddenly I was climbing the ranks, right up to club president, and later, after reaching the age of 25, I became an adviser. The Rural Youth badge, which I proudly wear—and this is an original one—has three sides: one side represents culture; the second side represents education; and the third side represents social interaction. At every meeting we recited the Rural Youth promise—and I can still remember it—‘I promise to do my best, to lead a clean and honest life, to help others at all times and to learn all I can about Australian country life.’ Mr Speaker, I note your smile: it certainly brings back a memory, does it not?

I owe so much to this organisation, and I will have to be careful as I might get a bit emotional. The goals of Rural Youth have certainly helped me in my social interactions. At a joint sports evening held between the Crystal Brook and Spalding branches of Rural Youth, I was fascinated by a young blonde. Well, Mr Speaker, you know the rest. We were married four years later and, after 33 years, Kay is still putting up with me. Kay was a member of the first Junior Rural Youth Branch which started at Spalding in 1952. Yes, Rural Youth was a top organisation and it taught us all skills that we did not realise we were learning.

Many of our rural leaders today certainly received their grounding in Rural Youth, as well as many members of parliament. Former premier John Olsen was a state president of the organisation, as was the Hon. David Ridgway MLC. The Hon. Malcolm Buckby was a member and also, you, Mr Speaker, were a member, and you will also be participating this weekend at the reunions. I also note that Peter Blacker, a previous member of this house, was a member, as was Mitch Williams, and today I learnt that Jennifer Rankine was a member. I certainly look forward to her contribution this morning because she said she will lift the lid on Rural Youth—I hope she will be kind.

Certainly, the past President of the Grains Council of Australia, Andrew Inglis AM (the highest award) was a Rural Youth state champion debater and he joined the Crystal Brook Rural Youth at the same time as I. Past presidents of the South Australian Farmers Federation and members of our statutory marketing bodies with names such as Shanahan, Andrews, Phitzner, Cornish, Hawker, Collins and Davies are all synonymous with Rural Youth. It is sad to see the demise of Rural Youth to the extent that it has declined to today. During its heyday, there were over 100 branches around the state with over 3 000 members. Some branches owned their own meeting rooms and other assets, including farm machinery and land.

Both Crystal Brook and Gladstone branches—a lot of strong rivalry between them—owned their own clubrooms and land, which, sadly, is now all gone. Why? Because governments, firstly, Labor in the late 1960s, and then all subsequent governments—I am not blaming only Labor for it—took away the resources to fund this organisation—

**Mr Hanna:** Be bipartisan.

**Mr VENNING:** I am. Under the Playford government, Minister Brookman and others, the Department of Agriculture funded the Rural Youth secretariat with up to six full-time extension officers in employment. These extension officers



acted as advisers and were always there to keep things heading in the right direction, particularly at annual general meetings. They ensured that the right people got the right jobs. Alcohol was pretty well kept under control and, of course, there were not drugs back then.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** Apart from alcohol. Some of our advisers were legendary. Peter Angove was the first chief adviser and was, indeed, a great man. Another legend who came along was the chief adviser Art Hooper. The late Art Hooper was a very enigmatic man who was seconded from the dairy department in the Department of Agriculture. Our memories of him are vivid, for it was under his steely rule that Rural Youth reached its peak. He was aided by a number of other legends, all of whom are affectionately remembered by so many, and I include here Max Glenn, Paul Guerin, John Playford and Ron Baker, just to mention a few whom I recall. The demise of Rural Youth began only a few weeks before the organisation was to begin operating in its new state headquarters at Northfield. What happened? We had an election and the Liberal Party lost, and when Labor won government it severely cut the budget.

The reason for the existence of Rural Youth is just as relevant today as it was back then—teaching young people skills and leadership. Today we have problems such as youth suicide, which is at a higher rate than ever—sadly, highest in South Australia in our rural areas—and drug and alcohol abuse. Young people in rural areas are among the most uneducated groups in Australian society. Where are our future young leaders, and where are they coming from? How timely this debate is, because next Friday, 26 July, I will be hosting a function in Parliament House for a group of young rural people from the South Australian Farmers Federation's Future Leaders Committee. Members would have all received invitations, and I am pleased to say that so far 15 members will be in attendance. Mr Peter Angus, who is my research officer here, is also a committee member and is currently the national young rural ambassador. This is a great opportunity for those people. However, it is a small group compared to the hundreds of young rural people whose potential we were developing in the 1960s.

Rural Youth had interstate affiliates with the Victorian Young Farmers and others, with interstate trips being a common occurrence. Also as encouragement, sponsors gave awards for achievement, the top award being the P&O award, with the winner receiving a trip to the United Kingdom for up to six months. Other Rural Youth members had the opportunity to travel to the United States of America and other countries. In paying tribute to the organisation, we must recognise the assistance given by others. The Australian Broadcasting Commission sponsored and encouraged the public speaking and debating competition. The Stud Breeders Association provided training for young stock handlers and also their competitions. Of course, the parents of members were usually acting as advisers and also provided encouragement, all for one cause—the good will and education of our young rural people.

To those assembling at Clare this weekend, some 800 or so people—and it may exceed 1 000, the way it is going—I say that it will be a wonderful way to commemorate 50 years since the beginning of a great organisation. As I said, Mr Speaker, I hope you will be there and you are the adjudicator of the great debate. We can be assured of a very high standard. I appreciate the cooperation of the current minister (Hon. Stephanie Key, Minister for Youth), and I am

very pleased she is in this portfolio area, because Rural Youth would probably like to speak to her and discuss the future. I wish Rural Youth all the best. However, does it have a future? I have made several mentions of Rural Youth in my speeches in my 12 years here. I truly believe it has—or should have—a future. If governments of both persuasions could be convinced that Rural Youth could do today what it did then, it will rise again. It certainly has my support to do so.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light):** I rise in support of the member for Schubert's motion on the anniversary of 50 years of Rural Youth in South Australia. I, like him, spent a number of years in the Rural Youth movement. In fact, in 1968 I joined the Gawler Rural Youth Club and spent some six or seven years there.

**An honourable member:** That explains a lot.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** It does explain a lot. There are a few instances that I will never forget and, when you look back now, you see that it was a different time. I will never forget the first debate I was involved in; it was a B-grade debate involving Gawler against Mallala. It was held in the Mallala Institute supper rooms. There was probably a total of 10 people listening to us—six speakers and perhaps five or six other people in the audience. The topic of the debate was: 'Is a tractor more important to a farmer than a wife?' It shows the times in 1968 and how things have moved along, with the women's movement and everything else.

**Mr Hanna:** The farmers haven't changed!

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** To a degree you're probably right. You look back at some of those topics now and they were just hilarious.

**Mr Caica:** What was the result?

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Well, actually, the farmer won: the affirmative won the debate! But, as the member for Schubert has said, the organisation was one that really did provide an excellent training ground for young farmers. When we started off we would meet every fortnight and the meetings were set up so they were a third cultural, a third social and a third which was to be agricultural. So you would come along one night and you might do a mock debate or public speaking. Another night we might go and visit the Art Gallery or something like that. Because Gawler was close to Adelaide we used to do those sorts of things. We might have a speaker in or, on another night, you might get someone from the Waite Institute or the Department of Agriculture come and speak about various agricultural issues in South Australia.

It was an excellent vehicle in terms of improving the knowledge of young rural people. But as the member for Schubert said, it was a great vehicle for having fun at the same time. I remember that a group of us used to travel around the state basically and go to balls, from Tintinara to Crystal Brook to the West Coast. When I was 21 or 22 years old I could have gone just about anywhere in the state and known somebody in a rural town or a rural community, because of Rural Youth. At that stage there was something like 1 300 or 1 400 members across the state. Show balls, held during Adelaide Show time—and the member for Schubert would remember—were just amazing occurrences. You would spend most of the night talking rather than dancing because you were catching up with people from all over the state. As the member for Schubert indicated as well, it really was good, clean fun. There was no alcohol allowed at balls or cabarets up until about 1972 or 1973, when

eventually it was allowed. So it was after the ball that things happened because you would go out on to somebody's property for a bushie and you would be there until four or five o'clock next morning and then drive home after that. I won't mention a few things I remember from those days but they were great times. It was a lot of fun and those of us who were in Rural Youth met a lot of people.

As the member for Schubert has said it was also a tremendous training ground for young farmers in terms of agro-politics and taking on positions in organisations like the Farmers Federation, learning meetings structure, how to run a meeting, leadership and public speaking. I could go through and list a number of people who are in senior positions in agro-politics around Australia now who had their training in Rural Youth. It was an excellent facility for that. The member for Schubert has mentioned people like Paul Guerin and Max Glenn and others. Paul, of course, is still around the place and did an excellent job.

Max Glenn was an apiarist who came into the Department for Agriculture and then became involved in Rural Youth and was just a wonderful man. He gave up many hours to come along to club meetings and then give advice about meetings structure and public speaking, as well as organise competitions. He did a tremendous amount of work and is to be commended on that, because a lot of it was out of hours. He would travel all over the state and get home very late at night after attending these meetings. The numerous competitions that were held were a highlight of the Rural Youth movement. I remember a demonstration competition held right across the state. A mate of mine, Peter Oliver from Wasleys, won the state demonstration competition by demonstrating how grapes are turned into wine.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** No, not the member's kind of demonstration competition. This was a practical demonstration. I think that a person had 10 minutes on stage for their particular demonstration. I remember that Peter was very good at crushing grapes—and he went on to win the national competition demonstrating this procedure. He had his own press set up on stage, and he demonstrated all aspects of winemaking through to the bottling process. The beauty of these sorts of competitions was that they were not only a lot of fun but they were also educational for the people who were involved in them. There were cooking competitions, and all those sorts of things.

*Ms Rankine interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** It does go back a way, and some of those things would not be demonstrated now, but it was a fantastic era. I remember the first rally that I attended. There were seven clubs in our lower north zone, so there were zone rallies. The judging of sheep, cattle and all sorts of things would take place. Members opposite might laugh about this but, in terms of rural education, it was great stuff, because one could go along and have a bit of fun. Then the stud master—the person who had brought along the cattle, the sheep, or whatever—would announce the winners—which cow, or whatever, was best—and would point out the reasons why one sheep, or whatever, was better than another. People learnt things that they could then apply to their own farm to judge their stock. If they bought a ram, a boar, or whatever, they could refer back to what they had learnt. I certainly applied that knowledge in my farming life.

When Rural Youth was operating, it was a fantastic time to be a young person in country South Australia. I made many friends in Rural Youth, and I am quite sure that my ability in

public speaking or debating would not be what it is now if it was not for that training in Rural Youth. I look forward to catching up with a few of my old mates from all around the state at Clare this weekend, where apparently some 800 people are gathering to celebrate 50 years of Rural Youth. It will be a real pleasure to catch up with some of those people. I am sure that the memories will flow (as will a few other things), and that we will have a great time.

**Ms RANKINE (Wright):** I am pleased to support the motion of the member for Schubert. I am not sure whether my congratulations are in order for him—I was not sure from his contribution whether, in fact, he was a founding member and had been a member for 50 years.

**Mr Venning:** No.

**Mr Williams:** Were you ever one?

**Ms RANKINE:** Was I a founding member? No. But I was a member of Rural Youth.

**An honourable member:** Which one?

**Ms RANKINE:** Adelaide. I thought that, because the member for Schubert was sporting an original badge, he may well have been a founding member. I noted some expressions of surprise across the chamber—certainly, the member for Schubert was surprised—to hear that I was a member of Adelaide Rural Youth—as, indeed, was our Speaker. In fact, the Speaker was President of the Adelaide Rural Youth club in 1963 and 1965. I had not joined at that time; I think my membership was in about 1969, 1970. Adelaide Rural Youth was a very progressive and active Rural Youth club, and I think it is not unfair to say that it was probably, at that time, the jewel in the crown of the Rural Youth Movement.

I was asked to join Rural Youth by a young woman with whom I was working and who had been involved for some time. She cajoled me into attending a meeting, and I became quite an enthusiastic participant. I must confess, however, that my interest was not in matters rural.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** No, not country matters rural, and not farming matters rural. My interest was basically the boys. I think if members opposite were honest in their contributions they would say, maybe, that they also had a greater interest in the girls than they did the cows at that time.

Rural Youth organised some quite amazing functions, I have to say, and I have been to a number of their balls. In fact, my very first ball was a Rural Youth ball at Birdwood. We heard from the member for Schubert about alcohol being controlled and the good clean fun that was had, and from the member for Light about the balls that he used to attend. Let me shed some light on those functions.

The balls only ever really happened between 10 p.m. and 1 a.m. The starting time may have been 8 o'clock, but the normal practice was to rock up with your partner, the males would drop the girls off at the hall and then disappear. In fact, I had a personal experience of this when my partner dropped me off at the hall and said he had a friend he needed to visit. Being quite miffed by this and, even at 16 years being quite a stropy little individual, I thought that I was not going to put up with that. So, when my girlfriend suggested that we might sneak down to the pub for a quiet time until the men returned, I was there with my ears pinned back.

Lo and behold, at about quarter past 10, just after closing time, the person I thought had been off to visit a friend walked past the lounge bar door. So, it was obviously the practice of the young men to drop their partners off, nick down to the pub until 10 o'clock, then come back and have

a quick dance and make up with the girls and go off again at about 1 o'clock, hopefully for some after-ball sustenance.

**The Hon. M.R. Buckby:** Some of us didn't go to the pub. We stayed at the ball and had a great time.

**Ms RANKINE:** I bet you did. I send my sympathies to Mrs Venning, because I understand the consequences of going to Rural Youth and meeting your partners. I have to confess that I met the father of my sons at Rural Youth, so I have that connection as well.

But I thought I would share one of the memories of Rural Youth that will stay with me forever. It was decided to take us to the Hampstead Centre to instruct us, as the member for Light said, on matters rural. The artificial insemination centre was the destination for this evening's functions. In my naivety and lack of knowledge about matters rural, I was quite interested in this because I thought it was actually about human reproduction but, lo and behold, when I got there it was about cows!

*Mr Hanna interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** We didn't even get that. We were just told about the mechanics of the instruments, the storage facilities and things like that. I have to say that at that point my interest in Rural Youth started to wane.

However, this weekend is a significant anniversary for Rural Youth and, as people have said in their quite serious addresses, it has made a great contribution and, whilst my knowledge of matters rural is very limited, the social aspect of Rural Youth was very important for young people and we have seen a great number of leaders come through as a result.

Our speaker, as I said, was President of Adelaide Rural Youth. He was also the national representative on the Youth Council of Australia and he was our national vice president. I think it should be acknowledged that a lot of quite significant people came through that movement and gained a lot, both socially and in their personal development. So, I wish those people who are participating this weekend the very best and thank the member for Schubert for moving this motion.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** I rise in support of this very important motion moved by the member for Schubert. I will, straight up, confess that I was never a member of the Rural Youth Movement. I left the rural town of Millicent and moved to Adelaide to further my studies. I was the youngest of four boys and my three older brothers were all members of the Rural Youth Movement. Whenever I was at home on weekends or on holidays I participated in the activities of the local Millicent Rural Youth club which included rallies throughout the South-East, but I mainly participated in the social events of the club, and in doing so I met a lot of people from the wider area, as other members have said.

Two things have been incredibly important to farming communities in our state: first, the Rural Youth Movement and the social interaction that came from that; and, secondly, the education department which, since forever, has been sending young women to rural areas. I do not know whether as part of their training at the universities in Adelaide they were told that the first thing they should do when they arrived in a country town was to join the local Rural Youth club, but that is certainly what happened, and I can say that, subsequently, all three of my older brothers married school teachers. So, the combination of what the education department has done for rural South Australia and the Rural Youth Movement in enhancing that has been incredibly important to our young farmers.

Sadly, I acknowledge that the Rural Youth Movement has largely died. I was very saddened to hear on local radio in the South-East only a few weeks ago that one of the few remaining Rural Youth clubs in the state (Mundulla) folded earlier this year. I had the pleasure of attending that club on, I think, at least two or possibly three occasions since having become the member for MacKillop. I think it was two years ago when the state conference was held at Mundulla, and both the member for Unley (as the former minister for youth) and I attended the annual state conference dinner at Mundulla. We had a terrific evening with members of clubs from right across the state. I think there were members there from the West Coast and nearer to Adelaide, so it saddens me that the Rural Youth Movement has largely died.

I hope other things have replaced it, because it would be a great pity if the benefits that have been derived from the Rural Youth Movement were lost to rural communities. The member for Unley referred to those benefits and the member for Light talked about leadership skills (the training of young leaders) and instilling the volunteer ethic in young people. That has been fantastic and, as everyone who has contributed to this debate has said, the Rural Youth Movement has done wonderful things for our rural communities.

There has been some light banter around the chamber during the course of the debate on this motion. Someone referred to judging. To my mind, there was a lot of judging of members of the opposite sex, but I understand that that was never an official part of the program.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Especially on houseboat trips, as the member for Mawson said. He may add more to the debate.

**Mr Brokenshire:** No, I'm not speaking.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I think it's probably best that all of us are very restrained in what we say. However, I wanted to add to this debate my comments and wish those people who will be gathering at Clare this weekend all the best. It would delight me if the Rural Youth Movement saw a resurgence. Over the last couple of years I have lobbied several ministers on behalf of, in particular, the club at Mundulla urging the government to do more to support the Rural Youth Movement and give it a bit of a rev up, because not only is the demise of the Rural Youth Movement sad but in country areas other more senior service clubs are also going down the same path, and I think the demise of the Rural Youth Movement could have led to that. The Apex, Lions and Rotary clubs are struggling for members because our youth are not being trained in leadership and formal meeting procedure skills and the ethic of volunteering. Even some of our sporting clubs in rural towns are struggling to get people who are trained in formal meeting procedure. That is something that will continue unless we do something to revive either Rural Youth or a like organisation. I commend the motion.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice):** I am very pleased to support the good initiative in the motion moved by the member for Schubert. Although I confess I have never been a member of Rural Youth, it is important that we look at the general concept of youth organisations and the assistance they give to young people. While not having been a Rural Youth member, I had the opportunity through the Ministerial Advisory Committee on Youth and also the Prime Minister's committee on Youth—quite a few years ago, I might say—to participate on many issues that surrounded resource allocation for young people and also the politics that

young people were interested in and wished to push. I also had an opportunity to be an active executive member in the Australian Union of Students. Although people of varying ages are involved in student politics, that was another forum for young people to put forward their point of view and represent themselves.

The points that are being made by members opposite are important, in that there obviously needs to be an opportunity and also a forum for young people not only to get together and socialise, as has been mentioned a number of times, but also in a safe environment to have the opportunity to access training, try out their debating skills, find out about meeting procedure and basically get the tools of trade that one needs for later life; if one wants to be an activist or make a contribution one really needs to learn all these skills. That is why I am very honoured to be the Minister for Youth. I hold these principles very strongly and, as the minister, I hope that in our time in government that opportunity will be shared throughout the community and that, whether people are in rural, remote outback or metropolitan areas, there is an opportunity for young people wherever they are to have an input in what is being said and also to be trained and access information. The old adage 'information is power' is really important in the youth sector, and all of us in this house of whatever our political party or persuasion need to make sure that that happens. I know there is at least that bipartisan feeling in this place.

