

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 26 May 2003

The SPEAKER (Hon. I.P. Lewis) took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

COFFIN BAY NATIONAL PARK PONIES

A petition signed by 29 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the Minister for Environment and Conservation to take into account the heritage, pastoral and colonial history of the Coffin Bay peninsula and reconsider his decision to relocate the Coffin Bay ponies, was presented by Mrs Penfold.

Petition received.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to the following question on the *Notice Paper*, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: No. 131.

STATE BUDGET

In reply to **Hon. R.G. KERIN** (15 August 2002).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has provided the following information:

It is important to recognise that the cost of a Section 7 Statement is less than the cost of the same information if accessed over the counter at individual agencies. The Section 7 services run by the Department of Environment and Heritage is a 'one-stop-shop' compilation of 57 interests that 16 different Government agencies may have in a property. Further, the current fee represents about 2 per cent of average property transfer costs. Unlike some other property transfer costs, Section 7 service fees are not functionally linked to property value and hence decrease as a proportion of total transfer costs when property prices are rising.

Although you note that the Section 7 Statement fee increased by 31 per cent in 2002-03, this should be considered in the context of the overall budget strategy. As it was advised at the time, money raised from the fee increase would be earmarked for a review of the service as well as providing funding for environmental management initiatives. The service review will include consultation with other government agencies that contribute to the service and receive disbursements to cover costs of doing so.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I wish to clarify an answer I gave to a question from the member for West Torrens on 24 March. At that time, I indicated that the former government had instigated an indexation system for fees and charges in 1996. In 1996, the former government introduced uniform indexation for fees and charges based on movements in CPI. However, the current composite index to which I referred, which takes into account movements in the public sector wages index as well as CPI, commenced in 1998.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The government is committed to delivering greater flexibility for South Australian families to shop together. Last year, the government attempted—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Last year, the government attempted to deliver greater shopping hours flexibility for families. However, the government bill was defeated in the Legislative Council. The risks of no change in terms of competition policy payments were made clear last year, as they were when the Liberal Party was in government. Following the rejection of the government's bill last year by the Liberal opposition, I made it clear that the government would return to the parliament to try to deliver a better deal for South Australian families. The government is getting on with the job of reforming shop trading hours arrangements. Today I will give notice that tomorrow I will introduce the Shop Trading Hours (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2003. The government's commitment has been shaped by: our election commitment not to fully deregulate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: They forget they opposed our bill last year. It was also shaped by the need to provide a balanced package of reforms; listening to the concerns of the stakeholders; and, safeguarding competition policy payments, whilst acting in the best interests of the South Australian community.

The bill will provide that Sunday trading for non-exempt stores in the metropolitan area will be introduced from the commencement of daylight saving this year. Sunday trading will be available on the same terms as are currently applicable to the central business district and the Glenelg tourist precinct: from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. The bill will also provide for an extension of week night trading within the wider metropolitan area to 9 p.m., commencing shortly after the bill is passed by the parliament; the confirmation of recent practice in relation to Easter, by making Easter Saturday a trading day for non-exempt stores and prohibiting trading on Easter Sunday for non-exempt stores; the review of the act in three years; and, complementary changes to the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995 which reduced core hours to 54 hours, and provide that core hours cannot be on Sundays.

Last Thursday I met with Graham Samuels, the chair of the National Competition Council. My discussions with him allowed me to get the best possible assessment of the National Competition Council's views. The government has taken those views into account in determining the package of reforms contained in the bill. The government has heard and taken account of the views of all contributors to the debate on shop trading hours. The bill represents a balance of the needs of all stakeholders.

QUESTION TIME

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Industrial Relations confirm that he has been advised by Graham Samuels that the previous Labor bill regarding the deregulation of shopping hours did not go far enough and that he must now have a new bill passed by both houses of parliament by 30 June to secure the national competition payments?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. Yes, Mr Samuels has confirmed that we need a bill passed by both houses of parliament by 30 June this year and he has encouraged me on behalf of the government to get on

with the job, but he has also encouraged the Liberal Party to do the same thing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The leghorns and other birds on my left should stop cackling.

NORTH ADELAIDE FOOTBALL CLUB

Mr RAU (Enfield): Will the Minister for Gambling advise the house of the situation with the gaming licence at the North Adelaide Football Club and what steps the government has taken to ensure the continuation and operation of the Roosters Club?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Gambling): I thank the honourable member for his question, and recognise his keen advocacy on behalf of the Roosters Football Club. As honourable members would be aware, the Roosters Football Club was granted approval to move its gaming machine licence—its clubroom arrangements—from Prospect Oval to 255 Main North Road, Sefton Park. That occurred some time last year. But last week the Supreme Court ruled, in pursuance of an earlier ruling on 29 January, that the licence was void and that it was considered in breach of the Gaming Machines Act for the club to have its premises within the boundaries of a shopping complex. The Roosters Club, as of today, is effectively without a gaming machine licence, and it faces substantial financial ruin in that situation. It has made substantial investments, and it relies upon the income that flows from the gaming machine venue to remain viable.

That situation had to be balanced with the obvious growing alarm in the community that is occurring around the question of poker machines and the increasing availability of opportunities for gambling. That whole dilemma about the accessibility of gaming machines in the community and the associated issues of problem gambling is presently being inquired into by the Independent Gambling Authority, and there are before this parliament bills to extend the gaming freeze to allow that inquiry to be properly concluded. So, we have, essentially, this dilemma—a club which is in short-term peril of closure associated with an interpretation of gaming machine provisions about which it argues it was taken by surprise. It had two levels of appeal where its view of the law was upheld, and the Supreme Court overtook that position.

Obviously, we were faced with this dilemma. On behalf of the club, substantial and powerful advocacy was put forward by the member for Adelaide and the member for Enfield about the important role that this club plays in the community in terms of junior football, and the way in which it promotes community development in its area. It has deep roots into the local community, and it is a valuable community club that has made a contribution over many years. I do not appreciate its contribution when it—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, that is right. I do not appreciate its contribution when it cleans up Port Adelaide, but it is a club of merit and it makes a substantial contribution to the local community. So, we had to balance those issues.

In proposing the solution that the parliament will have the opportunity to debate tomorrow, we need to make it completely clear to other clubs, which may wish to rely upon the government's coming to their aid in what they may argue is a situation where they wish to rely on poker machines to deal with their financial difficulties, that we see the situation with respect to the Roosters Club as being an exceptional set of

circumstances that cannot be applied to the circumstances of other clubs. There can be no complaint by other clubs that they do not know the law as it presently stands. The Supreme Court has ruled in relation to this matter, and they cannot be heard now to say that they have relied upon an interpretation of the law of which they are unaware. Members opposite will have an opportunity to put their views when this matter comes before the parliament.

The long-term view about the way in which clubs should be treated—whether they should be treated differently from hotels, whether they should have greater opportunity to transfer their licences to other venues—is a matter that the Independent Gambling Authority is considering. It is a complex matter. It has to be balanced against a considerable number of other weighty arguments about reducing the number of gambling opportunities in the community, to try to grapple with the real issues of problem gambling. But those things are for another day.

FORESTRY FIRE TRUCKS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services (or whoever else might want it). Can the minister confirm that the South Australian forestry fire truck replacement program has fallen behind schedule, leaving the South-East and the Adelaide Hills under-resourced for fighting major bushfires? Last week, the Premier reannounced a reduced program to replace South Australian forestry fire trucks. In last year's budget, this program was announced as a \$9.78 million initiative to replace South Australian forestry fire trucks, with \$1.654 million to be spent in the current financial year. Not only has the \$1.654 million not been spent this year but also last week's announcement is a reduction of nearly half a million dollars on the first two times this program has been announced.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Forests): I am happy to answer the leader's question. My understanding is that we are sticking to the original budget, but I understand that there have been some delays in delivery which were of a technical nature. However, the first of those trucks are very close to being delivered, and we are delighted for all South Australians to see them here. We understand the difficulties with protection measures and, obviously, suppression measures when it comes to forestry. I will make sure and bring back a detailed answer, but my understanding is quite clear: the only delay has been caused by technical matters to do with supply.

NURSES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Is the government providing additional funding to support its strategies for the recruitment and retention of extra nurses in our public hospitals, and will this enable additional beds to be opened?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Florey for this very important question. The government is continuing with a wide range of strategies to overcome the shortage of nurses in our public hospitals. This will be boosted by an additional \$6.7 million a year to fund the recruitment and employment of extra nurses. This week's budget will include \$4.7 million a year to employ up to 85 extra nurses as we recruit them to improve nurse staffing ratios.

So far the government has recruited 400 of the latest nurse graduates, attracted almost 100 nurses from overseas, spent \$250 000 to create 100 extra university places in Adelaide this year, created 15 extra training places in Whyalla, spent \$1 million for free refresher and re-entry courses and grants up to \$5 000 to cover costs, set up a program to increase the number of indigenous nurses in the outback, and stepped up our nursing career promotion activities in schools. In addition to these results, this year's budget will include an extra \$2 million a year to cover the additional costs of the short-term use of agency nurses.

The early success of our recruitment and retention strategy means that we are now able to start bringing additional beds on line in our public hospitals, and I will be keeping the house informed of progress on that matter.

BUSHFIRES

Mr CAICA (Colton): My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services. What were the outcomes of the Premier's Bushfire Summit held in this place last Friday?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services): I am pleased to say that many people in the chamber would know the outcomes of the summit. It is disappointing that, despite the fact that the opposition attended and participated in a very healthy and bipartisan fashion, it was very unfortunate that we were not able to attract any Democrats. No doubt, they had much more important things to do.

Mr Venning: I didn't get invited, actually.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Schubert says that he did not get an invitation. The chamber might well note that one of the things we have been very careful to do is make sure (as with the economic development summit) that this summit was not a talkfest for politicians but rather for those who do the job. However, it is necessary that politicians are represented because, after all, we are the policy makers. We were very careful not to make it a talk summit, and if that has offended the politicians it has rather more pleased the public. So, we will stick with that approach.

I want to thank those who worked very hard to bring it about. I particularly want to give special thanks to the keynote speakers: Commissioner John Murray (the ACT Police Commissioner); Justin Leonard from CSIRO's Building Research Division; and Mr Phil Cheney from CSIRO's Division of Forestry. Their speeches were educational and thought provoking, and I thank them for the time and effort they contributed for the benefit of the state.

I know that the member for Stuart was one politician who was invited. It would have been very hard not to invite him, given his very longstanding interest in this subject. I can say that, in a bipartisan way, we were able to come to agreement on some issues on which I think the member for Stuart agrees, although we were not able to go so far as to support his intention to graze his stock in national parks. That was a bridge too far for us! However, we achieved other outcomes with which I think the member for Stuart will be very pleased.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He did. He was going to take very good care of the national parks; apparently, it is very good for wool on wethers, although I do not understand such things.

The recommendations from the bushfire summit will now be progressed through government and developed and implemented in the most effective way possible. Some very substantial extra funding was talked about by the Premier at the summit and, of course, the very high level emergency management council will be dealing with some of the recommendations very soon.

However, I would rather spend the time today to thank those who organised the summit, particularly the CFS Chief Officer, Euan Ferguson, who participated in some nine regional fora and who did a sterling job. Leigh Miller, Adam Thomson and Anouska Kranz from the CFS put in many hours of preparation. In addition, I thank the agencies that supported the CFS in this endeavour, specifically Mike Williams from the Department for Environment and Heritage; Brenton Burman and Bernard Steer from Planning SA; Amanda Parfilo and Shan Fowler, from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet; District Officer Mark Heinze from the MFS; and Senior Constable Peter Schar from SAPOL. I also mention my own Chief of Staff, Cathie King, and Leon Bignell, who did a very good job to bring the summit about.

The member for Mawson also attended the summit and was able to support us on a bipartisan basis on many of the important issues that were raised. I think that the reason for this was that it was driven not by politicians but by the participants, with regard not for political interests but for the interests of the state. It was a very useful initiative, and we have already confirmed that we will repeat the nine regional fora next year. We look forward to implementing some of the outcomes in the very near future.

COUNTER-TERRORISM EQUIPMENT

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): My question is directed to the Minister for Police. Given that the Premier recognises that the government is 'duty bound to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will ask his question.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Given that the Premier recognises that—

The SPEAKER: The member will ask his question and then explain it.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Will the Minister for Police advise the house why his government has constantly delayed placing an important order for counter-terrorism equipment? In November last year, the Premier announced the formation of a new state protective security branch. However, in the period leading up to this announcement, the South Australia Police requested a wide range of counter-terrorism response equipment, including an Echidna robot. In the 2002 budget, no provision for the robot was made, albeit that SAPOL had advised of its importance; therefore, funding for this equipment has only just been announced. As I am advised that delivery of some of this equipment is not expected for approximately 18 more months, it will be nearly three years, since it was first requested, before South Australia Police will be provided with this urgent counter-terrorism equipment for South Australia.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): My colleague, the former minister for police, reminded me that the police had been requesting a police station at Mount Barker for many years under the honourable member's government.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We're going to build it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We are going to build it. This will be a good budget for the police force and for South Australia. I say to members opposite: wait until Thursday; all will be revealed in the budget.

CFS FIRE TRUCKS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Emergency Services advise the house whether the government is planning to ignore one of the key findings of the royal commission into the Ash Wednesday bushfires and extend the life of CFS fire trucks from 20 to 25 years? The CFS budget for this current financial year was confirmed to CFS in only September last year. I have been advised that capital works programs, particularly for fire trucks, would not be spent before May this year—after the fire season. I have also been advised that, because it is 20 years post Ash Wednesday, more fire trucks are needed this year than ever before, yet they are simply not being delivered to the fire front.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services): It always gives me great pleasure to get a question from the member for Mawson about the capital program of the Country Fire Service. I look forward very much to the report of the Auditor-General very soon concerning such matters because I can tell members that I think the Auditor-General's Report will be a lot kinder to the current government than it was to the previous government in terms of the handling of the capital budget of the Country Fire Service—because we know what happened to the capital budget of the Country Fire Service for three years under the previous government.

For three years its capital budget was spent on recurrent expenditure—or some \$2 million to \$3 million of it. So, whenever the member for Mawson wants to ask about fire trucks, he is a person who cries crocodile tears about them because he was running around the country promising a capital program and allowing it to be spent on salaries. I do not know what he was going to do when they ran out—perhaps they were going to start selling fire trucks. It really is interesting for him to have the gall to ask a question on this matter.

On the question of extending the life of fire trucks, this was an initiative of the Country Fire Service itself, because it found that, in some areas, many of the fire trucks, despite the recommendation that they be turned over after 20 years, did actually do very low mileage, and it found no need to change them over. The CFS took this initiative itself: it was never a policy decision of government. If I am told by an expert that the fire trucks do not need to be turned over, I am not going to tell anyone otherwise.

The member for Mawson wants to harp on about a royal commission. I note that the honourable member says that this is an important recommendation. There are a number of others, too, one of which he has criticised over and again, that is, the creation of a single fire service. We have not gone down that path; he has never criticised us for that, either. Let us not have the member for Mawson go back over what is an almost 20-year old royal commission and treat it like a Cadbury selection box and pick out the bits he likes. The decision on the fire trucks was taken by the Country Fire Service. I also point out—because not sufficient recognition is given for it—that, for years, this government was the first government to put some growth funding into emergency services.

We did it by increasing the amount of money available from the Emergency Services Fund, and we did it by making a contribution out of consolidated revenue, not by increasing the levy. Since coming to government we have an outstanding record with respect to the funding of emergency services. The previous government's record will be a matter of comment by the Auditor-General, and I will leave it at that.

GLENELG TRAMLINE

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question, without notice, is directed to the Minister for Transport. What is proposed for the replacement of the Greek—of the Glenelg-trams?

An honourable member: Greek trams?

The SPEAKER: O-Bahn buses, I hope. The Minister for Transport.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for West Torrens for his question. He was simply trying to see whether the opposition was listening. There is some good news here which I am sure the house will be delighted to hear and about which, I am sure, the member for Morphett will be even more excited. On Saturday the Premier and I announced the biggest public transport investment since the O-Bahn: a \$56 million project to replace the Glenelg trams with European-styled light rail vehicles. The project will start from 1 July this year, with the new trams expected to be in operation by late 2005.

The new light rail vehicles will be able to seat up to 80 people. They will be fully airconditioned and articulated. They will be fully accessible with low floor entry and provision for wheelchairs. They will be energy efficient and power regenerated as the vehicle slows. They will also be environmentally friendly, with low noise, negligible local pollutants and aesthetically pleasing designs. It will change from the Glenelg tram to Adelaide light rail.

Five of the recently restored 74-year old Glenelg trams will be retained for tourist operations and special weekend and holiday trips. They are much loved transport icons and will last for many more years under a gentler regime for what are vintage machines. New stocks will be designed to enable the operation of both the new and vintage trams as well as incorporate the latest technology for real time information or smart stops for passenger convenience.

This is an exciting initiative for the city's transport infrastructure and confirms the future of light rail or trams as a mode that can be further developed, extended and improved to meet future needs as budgets allow. Importantly, the project accelerates compliance with commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act standards by making the new system fully accessible. The project is tangible evidence of the government's commitment to the directions and desired outcomes of the state's draft transport plan.

EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Will the minister confirm that it is proposed to cut up to as many as 60 personnel in the Department of Education and Children's Services during the 2002-03 year?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): There is a number of surplus staff within the department, and they are defined as staff who are

paid out of the education budget who do not have positions in the Department of Education and Children's Services. I understand that 55 staff have been declared surplus, and some have been surplus for the past eight years, dating back to restructures within the department at the time of the administration of the then premier, Dean Brown. Three of those staff are executives.

So the Department of Education and Children's Services has surplus staff, which should not be a surprise to the member for Bragg because in August last year during estimates committees she and I discussed some of the structural changes that have been made to the department, including the abolition of the Office of Review and changes to the Office of Change Management and the like, and as a result of that process several executives of the Department of Education and Children's Services are no longer in our employ.

I AWARDS

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is directed to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. How did South Australian IT companies fare in the recent I Awards?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Science and Information Technology): I thank the member for Napier for his question. I know that he shows a keen interest in awards for the IT sector in our country, and the particular award that has just been announced is the I Award, which rates right up there with the Logies. It is perhaps not quite as significant as the Eurovision song contest, which I am sure some members enjoyed last night, but these awards are presented each year by the Australian Information Industry Association (AIIA), which is the leading body for IT industry goods and services in our country, and were jointly sponsored by the Australian *Financial Review*. This year's winners were announced at a gala presentation ceremony—which was every bit as glittering as the Logies—in Sydney on Wednesday 7 May, and I am delighted to say that four South Australian companies figured among seven of the possible 27 berths at the national finals of 260 entrants.

Out of the 10 awards presented, two South Australian companies were winners. YourAmigo, as discussed by the Deputy Premier last week, won the eBusiness and Internet Award for innovation. The award was for YourAmigo's internet based 'Spider Linker', which could revolutionise the ICT marketplace by significantly increasing sales to e-commerce sites through its technology that makes all the e-commerce web pages visible to one internet search engine.

The other company was Foursticks, which has also been supported by Playford Capital. It won the Telecommunications Award in the implementation category. Its network performance product is a software based solution to the growing problem of network congestion, enabling smarter processing of urgent information through networks. It is similar to a traffic management system, and it is the sort of system that gives urgent messages priority on the road, much as ambulances have priority in our road traffic system.

The other South Australian finalists were m.Net and eWord, and all four South Australian companies should be congratulated on their creativeness and on their success in harnessing niche markets and gaining opportunities for exports.

EDUCATION DISTRICTS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise the house whether the department intends reducing the number of districts and district superintendents? The Department of Education and Children's Services draft guidelines, 'Implementing for Futures Connect strategy', dated April 2003, reveals that, instead of the current 24 districts, there is to be a reorganisation to 17 FoCIS (that is, focus on connected integrated service) clusters. Although this information is available on the department's web site, there has been no public announcement or explanation to staff concerned that seven district superintendents will be axed.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the honourable member for her question, but I point out to her that she is confusing two concepts: the district organisation, whereby state funding is organised across our system, and the mechanism for the allocation of vocational education and training funding, which involves both state and federal funding. Prior to March 2002, or prior to this current government's administration, the funding was distributed via the state districts. The reduction in the number of arms that are currently with Futures Connect is to align with the federal ECEF districts.

Mr Brokenshire: You are cutting the budget.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The budget for Futures Connect has not been cut. In fact, more money is going into the districts than previously, and those district organisations align with the ECEF funding districts. The state and federal funding units are now aligned, whereas previously they were not.

ELDERLY, HOUSING

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is to the Minister for Housing. What work is being done to provide community housing for elderly people in regional areas?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Housing): I thank the member for Reynell for her question and I also acknowledge her advocacy, particularly in the area of housing, for the constituents of Reynell. Recently I had the pleasure of opening six new community housing dwellings for older people in Yankalilla. These are the latest of more than 4 000 homes managed through the South Australian Community Housing Authority. I was made to feel very welcome at the opening and enjoyed the opportunity given to me by the tenants to look through their homes, and I thank them for doing that. The member for Finnis (the deputy leader) and I had the opportunity not only to talk to people moving into their new homes but also to hear how much difference it has made to their lives. This first community housing project in Yankalilla has progressed on the basis of genuine community effort. The local council supported the project, and the Whalers Housing Cooperative undertook a particularly important role. The efforts of the Yankalilla and Districts Senior Citizens Club were instrumental in promoting the development. This project and others like it demonstrate both the capacity of the state's community housing program to respond to local needs in a regional setting and the importance of cooperative local planning and initiative.

The dwellings in Yankalilla, whilst homely and well finished, are practical. They are suitable for older residents who need the amenity of adaptable housing. The community housing was sited adjacent to a Meals on Wheels facility as

well as the local seniors community centre. It is important to ensure that accommodation is located near services, given some of the transport difficulties experienced by aged people, particularly in rural areas. The partnership between government and community groups is a powerful basis for responding to housing needs and aspirations in our communities. In this financial year some 40 community housing properties have been completed or commenced in regional areas, and I hope that we can build on this effort in the coming years.

The state housing plan progress suggests that this is what industry and the community wants, and we are fortunate to have this exemplary affordable housing project. I, and I am sure others, will look to Yankalilla as being a form of inspiration for community housing.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Will the Minister for Industrial Relations advise why the government made public announcements this morning that the SDA and Don Farrell supported the government's shopping hours reform announced today? The opposition understands that the government told the media when announcing reforms that Don Farrell and the SDA supported the government's position on shop trading hours.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Premier might want to listen because the SDA has put out a media release saying:

The SDA opposes proposed new trading hours.

It continues:

The Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association (the SDA) says that it opposes the new shopping hours proposed by the state government.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I am delighted that the member for Davenport has a different position on shop trading. It would appear that he now has a different position on shop trading hours and, if he is sincere and genuine about that, it is a good thing. We offer a hand of reason to him. The member for Davenport needs to be reminded that this government consults with all stakeholders. This government is a very inclusive government and discusses a whole range of issues with all stakeholders and takes account of all views when coming forward with a particular position. That is a good way to approach government. It is important now that the Liberal Party does not do another backflip on shop trading hours and that we do not have any more dummy spits from the Liberal Party.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will answer the question and not talk about the Liberal Party's juvenile conduct.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Thank you, sir. The government will come forward with legislation, sweeping in its reforms—the biggest reform package provided for South Australians on shop trading hours in its history. We look forward to the opposition's grappling with that debate. Can I say—

The SPEAKER: As long as it is in answer to the question. I want the minister to get to that; otherwise, he should sit down.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The SDA, like any other stakeholder, is entitled to its view. We have taken account of all the views of the stakeholders. It seems that the member for Davenport knows more about what the SDA is saying, from what he is saying.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: If he is now consulting with the SDA, I welcome that. But, certainly, the government has met with the SDA (as it has met with all the major stakeholders), and we are pleased with the reform package that we bring forward to the parliament.

DEAF CHILDREN

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What is the government doing to assist our preschool children who are deaf or are children of deaf parents, so that they may be able to better communicate with their peers and others in the community?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I think that, as members would expect me to say, where a need is created (and, of course, over time these needs shift from one geographical area to another), the department and the government provide the services that are needed for these students. Fortunately, as time goes on and medical technology improves, there is less occurrence of deafness in the community, and we are seeing this in the number of deaf children who need particular levels of support.

However, the state government has taken the decision to reintroduce a special early intervention program for deaf children and children of deaf adults at Klemzig Primary School. The program (which was closed by the previous Liberal government in 2001) will begin again in term 3, and it will offer children aged 3½ to five years two sessions per week. This government will provide a quality preschool program where children can learn and use the Auslan and English languages with their peers.

Klemzig Primary School, as I am sure members will know, is a widely known school in the deaf community and in the wider community for the unique Auslan language program that it offers to all its students. The reintroduction of the early intervention program will extend that to preschoolers. It will be staffed by people who have expertise and experience in working with deaf and hearing impaired children, and the children will also be able to mix with deaf adults and other deaf children in an environment where they can extend and practise their signing skills.

The previous government chose to discontinue that program after three years (it ran from 1999 to 2001). An evaluation of the program in June 2001 showed that children had developed confidence and competency in Auslan, had gained social skills and had engaged in more meaningful activities in the curriculum. The school and the deaf community put a very strong case to the state government for the reopening of that program, and I am confident that it will lead to better outcomes for deaf and hearing impaired children in South Australia.