I congratulate all the past and present members of Rural Youth South Australia on their golden jubilee. This represents 50 years of giving a voice and representing rural youth, 50 years of leadership and other training, 50 years in competing in traditional farming skills such as hay stacking and tractor driving, among other interesting agricultural areas we have heard about which I do not need to repeat.

We are also celebrating 50 years of providing support, friendship and companionship and, for some as we have heard, the opportunity for finding lifelong partners. Rural Youth has been and still is a necessary and powerful voice for young rural South Australians. Many successful famous and infamous people, including politicians, have learnt and benefited from their involvement with Rural Youth. My colleague the member for Schubert, Mr Ivan Venning, has named just a few of them. The honourable member has also mentioned the important assistance and support provided to Rural Youth during its inception and early years by the then Department of Agriculture. This government continues to fund and provide opportunities for rural youth in areas of leadership training, appointment to government boards, committees and traineeships.

As a lot of members in this place would know, PIRSA provides in excess of \$200 000 annually for leadership programs for young people from rural areas. During 2001, 37 regional councils participated in the National Youth Week, which involved 15 367 young people. Young rural people are on the youth register, which is managed by the Office of Youth, for the appointment of government boards and committees. The Office of Youth financially supports 34 youth advisory committees that provide advice and information to regional councils and state and federal governments. Similarly, the office supports Active8 programs. The target for rural participation was set at 26 per cent; however, the actual participation rates have reached a 32 per cent level.

Ms Emma Irvine from Yankalilla Area School is the chairperson of Active8 Youth Voice, the Youth Advisory

Committee, and seven out of 20 people on this committee are from rural South Australia. Young rural South Australians continue to voice and demonstrate their desire and ability to actively participate in decision-making at all levels. I pass on my congratulations to Rural Youth and wish them an enjoyable weekend of remembering and celebration, and I wish them every success in the next 50 years of active involvement in our state.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I thank all members for participating in the debate. This weekend, I will circulate copies of the report of the debate to all people returning, and I will extend to them the good wishes of the house.

Motion carried.

### SURF LIFE SAVING

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** I move:

That this house congratulates the Moana Surf Life Saving Club, City of Onkaparinga, the South Australian Surf Life Saving Association, the Emergency Services Fund and surf life saving volunteers on the opening of the new Moana Surf Life Saving Club as a pilot development of the partnership approach to provide surf lifesaving facilities to clubs in the future.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to move this motion today. Most importantly, I would like to congratulate the surf life saving volunteers on what is a magnificent achievement—which was a pilot and which, I believe, will be carried into the future—and that is the partnership approach to building new capital works facilities for another very important part of our volunteers in emergency services, and that is those people who look after us when we are down at the beaches. They do an enormous job. They are professional and highly trained. Some of them put in so many hours on the beach during summer that it is unbelievable. There is also a great spirit of support in Surf Life Saving SA amongst the volunteers and, I must say, the paid staff.

In late 1999, when we were in government and I was the minister for emergency services, there was a conference, brought together after some preliminary discussion about how capital works was to be addressed when it came to surf life saving clubs, given that capital works were being addressed in other emergency services agencies. I commend Surf Life Saving SA which headed up a conference with state government and local government representatives and I also, at this stage, want to commend the City of Onkaparinga which, behind the scenes, was driving this initiative and concept. Councils, like any other tier of government, tend to get knocked now and again for the work that they do and are not necessarily appreciated for what they deliver, but the City of Onkaparinga have led the way with this and it is not the only thing that they have achieved in their short five years—they just had their birthday the other day—but this one was an initiative. I want to congratulate Mayor Ray Gilbert, who is a long-term patron of surf life saving, and his leadership; the City Manager, Jeff Tate; Councillor Bill Jamieson, who is taking up the appointment of President of Surf Life Saving SA; and I congratulate all the other councillors and staff who were involved in the City of Onkaparinga working party.

I also congratulate Elaine Farmer, who is the Manager of Surf Life Saving SA, and her staff, and the now retired president, John Fitzgerald, who was a champion of surf life saving, and I commend him for the way that we were able to work with him for a good outcome.

In March 2000 a working party was established comprising surf life saving, state government and local government

to address the wider needs of surf lifesaving facilities in South Australia, and eventually the concept was adopted. The concept was that the state government would provide 56 per cent of the capital needed for a new or upgrading project because, after assessment, I understand that 56 per cent was the amount that was relative to the emergency services aspects of surf lifesaving; local government's share was 33 per cent; and Surf Life Saving SA, in conjunction with its individual clubs, had to make a contribution of 11 per cent. That is how the project was developed, and what a magnificent project it was.

Local government authorities put in even more money—hundreds of thousands of dollars more—because they saw it as a benefit, given the unique location of surf life saving clubrooms along prime parts of the esplanade from West Lakes right through to Port Elliot. Because they are often located in good areas, local councils saw this as a chance to enhance those areas even more and encourage people to visit the beach. Of course, if tourists and local people use the beaches, they will be well protected by their surf lifesavers.

That is the background to this, but let us talk also about the people who worked so hard in Moana. First, I mention for the parliamentary record Graham Whiting, the President, and his wife Pat, and all the committee and the volunteers at Moana who worked tirelessly to get this project going. The club had the worst facilities within the City of Onkaparinga and that is why it was decided that it should be the first to be built, but others, like Christies Beach, also need work done to them. Some of the clubs are in good order but others need work. The principle is that all the clubs will be upgraded to a good standard over the next 10 to 15 years, maximum, and then for some time surf lifesaving will not require much in the way of capital works infrastructure because the buildings are designed to provide a minimum of 40 to 50 years' practical use by the surf life saving club that they are built to assist, in whatever area they are located.

A lot of work went into the opening, and it was one of the nicest days I can remember for the opening of any building, and the weather added to it. Jeff Tate, Chief Executive Officer of the City of Onkaparinga, did a good job as MC, and the Minister for Emergency Services was there, as was my colleague the member for Kaurana. When I was minister and this was being developed, I put on the public record my appreciation of the support that the member for Kaurana provided when we discussed the concept. Also present at the opening was Father Peter Coote, who is a hard-working Anglican priest in the area, and the Kaurana people. The Kaurana people did a magnificent job on the day, as did the choir from Tatachilla Lutheran College.

As a result of the redevelopment of the Moana club, there will be further growth in the number of young people joining surf lifesaving. They will be trained to be efficient surf lifesavers and they will learn to use the modern equipment that is available as a result of the partnership between surf lifesaving and the emergency services fund. I thank the public servants who work with the emergency services fund for their diligent work, particularly people such as David Burke, who was involved in the development of the concept, and who represented the state government when we were in office. The outcome is a great model and a fantastic example of what can be done with initiative and vision and if a partnership approach is brought to a project.

As I said, the facility will bring a lot more people into surf lifesaving. It is a great way of encouraging young people to feel good about themselves, to be highly trained, and not to

wonder what they are going to do on the weekend. We do not see nippers, junior lifesavers and senior lifesavers wandering the street. They are usually at home getting ready for a championship the next weekend.

**The Hon. J.W. Weatherill:** Or too tired afterwards!

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** Or too tired after, as the minister just said. I think it is fair to say that he is also tied up with surf lifesaving or—

**The Hon. J.W. Weatherill:** No, I was a nipper once upon a time.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** He was a nipper—there you go—and he ended up being a minister! That is the sort of example I am talking about. The fact is that, like all members in this house, I am sure the minister strongly supports surf lifesaving. He understands the ethos of it and he himself has been able to further develop in that way through his contact with surf lifesaving, and that is what is so important, I believe, as a benefit to someone who, as a volunteer, joined the surf life saving movement. Also, the benefit that they have in protecting so many people when they go into the water is huge.

Their equipment—the 'rubber duckies', as they are known now, the surf skis and the jet boats—is improving. I understand that another jet boat will be approved by the government under this budget, and it comes on top of two that we approved when we were in office. As a result, there are three brand new jet boats out there, so things augur well for surf lifesaving in the future.

One of the other important aspects about this pilot at Moana is that they have been able, through the non-state government share where they cannot contribute to the social side, to develop with the council contribution and surf lifesaving's own contribution the great bar and catering services. I know they have had at least one wedding there, and that not only will be of benefit to members and the locals living in the area, coming in and utilising that facility, but also it will be an income generator. We all know how hard it is for any organisation today to generate income with competition from so many different organisations and sporting associations, but it will give these clubs an opportunity to stand on their own feet in time, with financial support coming in from that. It is a revenue stream for them, and also a great training facility.

Last year, going to quite a few surf life saving clubs and presenting the International Year of the Volunteer certificates really opened my eyes to just what a family environment surf lifesaving is. The whole family becomes involved in surf lifesaving. It is often the children who bring the parents along in the first instance, which is interesting, but it is not long before many of those parents become leaders, educational trainers or committee members, and then you get the benefit from that.

The other point I want to raise is the very fair way in which the presidents of surf life saving clubs within the city of Onkaparinga were prepared to sit down as a group and discuss what the priorities would be for the building of their new clubs in Onkaparinga. That is not easy, particularly when you see a club that is as fantastic as the Moana club is today with its new facility. They did it in a professional and fair way, and I want to congratulate all of them.

I also want to talk about the representatives on the Facilities Management Group, which was the ultimate initiative that came out of the conference that I talked about and then the working party, and that Facilities Management Group, with some funding from the Emergency Services

Fund, will develop a long-term strategy to replace or upgrade all the surf life saving clubs in the state. I think there are 18 such clubs at the moment. There is talk of a nineteenth, and I hope that happens. As a result, I think other organisations could look at a Facilities Management Group which could bring this partnership approach to other organisations with outcomes as positive as those for surf lifesaving. I am pleased to see that the budget has been maintained this year for surf lifesaving. I understand that it is around \$575 000 for the operational budget and around \$625 000 for capital, which is the same as we put into it last year.

I believe that, when you look back and see what surf lifesaving was getting a few years before the existence of the Emergency Services Fund, compared to what it gets today, you will see that, whilst budgets always need to grow, if possible, that sort of recurrent funding which is being sustained through the fund will be very beneficial for the whole management of surf lifesaving.

In conclusion, I want to reinforce to my colleagues that that money is really for emergency services. There is so much more money needed to run surf lifesaving in South Australia; in fact, much more—probably double the amount provided by the government. I encourage councils, because they do have some responsibility to continue to support surf lifesaving. If you are going to encourage and support small businesses by getting people from all over the state and interstate to come and utilise our beaches during summer holidays, you need to be able to put additional support into those volunteers who, at the end of the day, are the core of the whole of surf lifesaving in South Australia.

I also encourage the traditional sponsors, and I particularly commend Mobil. I have actually seen representatives of that company with the Hon. John Hill, the member for Kaurna, at Southport, I think it was, with a huge number of surf skis and the like that they had donated. I am not sure why John and I did not hop on the surf skis. It was probably a little bit cold or John wanted me to go first. The point is that we are aware of those sponsorships in our local area; and we are aware of the sponsorship that is still needed by surf lifesaving. As I have said, even though they now get some money from the state government and from local government, general sponsorship would always be welcome.

Finally, I wish the new board all the best for the future and congratulate the previous board of surf lifesaving. I congratulate the president, Graham Whiting, and all the committee members of the Moana Surf Life Saving Club for their patience and the great outcome they have achieved for their club and the community. There is very strong bipartisanship when it comes to surf life saving clubs across the state, particularly in the south. It is often pointed out to me by my colleagues when I have been with them at surf lifesaving functions that, whilst I do not have any coastal strip in my electorate, there are probably more people from Mawson who attend the surf life saving clubs than from the electorate of Kaurna. We are well aware of that. That is why the member for Kaurna and I work so well on these issues: surf lifesaving gives multiple benefit to a huge number of people across the southern area.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I am very pleased to support this motion moved by the member for Mawson, and I thank him for it. Surf life saving clubs obviously play a vital role in our community. I represent an electorate which has five surf life saving clubs. In fact, I probably represent more surf life sa-

ving clubs than any other member (although I might stand corrected on that), I think in excess of one-quarter of the life saving clubs in South Australia. So, I have a particular and special interest in surf lifesaving and surf life saving clubs.

My electorate, of course, covers 30 kilometres-plus of very popular beaches that are used by people other than my electors. If we could work out a way of getting contributions from them to help with the infrastructure along the coastline, we would be very pleased if they would kick the can a bit when they came down.

**Mr Brokenshire:** I buy an ice cream and a coke.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I am glad to hear that the member for Mawson buys an ice cream and a coke when he visits my electorate. He does not inform me on every occasion, of course, that he visits my electorate to do these things.

I want to put on the record my congratulations to the Moana Surf Life Saving Club. They have worked very hard as a community for a long time to get this excellent result. I remember them coming to see me some years ago when the proposition of a new club was first raised. The former facilities were quite derelict and would not have passed too many health and safety inspections. There was a great need to upgrade those facilities, both for the benefit of the members as well as the general community who benefit from the services they provide.

I remember them coming to see me. I arranged a meeting with the Hon. Patrick Conlon (who was then the shadow minister for emergency services), Jeff Tate (the City Manager) and, I think, His Worship, the Mayor of Onkaparinga, Ray Gilbert, to talk about what a state Labor government could contribute. We talked through, in general terms, how funding should be allocated or where funding should come from to get surf life saving clubs up on their feet. I suggested that it should be a third-a third-a third: a third from the council; a third from the state government; and a third from the local community. I was pleased that the former government adopted, if not exactly that formula, that same sort of notion that there should be contributions from each level: the community had to put in money; the state government would put in money through the emergency services levy; and the local council would put in support, too.

**Mr Brindal:** You're actually acknowledging you haven't got a monopoly on commonsense.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Tempting as it is. So, the three players all contributed to the extent of their capacity. The surf life saving club did not put in a full third, but they did put in an enormous amount of their own effort. They came up with some cash and they are paying off a sizeable loan.

I certainly commend the leadership shown by Graham and Pat Whiting, as was mentioned by the member for Mawson, and I congratulate other members of the club: the committee and the participants in the club, all of whom are a dedicated group of people who work very well together. They provide a great service to our community. They have fun, they train kids, and they provide really good opportunities for a lot of people in my district.

Moana Beach is a very popular beach, and it is my preference when my family and I go to the beach.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** No, I visit Maslins, but not for swimming or for going to the beach. I do not go to the beach at Maslins. Moana Beach is a very popular beach, and it is absolutely vital that we have a proper surf lifesaving facility there. I must say that I commend the facility there to all members. If they feel so inclined, they should visit the great

southern suburbs and have a look at that facility. I think happy hour is on Friday afternoon, so you can have a drink while looking at the beach. It is one of the best views in the state, right on the beach. It is a fantastic facility.

I commend all those involved and congratulate the council and the former government for its contribution, too, in having the surf life saving club established.

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** I want to add briefly to the comments made by the member for Mawson and the member for Kaurua, who is, of course, the Minister for Environment and many other things. I also had the opportunity to visit the Moana Surf Life Saving Club shortly after it was opened. Anyone looking at my skin would know that I do not visit the beach very often in daylight. What attracted me particularly to the idea of the Moana Surf Life Saving Club was that not only can you have a drink and enjoy a magnificent view but also, if you join and really get involved, you can exercise in a gym with the most magnificent view probably in the world; it is quite spectacular.

I commend the Moana Surf Life Saving Club for its involvement in the Activ8 program and the work it is doing with the Seaford 6-12 school. I was able to represent the Minister for Youth and provide a cheque to the club and the school in relation to that program, in the establishment of which I acknowledge the member for Unley was involved.

The young people were particularly proud to be wearing their Moana Surf Life Saving Club tops and, amazingly, their hats. It was fantastic to see young people in their mid-teens very proudly sporting hats, because I think most of us know how difficult it is to get them to wear hats in a way that does protect their skin.

The program they are involved in jointly—Moana and Seaford 6-12 school—has enabled young people to develop skills and confidence on the beach and, working in teams, to improve their knowledge of water safety, the use of equipment and safe practices in using that equipment. They are going on to study a number of other areas in terms of physical and technical skills in the development of that program.

As I said, the celebration of that program gave me an opportunity to visit the surf life saving club just after it was opened and to acknowledge that it is indeed a magnificent building that will enhance the coastal facilities in the City of Onkaparinga. We are beginning to develop some really nice buildings along the seafront. Like other speakers, I encourage all members to visit the facility to see just what is happening down there; and those members who are able to stand the sunlight can really enjoy it.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** I thank all members who contributed to this debate. Again, I congratulate the hard work of the Moana Surf Life Saving Club and all those I mentioned in my remarks. I have very much pleasure in moving the motion.

Motion carried.

#### COMMONWEALTH GAMES, LAWN BOWLS

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** I move:

That this house congratulates the South Australian lawn bowls players, Andrew Smith, Arienne Wynen and Neville Read who have been selected to represent Australia in lawn bowls at the 2002 Commonwealth Games.

I am sure that most members in this chamber would agree that sport is a great leveller. It brings together individuals

from every background demonstrating the essence of team work, good grace and cooperation. The Commonwealth Games is an event that celebrates sporting excellence, and this year's will be the largest ever with athletes from 72 nations competing in 14 individual sports and three team sports, from 25 July to 4 August. Australia and the rest of the world will focus on Manchester, England next month and I would like to congratulate the three athletes, Arienne Wynen, Andrew Smith and Neville Read for their selection in the Australian lawn bowls team.

I would first like to congratulate Arienne Wynen on her selection. I understand that, when Arienne first bowled, representing Australia was the farthest thing from her mind. Initially, I understand that she began playing so that she could share some time with her husband. Over 20 years later Arienne is an extremely accomplished women's bowler at all levels of the sport. Arienne is a member of the Holdfast Bay Bowling Club and the highlights of her career include winning silver and bronze medals at the Moama World Bowls Tournament in the pairs and fours events.

Arienne has been a member of the Australian women's squad for the past five years and has won numerous masters titles throughout her career. Arienne has been selected to compete in the women's fours event at the Commonwealth Games with Jan Palazzi of the Northern Territory, Gordana Baric of Victoria and Jenny Harrigon of Queensland. I would also like to congratulate Andrew Smith for his selection into the Commonwealth Games lawn bowls team. Andrew is another very experienced lawn bowls competitor, with over 20 years experience in the sport. At 41, Andrew has been selected to play alongside Queenslander Kelvin Kerkow in the men's pairs.

It is interesting to note that Australia won gold in the men's pairs event at the 1998 Commonwealth Games in Kuala Lumpur, so I am sure that Andrew and his pairs' partner, Kelvin, will be looking forward to defending their title very vigorously. Andrew is another outstanding athlete, having played seven test matches for Australia since making his international debut in 1999. He is presently ranked ninth in his sport in Australia and has claimed the Australian singles' title at a past champion of champions event. I would also like to congratulate Neville Read for his selection into the team. Neville is also, along with his fellow competitors, an outstanding athlete and will represent Australia in the elite disabled athletes' triples in Manchester.

This is the first year that elite athletes with a disability will be included in the main sports program and medal table at a major international multisports event. I am sure that we will most eagerly follow Neville's performance in the triples event together with Jaymes Reynolds and Phillip Kearins from New South Wales. Neville is a member of the Payneham Bowls Club, and I have played there occasionally myself. He has also enjoyed many high points throughout his sporting career. Some of Neville's finest achievements including winning national singles and pair titles, representing South Australia in South Africa, New Zealand and Korea, and a recent win at the national pairs championships title in Adelaide. I congratulate all of them, including Arienne Wynen, Andrew Smith and Neville Read. They are remarkable athletes and we are confident that they will make a significant contribution to Australia's medal tally at the Commonwealth Games.