APPRENTICES AND TRAINEES, FEES

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): How does the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education justify the claim she made this morning that it was necessary to raise fees for instructional time for apprentices and trainees on the basis that this brings them into line with the fees paid at TAFE by unemployed people? In her cabinet submission of 28 April, she asked cabinet to approve either a 50 per cent

increase, from \$1 to \$1.50, or a 100 per cent increase, from \$1 to \$2. Both cannot meet the criteria.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): The issue of training fees is a vexed one. Of course, when the member for Unley was the minister in my portfolio, he signed up to the user choice agreement and, within a matter of four years, the number of trainees had doubled, which I think is a good thing. The budget had blown out considerably and, by the time we took office, there was a \$12.1 million unfunded user choice account to pay. So, clearly, the books had not balanced for some years, and we were left with a very difficult situation. The fact remains that the training fee paid by apprentices and trainees accounts for around 10 to 20 per cent of the costs of their training hours.

The reality is that, in terms of what it costs to deliver those hours, those people undertaking apprenticeships pay substantially less than those unemployed people who do similar courses in our TAFE institutes. That difference is in the order of 120 per cent more if you are a non-apprentice or non-trainee doing a similar course.

Since we came to government, we have pegged and capped the cost of TAFE courses and increased the support for those on low incomes. This has produced a level of equity in the TAFE sector that is really not balanced by the comparison between those who work as apprentices and those who do not work or are full-time students.

Clearly, it gives a level of equity not only across the system but also in terms of the cost of similar courses around the country. In fact, if the member of Unley were to do Certificate 3 in plumbing—a course which I suspect he would do very well at and which would also lead to good job opportunities and a bright future, because the skill sector does lead to those opportunities—he would find that the lowest levels of fees charged across the country are in South Australia. The fees per annum for that course range from \$260 up to \$425, and Adelaide's costs in that scheme were \$266, which is at the very bottom.

So, we did have very cheap training costs. However, on a matter of fairness across the system in allowing people in training to have a similar fee structure and finding ways to redirect funds into pre-employment and pre-vocational and unemployed youth and school leavers programs, it is equitable to redirect funds into those areas rather than to use the moneys to subsidise those who are, after all, in employment. So, if the member compares the \$12.1 million deficit left by the previous government with our moves to cap fees, subsidise low-income earners and produce equity across the system, I think our outcome is for the benefit of the community.

PLASTIC SHOPPING BAGS

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What options were considered to remove plastic shopping bags from supermarket checkouts at last week's meeting of Australia's environment ministers held in Melbourne?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for Wright for her question, and I acknowledge her great interest in this topic and, in fact, her development of a particular calico bag which features her name and details and which is distributed widely in her electorate to assist in the campaign to rid our community of plastic shopping bags.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: And the member for Torrens has done the same as well. For some time, the National Environment Ministers Council has had the issue of plastic shopping bags on its agenda (in fact, I placed that item on the agenda last year) and there is widespread agreement across the ministerial council that plastic shopping bags are bad for the environment, killing thousands of birds and animals each year. Indeed, 6.9 billion plastic shopping bags are used in Australia each year, and approximately 400 million of them were used in South Australia last year.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I use calico bags now. Last year, I put my view to the ministerial council and to the public of South Australia that plastic bags should be banned. It is clear that South Australians want action to remove plastic shopping bags once and for all, but it would be better if there was a national outcome. I can report to the house that the meeting last Friday resolved as follows:

Ministers have agreed in principle to pursue nationally coordinated mandatory measures and will consider this at their July meeting in 2003.

It is fair to say that this is quite an advance on the position of some months ago. In fact, we asked the retailers to come up with a voluntary code of practice. They made three attempts, but the ministers, including the federal minister, the Hon. David Kemp (who I think has shown very good leadership on this issue) rejected all those. If we have a mandatory scheme, the options are whether we have a ban or a levy. It is fair to say that the ministers are divided: the minister from Victoria strongly supports a levy, whereas I strongly support a ban (the others are yet to say exactly what they believe); however, we are considering these options. We have told the industry that they have one last chance. We are meeting again in July by telephone and, if they do not come up with a satisfactory solution, we will have to impose some sort of mandatory measure, and this parliament will need to be involved in that.

Finally, today I am very pleased to welcome a group of students from Seymour College who have been researching the topic of plastic shopping bags over the last couple of months.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No; they have been preparing to show me their work. They are coming to see me this afternoon, and they will be giving me a detailed analysis of the community's views according to the research that they have undertaken.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has had the call.

POLICE NUMBERS

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Can the Minister for Police assure the house that the government will reverse its current policy of the South Australian police department recruiting below the attrition level and provide sufficient funds to allow more police to be recruited in South Australia? Constituents have brought to my attention that, due to the lack of police recruits, long delays have occurred before police officers are replaced when they are moved from one location to another.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): Since coming to office, the government has maintained a policy of recruiting against attrition. That is not to say that complica-

tions do not arise in terms of practicality, but we have that firm policy. I will seek an answer from the Commissioner for Police. Clearly, the member for Stuart has a concern about recruitment, the availability and the filling of positions in his area. I am happy to obtain a detailed response from the commissioner on any other matters relating to recruitment. If I have not given the fullest of answers, I will come back with one.

WATER, KANGAROO ISLAND

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My questions are directed to the Minister for Administrative Services:

1. Now that SA Water has acknowledged problems with water quality at Penneshaw, will the minister explain why no public warning was issued, especially as people have suffered financially?

2. Will the minister agree to compensate residents who have had to replace damaged hot water systems?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Administrative Services): The honourable member's questions relate to circumstances that have occurred on Kangaroo Island following the introduction of a desalination plant. A number of residents (a small number at this stage) have said that they are experiencing particular difficulties with their hot water systems. The relationship has been drawn between that and the supply of water associated with the desalination plant. That whole process is being inquired into, and I understand that a report will be with me very soon. It is ordinarily the case that one does not jump to conclusions and issue warnings and alarm the community before one has a factual basis upon which to act. That is why I will accept the report before deciding to issue any warnings. We will also look at the question of what role SA Water, the operator, plays in this situation, and whether some proper basis and some mitigation, or measures to be taken for the residents, should be put in place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We do not act on the basis of half a piece of information: we seek to identify the full picture before acting, and we will certainly do that. I know that it is a serious issue, and it is receiving my active consideration.

TOY CAP RIFLES

Mr SNELLING (Playford): Is the Minister for Consumer Affairs aware of the possible risk of injury to children using some types of toy cap rifles and, if so, what is he doing to protect South Australian children from such dangerous toys?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Minister for Consumer Affairs): Earlier this year the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs received a complaint from a parent who was concerned that her two sons had been injured when firing the Western Ranger toy cap rifle. The parent had complained that sparks from the cap gun had blown back into the faces of the boys when the caps were fired. Last month the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs issued a public warning about this particular toy cap rifle and encouraged anyone who may have bought the rifle to return it to the place of purchase for a full refund.

Mr Brokenshire: That's a buy-back.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Good, very good! The member for Mawson is in top form today. To avoid possible confusion, I must emphasise that ordinary types of cap-firing pistols with exposed cylinders and firing chambers are not considered a threat to children because they are designed to be pointed and fired away from the child's face.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Pardon?

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Make my day! The problem with toy cap rifles, such as the Western Ranger, is that the child is required to hold the stock against his or her shoulder, and the exposed firing chamber then radiates sparks from the chamber into the child's face and eyes. Indeed, the Western Ranger rifle's telescopic sight encourages children to look through it, drawing the face of the child even closer to the exposed firing chamber. Retailers have cooperated since the Commissioner's first public warning last month by removing Western Ranger rifles from sale in South Australia. It is highly likely, however, that this type of toy rifle may resurface in other outlets. I have therefore taken the extra step of officially declaring this type of product to be dangerous goods. This means that it is now unlawful to make or trade toy cap rifles with exposed firing cylinders in South Australia.

SALISBURY INTERSECTION

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Transport advise the house when traffic signals at the corner of Salisbury Highway and Spains Road will be installed? On 31 July 2002 the minister announced in a media release that, as part of the black spot program, the Salisbury Highway and Spains Road intersection would have traffic lights installed this financial year. As I understand it, the Salisbury council has not yet seen any plans and has had no indication as to when construction will begin, yet we are only five weeks away from the end of the financial year.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for Light for his question. If my memory serves me correctly, he asked me this exact question a week or two ago, and my response was that I would seek some advice about it, as I have done. Obviously, once I have received that advice I am happy to share it not only with the member for Light but also, of course, with the house. I am pretty sure that the tenor of the question is the same as that of the question a week or two ago. I apologise if that is not the case, but it is my understanding that the same question was asked last time we sat.

The SPEAKER: The chair's recollection is that it was in relation to a different intersection.

An honourable member: No, it was the same one, sir.

The SPEAKER: Then I apologise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Deputy Premier! I apologise to the house for not having ruled the question out of order if it was in relation to the same intersection, because it seeks information about the same matter and, under standing orders, that is out of order.

WHEAT STREAK MOSAIC VIRUS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Is the minister aware of the serious situation in which South Australia finds itself with the outbreak of the wheat disease wheat streak mosaic virus, and will he outline what action the government is taking regarding this matter?

South Australia's Waite Research Institute is under strict quarantine following the discovery of the outbreak of the wheat streak mosaic virus. It is also confirmed to be at the Adelaide University's Roseworthy campus and at several locations throughout the state. It has been stated today that people doing scientific investigation into the matter have been told not to comment publicly.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I am delighted to respond to the question of the member for Schubert. As honourable members are aware, on 24 April 2003 PIRSA received confirmation from CSIRO Plant Industries that a sample of wheat from an experimental planting at the Waite Institute had tested positive for WSMV (wheat streak mosaic virus). Under the provisions of the Fruit and Plant Protection Act 1992, quarantine orders were established at the Waite site to assist in containment. Hosts of the WSMV have been required to remain on site. The area from which a positive sample was detected has been secured and appropriate miticide (mite killing) treatment has been applied.

A national survey program at cereal breeding sites across Australia has been fast-tracked following the detection at Waite. Sampling is also being undertaken at other sites within the state. This extensive sampling program will target those areas where the vector of the virus, the wheat curl mite, is expected to be present all year. The virus was subsequently detected at two additional sites—the University of Adelaide's Roseworthy campus and a farm in the South-East region near Bordertown. Both have been quarantined, and these orders have been issued to minimise the chances of further spread while initial targeted national surveys were completed.

The national Consultative Committee on Wheat Streak Mosaic Virus met via teleconference on 20 May 2003 and considered the available results of further testing from across the country. Testing results from targeted surveys in South Australia over the past two weeks have now demonstrated the presence of the virus across most of the cereal belt in South Australia as well as its cereal breeding sites. Besides being detected in trial plantings, many unrelated sites have been confirmed. A further five sites have returned positive readings and are awaiting confirmation.

On the basis of the very widespread presence of the mite vector and the widely dispersed detections across South Australia's cereal belt, the consultative committee agreed that the virus is established in South Australia and not able to be eradicated. The current situation in other states still remains unclear, as testing of samples is continuing. Victoria has announced that the virus has been confirmed at nine sites and that seven of those are not associated with the research establishments.

Queensland had previously indicated that it did not believe that the virus was eradicable at the Leslie Research Centre at Toowoomba. To date, the virus has been confirmed in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, and testing is continuing in Western Australia.

The National Management Group is made up of commonwealth and state territory chief executives, and they have met

again in the last week to discuss the matter. They have decided that quarantine measures will remain in effect. In addition to the foregoing, urgent work is being undertaken to develop protocols for the states and territories to manage the situation, and these will include protocols for this season's wheat breeding programs and advice to growers. A range of questions remain to be answered in relation to WSMV, including whether the virus is seed transmitted and, if so, what impact this might have; the susceptibility of wheat and other hosts to the virus; what impact the virus is likely to have; and the level of resistance to the virus in commercial varieties within Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I'm glad you asked this. A nationally coordinated research approach will be required to work through these issues. This task force will continue to include representation from the major industry groups including the South Australian Farmers Federation Grains Council and the Advisory Board of Agriculture. On the basis of the national management group decision, the quarantine orders that are currently in place on three initial detection sites in South Australia will remain, that is, Waite, Roseworthy and a farm in the South-East near Bordertown. However, given the widespread distribution of WSMV across South Australia's cereal belt, it is not proposed to apply additional quarantine orders. At this stage the origin of the infections is still unknown.

The SPEAKER: Order! Whilst the house has been hearing the minister's response, I have been cogitating on my own position on this matter, since it is now of grave concern in my electorate, and I am otherwise unable to participate in any debate. I do not reflect on the motives of the member asking the question or the information provided by the minister in answering it, but I will provide the following information about what I have done for the benefit of my electors, at least.

At the time the Australian government set out to allow importation of grain, I begged state government ministers, federal government ministers and National Party members to oppose the government's decision to allow the importation of both cereals and zea species, that is, maize. It is almost certain that the virus came into this country in consequence of the lily-livered, half-witted, weak-kneed policy of agreeing under competition policy and world trade arrangements to let those grains in here without appropriate quarantine restrictions.

I make those remarks against the background of my own involvement and training in agricultural science and plant quarantine measures, and as a representative of a significant area in this state producing products which are now at risk in consequence of that ill-advised decision, which need not have been taken for the very reasons that are now illustrated to us. The solution to the problem is to genetically modify the species that are susceptible to remove their susceptibility.