As a member of the parliamentary bowls team and recently elected club captain, I can certainly appreciate the skills and dedication required to rise to this level of the sport. I will not profess to be at their level. When we were first

advised of the selection of these wonderful athletes, I do not know whether I was offended by this, but I intercepted an email going from one of my staff to another and it had in brackets, talking about me, 'however, she is definitely not commonwealth games material'. Unfortunately, Louisa has left, so I can no longer chastise her for that. I am sure the other members of the parliamentary bowls team will join with me in congratulating these athletes.

One of the good things about playing a game of bowls—not that members in this chamber and in the other place are able to get together very often—is that we share a camaraderie, politics are put aside and our only goal when out on the green is to defeat the team we are playing. It is a good leveller and a very good sport in which to be involved. I encourage all of our colleagues in this place, as we need more members on our parliamentary bowls team, to consider joining. They will enjoy the camaraderie and together we may even be able to upgrade our standards to a level where, even if we never reach the Commonwealth Games, at least we have something to aspire to. I congratulate the athletes.

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** I join the member for Torrens in congratulating Andrew Smith, Arianne Wynen and Neville Read for having been selected to represent Australia in the Commonwealth Games team. I had my introduction to bowling about two years ago. Having never considered the idea of playing the game of bowls, because we are always brought up to believe it was an old persons' game—

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms CICCARELLO:** I do not like to think I am old, but getting older. The picture of people playing bowls was always of fairly elderly people in very unattractive clothes—

**Ms Breuer:** Crimplene.

**Ms CICCARELLO:** Crimplene dresses, which had to be a particular length for the women, and unattractive shoes and hats. The men wear the creams as well. It was the member for Schubert who actually introduced me to the game of bowls, I think in an act of desperation when the carnival was being held in South Australia and there were not enough people to go around. Ivan said, 'Come on, you can do it.' So, I went along with the member for Torrens and, from being a novice, ended up being the lead bowler. I had some difficulty as well, because I have very small hands and they found it very difficult to find me a set of bowls.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms CICCARELLO:** I did get myself into trouble previously, yes. They could not find a set of bowls that were small enough for my hand. It is actually a very interesting sport which requires a lot of skill. I had hoped to maintain my activity in that area, but I have not had too much time to spare recently. I look forward to next January, when the carnival will be conducted here in South Australia and, hopefully, I will be a member of the parliamentary bowls team. Again, I congratulate those players who will be going to Manchester for the Commonwealth Games. I look forward to their great success.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** I congratulate Arianne, Andrew and Neville on their selection in the bowls team and, looking at the web site for Manchester, I see that they do not have long to wait for their debut. The venues to which they are going look spectacular, and I know that they will represent Australia to the best of their ability.

In 1998 at the Commonwealth Games, Australia won gold in the men's pairs; silver in the men's and women's fours;

and silver in the women's pairs. Over the 60 odd years of Commonwealth Games' history, Australia has won six gold medals in lawn bowls. So, we have a proud history which I am sure Arianne, Andrew and Neville will continue to live up to.

I met Arianne at a recent Holdfast Bay Bowling Club trophy night. I presented Arianne with a number of trophies. She is a top A-grade bowler, and I believe she did exceptionally well in the recent national round robin competition in Canberra. I have never played lawn bowls, although I did play a little carpet bowls. I have been challenged by the federal member for Hindmarsh to a game of bowls at Holdfast Bay; so, perhaps I should take the Whip's advice and join the parliamentary bowling team.

It is a sport that looks easy when one is watching it. But, like most sports, watching and playing are miles apart. People such as Arianne, Andrew and Neville dedicate a significant, if not a major, portion of their life to bowls; and they put other parts of their life on hold. Families sometimes suffer and, certainly, potential careers suffer.

The dedication of all athletes who compete at both Olympic and Commonwealth games is amazing. In some sports, such as lawn bowls, which are not terribly high profile, the dedication and enthusiasm is still there. Certainly, the proficiency, prowess and skill is evident when one watches the way in which they get the bias and length just right and win their competitions easily.

I know the trend at the moment is to wear colourful uniforms and use colourful bowls. I was advised, if I was to go into a bowling competition, not to use coloured bowls because people would see which were my bowls and, if I did not play very well, it would be embarrassing. That would not be the case with Arianne, Andrew and Neville. Neville is going in the physically disabled men's triples, which is an absolute compliment to his dedication, and his ambition, I am sure, will be rewarded.

I wholeheartedly support the motion. I wish Arianne, Andrew and Neville, and all the other athletes going to Manchester 2002, the very best not only from me and the people of Morphett but also from all South Australians.

Motion carried.

## PLANT FUNCTIONAL GENOMICS CENTRE

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I move:

That this house congratulates the University of Adelaide on winning its bid to establish the \$35 million National Centre for Plant Functional Genomics at the Waite Campus which will lead to significant benefits for Australia's \$8 billion grains industry and provide over 100 jobs in South Australia.

Let me, as minister for innovation in the former government, make very clear from the outset that this was a project initiated by the former government. It went to cabinet in December and January and was fully funded in the forward estimates, a point that has been acknowledged by the opposition. I was overjoyed to be at the Waite campus during the official announcement by the federal education minister, Brendan Nelson, that the South Australian bid had been successful.

The reason that the former government and I as minister supported and put forward this proposal was the fact that we were firmly committed to innovation as the necessary basis for growing the economy. We see innovation as the way ahead. This \$12 million commitment, which was agreed to on 14 January 2002, supported the application led by the



University of Adelaide for the Australian Plant Functional Genomics Centre. The South Australian bid was one of two short-listed bids, the other being based in Western Australia. The ARC/GRDC held a full day's meeting with each applicant on 19 March 2002 and, as you have heard, Madam Acting Speaker, ultimately our bid was successful.

The proposal 'Abiotic Stress and Productivity in Cereals' will focus on gene technology applied to the development of new cereal varieties that tolerate soil and climatic conditions such as salt and drought often found in Australia. The R&D program will be carried out in collaboration with research institutions in Melbourne to establish a \$60 million research program and a new \$5 million facility at the Waite campus. State government funding over five years was to provide \$5 million for capital works and a further \$7 million for the recruitment of an additional 60 researchers and for laboratory equipment. I must say at this point that I find some confusion in the new government's budget about whether it will provide \$5 million or \$12 million; and I might just flag that to the Minister for Science (although she is not present) and ask her to explain to me during estimates how much she will fund. I hope she is sticking to the \$12 million commitment made by me and the former government prior to the change of government.

BioInnovation SA assisted the University of Adelaide in preparing the bid. I want to commend Dr Jurgen Michaelis at BioInnovation SA and his team for their hard work. They have revolutionised the face of bioinnovation in this state and they are to be congratulated, in concert with our university.

Debate adjourned.

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

### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Adelaide Airport is a vital part of our state's infrastructure and our economic future. It is the gateway to Adelaide and South Australia for international and interstate visitors. An efficiently operated airport is vital to how well and how quickly we can do business in interstate and overseas markets. Adelaide Airport is also vitally important for our regions.

The Adelaide Airport has for too long offered a substandard set of facilities for travellers and commercial users. There has been gridlock for international passengers arriving early in the morning. When I arrived at the international terminal of our airport three weeks ago I was appalled at the shambles that greeted us despite the brilliant efforts of airport staff. So many people spoke to me as they waited and waited to be processed through customs and immigration, pleading for something to be done to fix the problem.

To our visitors, these bad first impressions can be lasting bad impressions. To residents arriving home after a long flight and anxious to see their loved ones, it is unnecessarily frustrating and exhausting. I assured those passengers and airport staff who spoke to me, somewhat forcefully that morning, that I would make it my mission to see this redevelopment happen soon.

The airport redevelopment proposal always enjoyed bipartisan support from Labor when in opposition and in the four or five years we have been waiting for something to happen, and I am sure it will enjoy bipartisan support in the

future. Tomorrow, I will fly to Sydney with the Chief Executive Officer of the Office of Economic Development, Dr Roger Sexton, to meet with the head of Qantas, Mr Geoff Dixon, to discuss how we can progress the airport redevelopment as a matter of urgency. It is now a matter of necessity that a deal is sealed quickly and that work gets under way.

The benefits for Qantas and Virgin are obvious. There will be greater efficiency of integrated operations, lower operating costs and greater room for future expansion. The benefits for the passengers include a more streamlined and faster means of getting through the terminal and booking in or collecting luggage. The long and laborious waiting in queues in cramped conditions after long flights home or long flights to visit our state will be a feature of the past.

I am hopeful, but not complacent, about obtaining an agreement of the airlines for a multiuser terminal facility. This type of facility has advantages over airlines investing solely in their own facilities as has recently both been proposed and reported. We do not want the airports to go it alone and simply upgrade their own facilities. A new multiuser terminal would link the servicing of all three levels of air travel—regional, domestic and international—through a single integrated and efficient facility. The position of one airline depends on the negotiating position of the other, as well as the position of the Adelaide Airport Limited, and I know that Phil Baker, head of Adelaide Airport Limited, has been working tirelessly towards a successful deal.

I intend to impress upon Qantas tomorrow that the South Australian government fully supports the proposed multi-user facility and does not want Qantas to go it alone by simply upgrading its own facilities. Having the facilities required for the operations of the two main airlines—Qantas and Virgin Blue—integrated in one purpose-built modern facility would mean that we would gain a competitive advantage compared to what we would have with each of the airlines going their own way. As the house would be aware, plans were well advanced towards getting an agreement on the multi-user terminal last year prior to the Ansett collapse. When that disaster struck, progress towards a multi-user facility faltered.

South Australians are tired of the years of delays, false starts and false announcements of this project. That is why I have been heartened to see that the parties are now working to a tight time frame to try to reach an agreement—and that there has been a good level of cooperation and goodwill shown on all sides. Each airline can benefit from a cooperative approach, and so, too, will South Australians. All South Australians, the airlines and Adelaide Airport Ltd want this redevelopment to happen and happen soon. As Premier, I hope a real announcement about the deal can be made very soon. By real, I mean wanting to see to multi-million dollar contracts signed, builders on-the-job and concrete poured, because a first-class city deserves a first-class airport, not a Third World airport.

### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

South Australian Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Report 30 June 2001.

### DOCUMENTS, PRIVILEGE

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** You asked for it. On 16 July, the member for Bragg asked a question about parliamentary privilege. Her question was:

In light of the statement of the Speaker yesterday that 'absolute privilege applies to documents which are simply tabled' (that is, in the House), does the Attorney-General propose introducing amendments to the Wrongs Act to make the law conform to the proposition just quoted?

Parliamentary privilege attaches to the proceedings of parliament—that is, to what is said and done in parliament. The privilege is absolute privilege. The tabling of a document in parliament by a member is a part of the proceedings of parliament and so it attracts parliamentary privilege. However, the mere fact that a document has been tabled in parliament does not give absolute privilege to the publication of that document outside parliament. But if the house has ordered or authorised the publication of the document then section 12 of the Wrongs Act 1936 operates to protect persons who published the document or a copy of it outside parliament. The way section 12 operates is to allow a person who has been sued in respect of the publication of a document that has been published by order or under the authority of the house to obtain a stay of the proceedings. This provision is based on the English Parliamentary Papers Act 1840, and it has been part of South Australian law since the 19th century.

A number of provisions authorise the publication of reports; for example, the Government Printer and those members of the Public Service who are employed in the making of official reports of the debates and proceedings of the parliament are authorised by section 12(4) of the Wrongs Act to publish reports of the debates and proceedings of the house. The publication of notices and orders of the day is authorised by section 12(5) of the Wrongs Act. These are permanent authorisations. Another example is section 17(8) of Parliamentary Committees Act 1992. It allows the Presiding Officer or officers to authorise publication of committee reports that are presented when parliament is not sitting. As was said in the minister's explanation of the bill for this provision (which is recorded in *Hansard* of 19 November 1992 at page 1597):

This provision is intended to operate in conjunction with section 12 of the Wrongs Act. . .

Publication outside parliament of a document that has been merely tabled in parliament may be subject to a qualified privilege. It would depend on the circumstances of the publication. For instance, section 7 of the Wrongs Act provides that a fair and accurate report of the proceedings of either house of parliament by newspaper, radio or television is privileged, unless it is proved that the publication was malicious.

**Mr Brindal:** Often the case.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** It is a tremendous difficulty! Common law qualified privilege may also be available in particular circumstances.

I do not have any present intention of introducing a bill to amend section 12 to confer absolute privilege in regard to the publication outside parliament of a document that has been merely tabled in one of the houses. If a member wishes that persons who publish outside parliament a document that the member intends to table be protected absolutely, the member can move a motion for an order that the document be published, as I did with respect to the report written by

Detective Chief Superintendent R.J. McGowan, concerning the death of Dr George Ian Ogilvie Duncan. This is the procedure that was used in relation to the report of Mr Dean Clayton QC into issues surrounding Mr Cramond's inquiry regarding Motorola (members can read that in *Hansard* of 25 July 2001). It is then for the house to decide whether such protection is warranted in a particular case.

## QUESTION TIME

### TRANSPORT SA, CREDIT CARD FACILITIES

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister for Transport confirm that credit card payment facilities for charges such as registration and licence fees will no longer be available at Transport SA after September? The opposition has been informed that, as part of cost saving measures, Transport SA has been instructed to cancel credit card payment options for registration, licence and other public fees administered by the office. The opposition also has been informed that no impact statement has been carried out to determine the effect of changes on low income earners and South Australians living in rural and remote areas.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** This initiative is one of Transport SA's internal efficiency drives to reduce operating expenditure—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** Do members want an answer or not? I know that the Leader of the Opposition, at least, would like to hear the answer, even if his colleagues do not. I am happy to continue, despite the rabble that sits alongside him. From 1 January 2003, credit cards will no longer be accepted from motor dealers for Transport SA related transactions, such as applications for the transfer of vehicle registrations and applications for the registration of new second-hand vehicles. This e-commerce initiative, scheduled to be operating by the end of the year, will enable motor vehicle dealers to process from their business premises transactions to register and transfer vehicles that they buy and sell.

From 1 September 2002, Amex and Diners Club cards will no longer be accepted for the payment of any Transport SA transactions. These changes are necessary due to the spiralling cost of merchant fees associated with the use of credit cards. Transport SA is currently working with EDS to provide an internet-based electronic commerce facility.

### COMPULSORY VEHICLE INSPECTIONS

**Mr O'BRIEN (Napier):** My question is directed to the Minister for Transport. Will the minister advise whether the government will introduce compulsory vehicle inspections?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** A recent Australian review by the Monash University Accident Research Centre (completed in 2002) found considerable variation across studies regarding the extent to which vehicle defects contributed to crashes. Studies that entailed in-depth inspections and formal investigations suggested that defects make a contribution in only 2.9 per cent to 4.5 per cent of crashes.

The Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry into Victoria's Vehicle Road Worthiness System 2001 was given the following estimates based on police accident investigation reports for the period 1992-99: first, 1.1 per cent of involved

vehicles had defects that caused or contributed to the crash; and, secondly, this increased to only 2.7 per cent if defects that may have contributed were included, supporting the claim that vehicle defects, although often present, rarely play a role in the causation of accidents.

The inquiry investigated crash patterns across the various Australasian jurisdictions and reached the following conclusions. Australian states which have annual testing schemes have similar defect related crash rates to Victoria and Queensland which do not have annual inspections. New Zealand, which has a high level of testing, experiences higher rates of vehicle defects in fatal and serious injury crashes than does Victoria.

The inquiry estimated that the cost to the Victorian community of an annual inspection program for all 3 million light vehicles would be \$304 million. Extrapolating these costs to South Australia, an annual inspection program in this state would cost the taxpayer approximately \$90 million. Given these figures, compulsory vehicle inspection costs far outweigh the benefits. I can announce today that the government is not considering the introduction of compulsory vehicle inspections at this time.

#### ROAD SAFETY

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mawson should not have a problem, I would have thought. His nuts and bolts are all in order, aren't they? The member for Light.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light):** My question is directed to the Minister for Transport. Given the minister's statement on road safety yesterday, does he concede that savage cuts to the state funding of regional roads will have a negative impact on road safety in the future? The government has announced a major cut to the program to seal unsealed rural arterial roads—a 10-year \$77 million program. Last year, \$12.4 million was spent on this program. The decision to cut spending to \$2.82 million this year will see a major delay in the completion of the program and disappointment in many rural communities.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** There has been a cut, and virtually every last cent of it has been put into two specific measures that were announced in the budget. I have here various figures put forward by the shadow minister, but there are figures of which I think he needs to be made aware. There have been cuts to the outback roads, regional roads and unsealed rural arterial roads programs. Those cuts equate to the new spending that goes into the state's black spot program and the additional money for shoulder sealing.

This government has been proactive with regard to safety. The comprehensive road safety package which was announced yesterday is now out for consultation, and might I say that we are delighted with the early reaction from organisations such as the RAA. Jack Maclean of the RAA has described it as all of his Christmases coming at once. With respect to those programs, yes, there have been cuts, and that money has been reprioritised because we are putting that money into state blackspot and additional shoulder sealing, because we know that is where we will get the maximum impact with respect to road safety.

The other assurance that I can give the shadow minister and the house is that with state blackspot, into which we have

put an additional \$3.5 million, at least half of that will go into regional South Australia. As to the additional shoulder sealing, an additional \$1.7 million has been added, in addition to the \$3.4 million which has previously been spent and which continues to be spent; and all that money goes to regional South Australia and to road safety. And, of course, this government yesterday, while the previous government had been sleeping behind the wheel for eight years and would not come forward with a road safety package, put a road safety package on the table; it has put it out to the broad community for consultation. This government is about saving lives, not about putting transport money into the arts portfolio.

#### PARKLANDS

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** Can the Minister for Environment and Conservation indicate to the house what steps have been taken to ensure that Adelaide's parklands are properly protected?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** As all members would know, the government has a policy commitment to protect Adelaide's parklands. It will go about that by developing legislation that will establish a special parklands trust—if that is the will of those in the community who have concerns about the parklands—to manage the city's greenbelt.

As the minister with responsibility for the parklands, I have recently established a consultative group, a parklands working group, which will spend the next few months examining models for trusts and foundations. The group is headed by Mr Stephen Forbes, the Director of the Botanic Gardens, and involves—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:**—good choice, the member for Davenport is implying—Mr Stuart Moseley from the Adelaide City Council and Mr Jim Daley, a member of the community and also a member of the Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association. I have met with the parklands working group and discussed its role and direction, and I look forward to receiving an options paper from them within the next two to three months.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Ian? Ian is fine. I have also met with Ian; that is right. Once a preferred model has been chosen, it is my intention to develop a draft bill and discussion paper to be put out for public consultation—that will be later this year—and I look forward to introducing that bill in the parliament early next year.

As part of the consultation process, I have already met with the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Alfred Huang, his CEO Susan Law and most of the councillors, and discussed the government's general plans for the parklands. A member of my staff has also held regular meetings with very special interest groups outlining the government's directions and listened to the issues raised by the groups in relation to protecting the parklands.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I have not yet looked at Mr Gillfillan's bill. I am sure it contains many wise and sensible provisions, and I will look at it very carefully. The government has also committed funding in this financial year to ensure that a comprehensive study of the parklands is undertaken, and I understand that for the first time the

Adelaide City Council has allocated significant funding for a biodiversity study of the parklands, and I congratulate it on that initiative.

There is no doubt that Adelaide parklands hold a special place in the consciousness of South Australians. The parklands have been an integral part of Adelaide since it was first established in 1836 (Adelaide was established in 1836). There have always been legislative protections for the parklands, but it is time to develop a single act that protects the biodiversity, cultural and heritage values of the area and ensure that this unique part of our city is free of unwarranted development and exploitation.

#### OUTBACK ROAD JOB LOSSES

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** Will the Minister for Transport confirm that the government intends cutting Department of Transport outback road maintenance gangs and advise the house how many jobs will be lost? The opposition has been told that up to 20 people will lose their jobs as a result of the government's decision to cut funding of outback road gangs, which it has been estimated will save in excess of \$3 million. The gangs most likely to be dismissed are those in the north-west of the state or in the Everard resheeting gang. The opposition has been informed—

**An honourable member:** By whom?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the member for Stuart would be kind enough to state his authority and proceed with his explanation.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I am very happy to do so: I am just waiting for the house to have a little decorum. For the benefit of the member for West Torrens, it is people who have been told they are going to lose their jobs; that is our authority—three at Marree, a couple at Coober Pedy, and I could go on. These hard working people have maintained roads at a very high standard for the benefit of all South Australians.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** I am delighted to receive a question from the member for Stuart. I have already acknowledged in part, in the earlier answer to the shadow minister for transport, that there has been a cut in outback roads. We have reprioritised our spending in this area. I talked earlier about—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** Give me a chance to answer the question. We have reprioritised our spending in respect of state black spot programs. There was an interjection, 'Into Labor electorates': obviously, the poor member did not listen to my earlier answer where I identified that at least half that money that is going into state black spot funding will go into regional South Australia. At least half of that money for state black spot funding, \$3.5 million, will go into rural South Australia. There has already been an identification of a number of areas around South Australia, in both rural and metropolitan South Australia, which may well qualify for this new state black spot funding.

I have already said that all the additional money, an additional \$1.7 million for shoulder sealing, is going into regional South Australia, so members can hardly sit opposite and say that this is going into Labor electorates. This is a government for all South Australians, unlike the former government, which polarised the community and divided South Australia. This government is a government for all South Australians, and we will stand on that record.

#### OPEN SPACE PLANNING

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** My question is directed to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning. Given the value placed on public open spaces by South Australians, what is the new Labor government doing to promote and provide open space for the wider community?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning):** I thank the honourable member for this important question and acknowledge his keen interest in environmental matters. I suppose the way in which we live in our communities is greatly affected by the way in which open space is provided. We on this side of the house understand that it is a major contributor to the lifestyle we enjoy.

Some of our best parks and open spaces are a real feature of the way in which South Australia and the City of Adelaide has been laid out. The new state government is committed to the ongoing provision of quality open space for all members of the South Australian community. Over the years there has been a bipartisan approach to this issue. The Parklands 21 strategy, which was introduced by the former Liberal government, has built on the Metropolitan Open Space System (MOSS), which was first established by the previous Labor government. The Parklands 21 strategy sets a blueprint for open space in South Australia for the next 10 years.

Its objectives are to set major open space initiatives that build on the MOSS system and link open space in an organised way. It also provides a vision for the revitalisation of the metropolitan coastline. The government will provide over \$6 million this year for the purchase and development of strategic open space. The allocation is made from the Planning and Development Fund, which has been established under legislation with the provision of open space as one of its key aims. Out of this allocation an amount of \$4.2 million will be used to implement the MOSS system (as designated in the Parklands 21 strategy), which includes the full 70 kilometres of the metropolitan coastline.

Work is under way with local government to develop specific proposals about that matter. In addition to the Parklands 21 strategy, the balance of the allocation (amounting to some \$1.9 million) will be provided to local government in the form of grants for specific open-space projects throughout South Australia. These subsidies are aimed at assisting councils to purchase, develop and plan regional open space and other open spaces within the state. The open space program for 2002-03 will add to \$14 million already provided by that fund since the inception of the program established by the former Labor deputy premier, Don Hopgood.

The program is well-organised and appreciated by local government across South Australia, and I am pleased to announce that I have considered and approved \$470 000 in grants to the following councils throughout the state. Members will be advised of this in due course, but the happy councils include Unley—Windsor Street Linear Reserve, \$189 890; Lower—

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** It involves the development of a significant native plant linear reserve, in fact. Unfortunately, it already has a name: it cannot be renamed the Brindal Reserve. Another council is Lower Eyre Peninsula—George Dorwood Reserve, \$15 000, and that money will be used to purchase land for a reserve in the township of North Shield to provide for a passive, unstruc-

tured recreational opportunity for the community; Salisbury (the Premier's electorate)—Dry Creek Linear Park, \$41 500—

**Mr Koutsantonis:** Rann Reserve?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Yes, that may be renamed. This will see the construction of a linear park along Dry Creek at Valley View, including significant revegetation and the development of recreational trails; and, finally, Mount Gambier—Cave Gardens Reserve, \$223 750, which is a major landscape redevelopment of the Cave Gardens precinct. There were many tremendous applications. There is an opportunity to make further application, which I will happily consider in next year's round. One can see that this allocation was clearly done in a bipartisan and sensible fashion. It was not directed in a pork-barrelling exercise: it was done on merit. We will consider the criteria against any good applications, and we encourage members to encourage their councils to submit proposals to us. On a serious note, the funding criteria, we do accept, may disadvantage some poorer councils. I am looking at the \$1 for \$1 funding, which is the present criteria. There may be some basis for relaxing that method for councils that find some difficulty in meeting that arrangement.

### BIOSECURITY

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Treasurer assure the house that the state's biosecurity and primary industries will not be put at risk through major cuts to the primary industries budget, particularly the 40 per cent or \$4 million cut to Incident Response Services? The government has said this cut is justified due to a high number of biosecurity incidents in 2001-02. This ignores the fact that last year was the first year for several years that significant money was not spent on locust control. The Treasurer has signalled that a significant percentage of the allocation will be used for funding strategies to respond to foot and mouth disease and mad cow disease, and there is a major concern among producers that the allocation is far from adequate to protect the state from biosecurity incidents such as fruit fly, locusts, and other pests and diseases.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** I am happy to get a detailed answer to the question for the Leader of the Opposition. In the budget, as the honourable member acknowledged and as we have put to the house, we are putting a significant contribution towards safeguarding our state against possible threat from foot and mouth disease and mad cow disease. Indeed, a biosecurity subcommittee of cabinet, of which I am member, was briefed about a month or so ago on the need to be ready for an outbreak of foot and mouth disease or mad cow disease.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** That happens when you get into government.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Yes, they are a bit scary—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Yes, foot and mouth—that's very clever, very funny. It was an interesting briefing on what has happened in the United Kingdom with mad cow disease—

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Yes, you probably did—and just how South Australia needs to be prepared for such outbreaks, and the sheer devastation that can be wrought upon primary production, indeed on the entire economy, should such an outbreak take hold and spread very quickly. On

advice from PIRSA, as a government we ensured that we had an appropriate allocation in the recurrent and, I think, capital budgets to ensure that we have the right preparation in place should such an outbreak occur. Of course, this is an investment in our security as an economy. We hope it is never called upon, but the government is adequately resourcing that. As to the specific amounts and details of the honourable member's question, I will take it on notice and get back to him.

### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** Will the Minister for Industry, Investment and Trade inform the house of the progress made by the government's Economic Development Board since its formation?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Industry, Investment and Trade):** I have had a number of meetings, actually. The Economic Development Board, under the chair of Robert Champion de Crespigny, is starting to undertake some very detailed and significant works. It has now met on a number of occasions. It had a workshop over the course of a large part of last weekend. Indeed, the Premier, the Minister for Small Business and I met with the members of the Economic Development Board on Friday evening for dinner and a discussion session on where the board is heading in terms of its work. I understand that the board met for most of Saturday to prepare its—

**An honourable member:** Two hours.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I know some members opposite are critical and cynical of the Economic Development Board, but as a government we are extremely confident that it will deliver good outcomes for the state. There are outstanding members on the board, including Carolyn Hewson, with whom I had a long discussion on the weekend about economic development options for our state. We are very lucky to have such a highly skilled and talented board. If the views and advice of Carolyn Hewson are any indication as to the work they are undertaking, and the options, ideas and recommendations the board will give to South Australia over time, I am extremely encouraged, because she is clearly an outstanding contributor.

**Mr Brindal:** It will depend on whether you have the courage to implement them.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** That is a good question: will we have the courage to implement recommendations of the Economic Development Board? Let us wait and see.

**Mr Brindal:** The Liberal government would: you mightn't.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** The honourable member says the Liberal government would; the Liberal government would have the courage to implement the recommendations of our Economic Development Board. The only problem is that it did not have an Economic Development Board; it did not think it needed help and expertise from other sources. Well, we do. We are prepared to acknowledge that we do not have all the answers and that we need some guidance and assistance from industry leaders. You can knock, knock, knock over there; you can knock the Economic Development Board, but please, for the sake of the state, I appeal to the opposition: don't politicise the Economic Development Board.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Don't whinge, whine, carp and knock the Economic Development Board.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** The Leader of the Opposition just said that most of them are theirs. It is not about the politics of the individuals: it is about the quality of their work. I ask that members opposite do not politicise it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** They just can't resist being a knock, knock, knock opposition, can they? They have fitted into the role of being a knock, knock, whingeing opposition very quickly.

**Mr MEIER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** As I said, the board—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Goyder has a point of order.

**Mr MEIER:** The question was asked by the member for West Torrens, yet the Treasurer is implying that the question came from us. Therefore his insinuations are totally incorrect.

**The SPEAKER:** In response to the point of order, I distinctly heard five questions come from the opposition, quite out of order, during the course of the Treasurer's reply. If it is the wish of the opposition to be protected from themselves, I will oblige. The Treasurer.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** As I said, I would like to think that the answer to the serious question that was asked could be listened to with some interest by members opposite, and that they would not always be doing their knock, knock, knocking. The board has met to discuss the approach it will take in preparing a status report on the issues facing our economy, as well as the five year strategic plan. The important point is that we acknowledge that a lot of planning has been done, and the former government undertook a number of studies, as did former governments.

The board's approach will not just simply be about preparing plans, but about giving us some very serious advice on the strategic decisions that we need to take, the hard decisions, the right decisions. It will be very much an action-oriented board. We will see some work coming from the board very shortly.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I invite the member for West Torrens, if he wishes to have a conversation, to do so in the lobbies, and the member for Unley to join him.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I am very disappointed that the opposition does not give this question and answer the serious consideration it deserves, given that we are talking about the economic development of our state. Nonetheless, I will battle on against the barrage of interjections, criticisms, whining and whingeing from members opposite.

The Economic Development Board is undertaking a snapshot for us. I understand it will be providing us with a report towards the end of September which will give us an initial assessment by the board of where it sees our economy and initial issues we need to be addressing. I have to say here, as I have said previously, that the board is working well. The efforts and input of Robert Champion DeCrespigny are outstanding.

**Mr Hamilton-Smith:** Are they consultants?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Are they consultants? I just simply say—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Waite might find himself waiting for the member for West Torrens and the member for Unley in the lobby, if he persists.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I just wish that they wouldn't be continually critical of the Economic Development Board, because it just will not work unless it has bipartisan support.

We have already seen the efforts of Robert Champion DeCrespigny. We know that Robert helped us secure Mitsubishi, the long-term investment of Mitsubishi, the new R&D facility with Mitsubishi, the new 1 000 jobs with Mitsubishi. He assisted us also with the National Wine Centre. I note that in another house the hapless shadow treasurer is, unlike members here, critical of the deal done for the National Wine Centre. Much of the work was undertaken by Robert, but never mind.

This week we have announced a restructure of the Department of Industry and Trade. Again, there has been a good body of advice provided to the government about our economic development structures. Former treasurer John Dawkins, former treasurer Stephen Baker and Chairman of the Adelaide Bank and former Liberal Party state branch treasurer (I understand), Mr Dick McKay, have provided us with a very good restructure, a refocused economic development structure. We will have an Office of Economic Development that will be restructured into two distinct activities: the investment attraction strategic approach, and the planning division of the office, together with the service delivery function. Some activities will be transferred to the Minister for Small Business.

The important thing is that, upon coming to office, this government set about doing the hard work with our economic development activities in this state. We have an excellent team with the Economic Development Board and the restructured Office of Economic Development. Excellent work has been done by former Treasurers Dawkins and Baker, and Mr McKay. That just demonstrates that, when it comes to our economy, we are a bipartisan government. We are a government for all South Australians, and we will pick the best of the best, regardless of their politics. I simply appeal to the opposition: do not be knockers and whingers and work with us on economic development.

#### PRIMARY INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome):** Given the savage cuts to the Department of Primary Industries, will the Treasurer assure the house that the additional resources required to compensate river fishermen and any non-budgeted broomrape initiatives will be allocated from Treasury and will not have to be sourced from the already depleted departmental budget?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** I am not sure what the leader is referring to. All money held by the government is taxpayers' money.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** You will once you get briefed by your agency.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** This guy! The member for Davenport, the would-be shadow treasurer! Maybe one day we will have a shadow treasurer in this house, but we will wait and see. An allocation has been for an appropriate amount of compensation to be held for a compensation package for the river fishers. We are going through a negotiation process.

*The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Not in the budget; a contingency is put aside for—

**Mr Brokenshire:** How much?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** We are going into negotiations for fair and just compensation, and the member for Mawson asks, 'How much?' It shows you how good the member for Mawson would be for negotiation if that amount was to be made public. We have a contingency, and that is put aside.

I am advised that it will be adequate to meet the needs. Once it is finalised, we will make the information available.

### CRIME PREVENTION COMMITTEES

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** Will the Attorney-General say what consultation occurred with local communities before the decision was made to cut funding to local crime prevention committees? The government has axed \$800 000 out of the local crime prevention committee program. Murray Bridge is one of a number of communities affected. In fact, the Murray Bridge program won a national community volunteers award. The coordinator at Murray Bridge, along with 17 others, will be sacked as a consequence of this decision. People in Murray Bridge and in other regions are entitled to know whether a regional impact statement was undertaken before this decision was made—

**The SPEAKER:** Notwithstanding that, the member for Schubert might like to consult standing orders as they relate to expressions of opinion in explanations. I invite the Attorney-General to answer the question.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** It has not decided which of the local government programs will be cut yet. What I can say is that the local crime prevention program was one of the programs—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** —that had its funding reduced, in the recent budget, from \$1.4 million to \$600 000 per annum. The government had to make savings in the justice portfolio in order to get the budget outcomes overall.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** We had a choice between continuing to fund local government crime prevention programs at their current high levels or maintaining police numbers and increasing funding to the prosecution service to overcome a backlog of home invasion cases. And you will recall, Mr Speaker, that it was the Liberal Party that was dragged kicking and screaming into introducing a dedicated home invasion law in 1999. It did not want to do it, but Ivy Skowronski made it do so—and the 100 000 South Australians who signed her petition. However, the Liberal government did not fund the Director of Public Prosecutions to prosecute those newly indictable offences. So, there is a major backlog of home invasion prosecutions—the cheap approach of the Liberal Party to law and order. There was a choice, and if you ask South Australians what is more important, police numbers and prosecution of home invaders on the one side, and local government crime prevention on the other, what do you think they will say?

*The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Some local government crime prevention programs will continue, but some will not. The Crime Prevention Unit of the Attorney-General's Department, which administers the program, has commenced a process that will try to minimise the impact of the reduction over the next six months. We will be working to persuade local government to step in and help fund the programs so that the \$600 000 the state government continues to spend in the area goes much further. But, if it is not a priority for local government, the programs will not go on.

A special briefing was held on Monday for the affected areas. We will soon begin negotiations with them to extend

the salary component of their grant, funding until December 2002, to be tied to agreed outcomes based on the completion of existing work, and continuing the work with local council funding if possible. It was a tough budget decision—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** It is in the nature of budget decisions that one does not consult beforehand.

### FILM INDUSTRY

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** Will the Premier and Minister for the Arts advise the house of the status of the film industry in South Australia?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I know that there is enormous interest: I can tell by the sighs from members opposite. I know that the member for Norwood, of course, has a profound and deep interest in film. Certainly, as Premier and Minister for the Arts, I am both committed to and passionate about supporting the growing film industry in this state. The significant contribution that the film industry already makes to the economic health of South Australia is not appreciated, nor is its potential. That is why I have asked Scott Hicks to join our Economic Development Board, and to make sure that the potential of film and the arts is fully realised in the context of economic development, because of their huge ability to generate jobs.

Let me give members an example of the film industry's contribution. Recently, I approved financial backing for two new feature films that will create the equivalent of more than 70 full-time jobs and generate an economic benefit of about \$5.5 million to the state. The films are *Travelling Light*, with an SA Film Corporation investment of \$330 000, and *Alexandra's Project*, with an investment from the SA Film Corporation of \$250 000. Both films will be shot entirely in South Australia and mixed at the SA Film Corporation's Hendon Studios. *Travelling Light* has an impressive cast, including Pia Miranda, of *Looking for Alibrandi* fame, and Sacha Horler of *Russian Doll* and *Praise*—

**An honourable member:** Andie MacDowell?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** No, Andie MacDowell is not in this current batch of film projects, but I am happy to try to use my influence on that score. *Alexandra's Project* stars Gary Sweet and Helen Buday, and is produced and directed by Ralph de Heer, whose most recent movie *The Tracker* premiered at the 2002 Adelaide festival. Although these films are all about Australians, their stories are universal and about real people. They are a great example of the sort of film that we can make in this state that do not have to be blockbusters to be entertaining.

In 2000-01 the combined direct spend in the South Australian economy by the film industry, was \$33 million. Using the ABS multiplier effect (from memory, 2.67) this translates into a spend of \$88 million across the state and the creation of 627 new jobs. The modest capital outlays invested by the South Australian Film Corporation in the industry bring major returns. For example, the \$100 000 investment in the film *Rabbit Proof Fence* returned approximately \$3.1 million directly to our economy, mostly in the regional area in which it was shot.

The South Australian Film Corporation invested \$550 000 in Channel 9's first series of *McLeod's Daughters*, and this first series alone has put \$6 million back into our economy. The third series of *McLeod's Daughters* (also to be filmed in South Australia) will contribute to the more than 300 jobs and \$24.5 million generated through economic benefits for our

state from recent film and television productions. I hope to make a series of announcements about our film industry later this year.

### VICTIM SUPPORT SERVICES

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** Will the Attorney-General advise the house why, when he was in Port Lincoln last Friday to launch a victim support service, he did not also report that funding for the Port Lincoln Crime Prevention Program was to be axed? The state government entered into a three-year agreement with local government to fund local crime prevention committees. In a media statement issued on 11 July by the Premier and the Minister for Regional Affairs (Hon. Terry Roberts) it was claimed that one of the regional highlights was an additional \$500 000 to support crime prevention committees in a number of centres including Port Lincoln.