TAFE

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: This relates to the investigation into TAFE fraud allegations. On 24 March, I informed the house of the progress being made in investigating various allegations regarding the TAFE system. In doing so, I advised of the processes initiated to deal with these allegations. In particular, the investigative process has involved resources of the internal branch of the department, KPMG and Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, and has included advice from SA Police and the Auditor-General.

On Friday, I received a summary of the findings from the Chief Auditor/Manager of Internal Audit, and I am happy to table this summary of findings. There were three broad areas of allegations regarding TAFE enrolments, and each of those has been investigated. Allegations were made that TAFE enrolment and subject statistics for 2002 had been artificially elevated at the Kangaroo Island campus in order to obtain increased levels of government funding. The review involved an examination of all student enrolment records for the campus for 2002. No evidence was found to substantiate the allegations.

Allegations were also made that student statistics (enrolments, subject matters and contact hours) in the VET in Schools Program were artificially inflated, apparently across the system of schools and TAFE institutes involved in conduct of the program. The investigation discovered inaccurate data collection detailing contact hours. However, the summary of findings states:

They did not result in any increased TAFE funding and only marginally affected allocations of funding to individual institutes.

Data collection processes are now being reviewed. The Auditor-General and SAPOL's Anti-corruption Branch have indicated that they are satisfied with the outcomes of the inquiry into both these allegations.

A third part of the investigation examined financial reporting, management practices, uncollected debts and irregular enrolment practices within the FarmBis program at Spencer TAFE. The investigation revealed poor administration and business practices, poor internal control and unreasonable exposure to risk. A program of improvement has commenced, including strict monitoring of further activity ensuring compliance. The audit team is carrying out further detailed work in relation to the FarmBis program at the request of the Anti-corruption Branch.

I have also ordered an assessment of other high value fee-for-service projects to see whether any of these warrant review, and any improvements suggested by the audit team are being implemented as a matter of urgency. It is reassuring to know that the allegations that sullied many hardworking TAFE employees' reputations were unfounded. Staff can hold their head high and take pride in what South Australia's TAFE system achieves.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

PAEDOPHILIA

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Paedophilia has been much in the news of late with the announcement yesterday of the resignation of the Governor-General, the first such resignation since the constitution of the commonwealth was formed. In South Australia, that matter has almost been pointed up by the emerging story of allegations concerning Mr Bob Brandenburg who, for four decades as a youth worker

involved with the Anglican archdiocese in Adelaide, is thought to have systematically abused a series of young people.

That story comes not that long after allegations, which were found and proven in a court of law, that a magistrate in South Australia, Mr Liddy, had also over a period of a great many years systematically abused young children in connection with their activities at the Somerton Park Surf Life Saving Club. That followed previous allegations of systematic abuse, not only in South Australia but elsewhere, in connection with the Catholic communion, particularly with the Christian Brothers.

That is the point that I wish to make, that it is not confined to one church or one diocese at one time: it is a matter of great concern to us all in the community. Indeed, serious allegations have been made, including in this place, of systematic abuse by paedophiles of young people who were at the time in the care of the state of South Australia, who were wards of the state. While we can sit here and contemplate whether the Anglican Church, the Catholic Church or Uncle Tom Cobbley should conduct their own inquiries, when it comes to our own house and the systematic abuse of those who are entrusted to the care of the Crown, we have to be more than careful.

It is in that context that we have recently had the Layton report, which I acknowledge, in so far as it goes, canvasses a new deal for people who are victims. However, I, for one, am worried by aspects of that report, because it does not go far enough. It does not canvass new penalties for perpetrators.

I note that in denying that during the last sitting week the Premier in this place was waxing lyrical about the fact that paedophiles who got less than five years did not appear before the Parole Board, and he said that he was going to tighten that up. That is all well and good, but my question before this house is simply: why are paedophiles getting less than five years in the first place and why, whether it was under the government of which I was a member or this government, all rehabilitation programs for paedophiles have been abandoned in the prisons? We lock them up, do nothing to rehabilitate them and then we let them out. Who cares whether it is in five, seven or 10 years, if there is no attempt at rehabilitation the certainty that they will reoffend continues to be unacceptably high?

It brings me to the main point I want to make. I listened last week to public statements of the Attorney-General and I thought he was too cute by half. I was most impressed on Friday to hear the Dean of St Peter's Cathedral, Reverend Stephen Ogden, speaking about this issue and saying that this is not an issue for one church or one diocese for a few days of media feeding frenzy; rather, it is a matter of great concern not only to the public of South Australia but the public of Australia generally. I stand here in support of my leader in his calling for a royal commission. I do not know why this parliament would deny the people of South Australia the right to have a royal commission. It has now been established systematically over decades that these people have been in every sector of our community, systematically abusing, betraying trust and destroying people's lives. I do not understand what argument there is for not standing up and saying that this is a matter of huge public importance and needs a royal commission, not only in South Australia but on an Australia-wide basis. What we have seen hopefully we did not understand, but we have seen generations of kids systematically used, abused and spat out. This parliament and the system in this country basically does not want to know.

If it is cheap media publicity and they can hang someone out to dry, they will do so, but they will not get to the cause of the problem.

VAHEDI, Dr HABIB

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I rise today to speak out of respect for Dr Habib Vahedi. An educated man and an Hazari from Afghanistan, he left behind a family, including a wife and four children in Afghanistan. He arrived in Australia in October 1999. Like most of the so-called boat people—the vast majority of them—he was judged to be a genuine refugee and granted a TPV (a temporary protection visa) in April 2000. Since then he was left with the terrible uncertainty faced by TPV holders, and it was too much for him. Dr Vahedi committed suicide at Murray Bridge on 3 February 2003.

Today I will read out Dr Vahedi's suicide message, recorded on tape and only just now transcribed and interpreted in English. I have omitted the names of individuals named in the suicide message. The message shows up the heartlessness and hypocrisy of minister Ruddock in criticising the lack of support shown to Dr Vahedi by his friends, allegedly, given the utter lack of support given to TPV holders in this country. I quote:

My statement is that this person living with me has no relationship with me. Last year I did not know him. Just for the sake of making the rent a bit cheaper I stayed with him. We rented a room, otherwise no business between us. We have no other relation. Also because of mental pressure, mental pressure and mental pressure in the factory such as [so on so] who were after people like me without experience just as factory worker. Because of these I suffered mental pressure. I have no alternative but to kill myself. I have no other alternative. I am forced to kill myself—this is the only way—to kill myself.

There are some issues for which I am being followed. I am from Afghanistan, I am Hazara, I am Shiite. Because of Taliban this is true, that all Afghani people left the country, but I cannot say that they belong to another nation. Wherever we are we are Afghans, we are Hazaras. Now my neighbours put so much pressure on me. Even the [such and such] house was very much afraid of me. Unfortunately, they may think I am a terrorist. No, Hazara people have never been and never will be terrorists.

Also I had \$14 000 in my account and \$2 185 in my pocket, also one year's worth superannuation money. Please take care of it so my body is sent to Kabul, to the previous address you had and still have. From the day I entered school, even when I left, I was a bit simple and people took advantage of my simplicity, but as they say 'little knowledge is very dangerous'. Secondly, what you got from me is my personal very hateful earnings. God has forced this on us: what more shall I say?

Father and mother forgive me. My children forgive me. Wife, I love you, I love you, I love you. But after me, you can marry anyone! From my part you are free. I hope you forgive me. I wish my brother to look after my children. My children should not hesitate to study. Also, dear mother! Forgive me. Mother forgive me! Mother forgive me! Pity I couldn't see your face once again. You were very sweet—a reunion would have been so sweet, but what can I do, that life did not let us meet each other again. The lack of sleep and mental pressures that you suffered, times I was late and you were waiting up for me. Forgive me. Say hello to all friends and relatives. Forgive me mother. I have no more to say to you. I have to kill myself. This is one way, a solution. Why? Time!

I lived in this land for three and a half years approximately—a bit less than three and a half years. I was thirsting to see my children, also my father and mother and sister and brother, but I realise that I can no longer tolerate these pains and I know that it has very dangerous consequences in future and so I commit suicide. It's the only way. When I became sick in my room I was being followed moment by moment, second by second, minute by minute. There I even once was close to leave this world behind, but it did not happen. I was under pressure there. My soul was being tortured and if I had not left I would have become sick, but when I came here to be in contact with people for some time I lived a few months in the

society. I never saw the relationships of a social life. This is why I came here and I had no real knowledge of my flat mate.

I had to . . . dear flatmate, forgive me, because I had no other alternative but to kill myself. Forgive me. Forgive me.

I will go to the ending of this transcript, which states:

But I tell you that the amount of money that is left in my account be used for my body to be sent to Kabul to the address you have with you. My bother's address or my father—they will be ready. You can contact the Red Cross to take my body. Advise them to bury me in Karte Sakhi (area in Kabul) beside my grandfather. May God protect and help you. Goodbye.

This was a tragic loss of life—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address his remarks to the chair.

Mr HANNA: This was a tragic loss of life—one that is echoed in the terrible uncertainty faced by so many thousands of TPV holders, genuine refugees, in Australia today.

WATER RESTRICTIONS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Personally I want to raise the very important issue of water restrictions here in South Australia. I support the implementation of the water restrictions in our state, but the most affected will be our irrigators. I have great concern that it may have an unfair impact. Many of our irrigators have taken big steps to reduce their water use already and are now operating at a very low level at maximum efficiency. Others have not done anything and are irrigating the same as they always did. If a percentage cut of last year's water usage is implemented, it will be most unfair to those who have done the right thing, that is, reducing their water use. An allocation per hectare would be more appropriate, particularly of five to six megalitres per hectare for vineyards and eight to nine megalitres per hectare for citrus, or a similar allocation. This will reward those who have been cutting back their water use already and then force the other more inefficient users to do the same.

The other issue I want to raise relates to the question I asked in the house today about the wheat streak mosaic virus. I compliment the Minister for Tourism on her answer to the question. It is a very important issue and I was very interested in the long and detailed answer that she gave. This is a very serious matter and farmers are most concerned. The biggest concern is the fear of the unknown aspect of this. No-one seems to know much about it, and every day we hear that the outbreak is even more widespread. Even this morning we heard of nine outbreaks in Victoria and Queensland and several in New South Wales, and it becoming widespread in our own state of South Australia. The question is: how long has it been here? It is widespread across South Australia, and it must have been here for a long time.

Mr Speaker, I note your comments about the importation of grain into our state—particularly cereals and maize—as drought stock feed several years ago. I agree with you, sir, that that could have been the source of this disease. It has definitely come from overseas. The importation of second-hand farm machinery also, I believe, could have been a source of this infestation—and I note now that this practice has been banned. Even if one cleans a machine very thoroughly, it does not get rid of all the debris: it is practically impossible to do that. So, that practice has now been banned. But the problem is already here.

The problem is that most farmers are unaware of what this disease looks like. How can they detect it now, when the crops are not growing? What do the farmers do as they start to sow their crop, probably this week? Are they sowing

infected seed? Is there any direction at all from the authorities as to what they should do about that? What damage will it do to the farmers? What percentage of crops could be spoiled or ruined? The big question is: why has it gone undetected for so long?

This has been a favourite subject of mine. I believe that, over the years, bit by bit, successive governments have reduced the staffing of government agronomists in the field. These are the people who are out there working with the farmers. It will take a disease, an outbreak such as this, to highlight this problem—that we do not have these scientists, these independent people, out there in the field who are able to work with the farmers and detect these sorts of things very early. There are still many questions to be answered in relation to this matter, and I will be calling for a briefing for members of parliament who wish to attend, so that we are able to be told what this disease looks like, what its effect will be, how it is transported and how it is moved around the state, so that we can immediately make sure it does not continue, and how those farmers who do not think that they are affected can take steps to ensure that they are not affected in the future. All these things are very vague, and it is a tragedy that, while we sit here and discuss this matter, the problem multiplies. I am very concerned about it.

RECONCILIATION WEEK

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): At the beginning of my contribution today, I would like to acknowledge that we are on Kaurna land. I do so because Reconciliation Week starts today—26 May—with Sorry Day. This year's theme is Reconciliation: Together We're Doing It. It gives people the chance to take part in and celebrate the achievements of indigenous Australia. It also presents the perfect opportunity to learn more about indigenous people and the continuing struggle for their rights, working together to heal the past and shape the future.

Reconciliation Week, of course, marks three very important anniversaries. Today is the sixth anniversary of Sorry Day; 27 May is the 36th anniversary of the 1967 referendum, which ended the exclusion of indigenous people from Australian society; and 3 June is the tenth anniversary of the historic Mabo High Court decision, which rejected the notion that Australia was terra nullius, or land belonging to no-one. It is unfortunate that, as Sorry Day approaches, we are still waiting for an apology from the federal government. As significant as the 1967 referendum was, let us remember that, by 1972, New South Wales Aborigines had been forced to set up a tent embassy that stands to this day as a protest against the continued marginalisation from land and Australian civic life. After 10 years, the native title legislation has been so diluted that there have been calls for it to be abolished.