The Treasurer issued a correction on Monday. However, his release did not reveal that, far from receiving an additional \$500 000, the crime prevention program had actually been cut by \$800 000 across the state. In Port Lincoln, the crime prevention program has been very successful with programs such as the excellent anti-spiking drinks campaign, *Don't Get Spiked*, attracting national attention. A crime prevention representative from Port Lincoln even went to Canberra to outline some of their initiatives.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** A decision has not been taken on which of the local government crime prevention programs will continue and which will not, but we have to achieve a budget saving of about \$800 000.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Yes we do in order to achieve the budget results in the justice department. The member for Flinders is quite right to say that the government erroneously advertised in a press release on the internet that there would be a \$500 000 increase in crime prevention funding in regional South Australia. That was an error and, as soon as it was detected by one of my officers, arrangements were made to issue another press release delivering the true situation. As I have told the house before, the mistake was made because the \$500 000 increase in crime prevention funding was a budget bid of the previous government. We are not here to put into effect every budget bid made under a previous government, nor are we here to implement the Liberal Party's election promises; that is not what we are about.

When I was in Port Lincoln on Friday, I discussed the issue of crime prevention with the relevant people from the Port Lincoln council. I advised them that an overall cut was coming in relation to crime prevention. I could not inform them whether there would be a cut to their program because that decision has not been taken even now.

### URBAN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** My question is directed to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning. What is the government doing to foster community life and pride by improving town centres and main streets?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning):** The member for Schubert is, I think, anticipating an announcement later in this answer. I have recently approved a new program to be called 'Places for People'. This program promotes place-based improve-

ment strategies and projects for town centres, as well as promoting greater design skills and understanding within local government. It builds on a program that was launched by the previous government called 'Streets Ahead'.

This government intends to build on it and create a greater emphasis on positive social outcomes. The program provides an effective means of early delivery of a number of Labor policies, including fostering social inclusion, partnering with local government to build stronger communities and strengthening neighbourhoods and communities.

As all members would be aware, the physical amenity of a neighbourhood can have a very big effect on the way in which people respond to each other and the way in which people interact with their open spaces, and I have great pleasure in announcing that I have recently approved the first round of grants: \$250 000 to 12 projects. I have asked for local members and councils to be advised, and I am pleased to say that the first cabs off the rank are:

1. Angaston Village Square development project—\$25 000; the Barossa Council;
2. Beach Road Christies Beach coastal node project—\$10 000; City of Onkaparinga;
3. Bordertown gateway project—\$6 500; Tatiara District Council;
4. Clare town centre strategy—\$20 000; Clare and Gilbert Valleys council;
5. Gawler Street Mount Barker design guidelines—\$4 000; District Council of Mount Barker;
6. Henley and Grange squares framework plan—\$25 000; City of Charles Sturt;
7. Moseley Square upgrade—\$10 000; City of Holdfast Bay;
8. Port Augusta CBD urban design framework—\$20 000; City Council of Port Augusta;
9. Port Pirie waterfront precinct design development—\$45 000; Port Pirie Regional Council;
10. Salisbury town square development plan—\$50 000; City of Salisbury—something in which the Premier might be interested;
11. Semaphore Road neighbourhood centre framework plan—\$27 000; City of Port Adelaide and Enfield;
12. Wudinna townscape plan—\$8 000; District Council of Le Hunte.

### CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg):** Given the Attorney-General's assurance yesterday that the cabinet had not yet signed off on its position regarding the Constitutional Convention, can he advise the house why advertisements seeking applications for a media liaison officer, senior project officer, administration officer and a senior legal officer, to be employed in his justice portfolio, were posted in the employment pages of the *Advertiser* on Saturday 20 June under the classification 'Justice Portfolio'?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** Well, there is going to be a Constitutional Convention and we need people to organise it, so we are hiring them.

### WATER QUALITY

**Mr HANNA (Mitchell):** My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. I ask the minister to detail new initiatives by the EPA to increase our capacity to review regional water quality across our state.



**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** It is my pleasure to announce that the government in this budget is putting an additional \$370 000 in funding to increase current water quality monitoring programs across South Australia. This is part of our continuing program to strengthen the EPA and finally to give it teeth. This funding is to be used on two initiatives: first, to employ two new water quality professionals within the EPA, a hydrologist and a marine scientist; and, secondly, to instigate a major expansion of regional surface and ground water monitoring in South Australia. The focus of that monitoring will be as follows:

- undertaking a program of ground water monitoring on the Eyre and York Peninsulas;
- reviewing the impact to major water bodies, including Lake Bonney and Lake George in the South-East;
- undertaking monitoring in unique habitats, including the Coorong and Ewens Ponds;
- implementing targeted studies to review the risk to the state's water from organochlorines (persistent in the environment), many of which are carcinogenic, and endocrine disruptors (as many members would know, these interfere with marine life reproduction);
- undertaking monitoring of surface water on Eyre Peninsula, Kangaroo Island and the mid and far north; and
- increasing marine and estuarine monitoring in Encounter Bay and key estuaries across the state, such as the Onkaparinga.

Overall, this program will increase our understanding of water quality across the state and identify key risks on a regional and state level. This is another example of this government's commitment to improved environmental protection.

#### LOCHIEL PARK

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Will the Premier honour his pre-election promise to save 100 per cent of Lochiel Park for open space, not merely the government's pledge to consult with the community? It has been recorded in the *East Torrens Messenger* of 3 July that consultation on Lochiel Park will be conducted by Connor Holmes Consulting and that the process to identify possible uses of the land will begin this month. Will the Premier give an assurance that such uses will be in accordance with the promise he made to the community during the election campaign, of 100 per cent open space?

**The SPEAKER:** It is not necessary for the member for Hartley to repeat his question.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning):** I am pleased to take this question on behalf of the Premier and to inform the honourable member that this matter is presently being handled by the Minister for Government Enterprises, who is not in the chamber today. As the honourable member is aware, this matter is being handled by the Land Management Corporation, a government enterprise. As he has rightly noted, it has commissioned a consultancy for the purposes of carrying out an assessment of the appropriateness of the open space.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** The honourable member would also be aware that he advocated that a big slab of this area be flogged, so I think perhaps he should just listen to the way in which a slightly more scientific analysis will be carried out than the honourable member had planned. The analysis that will be carried out will take into account a range

of issues. There are obvious questions about the need for open space for people in that locality, and that will be inquired into.

Members would also be aware that there is a range of surplus government land and, when surplus land identified by government departments is put in the hands of the Land Management Corporation, the first step the government has to undertake is a strategic analysis across the whole of each government department's needs, to work out whether there is a proper basis for that land to be held by another government department. It also carries out an analysis of whether that land could be developed in a fashion that could capture value for government.

The reality is that this land also is an asset of government. If it is capable of capturing value for government, it could be used for other government priorities, such as schools or hospitals. That is the analysis that has to be undertaken. It may be that this open space will need to be retained in its entirety and it may be that it will be retained in part. But, whatever happens, a sensible analysis will be taken; the needs of the whole of the government will be taken into account; and, when the decision is taken, it will be reported to the house.

#### STATE SWIMMING CENTRE

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright):** My question is directed to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Does the absence of any detail in government financial papers indicate that the government has abandoned the State Swimming Centre project adjacent to the Westfield Marion Shopping Centre, or does the government still propose a public/private sector partnership and, if so, what funds have been allocated to the project?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** The short answer to the honourable member's question is no. The longer answer is that this is an important issue. I have met with the Marion council and assured it that this government is taking on this debate, as did the previous government. The former minister (the member for Davenport) made available \$1 million to explore the potential for a PPP. In a meeting with representatives of the Marion council, we said that we were happy to explore the potential for a PPP. We met with representatives of the Marion council, I think, relatively early in our days of coming to government and assured them that we would be pursuing that process. I am happy to meet with them again if they want that certainty reiterated.

It would be fair to say that the Office for Recreation and Sport has been actively pursuing this issue and working with the Marion council in developing a policy position. Also, of course, the major projects group within DAIS has been working with Treasury on this matter. It would also be fair to say that work continues and that work has been done. Ultimately, I think, this would result in a presentation being made to the major projects infrastructure committee. We are certainly pursuing the matter.

As I said, I think that critical to all this (and I think it probably would have been similar with the previous government) is the potential for a PPP. We would want to see how the numbers rolled out before we made a decision.

## PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on grievances, there is a matter of considerable importance which I think needs to be addressed in the interests of every member and the people who serve this parliament—not just this house—and which warrants comment following the recent questions raised by members across the chamber about parliamentary privilege. Lest anyone misunderstands me, I make it plain that my role and purpose as Speaker is to protect and uphold privilege; but I despair that a significant proportion of the public think that we, as members of parliament, are unworthy of it largely because of our abuse of it as they see it.

It is actually for them that parliamentary privilege exists. Open and public questioning as to the meaning of privilege in this chamber further muddies the water and restricts the use in the public interest of the privilege by those of us who have the delegated authority of the people who have elected us here. The reason for my disturbance, I guess, more than anything, is that it is not only we, as members of parliament, who are now in jeopardy but, more particularly, those who professionally serve us, because each day papers and documents tabled are made available to the public for their inspection, for their photocopying, for their viewing on the net, or anywhere else for that matter.

In consequence of the questions that have been raised about privilege, I now wonder what members think their position, that is, the position of those who serve us, really is. In consequence, I believe that the Standing Orders Committee ought to be called together at the earliest possible opportunity to examine the questions that have been raised to enable me, on behalf of the members of this place and the people who serve this place, and the other house, to make a definitive statement as to whether an order, as I find referred to in the Attorney-General's remarks today, constitutes not only an order made by explicit motion of this place but also an order to be found in standing orders which expressly state what parliamentary privilege applies to documents and what does not. If our standing orders are not orders, then that is a matter for grave concern.

Since this is the commencement of a break of some time, during which the estimates committees will examine the budget papers, I urge all members to exercise extreme care and caution in making any statement during those estimates committees which may expose them and/or table officers of this house to any risk, until we have determined what we believe to be the ancient and quite proper privilege that should apply to the proceedings of parliament, part of which is the documents that are tabled in the parliament during the course of its deliberations. More than that at this time, I think it is probably unwise for me to canvass, other than to state that, as privilege has existed to this point, it relates to all papers and documents that have been tabled because they are considered public. I do not see any other interpretation that can be placed upon them.

**Mr BRINDAL:** Mr Speaker, as a matter of privilege, will you give this house some guidance, or will the Attorney-General give some guidance, as to the degree of privilege or what will apply in the estimates committees? Sir, you raised some very profound issues. The Attorney-General made a statement today. All members in going into estimates need to know the limit and extent to which you believe privilege applies.

**The SPEAKER:** For the benefit of the member for Unley, and the benefit of all members, I have just stated that all

papers and documents tabled, because they are considered public, are therefore covered by that privilege. However, if the member for Unley bothers to take heed of what I was saying, questions raised by him, yet again, after I have said it, only further confuse the situation. Unless and until we have had the opportunity to deliberate upon on it in the Standing Orders Committee and make a considered statement to the house, which the house can then adopt, amend or reject—and for whatever purpose it will reject it, I have no idea—we all must exercise great caution because of those questions. It is not only in our own interests but also in the public's interests—and, most especially, those of the servants of this parliament who are at risk in the meantime.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### DUNCAN, Mr P.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** Mr Speaker, the matter you have just raised is one of great importance and significance, and I sincerely—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** One you know nothing about.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** It is a great pity that the Attorney-General takes such a flippant view of such—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** No: only a flippant view of you.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Mr Speaker, I ask the Attorney-General to withdraw his personal insults and improper motives which he has expressed across the house to me.

**The SPEAKER:** I am sorry, I did not hear what the Attorney-General said.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Well, he referred to me by other than my title, which is against standing orders; secondly, he imputed an improper motive to me.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Did the Attorney-General impute improper motives to the member for Stuart?

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** No, sir. What I said is that I took a flippant view of the member for Stuart.

**The SPEAKER:** I invite the member for Stuart to continue with his grievance.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** We are aware of the views of the Attorney-General. I just want to make the point that this house needs to be very careful if it tampers with those undoubted rights and privileges that have been built up over a long time, because it will prevent us from properly discharging our duties as a member of parliament.

I want to refer to some of the activities of one Peter Duncan. I received yesterday a letter from a constituent of mine who appears to be the victim of other than honourable practices entered into by Mr Duncan as a result of some of his business dealings. My constituent, who comes from Eudunda, writes as follows:

In January 1999 my wife and I moved from Tamworth, NSW, to Eudunda in the Mid North region of SA at the request of Baiada Poultry Pty Ltd to complete the establishment of two poultry meat breeder farms at Eudunda and one at the nearby town of Robertstown. These are state of the art farms housing approximately 130 000 breeders and producing some 15 million fertile eggs annually, which at a nominal farm-gate value of 30¢ per fertile egg adds around \$5 million directly to the local and state economy.

He then says:

In walks Peter Duncan. Peter Duncan was a Labor politician and an ex-Attorney-General of South Australia. Our only association with him was in his capacity as a director of Omnipol Pty Ltd (and

Omnipol (Australia) Pty Ltd), one of Petan's clients in Adelaide during 2001-02.

Omnipol invented a process and machine capable of taking all types of plastic waste, granulating and heat treating it and manufacturing useful and saleable products from the resultant extrusion, including fence posts, oyster poles, sleepers, dunnage, pier poles, garden ornaments. . .

He goes on to say:

However, unbeknownst to the other main director of Omnipol, who had already invested most of his capital into the venture and was distracted by his own capital protection problems, Peter Duncan was playing political games. Earlier he had persuaded the other director to set up Omnipol (Australia) Pty Ltd ostensibly to separate the production plant from the intellectual property and had then gained control of Omnipol (Australia) by purchasing 100 per cent of the shares for \$50 000 in his wife's name and using (so I believe) money from his sister's trust.

As you can see, Peter Duncan has never invested any significant amounts of his own money in the scheme. He then set about attempting to establish control over the intellectual control of Omnipol (Australia). These matters were subsequently discovered by a financial controller (recruited by Petan at the request of the other director and under protest from Peter Duncan) and reported to the other director. This caused a major rift between the directors and Peter Duncan moved the Omnipol (Australia) office to the production plant site in Womma Road.

This rift in turn caused the other potential investors to talk about liquidating. He further states:

. . . Omnipol (Australia) Ltd has had a wind-up application by the ATO until 23 July. Peter Duncan, meanwhile, has separated from his wife who is now living in Tasmania I believe, sold his Adelaide townhouse and fled the country and was last heard of hiding out in Indonesia. I am told he also has property investments in Queensland (although I would not be surprised if he has protected/hidden these somehow).

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

*Ms Bedford interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. Gunn:** There's plenty more to come. You've got a bit to answer for, too.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms Bedford:** Are you threatening me, you bully?

**The Hon. G.M. Gunn:** No, just telling you a fact.

#### WOOMERA DETAINEES

**Ms BREUER (Giles):** Before lunch I was very concerned to see on television two young boys grabbed almost by the scruff of their necks and lifted off the ground, pulled along to a lift, shoved inside a lift and the doors shut. They disappeared from view. This really upset me, because they were young boys and just this week I had my young nephew about the same age staying with me. I believe these two young boys were about 11 and 13. I realised afterwards that this was probably for their protection, because they were the two young boys who recently escaped from Woomera.

First, I thank God that they are alive because there have been grave concerns about their safety. People suspected they were safe, but there was always the threat they were out in the middle of the desert somewhere, dead. So I am very glad that they are alive. The two young boys had been on the run for two months from the Australian authorities after escaping from the Woomera detention centre.

This morning they walked into the British Consulate in Melbourne to apply for asylum. They have been on the run since breaking out of the detention centre, where they had been for 18 months. Two boys aged 11 and 13 had been at a detention centre for 18 months! Their solicitor, Eric Vadarlis, says they are both in good health but they are very scared,

withdrawn and frightened because their mother and their siblings are still in detention in Woomera. They know that if they do step outside the British Consulate, they will be locked up by the police. Their lawyer has confirmed that the 13 year old did twice seriously harm himself in Woomera.

The boys' father, Ali Asqa Baktari, spoke to the ABC this morning expressing happiness that his children are safe. He said that his children were very unhappy in the detention centre. Of course, the tragedy and stupidity of this story is that their father has a temporary visa and is living in Sydney while their mother and their siblings are still in Woomera unable to get visas. How wrong and how tragic is this! It is just such a vicious payback by the Howard government for this young family, for these two little boys. They are only children. As I have said before, it really distresses me. I believe it is systematic child abuse by our government to these young children.

Someone from the Refugee Action Collective said that it is highly symbolic that the children did walk into the British Consulate because they came to Australia seeking asylum from the Afghan regime that we supposedly had gone to war against, and in return were locked up for 18 months in the detention centre at Woomera. A considerable amount of criticism has been aimed at me because I have spoken out about this situation over and over again. In fact, there has been quite a lot of venom and hate about my stand on the refugees.

I was very heartened to read in the Australian on 13 and 14 July 2002 an article by Phillip Adams. Phillip Adams is a man whose weekly column regularly restores my faith in human nature and shows me that there are still decent Australians around who are prepared to think about issues and the dreadful injustices that we have in our society. In his article, Phillip Adams said:

Before the Tampa controversy, Philip Ruddock threatened to jail anyone harbouring escapees from Woomera and Villawood. He talked of a 10-year sentence, harsher than that handed down to many miscreants convicted of rape, paedophilia or murder. I asked readers to think carefully about the issue. . . before signing up for a civil disobedience register. And thousands upon thousands of you did just that.

Even more wrote expressing grief and rage at government policy: 'I'm ashamed of being Australian'. . . With the letters came a flood of donations—\$250 000 in a couple of weeks—which enabled us to set up, just four months ago, Australians for Just Refugee Programs.

I want to talk about the calibre of people who joined this organisation, such as Lowitja O'Donoghue, Tim Costello, Fred Chaney, Malcolm Fraser, Margaret Reynolds, Barry Jones, Ian Macphee, Ian Chappell, Bill Kelty, Phillip Adams, John Menadue, John Newcombe, John Singleton, and organisations such as the Human Rights Council of Australia, the ACTU, and the Australian Education Union. This is not just a small group of people complaining about this: our society is starting to change.

Time expired.

#### ECLIPSE OF THE SUN

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I raise a matter within the ambit of the Minister for Tourism and ask her to give it her attention. It has to do with the forthcoming total eclipse of the sun which will occur on 4 December between Ceduna and Lyndhurst, the only place in the world where it is likely to be clearly observed. Potentially this phenomena could be attended by tens of thousands of people converging on these remote sites to gain a vantage point from which they

might observe it. Ceduna alone expects in excess of 19 000 visitors to the town, although it could be considerably more.

In an event such as this in the south of England some time ago—in Europe, admittedly—one million people came to observe. Obviously, those sorts of figures are out of the realm of credibility here in Australia. However, I foreshadow to the minister that she may well be surprised—if not astonished—by the level of visitation to this event. I ask her to give her most urgent attention to providing for the event, which could well turn out to be a very significant major event in the tourism calendar for the state and, in fact, could progress beyond that into an absolute catastrophe with very negative consequences if the appropriate administrative arrangements were not made.