As we acknowledge these anniversaries during Reconciliation Week, we reflect on the struggle of maintaining those rights and remind ourselves that, if we work together, we will do it. Uniting to fight for those rights, and rights not yet won, is a central platform of what true reconciliation means. As I look back on the recent struggles, I am reminded of the Walk for Reconciliation, where people all over Australia took part in marches across significant sites, such as the Sydney Harbor Bridge, and here in Adelaide we marched across the Torrens River in a crowd which had not been seen before, and which had hardly been imagined by the organisers, as part of a series of events in the year 2000 marking the handover of the

final proposals of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation. Its document for reconciliation was part of a significant ceremony that took place in the Opera House, and our South Australian documents are displayed here in centre hall at Parliament House.

I also look at the progress on the AP lands where the United Nations and World Vision are helping indigenous communities, which is a very sad necessity for a first world country. But there are real improvements on the way, and I acknowledge the work of our colleague in another place, minister Terry Roberts, who is working with the commonwealth government, and obtaining a commitment to help in the Pit Lands. Partnerships is certainly the way to go. Another point I would like to make today is that this is the only state that still does not have an Aboriginal MP. All other states have an Aboriginal representative in their parliament, and they make a very important contribution to legislative programs and bring first-hand accounts from their own life experiences and their community links. I think that is something that we really have to address here in South Australia.

In my own community, I was able to enjoy the ceremony at the Modbury School, which was held on Friday of last week, called Palti 2003. It was a large gathering, and 11 local schools participated. A ceremony was organised by the ASSPA Committee, and the whole day was promoted to put together cultural, environmental and educational displays for the children and parents to come and look at. There is a long list of people involved with the day, and I would like to acknowledge the work of Lina Scalfino, the Principal, and Karen Maynard and Lynette James, who are part of the Aboriginal Student Support and Parent Awareness Committee.

The Marketing Committee and the Parent Club were involved, as were the Values Reference Group members, the Canteen Committee members and the Tandanya National Aboriginal Cultural Institute, and they all paid a great deal of attention to their organisational task, which was mammoth. There is a large list of sponsors, including local traders from all over our area, many of them from Tea Tree Plaza and, again, I would like to acknowledge Michel's Patisserie, which provided the cake, and Tropicana Fruit and Veg continues to be an outstanding contributor to the community. I also acknowledge cultural instructors Stephanie Gollan, Amos Roach, Suzie Koolmitree Leonie Roberts and the Tal-Kin-jeri Dance Group, of course, led by Major Sumner. They and special guest Shirley Peisley were most welcome.

Time expired.

DEAF COMMUNITY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Yesterday, my wife Johanna and I had the pleasure of attending the thanksgiving service of the Adelaide deaf community at St Peter's Cathedral. The Attorney-General also attended, and he was able to share the wonderful experience of joining the deaf community in its thanksgiving service. If members have never been to a church service conducted by the deaf community, I would recommend it. The passion (and that is the best word to describe the enthusiasm and emotion) that was displayed by all the members of the congregation and, certainly, the minister and the various people participating in the service was something that I found quite inspiring.

Certainly, members of the deaf community face their inability to hear as a challenge, not a handicap. They do not

see it as a problem. They have developed an ability to communicate and, as is stated in the sheet of paper I am reading from, they encourage people like us to 'listen with your eyes'. The deaf community came together yesterday to celebrate a part of our life—attending church and being part of a community—that we just take for granted. When one sits down and has a normal conversation, it seems almost simplistic when one sees the way in which members of the deaf community get together and signal, sign and really bond as a good community.

They use a sign language called Auslan, which is not a straight spelling of the English language; it is a peculiar and different language. It has its own grammar and syntax, so learning English is often quite difficult for deaf people. The community there was able to convert songs, hymns and biblical stories into Auslan and communicate as rapidly as is done by any spoken word. To see the history of the world from creation to the birth of Jesus condensed down to about five minutes by one of the mimes was something I do not think even Readers Digest could do with such clarity.

The mime was Coralie Cunliffe, and the expression that she was able to portray in her mime, using Auslan, enabled anyone who was brand new to Auslan to understand the story. I certainly have never professed to being a biblical scholar but I was able to follow the storyline quite well. The sermon given by the Reverend John Hoopmann was entitled the 'Story of Zaccheus, the Tax Collector'. To help illustrate the story, various actors, including Coralie, Christine, John and Margaret, little Mary and Michael came out in their costumes and they were able to portray the story of Zaccheus, the tax collector, with great clarity, and certainly the biblical message of looking at people not only as a means to an end but also as part of society really came across. To consider other people in society was a message I received, and I hope that I am able to do that at all times.

The deaf community normally conduct their services on Sunday at 10 a.m. in the Royal Deaf Society building on South Terrace. So, if any members who missed out yesterday would like to go along on a Sunday morning, I would encourage them to do so to see how effectively the deaf community communicates not only within their small congregation but also in broader society. They play a very important part in society generally.

I thank all the members of the community who were there yesterday for their kind invitation and for taking their time to be patient with me communicating with them. I felt like a babe, not knowing the language, but they walked me through some of the simple signs and made me feel more than welcome. It is great to see the deaf community not only supporting each other but also being a vital part of the society of South Australia.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Gunn): The member for West Torrens.

STORMWATER CATCHMENT

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. It is indeed a privilege to make a grievance speech under the supervision of your chairmanship. Given that I was not a member of the house from 1993 to 1997, I was never able to experience the many qualities you showed as speaker of this house. I take great pleasure—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn): The member for West Torrens should not continue too far down that path.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: You are wiser than King Solomon himself, sir. I will continue with my grievance speech. On the weekend, the member for Kaurana (the Minister for Environment and Conservation, John Hill) was kind enough to launch a budget initiative in my electorate committing an extra \$16 million over the next four years for stormwater management, which will hopefully be matched by local government, making a total of \$32 million.

Members might be aware that the Patawalonga Water Catchment Management Board recently released a series of flood maps detailing the problems caused by Brownhill Creek and Keswick Creek flooding. There are a number of problems, but there is no one reason why we are experiencing flooding, other than, obviously, the rain events. What is important is the way in which we manage those rain events. As we all know, councils are responsible for managing our stormwater, but there is no statewide code of practice in place. For example, the City of Unley might decide in its management plan to remove stormwater in pipes that are a certain diameter. That water might then travel into the West Torrens council area, where the pipes could be a different diameter; and this involves a simple a breakdown in communication between those councils. Of course, it is not done on purpose. It is due to cost limitations and lack of communication. The five mayors in the affected councils are committed to working together, and we have a state government that, rather than slashing funding for the stormwater management scheme which was given to local governments and which the former minister (minister Brindal) slashed by half the allocation per year for councils, slashing it as he did from \$4 million to \$2 million in the last Liberal government budget—

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: From \$16 million to \$8 million over four years, which sounds far worse.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, it is far worse. We have now restored that funding and, if local government matches that dollar for dollar (as we hope they will; the LGA has indicated that it is very receptive to working with those local councils to do that), we will actually see some real stormwater management being implemented.

As members from the western suburbs (the members for Ashford and Colton, the member for Unley, and I) would realise, stormwater management affects everyone and, when it breaks down, it affects everyone tragically. I have constituents who live in Press Road, Brooklyn Park who, if we do have a one in 100 years rain event, are looking at about half a metre to 1 metre depth of water travelling at about 80 km/h down Press Road. When an insurance company sees that, the first thing it does is increase the premium—that is, if you can get flood insurance. Then, after you have gone through the problem of not being able to get flood insurance, the value of your property is then decreased because of infrastructure funding that has not been put in place not in your local area but upstream. The problems are not caused where they occur; they are caused upstream. That is the problem with stormwater management.

Of course, as the minister said yesterday, the clock is ticking. We have not experienced a one in 100 year rain event for about 100 years. Because of urban infill and people subdividing blocks and living closer to what would naturally be creeks, or else filling creeks with concrete to try to get the water away as fast as we can, we have aggravated the problem.

The Public Works Committee and the Environment, Resources and Development Committee are looking at ways

in which we can better use that stormwater. It is no good our flushing perfectly good water out into the ocean if we can reuse it. At the very least, we could reuse it in for irrigation or even as grey water. We have to do something with this water; we cannot just get it out as fast as we can. I congratulate the minister and, indeed, the government for that initiative, because the western suburbs will benefit from it. It is not sexy or flash; it is just good government. It is getting out there and getting on with the job, and putting money where it is needed and deserved.

I know from people calling my office last night after they saw it on the news or read it in the newspaper today that people are very appreciative that we are taking this problem seriously. It is their home and their one big investment, and the last thing they want to see is it being washed away because people in Burnside have not put in place the infrastructure to ensure that stormwater is treated effectively.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 31 March. Page 2613.)

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise to support this bill. I will speak briefly, because I understand that we want to get this bill through today. I will basically make my comments more dot points rather than going into great detail in a 20 minute speech.

In discussing this government's second supply bill, the question of the difference between the previous Liberal government and the current Labor government, particularly from the perspective of a country member of parliament, needs to be raised. I think that difference is quite stark. Under the previous Liberal government, country electorates—mine in particular—did extremely well. We had many projects, and many infrastructures were upgraded. Many new roads were built, including the Morgan to Burra road, which was in my electorate at the time and which was a \$19.6 million project. A new Gomersal Road was built, which was a \$7 million project. There was also a project to provide filtered water for the Barossa, which was an umpteen million dollar project and which was not just one plant but several. The list goes on.

There were projects involving the provision of infrastructure and the upgrade of hospitals, as well as construction of the new Barossa Convention Centre. The list goes on; I just cannot remember them all. In the last 14 months, there has been absolutely nothing; a total cut-off. The question needs to be asked: what has happened here? Was the previous government overdoing it? Was I receiving favourable treatment? Was the region being overtreated, or has this government decided that my region (the Barossa Valley) has had enough and does not need any more? The drought has hit—in more ways than one.

There has been a total cut-off of funds. Projects that were started under the previous government, particularly the new Barossa hospital, have been stopped. Everything was ready for that facility to be built, and it would have been under construction now had the government not changed. Every other promise made to me (which I relayed to my electorate) was delivered. I challenge anyone in the house or living in my electorate to tell me anything that I have said I will do that I

have not done; better still, put it in the local media so that I can read it there. I am very proud not only of my own record but also of the record of the previous government. This government has been in power for 14 months, and it has approximately three years left. The Barossa has a great need for this new hospital, and this government can cover that oversight—beginning this Thursday.

The other day, I was very happy to welcome the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. Trish White) to the electorate. The Minister for Health (Hon. Lea Stevens) has visited the area twice. I give both ministers credit for visiting the electorate of Schubert and seeing its needs at first hand. Nobody can argue that the electorate, particularly the Barossa Valley, is not the powerhouse of the state (and the member for Mount Gambier can say the same of his electorate). The Barossa Valley is the powerhouse, with its premium grade wines, its tourism, its food, and the list goes on.

The Barossa Valley is keeping our state and our economy buoyant, but it will not continue to do so if the government does not support it by upgrading the necessary infrastructure. I have already mentioned the hospital, but two schools are also in need of upgrading, particularly Kapunda Primary School, which is in a dreadful condition, and I challenge any member to find a school in a worse condition than this one. It was to be upgraded this year.

The previous government constructed Gomersal Road, which the current minister had great pleasure in opening. However, since then, not a cent has been spent. The valley has major infrastructure problems, particularly involving the new development near Orlando Wyndham. A very complex crossing needs to be constructed, and that was on the drawing board under the previous government. The railway line crosses the main road at a 45-degree angle, which is where Orlando Wyndham—

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: How long has it been there?

Mr VENNING: It has been there for years. This is the new development at Richmond Grove. I invite the Minister for Industry to visit the Barossa, because I am very proud of what they are doing. I have no doubt that the minister would be very impressed. However, 30 or 40 large trucks an hour cannot enter the main highway not only because of the road but also because of the railway line. Design work was being done in relation to a roundabout that would assist this problem, but a large cost was involved. It is not fair to expect Orlando Wyndham to meet that cost, and I believe that the government should at least come to the party, go into discussions and, over the next two or three years, devise a plan to encourage Orlando Wyndham to continue with this redevelopment (worth millions of dollars) and overcome these problems.

Bridges are also a problem throughout the Barossa Valley, and Mildara Blass (now Behringer Blass), as is happening with other companies, has spent \$60 million plus in moving wine product in and out of its winery (just north of Nuriootpa) day and night, 24 hours a day. Bridges were built more than 50 years ago and one just across the road, but it carries only eight tonnes. I put on the record that there will be an accident, and I only hope that somebody is not hurt. I hope that, if it happens, only the truck goes down (not the prime mover but the trailer). The Barossa has many of these bridges that are not designed to carry these loads. It is not fair to expect local government to pick up the bill in this respect. The government ought to get its priorities right and, first, examine the bridges; secondly, agree that there is a problem; and, thirdly, establish a plan to replace or upgrade these

bridges over the next two or three years. Certainly, I put that challenge to the government, and it is now on the record. If there is a problem—and there will be—it is on the record and I warned them, as I have done in correspondence over the last 12 months or so.