Undoubtedly, great strain will be put on our roads, on traffic management and the police, water supplies, effluent treatment works disposal, power supplies, accommodation and a range of civil services not only at Ceduna and Lyndhurst but also en route to those destinations and in the peripheral zones. South Australia's Astronomical Society President Steven Cook on ABC radio warned the Labor government of this upcoming event, when he said:

Thousands of visitors will face chaos at this year's total solar eclipse in SA's outback.

He pointed to 'shortages of medical staff and equipment' being amongst many of the serious problems looming. He also cited a lack of planning by the state government. The message that the state government should be getting is that—

*Ms Breuer interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Giles is getting carried away.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**—people are concerned about the lack of preparation. Towns may well be stressed beyond coping point if the level of visitation is as high as it could possibly be. On the same ABC radio broadcast, I asked questions of the minister and I note her comments. She said:

Planning on many issues is being done with military precision.

I look forward to seeing that military precision at work. The minister said that she had been working on ways to manage effluent and water supplies and that she was confident that, with six months to go and plenty of time to get resources prepared, visitors would be welcomed and given the opportunity of a lifetime to see a very special event. The minister said:

Although it's a terrifying prospect, I'm confident that when it happens, we'll be ready.

South Australia will be watching, and I want to get it on the record that the minister is very confident that this will go off like clockwork. I wish I was as confident; for example, I understand that the District Council of Ceduna has put to the Labor government a request seeking assistance for funding in the order of \$350 000 to \$500 000. I ask, 'Has the minister provided the funding?' I also ask, 'What funding has been allowed for in this budget to cater for the event?' Will she ensure not only that these two regional towns cope with the tourism influx but also that the international tourists return to their home countries, praising their South Australian and Eyre Peninsula visit? Will she ensure that this event does not turn into a fiasco to the detriment of tourism and South Australia's reputation as a destination? This question has also been raised in the other place, to which a very shoddy response has been provided. I ask the minister to give it her attention.

## PARLIAMENT, MEMBERS' DUTIES

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** I am not sure of the title of this grievance, but I have every confidence in my friends in Hansard that they will come up with an appropriate heading. I want to speak about parliamentarians. Indeed, I am in a room with a host of them at this point. However, just as importantly, I want to talk about the perception—indeed, it is a misconception—that, if we are not sitting in parliament, we are not doing our job. I do not really want to focus on behavioural problems that occur in parliament or, indeed, on the matters of privilege that have been spoken about; they are separate issues. I want to talk about the perception that, if we are not sitting in parliament house, we as parliamentarians are not doing our job.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr CAICA:** Indeed, I note the point made by the member for Mitchell. I have never been so thankful in most recent times that the *Advertiser* is our local paper, but along with other media it is guilty of promoting the misconception that, if we are not in parliament, we as parliamentarians are not doing our job.

It was interesting to note the other day that my son James, who is 14 years of age (and I forget what we were talking about; it was probably something to do with football) said something to the effect, 'Well, it's in the paper; it must be true.' I explained to him that that was not necessarily the case. In fact, not just children of James' tender age of 14 years believe that what they read in the paper must be true; a lot of people of different ages and different backgrounds also believe that what they read in the paper must be true. We know that that is a nonsense. I urge the media—not just the *Advertiser* but all media—to promote a little more factually what parliamentarians do. It would appear that there is a perception or a misconception out in the community that if parliamentarians are not in parliament they are not doing their job properly. Of course, I say that is a nonsense.

We can look at other occupations; for example, my previous occupation was a firefighter. As firefighters, we spend 5 per cent of our time fighting fires and saving lives. The argument is, 'If you are not fighting a fire, you are not actually doing your job.' Of course, we could go through a host of other occupations in which that assumption would be just as preposterous; for example, if the defence forces are not at war and not killing people the assumption would be that they are not doing their job. The same could be said for a heart surgeon: if he did not have someone opened up on the operating table at any time, he was not doing his job. The same assumption could apply to a lawyer, a teacher or a host of other occupations. It is a nonsense to suggest that, if we are not in parliament we as parliamentarians are not doing our job. I will admit, as we all will, that one of our primary tasks is to be in this house, and it has been a pleasure for me to be in here on the occasions that I have.

With regard to the length of time I have been in this house, some in the Fire Brigade would say that my name is not even dry in the book—that I have not been here for very long. I have not sat under a different sitting program from the one we now have. I understand that parliament is committed to sitting those extra days, and I am not calling for a change now. However, with more time and the ability and the opportunity to be able to reflect properly on how things are done in this house, I will not be backward in coming forward—as I suggest no-one in this house should be—with

suggestions by which we can do things better with regard to the relationship between my responsibilities to this parliament and my direct responsibilities to the electorate I serve, and the efficiencies of discharging both responsibilities under the current format.

We should be in the position of ever improving the manner by which we deliver our service to the people whom we represent. There should be that constant review by all members—and, indeed, the parliament—about enhancing the processes that are to be in place so that we can constantly improve the delivery of our service to the people we serve—to all South Australians.

Each of us in this chamber knows the pressures that are now on us with respect to our electoral responsibilities. Come tomorrow, I will spend all day meeting the people whom I have not had the opportunity of seeing during the week. Indeed, I will spend an enormous amount of time over the weekend carrying out those responsibilities. I am not complaining about that. I am saying that there may be ways in the future by which we can ensure that those dual responsibilities—serving in parliament and at the same time effectively discharging those electoral responsibilities—have more continuity to them and more efficiencies in place.

I am not judging the system that we now have in place, and I do not want what I am saying to be misconstrued. All I am saying is that we would be negligent in the future not to review how we do things. Our responsibility is to educate not only the media but also the electorate about our responsibilities. I do not blame the electorate for thinking that, if we are not in parliament, we are not doing our job.

#### TELECOMMUNICATIONS GRANT

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg):** The issue that I want to raise today is one of good news and, unfortunately, some bad news. At midday today, the Prime Minister made a very significant announcement for rural and regional Australia. The good news is that announcement, and the bad news is the failure on the part of the state government to get its act together and confirm arrangements—unlike other states—to ensure that the good news is actioned, and actioned quickly. This is something that we will clearly need in circumstances where the state government has just handed down a budget which, suffice to say, gives scant regard to the real needs of real people in rural South Australia.

Today at the Perth Royal Hospital, the Prime Minister announced \$50 million in funding for eight telecommunication projects, which are to be funded through the National Communications Fund. This is clearly a very large-scale and ambitious telecommunications project, which will deliver improved health and education outcomes to Australians living in regional communities. We will welcome the announcement and, in particular, the \$6 million of those funds that has been allocated for those telecommunication networks in regional, rural and remote South Australian communities. The announcement means that communities throughout regional South Australia will benefit from receiving more affordable and accessible telecommunications services.

The project, which is to be managed by the South Australian Department of Education and Children's Services, will support video conferencing and video streaming by way of multi-casting services, and deliver scheduled multimedia content directly to the desktop. The project proposes to provide up to 262 broadband internet protocol-based networking connections, linking more than 30 000 students

and educators across the state. That is all the good news and, of course, we welcome the Prime Minister's announcement in Western Australia today. We welcome his commitment to rural and regional Australia, and we welcome the \$6 million that is there, ready for us to receive and benefit from.

Now here is the bad news. Unlike every other press release in every other state announcing this important contribution and this important funding initiative by the federal government, the South Australian release is qualified in the following way: it states that the proposal, as applicable to South Australia, is subject to further discussion and agreement by the South Australian government. This has nothing to do with Liberal or Labor, because there are Labor administrations at the state level all around the country, and they have got their act together and worked out the agreement and are ready to go. So, not only do they enjoy the privilege of the funds being received but also those funds will be actioned and delivered and readily moved into those communities as promptly as is possibly able to be initiated. However, given that the state government has not got its act together and has not determined the terms of the agreement, it is simply not ready, and it is letting down the people of South Australia in relation to the delivery of these services as early as they would otherwise be available to them.

I appreciate that the responsibilities of the Minister for Education are currently being undertaken by the Minister for Environment and Conservation, and I ask that, when he reads this contribution on a subsequent occasion, he takes note of it and that he brings some action within the Department of Education and Children's Services to ensure that South Australia does not lose the benefit of these funds—in particular, their application forthwith. I point out that, of course, that may not have been a priority for this state government, given the budget that it has just delivered and its lack of care and consideration for rural South Australia, but it is important to these people. These are urgently needed funds, and I ask that the government act on it as promptly as possible.

#### NATIONAL CRIME AUTHORITY

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** Today I would like to make a few comments about the National Crime Authority. In so doing, I lament the fact that my sparring partner, the member for Morphett, is speaking later on and not in the grievance—and this has become quite traditional. I know that he is making good contributions there. Members might be aware that the National Crime Authority arose in the first place from what turned out to be the ashes of the Costigan royal commission. The Costigan findings, together with all the reports, were handed over to a new body, the National Crime Authority, which was established as a national crime fighting body. Everyone in this chamber would be aware that criminals, along with legitimate businesses, do not recognise state borders. They operate as and where they please, as and when they please, and they tend to operate very efficiently when they are left alone and no-one is able to tackle them. The National Crime Authority was established in order to overcome the multi-jurisdictional problem that has confounded successive Australian governments since Federation. It involved the various states cooperating through their police forces and various agencies with the federal police, the Bureau of Criminal Intelligence, and so forth, in order to track down and work on major criminal activities throughout Australia.

The National Crime Authority has operated for nearly 20 years, and it is impossible for me, or probably anyone else, to say what percentage of major crime the National Crime Authority has touched upon, and to what extent its activities have resulted in Australia being a safer place. But I can tell the parliament with confidence that this is certainly a safer place than it would have been had the National Crime Authority not been operating: of that we can be sure. It is from that point that I approach with some concern the present unseemly argument that appears to have broken out between the states and the commonwealth government in relation to the establishment of the proposed Australian Crime Commission.

It is important, I think, for us to understand that the Australian Crime Commission that is being proposed by the federal government does not even have the full support of members of the federal coalition in Canberra. Indeed, National Party Senator Julian McGauran is recently quoted as having said:

Why are we changing something that's working, anyway?

Of course, Senator McGauran's contribution is significant, because he, in fact, is the chair of the National Crime Authority body, which is the parliamentary supervisory body.

There is also a concern that the moves against the National Crime Authority seem to have some sort of relationship with the much publicised unsuccessful attempt by the National Crime Authority some years ago to prosecute former Liberal Party president John Elliott. Whether or not that has anything to do with it, it is unfortunate that the National Crime Authority, so soon after that failed prosecution, is now being lined up for what amounts to dismemberment. The effect of the proposals, as I understand them, is that the commonwealth government will attempt to replace the National Crime Authority with a smaller bureaucratic outfit, which will have fewer policemen and investigators and a lot more bureaucrats and paper shufflers.

**An honourable member:** It's a gift to organised crime.

**Mr RAU:** It is a gift, it would appear, to organised crime.

It is interesting to note that all the states and the police forces of the various states are unified in their objection to this proposal. It is also interesting that, if it is looked at from a financial point of view, it appears to be nothing more than a cynical cost shifting exercise whereby the federal government unloads the responsibility for paying a number of police officers from various states whose tasks have been aimed at organised crime, and loads that responsibility back onto the states.

I think that all of us here should be concerned about any move by any government, state or federal, to undermine a national coordinated crime fighting activity. Although I am not wedding myself to the National Crime Authority as the be-all and end-all, any changes made to it had better be changes for the better, otherwise all of us will be considerably worse off. This has implications not only for crime but also for the state budget.

---

## CHILD PROTECTION REVIEW (POWERS AND IMMUNITIES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 10 July. Page 708.)

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland):** The bill before us, as has been explained by the minister, seeks to establish a review of child protection policies with enabling powers and immunities for those who are to be appointed as authorised officers under the bill. The opposition agrees with the intent and principles of the bill which will enable it, at the conclusion of the review and the report, to develop strategies to improve the way in which government responds to the needs and welfare of children. The review will be set up to look at child protection policies and practices within government departments and government funded services, as well as criminal processes and legislative frameworks. The bill has already been put out for public consultation, and the minister has so far received 380 registrations of interest, all of which have made a submission on this review.

The purpose and intent of this bill (in facilitating the conduct of the review) is to ensure that people are not prevented from providing information to the review because of confidentiality provisions in existing legislation. As members are aware, the Children's Protection Act 1993 identifies a number of confidentiality provisions which could prevent people from providing information that is relevant to the review. So, for the review to be effective this bill needs to enable people to provide relevant information.

The bill also provides that certain personal information provided to the review will be confidential in accordance with the provisions of the Children's Protection Act 1993. The bill specifically provides the ability for the reviewer (Ms Robyn Layton QC) to determine that other information should be kept confidential if she considers it appropriate to do so in the interests of justice or to prevent hardship or embarrassment to any other person. Obviously, there are exceptions when such information can actually be divulged.

Finally, the minister advises that the bill provides people involved in the conduct of the review with the same protections, privileges and immunities as those that apply to a judge of the Supreme Court. It also provides people who provide information to the review with the same protections that they would have if they were a witness in proceedings before the court.

As I said at the beginning of my address, the opposition supports the intent of this bill and commends the minister for bringing it to the house to enable this very important review to take place. Of course, the opposition will seek answers to a couple of concerns that have arisen from our reading of the bill. Clause 3, relating to procedure, provides:

- (1) the person appointed to conduct the review—
  - (a) is not required to hold a hearing for the purposes of the review; and
  - (b) may obtain information from such persons and in such manner as the person thinks fit. . .

This provision causes slight concern for the opposition, but I will address that in committee. Another item of concern—of which I have already advised the minister—relates to clause 5(3), which provides:

However, subsection (2) does not prevent the further disclosure or publication of information—

in certain areas, including paragraph (d), which provides:

to a member of the police force of this state or the commonwealth or another state or a territory of the commonwealth. . .

The Children's Protection Act 1993 refers to an 'authorised police officer', but this bill refers to a 'member of the police force'. I have brought this matter to the minister's attention so that the terminology used in paragraph (d) can be brought

into line with that used in the act. In the principal act, 'authorised police officer' is defined as:

... a member of the police force who is of or above the rank of sergeant or who is in charge of a police station or any other member of the police force designated as an authorised police officer by the Commissioner of Police for the purpose of this act.

I believe it is more appropriate to have the same definition in this bill, as it would be inappropriate to consider that any member of the general police force would be suitable to discuss information under the privacy requirements of the act. I am pleased to see that the minister has agreed to this and will move an amendment to that effect. The provisions of clause 3 are generally taken from the Children's Protection Act, and I concur with those provisions.

My only other concern at this point—although, as I have said, there are other concerns that I will raise in committee—is that this bill has been introduced for a particular reason, that is, to enable the review to take place with the collective powers of being able to access information without regard to privacy and confidentiality sections in the principal act. This is an enabling bill, but under most circumstances it would no longer be in force on completion of the review or report. However, I am advised that, because of the requirement for confidentiality and privacy provisions, when the review and the report have been concluded it will be necessary that this bill remain active in order to preserve those confidentiality and privacy provisions. However, it does concern me that under the interpretation provision of the bill, clause 2 states:

'authorised person' means—

(a) the person appointed to conduct the review;—

and in this instance we know that it is Ms Robyn Layton QC—

or

(b) any person appointed to assist in the conduct of the review;

That means that there will be delegated powers that will enable information to be sought under the confidentiality and privacy areas, so that other persons appointed by the person who conducts the review will therefore hold those powers. Because the act needs to remain a live act for some considerable time, I felt that it would perhaps be more conclusive if this bill actually made it quite clear that those delegated powers no longer exist at the termination of the actual report received after the review. That is a concern that I raised with the minister and, again, the minister has consented, for which I thank her, to make sure that there is a clause in the bill that identifies that matter; so that is a further amendment that the minister has undertaken to put forward today. I leave my comments there and will address my other remarks on the clauses of the bill.

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** As the member for Newland has already indicated, we basically support the general intention and thrust of this legislation, and we understand that unless this amendment is passed there will not be power for Ms Robyn Layton to receive the information which she needs to receive in order to conduct the review; and we are perfectly happy with that.

In essence, there are two issues which I think need to be very carefully considered. The first part of this legislation sets up an ability for Ms Layton to receive the information and that is, as I said, fine. It is the ability of Ms Layton to then further disclose the information which raises some concerns. As the house would be aware from matters that have already been discussed here today, the difficulty which may arise can

arise because of the tabling of a report. It is part of the essence of this review that Ms Layton will prepare a report that will be given to the minister. The issue was raised with the minister, and I apologise to her in advance because I have not had time to get back to her. I have received a letter from the minister in response to discussions in this matter indicating that she did not have any difficulty, and nor do I, with the idea that Ms Layton would be authorised to receive information and pass it on to her in appropriate circumstances. For instance, I refer to a situation in which, if information was received in the course of Ms Layton's investigations which Ms Layton felt were necessary to pass on to the minister, she would pass on that information in order for action to be taken. Indeed, I think she said in the letter:

I understand that it was explained to you that the first part of this clause 'for the purposes of the review' is designed to ensure that the review (that is, Ms Layton and the staff supporting her) can operate effectively and exchange information. The second part of the clause 'for the purposes of... a report to the minister' is to ensure that information that is provided to Ms Layton is able to be communicated to me if necessary, for example, for remedial and other action to take place.

I do not have any difficulty with that, but that presupposes that the reporting by Ms Layton is personal to the minister and is not in the form of a formal report which is then provided to the minister and tabled in this house. Clearly, the intention of the legislation is to make sure that no child, in particular, is identified, and if I could just refer to the bill itself and the clause in particular I point out that the first part of the clause refers to the disclosure of information, and it goes on to state:

(2) Information obtained in the course of or for the purposes of the review must not be further disclosed or published if—

- (a) the information is personal information relating to a child, a child's guardian or other family members or any person alleged to have abused, neglected or threatened a child; or
- (b) the information discloses the identity of, or leads to the identification of a person who has notified an authorised person or the department that he or she suspects that a child has been, or is being, abused or neglected; or
- (c) the person appointed to conduct the review, having formed the view that it is necessary to do so in the interests of justice or to prevent hardship or embarrassment to any person, makes a declaration forbidding the further disclosure or publication of the information.

That is fine because that then stops the information being further published. But it then states in subclause (3)—and this is where the concern arises:

(3) However, subsection (2) does not prevent the further disclosure or publication of information—

in a whole range of circumstances. The potential difficulty that I perceive—and I am sure that it can be overcome because, as I said, we are happy with the thrust and intention of the legislation; it is just a matter of making sure that it is acceptable in terms of protection—is that issue of the report coming to the minister. We all know that not naming a person is not sufficient to provide the protection, because if I talked about, for instance, a case of a father who was alleged to have driven a car over a cliff with four children in it, everyone would know about whom I was talking, notwithstanding that no names were used in that description.

Therein lies the difficulty: that, if there are items in the report which, although no names are used, are sufficient to identify people and that report, by virtue of the provisions of the proposed legislation, becomes public knowledge, I think there is a risk that we could be disclosing information which might not protect the children in the way that I accept the

minister intends to protect them; and I have every confidence that Ms Layton as well would intend to protect the children.

The second area of concern arises from the potential for this particular proposal to impinge on the area of children in detention centres in this state. Currently, as I understand it, that would be only in Woomera, but potentially, fairly shortly, it also involves Baxter Detention Centre. As I understand it—and my knowledge on this is scant to say the least—there is a memorandum of understanding between the state and the commonwealth in relation to the management of issues concerning those centres. I have been trying to obtain information about the potential impact of this legislation on the issue of that memorandum of understanding and whether it would potentially breach any such memorandum of understanding.

Again, I am happy that the minister does not intend to do any such thing, but I am concerned that the bill in its present form, unless it were amended to potentially exclude the detention centres, could go on to become an infringement of the current memorandum of understanding. I have been seeking advice on that, but at this stage I am not certain as to the legal position. I do, however, raise that as a concern in the drafting of the bill.

As I said, in terms of its essence, I have no difficulty at all in supporting the proposal. We obviously need to give the review power to go ahead. As I understand it, Ms Robyn Layton has already been appointed to conduct the review and essentially cannot proceed to do anything until this difficulty is overcome, because there are numerous people ready and willing, but not able, to give information to her, and if they did at the moment there would be a breach of their own obligations under the Child Protection Act. So, subject to those two cautions—as I said, I am not certain of the legal position on the second one—I am happy to support the bill.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg):** With some caveats, I support this bill, but I do not propose to speak of it with such enthusiastic support as previous speakers, and I will outline why. In relation to the question of amendments, I have an amendment in relation to the redefinition of ‘authorised police officer’, and a clause that I think purports to cover the question of concluding the review. I have only just been handed it, but it is an amendment to subparagraph (3) of clause 3, page 3 after line 19. I will come back to that in committee, but that seems to purport to confine the entitlement to have access to information as ceasing after the completion of the review. I have not seen any other amendments: if there are some, perhaps while I am speaking someone could attend to bringing them over. Perhaps previous speakers have indicated that these amendments are on their way or are being considered favourably, or the like, in which case they can also hand me a note to let me know if that is the case.

In passing this bill, the government is asking us to enable the appointed review person, Robyn Layton QC, to receive certain information that she would otherwise not have access to, she and other members who are conducting the review (who to the best of my knowledge are officers of the Department of Family and Youth Services and, I understand, no other persons having any other employment or qualification outside of those two parameters); there is a provision for publication in certain limited circumstances of the information that would otherwise be prohibited; thirdly, penalty for persons who are to be invited to submit any written or personal submission to the review; and, fourthly, provision

for immunity to certain parties in respect of consequences they might otherwise face pursuant to the Children’s Protection Act.

Unlike other speakers, I would like to highlight another important class of persons who are protected by the Children’s Protection Act, and necessarily so, and they are the notifiers of suspected child sexual abuse. They are a group of people, usually defined by occupation, who are required as a matter of law, if circumstances present before them, to notify the relevant department of suspected child sexual abuse. They are directed to do so, they face considerable penalty if they fail to do so, and they are of course entitled to appropriate protection and immunity. Part of that, of course, is to ensure that the records that disclose the notifier’s name or any information identifying the notifier are to be kept confidential.

We are not just talking here about the publication of the names of victims or suspected victims of child abuse or, indeed, members of their family and the like but, most importantly, protection of notifiers, who are required as a matter of law not just to be good citizens but to give the notification as I have indicated. Whilst I acknowledge that it is the prerogative of any new government to review matters and whilst this is an issue which, if it is not working as well as it should be, should be reviewed, it is important to point out that the Children’s Protection Act came into effect in 1993, there was a significant review circa 1995 to 1997 in relation to its operation, and here we find ourselves five years later undertaking another review.

I accept that the terms of reference of this review extend beyond the operation, procedures and process within the department (the relevant department being the Department of Family and Youth Services) because this is extended to look at the most important aspects, including aspects of the SA criminal law that were also in the police procedures, and, importantly, how we address the question of child abuse in a coordinated but whole of government approach to the protection of children. Certainly, the terms of reference are wider, so I do not criticise the minister for bringing on this review. I simply highlight that it has been an area of considerable reform leading up to 1993.

I have had more than 20 years of legal practice which, particularly during the 1980s, was fairly heavily dominated in relation to representation of parties (both victims and accused) by child abuse and, in particular, by child sexual abuse. This topic dominated the issue of protection of children in this state. It produced areas of considerable concern. I have written papers about it, etc. What is important is that the South Australian government in the early 1990s acknowledged that this was a serious issue and that it required considerable legislative protection and upgrade to the legislative umbrella that was then applicable, and did something about it.

It is fair to say that, on the whole, the government and its agencies, particularly the department, have acted responsibly since that time (in the early 1990s) to address as well as possible their concerns for the protection of children in this state. While the review was announced in May, it has now become clear that the principal review party, namely Ms Layton, will not be able to see certain information. It is worth pointing out that other members of the review panel, whatever it is going to be called, in fact already have that power to receive information. There are already officers of the department who have certain capacity to receive, transfer and discuss that information, but it is Ms Layton who is



bereft of that opportunity, which she will clearly need to conduct a comprehensive review.

I might also point out that it puzzles me why persons—and I remove Ms Layton entirely out of this—employed by the department are also the review parties who will be reviewing the Department of Human Services' policy, practice and procedures. A situation where members of their own department are looking at the review of officers in the department could hardly be described as an independent or appropriate way to proceed. Nevertheless, that is the way the government has decided to proceed. I would urge it to review that, because it is very important not only to be able to have an adequate and comprehensive review but to be able to demonstrate to people in South Australia who are concerned about these matters—which must be every parent, teacher and other person directly involved with the interests of children—that the process has been comprehensive, honest and accountable.

That, of course, is a very specific obligation that this team has been given, to undertake in a review and report on to the Minister for Social Justice. I come back to the review process itself and my concern at the introduction of this bill at this time. First, we know that the discussion paper was issued in May. We know that the discussion paper, having been forwarded to various parties, invited written and other types of submissions by persons but invited them to make those submissions no later than 28 June 2002. It would not escape your attention, Mr Acting Speaker, that we are way past 28 June 2002, so that the people who have already received the discussion paper and put in submissions are now in a situation where a legislative imposition is going to be put in place by this parliament in relation to their direct involvement in this review.

In particular, I refer to clause 4 of the bill, which makes provision for a \$10 000 penalty as a maximum penalty for the provision of false information. I make quite clear that I do not in any way endorse a situation where anyone who is making any contribution to a review of any nature or to a minister of the Crown gives information that is false or misleading. But to impose a penalty of up to \$10 000 in July 2002 when they have already submitted their submissions, and they have a discussion paper that gives no notice of that, is of grave concern to me and introduces an aspect of retrospectivity that is quite alarming. I point out that the submissions that are invited to be presented can, of course, be written, typed, emailed or presented with supporting documentation, and all of that would have been done in an environment in which people had no notice whatsoever of this potential penalty if they were to present information that was false or misleading.

Of course, the provision makes it clear that the person must know that the information is false or misleading, but it is quite possible that that may have been overlooked in addendums of information that have been presented already in submissions; and this provision places the onus on the person who has presented a submission to establish that, in some way, it was not knowingly done or that it was inadvertent.

One way around this is to look at making sure that everyone who has put in a submission to date, or who has given notice of the same (and therefore may present a submission prior to the passing of this bill), has received an indication from the minister. The minister can, of course, indicate in her response whether she would ensure that anyone who has been invited to put a submission or who has already done so is given written notice of the terms of this bill

so that they are quite clear about their obligations and, of course, have every opportunity then to ensure that they recheck the material that they have presented. In those circumstances that would be one way of remedying the potential problems in that area.

The provision of immunity is an important issue, particularly, as I said, for the class of notifiers and then, of course, the people who become privy to this information in the course of the investigation, and that includes police officers and the like. The importance of the legislation protecting the confidentiality of this information and immunity to notifiers has been taken very seriously. I had occasion a few years ago to subpoena the records of the equivalent department in the Northern Territory, and there was a requirement that the director of that department produce the records of a child, which included very similar information, namely, the disclosure of documentation supporting a reporting of an Adelaide child's sexual abuse and, indeed, the name of the alleged victim, the names of the alleged perpetrators and indeed of the alleged notifier.

The High Court took a very serious interest in this matter. Indeed, the matter proceeded to the Full Court of the Family Court of Australia, which had referred this matter to the High Court in the case of *In Re Z*. That court made it quite clear that the state protection laws were something that could not be removed or taken lightly, even to the extent that, in that case (as there have been in others), courts—even those superior to state courts—have been refused the opportunity to have material presented to them.

One could probably expect that judges and members of a court would act responsibly. Indeed, one would expect that the minister would act responsibly to ensure the protection of information that might otherwise cause damage or harm to persons if the information was disclosed. This house is just as responsible as a superior court and a judge who is bound under the relevant legislation to act in the paramount interests of a child. I give credit to this house that it would do so equally. However, it is the disclosure outside the house that becomes the concern, and that is a matter to which I will briefly refer in committee.

I do highlight that this is not a matter to be taken lightly. Those laws are there for good reason, and I appreciate that Ms Layton will need the opportunity, first, to collate the information and to properly investigate and report this matter; and, secondly, to be able to disclose that to the minister fully so that the minister may responsibly act on any recommendations that are given in the full confidence that all the information has been provided. The publication, post that process, remains a matter of concern to me and ought to this house.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I would like to make some brief comments in general terms about this whole area and indicate at the start that I support the review and the bill. The issue of child sexual abuse is a very serious matter. One of the sad, unfortunate consequences in our society—and it is experienced particularly by males—is the reluctance nowadays often to show affection publicly or in any way take hold of a young child, and I am talking particularly of teachers in the school environment. In fact, it has reached a point where I think nowadays many men are reluctant to show that affection, and the consequence is that everyone misses out, including, obviously, the child.

Some time back at a school sports day I witnessed a year 1 athlete—no doubt seeking to be a future Olympian—running in a race. This young boy lost his shoe, came last and was in

tears. The school principal, who was a male, picked up the lad and gave him a hug, which was probably what that young lad wanted more than anything else. But, according to the rule book, the principal probably did the wrong thing. From talking to many men, I know that they feel a reluctance to show affection or to provide comfort in a situation like that.

The other day I was waiting at the station to catch the train into town. A father was with his young daughter who was probably aged two or three. He told me that he was taking her to the zoo, obviously to show her zoo life. The child was clutching onto the father, obviously with great fondness, but it was obvious that the father was concerned that the way in which the child was hugging him might be seen as inappropriate.

Whilst we need, clearly, to pursue and deal severely with people who abuse children, as a society we need to take stock and not throw out the good aspects of interrelationships, particularly between adult males and young girls, or put people in a position where they feel reluctant to show appropriate affection and comfort.

This whole issue of child sexual abuse, as I indicated at the start, is very serious, but it is probably a reflection of the fact that our society does not cope well with sexuality. One has only to look at the contradictions and the paradoxes that exist in the media, videos and so on. The messages that are pumped out and directed at young people, as well as older people, are, in many ways, quite dishonest and promote what is almost an encouragement towards being addicted to sexuality in only a physical sense. That one-sided obsession and the fact that, as a society, we cannot come to terms with our own sexuality manifests itself in some of these aspects of deviant behaviour. That will not change overnight but, as a society, I think we should be more accepting of our sexuality not only in a physical sense but also in an emotional sense and, I guess, many people would say in a spiritual sense.

We do not even provide any adequate or comprehensive sex education in our schools. Again, I am talking not only about the physical aspects but also about the emotional aspects. It is not surprising, therefore, that we have one of the highest rates of teenage pregnancy and teenage abortion in the developed world. I know the review is not dealing with these macro issues but, rather, it is dealing with issues that are the consequence of that immature approach in our society, an inability to accept sexuality. Sexuality is a wonderful thing, but it gets distorted and is manifested in activities such as paedophilia or other forms of child abuse. It is something of which we need to be mindful and we need to deal with some of those issues not only at the micro level but also at the macro level.

As I have said, child sex abuse is a very serious matter. The consequences for individual children can vary, as we know. Some easily recover; some never recover from it. In my mind the greatest crime against any child is for a child not to be loved and for that child not to be shown affection. There is no way that any bureaucracy can ever offer that. Bureaucracies can seek to protect children from sexual abuse but no bureaucracy can offer what a child may need most of all, that is, to feel wanted and loved and to get affection. When we see children in our society often being neglected in that way, or probably, more often, ignored, then I think it is great cause for concern. I would not want our focus and concern about protecting animals to be diminished, but in many ways we pay more regard to protecting the welfare of animals—and that should be a priority, too—than we pay to protecting the welfare and wellbeing of our children. We all see examples

where people are treating young children in inappropriate ways.

I guess those of us who are parents would know we are not perfect in what we have done. If we had our time again we might be more knowledgeable, effective and competent as parents. That raises the point of the ability of people to parent with skill. Nowadays, with the extended family having disappeared to a large extent, many young people have not had the experience, or have not had the knowledge and wisdom transferred to them, in relation to rearing children. That is another aspect on which we as a society need to focus. Some people seem to have natural talents in terms of parenting, but many do not. It is not just the immediate parents but, rather, the wider community.

Traditional Aboriginal culture has a fantastic aspect to it; they have the view that children belong to everyone. I think it is a great concept because children do not just belong to the immediate parents; they do belong to us all. The fact that this review is to take place is an indication that the community has a responsibility for all children. As individuals, all children belong to us in the sense of collective responsibility, and we should ensure that they are protected and nurtured, particularly in the early years. Increasingly, researchers are showing that those early years are not only the most vulnerable but also the most vital in terms of a child's outlook on life; their capabilities are developed and extended. We do not say that after the age of three you forget about it, but the die is cast between zero and three and, many would argue to include the stage of pregnancy as well, and that can relate to various impacts such as smoking, and so on.

We need to value children. That comes to the point of the need in our society, through our schools and other agencies, to ensure that we stress basic values. Irrespective of whether or not people have a religious belief, all civilised societies must have a set of core values which includes respect for others and respect for oneself. That is partly why we have seen an increase in child abuse of varying kinds—a lack of valuing of others and a lack of respect for others. I do not believe that our school systems, whether government or private, should make any apology for reinforcing strongly those values of respect for others and respect for oneself. There should be no vagueness about it whatsoever. It should be reinforced explicitly, as well as implicitly, in whatever happens within the school, the family and the wider community.

I welcome this child protection review, limited as it must be by the very nature of the way in which our system operates. I welcome this bill and I think that, in terms of the bigger picture, we in this place, as well as the bureaucratic system as a whole, along with opinion makers in the community, need to develop in our society a more wholesome attitude towards human sexuality, not only the physical aspects but also the emotional aspects, and to have greater respect and understanding and valuing of children, in particular, not just in those early years but during all the years they enjoy as part of the process of growing up. I commend this bill to the house. I will be supporting it, and I look forward to its speedy passage through the house so that, as a result of this review, we can help ensure that our children can grow up and exist without the threat, fear or action of people who seek to abuse them.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice):** I thank members for their contributions. On a philosophical level, I am probably very close to the position that the

member for Fisher has enunciated, and it is certainly part of the reasoning for initiating this bill. I also acknowledge the contribution of the member for Newland. I would argue that the appropriate amendments before us are mainly her contribution to this bill. I acknowledge that, and I thank her. Obviously, we need to debate those amendments, but I think that has been a very helpful contribution.

The shadow minister (the member for Finnis) and the member for Heysen did avail themselves of a briefing on the reasons for the bill. The caucus committee—interestingly, an all women team—the members for Giles, Torrens, Wright, Norwood, Florey, and Reynell, and my colleagues in the other place, the Hons. Carmel Zollo and Gail Gago, and I—spent considerable time not only on this bill but also on the whole issue of child protection. I thank them for their support.

The main thing I need to say is that the aim of this exercise of having a child protection review is to ensure that the process is as open as possible and that we have an opportunity to consult. As has been mentioned, a discussion paper has been circulated very widely. There have been advertisements in the local press to try to ensure that people know that a review is happening and that there is an opportunity to contribute to it. One of the reasons why I was keen to get this review happening is that there have been a number of suggestions, both around Australia and in this state, that we need to look again at the child protection area. Unfortunately, a number of examples have been brought to my attention. I think that on the first day I became a minister I became aware of a number of complaints which had been made in the area of child protection and which had not been resolved. It seemed to me that it was important to look at this area as a matter of priority.

There has been considerable interest in the area. I am hoping that, in concert with the initiatives that have been moved in the other house for investigations into cases before 1982, this review will be forward looking and will recommend a system that people in our community feel supports and advances the cause of making sure we do protect children and young people in our community, not to mention other vulnerable people. So, it is within that context that the review has actually been put forward.

A number of excellent suggestions have been made, by members opposite in particular. The member for Newland has identified the need to make sure that, while supporting the bill as it stands with the amendments we will discuss later in committee, it also needs to be made clear that there is a sunset provision to this particular power that we are wanting to have rest with Robyn Layton QC.

I also agree with the suggestion that the information presented by those people who have already submitted to the review thus far, assuming this bill gets through both houses of parliament and is passed, is made available to everyone who contributes to the review, as well as making sure that we have an opportunity, if necessary, perhaps to extend the deadline.

A couple of community organisations have said that this is a very tight deadline for them. I must say that I will need to negotiate that with the chairperson of the review, because she is hoping to deliver a report to me by the end of the year. Because of the seriousness of the review that we are undertaking, I would like as much as possible to stick to that timetable. In saying that, however, if people feel that they need to make a submission, I would be happy to consider those points.

Also, the issue about the terms of reference providing for Ms Layton to deliver a report or plan to me is important. Other than information that is inappropriate (by the very nature of the bill we are looking at) to disclose publicly, I would envisage that we would have a report that was accessible to the public, so there would be an opportunity again for the public to respond to the collective report that I aim to put out, as I said, by the end of this year, or maybe early next year—but certainly within the next six months or so. As is the style that I have promoted in the department, I think there also needs to be some follow-up consultation. It is not my intention for there to be a report and then for that to be the end of it. I would like, wherever possible, to be able to publish that report and give an opportunity to those interested to respond.

It is also important to emphasise that, with respect to the issue of its being an offence to provide false information after the time for submissions has closed, my understanding and advice is that the offence will apply only to submissions received after the commencement of the act. It will not have a retrospective operation, but it may be a question that the member for Bragg might want to ask in committee. It is certainly my advice that that is the case. I hope that answers one of her questions at least.

I would also like to say, particularly to the member for Bragg, noting her considerable experience in this area, that it would be very helpful if perhaps she would consider making a submission to the review. I am not sure, but I suspect she has not already done so. If that is the case, I would be more than happy to speak to Robyn Layton about extending the deadline date for the member for Bragg, the member for Heysen and anyone else in this place who would like to make a submission.

As part of the consultative process that we undertook in this review, copies of the discussion paper were made available to all members of parliament very early in the process, and I was hoping, probably foolishly, that members of parliament would, perhaps like the rest of the public, government departments and interested people, abide by the deadline that was set some time in April! Notwithstanding that, if there are members in both this chamber and another place who want to make submissions, I am sure we can accommodate that desire. As I said, there is considerable experience in this house that I acknowledge I would not like to miss out on, and I am sure that Robyn Layton would not want to, either.