Another very important issue involves the Lower Murray irrigators. I had a speech prepared today that I did not read to the house because it was so bad that I did not want to cause the minister any embarrassment; however, I will fine-tune it for tomorrow. Some of the stories that are coming from the Lower Murray irrigators are absolutely disgraceful: people are being told that they are not allowed to make comment; and people involved in negotiations are told that they are not allowed to speak to the media or anybody else. The whole thing is very sad.

I am urging the irrigators not to leave their properties but to wait for a while; however, we are already losing them. They are leaving their farms, and some are third or fourth generation farmers. They are being put to the huge cost of upgrade, on top of the huge impost of the dairy deregulation. No person in this house can deny that the cost of dairy deregulation has upset and hurt all our dairy farmers—hurt them badly—particularly coming on top of drought, cash restraints and banks that are now being very critical and refusing to lend money for upgrades. The problem of the Lower Murray irrigators is a long-term concern for me. I do not intend to stand here and slag the minister. I believe that the minister is one of the better ministers, but I think he has too much power: first, I hope that it does not go to his head; secondly, that he is able to handle his huge workload.

I look forward to a discussion this evening with the minister regarding crown leases. It is a favourite issue of mine since I entered this house in 1990, and I raised it in my maiden speech and again when we came to government in 1993. The member for Stuart and I addressed the issue in 1995; we battled hard and got some sense. A lot of people have already freeholded their leases, but those who have not now face the huge impost of having to because, if they do not, they will be up for a levy of \$300 per year per lease, plus a large increase from \$2 000 to \$6 000 for the cost of freeholding.

I was going to raise the issue of shearing instructors. Apparently, our shearing instruction has been carried out via a private operation, particularly by a very well-known shearer, Mr John Hutchison, who has taken on this school. Under this government, what has happened? It wishes to unionise it and, via a contact in the other place and the local shearing organiser (no names here), it wishes to take over the training of shearers and do it itself. This has tremendous resistance in the bush. Only half a dozen shearers will be trained instead of several hundred.

It is identical to when the union took over the Royal Adelaide Show: instead of getting 50 shearers for the shearing competition, you got 15. People in the shearing shed, on the board and, in this instance, at the training courses are resisting union control. I am urging the Minister for Tourism and Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith), because I believe this matter falls within her portfolio responsibility, to address this issue. I will be watching what happens very carefully. I particularly give the minister notice that, during estimates, I will be asking why the government is interfering with something that is working extremely well.

John Hutchison has one of the best reputations of any shearer in Australia. In fact, he trained a three-time world champion; so, why would you want to change that? Obviously,

ly, this government has done so, but what is it costing? Here we are discussing supply, and that question needs to be asked. Thursday is budget day. I look forward to that and I hope I see a reversal of these unfortunate trends. I am not a naturally negative person, as people know. I like to be thankful. I like to give praise and I like to acknowledge good work, particularly by the government, irrespective of which party is in power.

A few days ago the Minister for Education and Children's Services visited our electorate and the Nuriootpa High School. I hope the government will find money to fund a new Nuriootpa High School wine centre. After all, this school founded wine education in secondary schools. As a result of the lack of funding, other schools are now overtaking in this respect, and I think that is grossly unfair. The honourable member looks at me, but the private sector has taken up the idea. I remind the honourable member that a private school has taken the brains and the expertise from this public school and is now implementing the idea with money from the private sector.

I urge the government to back the public system. Nuriootpa High School is one of South Australia's best public schools, and I ask the government to provide funding for a new Nuriootpa High School wine education centre. It is extremely popular and, as you, sir, would know, its wines are world class. They have been recognised in America as high grade premium wine. Also, I hope there is more funding for tourism because, certainly, that has suffered the effects of the financial drought in the last 14 months. I hope that the government will again direct some funds towards that.

As I have already discussed, road infrastructure goes together with tourism. Often I speak with strangers in the streets of Tanunda, Nuriootpa and Angaston. I say, 'How do you like our Barossa?' They love it. They say, 'What a magnificent place, what a great secret, but your roads are terrible.' You get off the main road and you are onto dirt tracks and, in this sort of weather, you are in the slush. It is a disgrace. I also want to say that still there are no public works projects; after 14 months in office, this government has not put one new project before the Public Works Committee—and there is not one in sight. What has been going on?

I understand that we will be looking at a project in a couple of weeks. It is a \$3 million project, which is below the category that stipulates investigation. We will investigate it because it is something the government intends to do. I throw down the challenge. After all, the Public Works Committee is there to scrutinise government expenditure, but what is being spent? Absolutely—and I am not allowed to say it—B nothing, bloody nothing! It is an absolute disgrace. It is a disgrace.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. G.M. Gunn): I suggest that the honourable member is taking considerable licence and that he not continue in that vein.

Mr VENNING: I do not swear, sir.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I should say 'B all'; that would be better. I will change the record. I do get a bit emotional. I made a speech in this vein two months ago and the minister had the temerity to challenge me. The Minister for Infrastructure said to me, 'Oh, but what about the hydro system on the dam?' If he is listening, I say to the minister, 'Have a look at the project details and note the date. Read the history of this and you will see quite clearly that the mini-hydro on the dam was an initiative of the previous Liberal government.' Fact. End of story. Do not come into this place and say that there are projects, because there are not.

I challenge the minister. If he thinks that I am wrong he should stand up in this place and challenge me. The Public Works Committee is a good committee. I serve on that committee and it is well chaired by the member for Colton. I certainly enjoy it, but I do question why that committee is treated as junior to the senior committees. It should be a senior committee. It works harder than the other two committees, and I ought to know because I have served on them. Also, I plead for adequate funding so that the members can attend the annual conference. It is a disgrace. An annual conference is held in a different state every year.

We are penny pinching and sending only two delegates. I think that is ridiculously wrong. The Treasurer ought to open up his wallet and realise where his priorities lay. Whoever wishes to attend the conference should be able to do so. I plead on behalf of my electorate—all those people who live in Schubert—and all country electorates in South Australia for this government to treat them fairly in this coming budget and to recognise that the people in rural South Australia do not have the luxuries of infrastructure that exist in Adelaide.

All they ask for is a fair go. All they ask for is a reasonable road—a road that is not slushy in the wet weather or dusty and rutted during summer—so that they can drive to their towns. Adelaide has some of the most magnificent infrastructure. The other night I walked along this new bicycle track from West Beach to Glenelg for fitness. What a magnificent structure that is. Most country people do not get a road like that, let alone a bicycle track for recreation purposes. I plead that, in this budget, this government will turn around and give the country people a fair go.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I support this bill, which is essentially procedural and, on this occasion, releases \$1 500 million for expenditure, or authorises those moneys for expenditure, to be undertaken by the government between the time of passage of the state budget and the commencement of the new financial year. In my 13½ years experience in this chamber, such bills have been largely procedural but, of course, they afford members the opportunity to scrutinise the government's endeavours with expenditures to date and also to speculate on what it might do with the moneys so authorised for expenditure in the intervening period.

I pose the question to members: have things really changed and has the leopard changed its spots? In my 13½ years in this chamber, regrettably, that included a portion of time under a Labor government. I can well recall the time of Labor government during my four years in this place under premiers Bannon and later Arnold from 1989 to 1993. I well remember the problems that occurred in the health system under Labor, the problems that occurred within our policing under Labor, the problems that occurred in relation to crime prevention under Labor, the problems that occurred in our education system under Labor and the problems that occurred in transport under Labor.

What we are seeing in this chamber is a case of 'back to the future'. We now have as Premier the person who advised successive and disgraced Labor Party premiers in this state. We now have a government that is starting to bungle in exactly the same way as did previous Labor governments. After eight years of Liberal government and not seeing the complaints coming to my office about problems in getting urgent surgery, in getting important elective surgery, in largely stemming the flow of those problems (as under a Liberal government), we are now seeing them come back

under a Labor government as we see more and more South Australians unable to get the satisfactory standard of health care that they enjoyed previously.

We see a minister who is clearly out of her depth in the way in which she handles the portfolio. Members on this side of the house watch with interest the expressions on the faces of the Labor members on the backbench as they wince and grimace as that minister gets to her feet and bumbles on the floor of the house as further embarrassments in the health system are highlighted.

We are also seeing problems in our electorate offices in relation to policing—the same sort of problems we had under Labor previously which are now coming back to haunt this Labor government, such as having insufficient patrol cars and the disgraceful cutting of funding for crime prevention programs. I doubt that one single Labor member of parliament on the back bench will have the courage to stand in this chamber and support what Labor has done in the area of crime prevention. If there is one Labor member in this parliament who supports what their government has done in slashing crime prevention, let him or her stand up in their place and announce to the parliament that they support what has happened. However, we know that no Labor member will take up that challenge, because they all know that it was a disastrous decision and a cut that never should have occurred. I dare say that their electorates, like mine and like yours, Mr Acting Speaker, are now experiencing the results of that stupid decision made by this Labor government.

In the field of education, I well remember the disastrous situation that we inherited, not just in terms of resources in classrooms, teaching resources and training available to teachers, but also in terms of capital works for education and the sorry state of our schools. I well remember the Paringa Park Primary School at North Brighton and its disgraceful neglect time and time again, budget after budget. Labor governments would promise expenditure on that school but that expenditure was not forthcoming until the time of a Liberal government. One thing I know is that this \$1 500 million that is being authorised for expenditure through the passage of this bill will not see its way towards school maintenance, because Labor is again starting to neglect our schools and let maintenance fall behind as they start to look for the first areas from which to scoop money to start spending on the socialist regime projects that became so notoriously common during Labor governments of the past.

I mention transport, as well. We are now seeing changes to transport routes without consultation with either people who live within the region or members of the public, and I am becoming increasingly frustrated and disgusted at the changes that are occurring without any consideration for the travelling public. We have today heard the announcement by the Minister for Transport about expenditure that will occur on our tram system. That announcement is scant in detail: it does not give a time line for the completion of this work. But I remember with some cynicism that it was a Labor government that opposed the O-Bahn system. Well may they try to hail it now as a success, and a success that they wish to emulate, but never let members of this chamber forget that the Labor government not only opposed the O-Bahn system but did so vociferously through its leader John Bannon, who later became premier.

Labor governments are notorious for not delivering sensibly on public transport. A railway line goes through my electorate, and I know that this \$1 500 million that we are authorising payment of today will not be spent on ensuring

a sensible rail system for the future. I listened with interest to the minister talk about light rail and trams together, but the purchase of heavy rail carriages by a Labor government was one of the most short-sighted public transport decisions that this state has ever seen. Then was the time to convert the heavy diesel-belching rolling stock to a much more fuel-efficient, passenger-friendly and economical light rail system. I know you spoke in favour of the system during the Tonkin government, Mr Acting Speaker. That could have also interacted with the O-Bahn, which is capable of conversion to light rail, and we could have had a sensible public transport system. So, I do not have too much faith that any expenditure by this government on transport will be in the right direction, because its track record is very poor.

We are also seeing dramatically reduced funding for roads, and none of this money that we are authorising for payment today is likely to see its way into roads. After all, it was the Labor government that promised what is now the Southern Expressway budget after budget—in those days it was a third arterial road—but they never delivered on it. Had it not been for a Liberal government, that road would not have been built. But the road is not completed, and one thing we know is that this Labor government will not complete it and the people of the south will not get the road, and certainly this money we are authorising for payment today will not in any way, shape or form go to any part of it.

But it might go towards some Labor party window-dressing, because the Labor Party has created a Minister for the Southern Suburbs and, after more than 14 months in office, is about to open the Office of the Southern Suburbs to go with the ministry. It has taken more than 14 months for them to get around to that. What the office will do—and, for that matter, what the minister does—remains an absolute mystery. So I doubt that he will need any of the \$1 500 million that we are authorising for expenditure through this bill, because that office is doing nothing. The Minister for the Southern Suburbs has been frequently asked questions in this chamber, and every time he has been asked a question another minister has jumped up and answered it for him. I do not believe that the Minister for the Southern Suburbs has answered a single question in this chamber in that role. Southern residents look with cynicism at this Office of the Southern Suburbs: I am not going to the opening of it, although I have been invited, because, in my view, it is an inappropriate waste of taxpayers' money, and I certainly will not see any more money wasted on drinks and nibbles which will no doubt be served at that opening. I do not want to be part of that sort of waste of public expenditure, and I will certainly have more to say about it after that opening occurs.