With those words, I thank all members for their contributions. Assuming that this bill is successful, as I said, the matter does not stop there. I think we have another whole stage of consideration that needs to take place to make sure that we do have the best situation in South Australia for children and young people and other vulnerable people in particular.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I move:

Clause 2, page 3, after line 8—Insert ‘authorised police officer’ means—

- (a) a member of the police force who is of or above the rank of sergeant or who is in charge of a police station, or any other member of the police force designated as an authorised police officer by the Commissioner of Police for the purposes of this act; or

- (b) a member of the police force of another state or a territory of the commonwealth, or of the commonwealth, who is of or above the rank of sergeant (or an equivalent rank), or any other member of any such police force designated as an authorised police officer by the Commissioner of Police for the purposes of this act with the agreement of the officer who is in charge of the relevant police force;

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Paragraph (b) of the amendment states:

a member of the police force of another state or a territory of the commonwealth, or of the commonwealth—

It then makes the appropriate designation of the rank of the police officer. Why has the commonwealth been included in this act? I am aware that the jurisdictions under normal circumstances with which the states would deal through their welfare agencies cover jurisdictional arrangements between states and territories. The Children's Protection Act itself identifies those different areas in relation to the means by which these arrangements concur, and it also includes New Zealand. Would the minister explain why the commonwealth in this sense has been included in this clause?

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I am advised that there are two major reasons for including the commonwealth in this whole area. First, as the honourable member has already stated, it is consistent with the Child Protection Act that we have a relationship not only between the states and territories but also with the commonwealth. So, this is a consistent part of that relationship. I am also advised that in the cases of abduction of children sometimes we need to make sure there are instances where the commonwealth has an input as well. It is really just to cover all bases, but the honourable member may wish to ask me a further question on that.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I asked the question because it is my understanding that the commonwealth is not regarded as being part of the state legislative jurisdictional arrangements. I may be incorrect about that, and I am quite happy to hear that that is the case. However, on reading the Children's Protection Act, it appears to me that the jurisdictions we are talking about in terms of state welfare relate to state and territory governments of the commonwealth, but not the commonwealth government and then the commonwealth in relation to federal police. Procedures under other acts enable processes of interjurisdictional arrangements to be made even between the Commonwealth of Australia through its federal police and our state, both welfare agencies and police. As far as I am aware, they are not defined in the jurisdictional matters that we deal with in child welfare specifically. It is my understanding that this has not been a recognised area where the commonwealth is part of our jurisdictional arrangement, specifically in state welfare matters.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** My advice is that the honourable member is strictly correct that the commonwealth is not a child welfare organisation, but there may be a need to have the ability to divulge such information. As I was saying before, under the Child Protection Act there is provision for divulging information, and it was felt—certainly in the drafting of this amendment—that we needed to make sure that there were no loopholes in the bill, and we should include the commonwealth in this area, as well as the states and territories.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I do not mean to be perverse on this issue, but it is a matter of the legality of the legislation we are about to write. As the minister has stated, technically my comments are as correct as I can make them. The specifics of this amendment seek to have a member of the

commonwealth police force or the federal police engaged in some discussion with the appointed authorised officer of the review, Ms Layton. What is the legality of the commonwealth, through this legislation, in taking part in something that we are presenting through state legislation and through courts that are already set up in the state to deal with this? I want to make clear that I am not suggesting by any means that my understanding of the commonwealth position on this is that it would not be more than pleased to be able to accommodate any question that arises in relation to child abuse, child abduction or anything else. It is my understanding that processes are already in place where the outcome sought by the minister through this amendment is already provided for in other legislative acts, and in the processes and procedures of arrangements that are now available through the federal and state processes.

It comes down to whether there is a legal question in terms of the correctness of applying some force of legality on the commonwealth. The question then would be: can the state act, in effect, have that legal standing which I believe is in question by this measure? I want to assure the minister that it is not in any way a reflection on the commonwealth in respect of any cooperation that it may give, because that has already been stated and is already there.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** Because we are talking about the interpretation of the act and about the definition of an authorised police officer, we are trying to make sure that we cover as many bases as possible by including the commonwealth. That is the first thing. I do not disagree with what the member for Newland is saying. The advice I have had is that we include the commonwealth under that definition of 'authorised police officer'. The example I gave before—and I would have to say that I would be hard-pressed to have to come up with too many more—is that in cases of abduction or where there are some concerns about children being kidnapped or taken, it may be helpful to be able to have advice and input from a commonwealth police officer. We are seeking not to exclude them. However, if the shadow minister feels strongly about this issue, I am quite prepared to undertake to have this matter investigated further, and perhaps we can come to some agreement before it goes to the other house. Not being a lawyer, that is about the extent of my explanation at this stage.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I appreciate the minister's cooperation in looking at this matter. In this instance, the bottom line appears to be that we are looking at an appointed, authorised officer of the commonwealth who will be available for these questions. Therefore, the legal clarification—and I am not a lawyer, either—I am seeking is: can a state act, in effect, do what you are asking this to do? It is asking for the authorisation and appointment of a federal police officer.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** The point I have not made—and this is probably remiss of me—is that we are also able to provide information to the commonwealth police. I was looking only at one side of the argument in my answer. We are talking about information and about the ability of the state also to provide information to the commonwealth. In this case, we are talking about an authorised police officer. As I said, if, in the passage of this bill, we need further information, I am happy to make that available.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** We are discussing the definition of an 'authorised police officer' because under new clause 5(3)(d) of this bill we are proposing to list police officers as persons who are to receive information that is otherwise restricted from being published. There is not any imposition on police

officers, from my understanding of this bill (I have not seen anything), to do anything other than what are their normal requirements under principal acts and others in relation to the protection of children. I will perhaps be asking questions in relation to clause 5(3)(d) when it comes to why police officers—or anyone, for that matter—either South Australian, interstate or commonwealth police officers, should be on that list, anyway. I just flag that, in relation to an authorised police officer, you are really transferring who you are talking about from the current section 5(3)(d) to the definition clause, and I appreciate that it certainly makes it neater. Obviously, you have also—I think appropriately—determined the rank of a police officer. Subparagraph (a) covers South Australian police and subparagraph (b) covers other states and territories of the commonwealth and the commonwealth. I wonder why we need to deal with any of those when, under (a), if a member of the police force receives that information and they are a South Australian police officer, they have certain powers and obligations of their own to call in, etc., to others.

I understood that the minister's reasons for including this are, first, because it is consistent with the principal act. There is nowhere in the principal act where any commonwealth officer has an obligation either to report or to receive; and, secondly, to cover the issue of abduction. The Australian Federal Police, who we are talking about here—commonwealth officers—have certain powers. They do not actually exercise them any more, I might say, but with respect to state police officers, the process would be that, if a representative from the minister's department, or whomever, in this review becomes privy to certain information, it is appropriate that it be reported to the state police, and they use their interstate arrangements to then invoke the powers of others if a child were to have been abducted or taken out of the state for the purposes of either removing that child as a witness or, of course, for the alleged accused to escape some penalty.

I still wonder why there is any point. I appreciate that it might have been done on the basis of, 'We will put in a whole number of people who are able to have information disclosed to them,' but when we come to clause 5(3), we are really talking about the exemptions where a person who is otherwise prohibited from publishing can do it for a number of different purposes and to a number of different persons. The only category of persons who are identified here are a person who is otherwise administering the Children's Protection Act and police officers. I will come back to that later. But I do raise, minister, the matter of the need for subparagraph (b) at all and I invite you, in considering this, to have subparagraph (a) as it is and delete subparagraph (b).

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I defer to the member for Bragg's expertise in this area. I think she has partly explained the reason for having this clause at all. However, it was felt that there needed to be a provision in the review where Robyn Layton was also able to speak to commonwealth authorised police officers, and that is why the provision was inserted. As I said to the member for Newland, if this is seen by the member for Bragg or by the member for Newland to be a major problem, I am happy to obtain some further advice between here and the other place. I guess I can really only explain what I said before to the member for Newland. I do not see that this is a major problem in the bill overall, but if the member for Bragg and the member for Newland have major problems with information going backwards and forwards between the review chair and the commonwealth authorised police officer, we will try to accommodate that point of view before the bill goes to the other house.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I move:

Page 3, after line 19—Insert:

(3) An authorised person is not entitled after the completion of the review to exercise any powers conferred on the authorised person by this act.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I again want to record my appreciation to the minister for her consideration in taking that amendment on board. It certainly is seconded. This is the area where the bill picks up procedure; where the person appointed to conduct the review is not required to hold a hearing for the purposes of the review, and may obtain information from such persons and in such manner as the person thinks fit, and may determine whether a person providing information or making submissions may have legal or other representation. The question I want to ask relates to the area where information is being obtained, whether it be in the manner of one-to-one meetings with Ms Layton or others, whether it is public hearings, or whatever.

I can only presume that, in the taking of evidence or information, some form of record is kept (whether a taped recording, a stenograph recording or note taking); that that is all part of the procedures of the ability to gather privileged information. If there is information that becomes a record, are there measures that will look at the security of that information? Has there been consideration as to what will happen to that information once the review—and, therefore, the report—has been brought down? What happens in the meantime with the collation and the collection of information?

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I think that that is a very important question. As the member for Newland has already pointed out, clause 3 talks about the procedural powers that may be exercised. To a certain extent, it replicates some of the powers of the Ombudsman, with which all of us, particularly in this house, are familiar. I think there probably does need to be some reassurance, and I think it is an excellent question for that reason. My understanding is that this needs to be read in conjunction with clause 5(2), where there is a provision to talk about confidentiality. I hope that the information will be on a lot of different levels to maximise the access to the review, so it may be that there are tape recordings; it may be that there are written submissions. I have asked that the review take evidence in whatever way it can to maximise the input from the community.

Evidence that is confidential to the state government would remain confidential by virtue of this bill being passed, and access would not be available to that information in the same way as it is not available to other state records. My understanding is that by moving this amendment (and looking at clause 5(2)) we are making sure that information is kept confidential in whatever form in which it is received.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The member for Unley is out of his seat and out of order.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I move:

Page 4, line 14—Strike out 'a member of the police force' and insert 'an authorised police officer'.

This amendment is in line with clauses that have already been passed in an amended form.

Amendment carried.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Obviously, provision is made for all officers who have information that would otherwise be prohibited from being presented. Under clause 5(2), the review officer, Ms Layton, having got that information, is able to republish it for the purposes of either the review or her report to the minister (under subclause (3)(a)) and ‘with the consent of the person. . . to whom the information relates’ (paragraph (b))—that is, if the information relates to the protection of a child she can disclose it.

Paragraph (c) applies to a person engaged in the administration of the principal act, and I have no problem with that; paragraph (d) relates to a police officer, as has been referred to; paragraph (e) is ‘by way of evidence adduced in accordance with subsections (4) and (5)’ (evidence which has already been provided); and paragraph (f) contains the words ‘if the information has been made public’ (in other words, if it has already been published). My first question is: have these paragraphs in subclause (3) been inserted at the request of Ms Layton?

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I am advised that Robyn Layton has been consulted on the bill but that these paragraphs were drafted by our department to make sure that, if there are issues which I as minister need to take up or refer on, that can happen. My understanding is that Robyn Layton—I do not know whether she is even in the country at the moment—has seen the draft bill but she would not have seen the amendments. I am not sure if I am answering the honourable member’s question, but that is my information.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** My question raises the question whether there is any need for any of these paragraphs other than (a) or (c). I have heard the minister’s reasons in relation to the amendment to paragraph (d), which relates to police officers and, if the minister or Ms Layton became apprised of information, paragraph (a) would be necessary for the purpose of Ms Layton giving that information to the minister, and it seems to me that paragraph (c) would be necessary for the minister to be able to report information of which either Ms Layton or the minister becomes apprised under the Children’s Protection Act and, if something really serious came to the attention of Ms Layton, paragraph (d) would be necessary; I accept all that.

So, I do not have a problem with paragraphs (a), (c) and (d) because I can see the reasons for them, but paragraph (b) relates to disclosure ‘with the consent of the person. . . to whom the information relates’. I cannot understand the purpose of that. I suppose it relates to the consequence of that information being received in evidence, but I do not see any need for it to be republished even if it had been made public, because that information might have been published inappropriately or to the detriment of others. So, I accept police protection, if necessary, and that reporting to the minister is obvious and necessary, but I question whether the others are necessary at all.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I am advised that this enables the chair of the review to have some flexibility in the publication of information which perhaps initially was not going to be made public but which is seen to strengthen the recommendations of the report. If the person to whom the information relates (‘not being a child’) has given consent to disclosure, it may help to amplify the need for the recommendations in the report. I guess it is to provide extra flexibility in what I hope will be a report which we will be able to implement after consultation.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I do not want to dwell on this, as I am sure that it can be looked at on the way to the other house, but

under paragraphs (a), (c) and (d) Ms Layton already has the power to report to the minister, the police and a person who administers the Children’s Protection Act. Paragraph (b) contains an ‘or’; it is not an addition or a qualification. In this situation, Ms Layton could go to the newspaper—if she had the permission of the person who is affected by this—and publish this information. For some reason, she might consider that to be appropriate. I raise this issue because, with due respect to Ms Layton (whose appointment I fully applaud), in my view the minister is the person who ought to be responsible for ensuring publication other than for purposes which specifically give the full review and protection mechanisms back to the department or the police.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** On advice, I make two points. First, this relates to section 13 of the Children’s Protection Act, so it provides the same sort of provisions and connections. Secondly, Ms Layton has been engaged to report to me as minister, not to the media. I would not expect the example cited by the honourable member to be the case. I take her point, but that is the understanding on which Ms Layton has been engaged: to provide a report to me so that we can consult further and then put in place changes to improve child protection in South Australia. That is the purpose of the review and that is her role in this review as I see it as minister.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 6, schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I would like to thank members, particularly those opposite, for their assistance and patience with my first bill in parliament, and to thank the chair for his patience for this my first bill—an important one, I believe.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### SEEDS ACT REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 June. Page 492.)

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** I rise to support the bill. I know the early stages of the development of this bill well, as I was minister at the time. It certainly makes sense to go about it in the way that we have. The Mutual Recognition Act of 1992, which is commonwealth legislation, basically means that the act is no longer empowering and consistent in enforcing and enabling laws. Other aspects are picked up by other legislation, meaning that it makes sense to repeal the act, and I will not echo the second reading explanation, which outlines the logic for this measure.

As I indicated, I was minister throughout the early consultations on this bill, and I thank all those who agreed to take part in the working group, involving my former office (PIRSA), the state affiliates of the national peak bodies and particularly the seeds section of the Farmers Federation. Whilst I might say now that it is a logical move, it would also be true to say that initially there were some significant associated issues concerning the seed industry; and I thank all those who were involved in working through those issues and finding solutions for them in a range of ways.

The establishment of an Australian Seeds Authority will give the industry a watchdog on issues of importance. There

is no doubt that the seeds industry is an important industry to South Australia. South Australia is well and truly the national leader in this industry, and that leadership is welcome from industry leaders here, and also from certain people in both SARDI and PIRSA. The code of practice will ensure that the industry is well served through regulation. As I have said, the opposition has no problems with this bill. This matter arose while I was minister, so I understand the sense in repealing the legislation, and the opposition is fully in support of the bill.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his comments in support of the bill—and there is a fair chance that he knows a damn sight more about it than I do.

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

#### AGRICULTURAL AND VETERINARY CHEMICALS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA)(ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS)AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 3 June. Page 459.)

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Again, at the outset of this legislation, I indicate the opposition's support. This bill is before us as a result of a High Court decision whereby some sections of the Commonwealth Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals Legislation Amendment Act of 2001 have indeed been called into question. This bill seeks to amend the South Australian act to validate those sections and to give matching legislated powers across all jurisdictions within the commonwealth. The bill is required to give validity to certain administrative laws such as the Agricultural and Veterinary Code and Agricultural and Veterinary Regulations, and it affirms that administration laws and the Administrative Appeals Tribunal Act of the commonwealth also apply in South Australia. We well and truly understand the necessity for it. It has been brought about by, as I said, a High Court decision and it makes eminent sense for us to support the bill, which we wish a speedy passage through this place.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier):** Again, I defer to the judgment of the Leader of the Opposition. The bill has been extensively debated in another place and I am happy to move to the committee stage, if that is what is required.

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

#### EDUCATION (COMPULSORY EDUCATION AGE) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendment.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.  
Motion carried.

#### ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council gave leave to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. P Holloway) and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (Hon. T.G. Roberts) to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

#### NATIONAL WINE CENTRE (RESTRUCTURING AND LEASING ARRANGEMENTS) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

#### MURRAY RIVER FISHERY

In reply to **Hon. R.G. KERIN:** (6 June).

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries has provided the following information:

A legal representative of the fishers was present at the Loxton meeting held on 7 June 2002.

#### SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier):** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I move:

That the sittings of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells, not before 8.30 p.m.

**Mr McEWEN (Mount Gambier):** Mr Speaker, is it possible to speak to the motion?

**The SPEAKER:** Does the member for Mount Gambier wish to speak to the motion?

**Mr McEWEN:** Yes, sir. As much as I accept the motion, I would just like to put on the record my disgust at why we are still here. As a country member, I would like to be going home to my family tonight. The antics in the other place are totally unacceptable to a normal society.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** It's your members who are doing it.

**Mr McEWEN:** Absolutely!

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member may have those feelings, but it is not orderly to be venting his spleen in that manner.

Motion carried.

*[Sitting suspended from 6.01 to 8.42 p.m.]*

#### CHILD PROTECTION REVIEW (POWERS AND IMMUNITIES) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

Page 5, line 8 (clause 5)—After 'other than this Act' insert:  
'or contrary to a decision of the person appointed to conduct the review'.

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.  
Motion carried.

**GAMING MACHINES (LIMITATION ON  
EXCEPTION TO FREEZE) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 8.45 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 13 August at 2 p.m.



**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Monday, 15 July 2002****QUESTIONS ON NOTICE****NATIONAL PARKS**

2. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Does the government have a policy to ensure adequate fire breaks and access tracks are constructed and maintained by the National Parks and Wildlife Service?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:**

1. Yes. National Parks and Wildlife SA undertakes fire prevention measures on its reserves, including development and maintenance of fire breaks and access tracks, as determined by district bush fire plans, park management plans, and vegetation management guidelines.

**QUALCO SUNLANDS**

5. **Mrs MAYWALD:** What measures are being undertaken to resolve the problems incurred since the commissioning of

the Qualco Sunlands Groundwater Scheme?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The Qualco-Sunlands Groundwater Control Scheme was commissioned in May 2001 and has been operating for just over 12 months.

While the scheme has not been able to achieve the design flows in the first 12 months of operation, it is achieving its objective with drops in water levels under the irrigation area being observed around the bores. Some of the bores are achieving their design flows or better, while lower than design flows are being pumped from others. If all bores were operating, the design flows would be achieved.

Problems have been encountered in some of the bores, including 8 of the 15 pumps being damaged by sand in varying degrees and flows being affected by iron bacteria in the bores and pumps.

The iron bacteria problem is being resolved by the installation of chlorinators which effectively kills the bacteria and restores the flow.

The problem with sand in some of the bores is being addressed in a systematic approach. An independent report on the scheme has been prepared which recommends a series of staged actions. As a result of this, 4 of the affected bores have been rehabilitated and are now operating effectively. The remaining bores will be progressively rehabilitated over the next few weeks. It is expected that this will solve the problem of sand in the bores and bring the scheme back to its design performance.