We have also seen under this government scant regard paid to our coastal resources. The challenge for this government, and one towards which they could put some of the money that is being authorised for expenditure today, is sand replenishment along our beaches. There is no doubt that our beaches are suffering badly, and certainly in my electorate there has been no replenishment of sand since this mob came into office, although the minister at a meeting recently agreed that a small amount of sand will be trucked to Kingston Park. But that will not be enough. We need significant replenishment of sand along our beaches, and this government must grasp the nettle and ensure that that significant expenditure occurs, because once our beaches are gone they will be gone forever. We have seen the area of Hallett Cove in my electorate lose its sand and the surf life saving club close because there is no longer a beach left, and that is a tragedy

for all involved—the local residents as beach users, and the youngsters who used to be involved in club activities.

There is one area from which the government receives money, and that is speed camera revenue. I noticed on a recent list of areas where this government is spending money putting in cameras—they are buying a lot of speed cameras—that my electorate has the distinguished honour, if one can call it that, of having the most people on any one road picked up by speed cameras, and that is Ocean Boulevard at Seacliff Park, a road regularly traversed by southern residents making their way to Brighton Road. Mr Acting Speaker, I know that you have particular interest in such matters, and the location of cameras on this road is interesting because the cameras are always placed on the downhill side of the road where the speed of traffic is reduced from 80 to 60 km/h. So, what they are effectively doing is catching people who are not treading on the brake hard enough to slow their speed. It is a scandalous use of speed camera resources and a scandalous attack on the citizens who drive on that road.

That road, by any definition, cannot be classified as a black spot road. I reflect on the time when we were in government and when I was police minister, and those cameras were placed only at black spot locations. Each location of any such camera had to be justified. Any person complaining about a fine was provided with details of the number of accidents that had occurred on that road over the preceding five years and information as to whether there had been any deaths and injuries involved in those accidents. That is the sort of use to which those cameras should be put, not revenue raising. I recall that the treasurer of the day was not particularly happy because revenue dropped, but if it means that the number of accidents is also dropping because the cameras are in sensible locations—and also out in the open and visible, as they were—that is something that no-one can logically argue against.

We notice that money that we are authorising today also will not be going towards assisting low income earners and pensioners cope with their electricity bills. These are the electricity bills that have gone up by 32 per cent under this government. This government has bungled on electricity. It had every opportunity to deliver competition. It had every opportunity to ensure that prices by now were being driven down, but it bungled and it bungled appallingly.

Over the coming weeks and months in this house, it will be revealed just how badly the government bungled. Before the election, the Labor Party indicated that it would match the undertaking of the then Liberal government that low income earners and pensioners would receive greater assistance for electricity. The government has not done that. It also indicated that it would bring down electricity prices, and it has not done that, either. It has brought electricity prices up and, at the same time, it has refused to give the concessions that it promised. Pensioners and low income earners are significantly worse off as a consequence under this Labor government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: If the member for Norwood or any other member in this chamber who interjects wants to stand up and support the Labor Party's not providing these concessions, let them do so. I know that neither the member for Norwood nor any other member of the Labor Party will stand up in this chamber and support the failure by the Labor government to give concessions to low income earners and pensioners in their electorate. The member for Norwood has a lot of retirees in her electorate, many of them

self-funded, and I am sure they would be interested to learn whether she supported the concession going to them. Did she write to them or tell them that she supported it? However, it has not happened, so it is beholden on the member for Norwood, the member for Cheltenham and many other members to stand up in this chamber and demand fair and equitable treatment for those who are most in need of receiving that sort of government assistance.

We also know that the money that is being authorised for passage today is unlikely to see its way towards mining assistance programs. I know that you, sir, like I are a strong supporter of ensuring that mining in our state is encouraged. Under a Liberal government, the TEiSA program was strongly supported to encourage mining exploration in our state. That program involved the collecting of significant digital data through a variety of mechanisms and making it available to potential mining exploration companies in various areas. On occasions, it also meant the drilling of exploration holes, to enable that data to be passed on to companies to encourage exploration. It bore dividends, because we have seen a massive increase in exploration from those efforts.

However, because Labor has seen an increase in exploration, it has felt that it can cut back on that program, so it has cut the TEiSA program, and I encourage the government to use part of this \$1.5 billion to resupplement that fund in order to encourage further exploration because, if it does not, there is a real risk that mining exploration and new mining start-up will go backwards, and members on this side of the house know full well that mining is an important part of our state's economy.

The mining industry also knows full well that it is facing a Premier who is a long-time opponent of mining in this state and who as a matter of public record is a strong opponent of Roxby Downs. He even wrote a book telling people how they could demonstrate against Roxby Downs becoming a reality and how they could, in his words, boycott BP, which was a partner with Western Mining in the start-up of Roxby Downs. That strong opponent of Roxby Downs, that advocate of no mine in that area, is now the Premier of South Australia. Sir, you and I know full well that that sends a shiver down the spine of every mining operator in this state, because they fear that, under this Premier, under a Labor government, their industry will be savaged, and there are already signs of that starting to occur.

This government has been riding on the coat-tails of its Liberal government predecessor, and my colleague the member for Schubert outlined in his address some of the issues relating to regional South Australia. You, sir, like the member for Schubert, are aware of what has happened to country road funding and the potholes that are now appearing in country roads. Some of this \$1.5 billion that is being authorised for expenditure in this bill today could well be put towards rectification of the problems that we are now seeing on rural roads in South Australia. Again, I doubt very much that it will be.

We have also seen a government that has spoken a lot through its Premier about sustainable energy. In fact, the Premier, through the auspices of a federal government grant, has been able to put a photovoltaic system in his own home to harness the sun's energy and run electricity. Obviously he has paid for some of that, but a significant federal government grant would have been of assistance to him for that program. There was a media conference and much ado about this, but what is the government doing about sustainable

energy? It has put Energy SA into the mining section of government. It has taken electricity and thrown it to Treasury. It has an energy minister who does not have the direct reporting of any executive to him, because Energy SA reports to the Minister for Primary Industries and the electricity staff report to the Treasurer.

This government is totally directionless—totally rudderless—on issues relating to sustainable energy and alternative energy opportunities. The government has rhetoric through the mouthpiece of the Premier and the occasional media conference, but in reality the industry supporting and driving sustainable energy around the nation now looks at South Australia with frustration. I look at it with despair. This money could be used in part to rectify that and re-establish those important drivers and ensure that we move sustainable energy forward.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I support the second reading of the Supply Bill. In doing so, it does not mean that I support all the things to which the government has been applying—or rather not applying—the finances of the state. I take this opportunity to point out some of the failures that we have seen in South Australia over the last 12 months and to indicate why the economy of South Australia will continue to falter over the next few years. As the previous speaker, the member for Bright, has just pointed out, we are going back to the future and we are seeing some of the same mistakes that previous Labor governments have made.

That is a great pity because, after eight years of control under the previous Liberal government, the state was literally dragged up by its bootstraps. It was literally dragged out of the rust-bucket era that it was suffering at the end of the 1980s and in the early 1990s, culminating in the disaster involving the State Bank, the State Government Insurance Commission and a lot of other enterprises which the then Labor government entered into and through which it lost hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money.

We spent eight years resurrecting South Australia, we got the state to a point where it was starting to move forward in leaps and bounds, where we had great impact on economic activity right across the board, and now we have seen that start to slow down and falter. Unfortunately, I think it will come to a standstill, if not go backwards, over the next few years, unless this government starts to do things which, even in some mediocre way, might match its rhetoric. This government is one of rhetoric only: little action but plenty of hot air. I will come back to that in a few minutes.

One of the difficulties I have in addressing this Supply Bill is the fact that this government, which purports to be open, honest and accountable, has refused to answer questions, which it promised to answer as long ago as the last estimates hearings, with regard to the change in emphasis. It refuses to answer questions about the supposed \$997 million in funds that have been redirected from programs under the previous government to supposedly new programs. Questions have been asked month after month; yet the government, which purports to be open, honest and accountable, has refused to give the opposition and the public of South Australia any indication of the programs that have been axed, all \$997 million worth of them.

I will pick up the theme that the member for Schubert talked about, namely, capital works, infrastructure and the lack thereof. The member for Schubert is now a member of the Public Works Committee and complains that the committee has not looked at one project initiated by this government

in well over 12 months in office. For the information of other members who have not served on the Public Works Committee—and I served on that committee under the previous government—I point out that any project with a value of more than \$4 million sponsored by taxpayers' funds automatically is referred to the committee. We can therefore take it that since coming to power in March 2002 until now, virtually the end of May 2003, not one capital works project in excess of \$4 million has been instigated by this government.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Timid government.

Mr WILLIAMS: It is not only timid government, as the member for Waite interjects, but a government with no understanding of the economy of this state. One of the ways the previous Liberal Government resurrected the economy of this state was to start spending on capital works and building important infrastructure. Not only does it provide the infrastructure that industry and the community desperately need, but also it provided during those years substantial employment and economic drivers. About \$1 billion a year was being expended on capital works in this state when I was involved on the Public Works Committee. I do not know how much money has been spent on capital works in the past 12 months, but all projects over \$4 million were a hangover from the previous government.

Not one project worth \$4 million or more has been instigated by this government in over 12 months, and that is an absolute shame. That means that the construction and building industries and the heavy end of the major construction sector are heading for a downturn, because those projects started under the previous government will quickly come to completion and suddenly the construction industry will be looking around and saying, 'Where's the public sector in major construction and funding of major infrastructure projects?', because it is not to be seen.

Not only have we seen no new projects but we have seen money ripped out of a lot of the projects that stood to maintain existing infrastructure. If the government seeks to travel economically into the future without maintaining the existing infrastructure, we will quickly come to the point, as we did in the late 1980s and early 1990s, where we have a very run-down sector of the state and the economy will start to suffer. I will give one example of where money has been pulled out of the maintenance of infrastructure and will have a significant impact on an industry in my electorate. I talked about outback and northern roads. Some millions of dollars has been pulled out of the maintenance of those roads, as you well know, sir.

I have a cattle abattoir in my electorate at Naracoorte run by Teys Brothers. It is a Queensland company and has been in the meat industry for 40 years or longer. It is a very successful company, which came to Naracoorte a couple of years ago and took over what could then only be described as an ailing meatworks with a chequered history over the previous 10 years. They took it over and have been running it on a 12-month-a-year basis instead of shutting it down for months at a time, as had happened previously. They run a full shift, but they would dearly like at some time over the next few years to double the throughput and put on a second shift. They are currently employing about 270 people and, if they put on a second shift, they would employ probably another 120 to 150 people in those works. They will be able to do that only if they can bring cattle out of the north of South Australia. That means that they have to be able to bring those cattle down on our outback roads at a price comparable to

what those livestock producers in the north would pay to ship their livestock into Queensland.

Under the present regime it would cost about 14 cents a kilogram more to deliver those cattle south to Naracoorte (and I am told that the same situation would apply to the meatworks in Murray Bridge—the T & R works) than to ship them east into Queensland and have them slaughtered there. Not only are the cattle being processed in Queensland because of that cost impost but, because the works in South Australia cannot increase their capacity in the winter months when they would like to bring cattle out of the north, they do not have the capacity to have a bigger kill in the spring and summer months. As a consequence, a lot of the stock produced in the southern part of the state are exported live into Victoria and slaughtered there.

Dr McFetridge: Going 'Brackwards'!

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes, going 'Brackwards', as the member for Morphett says. There is a double whammy for that industry in South Australia and we are losing many millions of dollars of our economic activity every year. The key is spending more money on our outback roads. I have heard a lot of people talk about outback tourism and ecotourism, which depends on those roads being in good condition, and that part of the economy is suffering.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: \$16 million.

Mr WILLIAMS: The member for Waite tells me that \$16 million is the figure slashed in the past 12 months. It is impacting on tourism and on industry.

Another issue I will mention briefly is the decision made by the current Treasurer after first coming to power with regard to aged care in my electorate. It has impacted on some other electorates as well. The board of the Millicent Hospital is currently in the throes of building on to its aged care unit and adding another 30 beds. It has the licence to build these beds, which are federally funded. The federal government provides recurrent funds for these beds. Under the previous government the hospital had arranged to borrow funds through HomeStart to put up the infrastructure—the bricks and mortar—but one of the first acts of the Treasurer upon coming to government, even though the agreements in many cases had been signed off, was to cancel those loans because he said that any borrowings through HomeStart via a public hospital would show as a deficit on the bottom line of the budget.

Consequently, the hospitals—and certainly the hospital in my electorate at Millicent and a number of others—had to put on hold their development until they could get some other form of funding. The Treasurer said that the funding would have to come from the department of health budget, but that has not happened. In fact, some 12 months later the Millicent Hospital finds that it is in the exact position it was in when this new government took over and is now borrowing the funds from a government source to build stage 1 of this 30-bed extension. So, in the 12 months it has taken the Treasurer to work out that he was wrong, a number of my constituents, who were in desperate need of aged care facilities, have missed out. Because of those delays and instead of that project being completed late last year, it will be lucky to be completed this year or even next year. We have other cost escalations and people missing out on a service they are desperate for.

People in my community are being told that they have to go to aged care facilities far away from their home and community where they have spent all their life and spend their last days in virtual isolation from their loved ones,

families and friends. It is a disgraceful situation and I hope that this government can do something quickly to overcome the aged care problem, which is a glaring example of where mismanagement has caused much angst to a number of my constituents. The aged care problem exists right across the state.

Last Friday, the Premier held an emergency services summit, and today in the house during question time we heard some noises that it was not a talkfest—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: It was a good summit. Ask the Acting Speaker: he enjoyed it.

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister says it was a good summit. One of the headlines out of that was that the Premier announced that \$21 million odd, I think, would be spent this year on emergency services. He said that about \$9.2 million, I think, would be spent on upgrading ForestrySA fire trucks. I see in last year's capital works program (Capital Investment Statement 2002-03, budget paper 5 from last year's budget), regarding the fire truck replacement program in 2002-03, that it is planned to spend \$5 million on works for ForestrySA, including the following project, 'new works carried forward—fire truck replacement program'. It is listed there that the estimated total cost is \$9.78 million, and the proposed expenditure for the current financial year is \$1.654 million.

This relates to what I said earlier in my contribution about very little action, but lots of rhetoric. Here was the Premier standing up and beating his chest last Friday, saying what a wonderful Premier he is and what a great manager of the budget he is—that he will spend \$9.2 million dollars on replacing the fleet of fire trucks that protect our forests. However, he had already, in last year's budget, reannounced that project. So, this is a reannouncement of a reannouncement. At the same time, he reannounced it minus half a million dollars. With respect to the \$1.654 million that was due to be spent in this current financial year, my best information is that not one cent of it has been spent. Not only has the Premier reannounced a reannouncement—pulled half a million dollars out of it—but also he has slipped it back 12 months. He stood here in front of the media last Friday and tried to make out what a wonderful fellow he was, and how magnanimous this government is.

This government is nothing but hot air, and it frustrates me that, after eight hard years for the people of South Australia, led by a Liberal government, we are about to see all that good work undone, because we now have a government which, as the member for Mitchell said, is interested only in getting media accolades. It fascinates me that the media was hoodwinked last Friday; it fascinates me that the journalists around town did not pick up at least that one. I have not had a chance to go through all the others, but I saw in today's paper (or it might have been the *Sunday Mail*) that the Minister for Transport has tried the same trick. He is talking about more expenditure on roads, whereas we know that millions and millions of dollars have been pulled out of roads.

The reason why we have not been able to obtain the answer on the \$997 million of changed priorities by this government over the last 12 months is that it does not want to admit—it cannot afford to admit—that it has pulled millions of dollars out of those areas which it would purport to support, which it would have us believe are the key areas—health, education and law and order. We see a government that promised to create an extra 100 hospital beds now presiding over a public hospital system, a health system, that has many fewer hospital beds, after all the rhetoric that came out of this lot for a number of years.

We heard during question time today that the number of staff in the education department is being reduced. No wonder government members will not answer the questions which we ask in estimates; no wonder they will not put on the public record exactly what is happening with respect to their previous budget—because the figures tell the facts and give the lie to the rhetoric which they keep espousing.

I note the clock, and I am fast running out of time, but law and order is probably the area where rhetoric has been absolutely larger than life. It has been incredible. There has been no money at all—in fact, there have been cuts with respect to law and order—yet this Premier and this government would have us believe that they are doing something to reduce the crime rate in South Australia, and that they are doing something to get on top of law and order. I attended a seminar which was held in this building last week and which was sponsored by the Democrats in another place. There were a number of speakers from our universities, and Frances Nelson QC, who talked about our parole system, was one of the key speakers. I do not believe that anyone in South Australia with a modicum of understanding of our parole system, of our criminal justice system, would agree with the stance that this government is taking, particularly with regard to parole.

The only system that we have in our criminal justice system today that is trying to do anything to try to rehabilitate criminals is our parole system, and this government is working through destroying that system, purely because it believes that it can get a couple of media hits out of it. It looks good in the media, but it is destroying our parole system and our criminal justice system, and it will make life very difficult for a lot of South Australians in the not too distant future. I urge the government to do something responsible and put money into rehabilitation programs in our prisons, because keeping prisoners in prison, locked up with no chance of parole until the expiration of the head sentence, does nothing to increase the safety of South Australians.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I rise to use my valuable 10 minutes here to talk about the announcement made by the Premier and the Minister for Transport over the weekend which affects my electorate very dearly and very closely, and that is the matter of new trams. As members in this place will know, in my maiden speech I raised the issue of upgrading the tram line between Adelaide and Glenelg and replacing the old trams with new trams. This is the best backflip that I have seen by this government. The Minister for Transport was a PE teacher in his former life, and I think he has done a backflip with a double twist here. But I thank him for that. I was only disappointed that there was not the bipartisanship that this government promised, and that I was not in my electorate on Friday, I think, or Saturday—I do not know quite when they were down there announcing this to the media. It was about 200 yards from my home and about 100 yards from my office. I could have arranged to be there, I am sure, and I would have been more than happy to be bipartisan in supporting what I consider to be an absolutely fantastic step forward. I say 'a step', because there is a long way to go.

I heard the Premier talking about extending the tram line to Norwood. I have maps here of the old network of trams in Adelaide. The old network of light rail and trams not only went to Norwood, but it also extended to Morialta, Paradise, Cheltenham, Port Adelaide, Semaphore, Largs Bay, Henley, Grange—all those good Labor electorates; I am sure they would enjoy having some new light rail going out that way—and certainly down around Erindale, Burnside, Beaumont, Glen Osmond and Springfield, some of the Liberal electorates. It was a very bipartisan tramway that we had then, and I would like to see it remain that way. Something that I do not think we will ever see again is the old Glenelg-Somerton Park horse tram, which, it is interesting to note, was the last horse tram in South Australia. It finally closed down in 1919.

The patronage of the trams is absolutely amazing. According to the figures that I have been given, 2 072 000 people used them in the last 12 months, and just over 2 million people—2 019 000 in fact—used them in the previous 12 months. There was just a small rise—2.46 per cent—over the last couple years. But I guarantee that, with the new trams coming on board (no pun intended), passenger numbers will increase significantly.

The light rail numbers in Western Australia have gone up exponentially. I heard a figure of 30 million, referring to passengers travelling on their light rail system over there, although it is obviously more extensive than our tramline. They are expecting by 2010 that that figure will increase to 60 million. I found a document showing that on 28 December 1936 a record number of 88 422 passengers were carried on the Victoria Square to Glenelg tramline, that is, 8 000 passengers an hour. This represented a tram departing every 54 seconds from Victoria Square. People at that time were certainly keen to ride on the trams, and I am more than keen to see people return to travelling on trams.

The history of transport between Adelaide and Glenelg is a long one. The distance is only about seven miles in the old 'money', and the first transport was a horse and cart. It is interesting that the first horse and cart was pulled by a Timor pony. Those Timor ponies over in Coffin Bay are probably related to the pony that pulled the first cart from Adelaide to Glenelg. Not only is the tram an icon but also the Coffin Bay pony should be preserved for its part in the history of South Australia.

In 1854, the government gave to the people of South Australia the luxury of a macadamised road—a tarmac road—between Adelaide and Glenelg. We know that the government needs to spend more on roads, including country roads, as mentioned by previous speakers. The tram was not introduced for quite a while. In order to upgrade transport between Adelaide and Glenelg—because Glenelg has always been an icon and a place where most South Australians have wanted to visit—to take greater numbers, some people thought that a train would be the way to go.

The Adelaide, Glenelg and Suburban Railway Company was formed back in the early 1870s. It was called the 'suburban' railway because even then one of the destinations was Kensington and Norwood. Unfortunately for the residents of Norwood, that did not happen. I hope that they do get their tramline out there, and I know that the member for Norwood would be keen to have the cafes there serviced by a tram just as the 84 restaurants and cafes down on Jetty Road, Glenelg, would be more than happy to have a brand new tram going down there. I hope that part of this refurbishment will include pulling up the concrete bedding of the tramlines on Jetty Road, because when the old H-class trams,

with their bogies and little suspension, do come down there they rattle and roll and the noise and vibrations cause quite a bit of annoyance to the shopkeepers and the 45 000 tourists who visit Glenelg on any weekend (3 million a year).

The train trip to Glenelg, which commenced on 4 August 1873, was a fantastic trip and one enjoyed by all those who travelled on it to the point where some competition came in and there were actually two train lines operating to Glenelg. The Adelaide, Glenelg and Suburban Railway Company and the Holdfast Bay Railway Company both had train services to the Bay. The trains were old puffing billy types, and I am told that you could not see some of the shops in King William Street and Jetty Road because of the smoke. However, the people certainly enjoyed travelling on those trains. It was on 14 December 1929 at 3 p.m. that the last train left Glenelg for the city. Interestingly, as that train was going back up the old St Leonard's line, the new trams were coming down from Adelaide on that same afternoon. The last train ran from Glenelg to the city on the North Terrace line at 11.45 p.m. on 14 December 1929, and the tram came down at 3 p.m.

At that time, the introduction of trams certainly encouraged people to use public transport, as I hope this government continues to encourage people to use public transport now by this move and expanding light rail in South Australia. The H-class trams used on the lines now are historic icons. They were built by A. Pengelley and Company at South Road, Edwardstown. Unfortunately, we no longer have that sort of industry there now. Mitsubishi is located there, but no tram or train manufacturers are located there. The H-class trams comprised two compartments (and still do), but initially the two compartments comprised a smoker for men and a separate one for women. In winter, the interior of the cars was quoted as being 'as warm and snug as one's own dining room'. The article to which I am referring goes on:

Looking at the finished article, bright as a new toy in its dazzling uniform of maroon, cream and black, it is possible to formulate an idea of the patient attention to detail and thorough workmanship behind these new models.

They are icons, and it is good to see that the previous Liberal government spent \$5 million on refurbishing some of these trams. I was reading a February 2002 copy of the *Trans-Adelaide Express*, and an article on the front page entitled 'New trams for Adelaide' stated:

The State Government announced on 10 January that expressions of interest are being sought from private companies to work jointly with TransAdelaide to upgrade Adelaide's tram service.

It goes on:

The plan will involve the introduction of new articulated trams equipped with airconditioning and low floors. Five of the city's refurbished heritage trams will also be retained.

It seems like a bit of *deja vu* to me, because it is a re-announcement but, at the same time, I am pleased about this, because light rail has a huge future for not only other capital cities but also Adelaide. I know that in Sydney they are looking at putting light rail into the CBD and down Parramatta Road. If they can do it there, they can do it anywhere. I have a photograph of one of the new Bombardier trams (the 'glam' trams) that they are looking at introducing in Sydney, and they appear similar to the photographs that I have seen over the last few days of the new trams for Adelaide.

I encourage this government to continue looking at developing light rail in Adelaide. It is the way to go, and we must not miss this opportunity. The extensive network of trams and light rail we had in the past is something we should look back at and learn from, because electrified rail is a clean,

green way of providing quick, smooth, easy and efficient transport for the people of South Australia. This is a good move by this government. I encourage it, and I hope that they involve me in a bipartisan way in any deliberations involving my electorate of Morphett.

Time expired.

Mr RAU (Enfield): I will start by saying what a privilege it always is to follow the member for Morphett. He always does a great deal to promote the wonders of his electorate, and I think he is doing a great job in that regard. I do understand, and it might be a matter that he can enlighten me a bit more about, that the fact that we do not have trams through most of Adelaide today has a great deal to do with Port Stanvac oil refinery. In fact, I understand that an offer was made to the then state government that we could have an oil refinery on condition that we got rid of our very efficient trams and replaced them with something which could supply fuel to a bunch of buses. Now, we do not have the trams and we do not have the oil refinery. Perhaps that is a lesson for us all.

I want to talk about something different; that is, the question of national competition policy. We hear quite a bit about national competition policy and, in the context of the Supply Bill—where I realise we are considering almost anything but, amongst other things, where our money is coming from—it is probably not a bad idea to work out what national competition policy is about and what it means. I decided that, because I do not know much about it, I would get onto the web site. My staff were kind enough to print out a large volume of material, and I can indicate that it is approximately 3 inches thick in the old ‘money’.

All of the material is about national competition policy. My goodness! What a wonderful read it has been over the last few days. It commences with an overview and asks the question: why do we need competition? Members will be delighted to know that the answer is this: between 1960 and 1992, Australia went from being the third richest OECD nation to the fifteenth. It is interesting that between 1960 and 1990 we went down the slippery slope. Up to 1960 we had apparently managed to be at No. 3 and, as I read it, from the time Charles Cameron Kingston introduced the tariff legislation in about 1903, with the addition of many famous people, including ‘Black Jack’ McEwen, we lived behind a very uncompetitive tariff rule, according to the gurus of free trade, and yet we were the third richest OECD country in the world. Between 1960 and 1992 we apparently slipped to No. 15. According to the authors of this august tome:

The protection from internal and external competition of large sectors of the economy contributed to much of this decline.

That is an expression of opinion. It continues:

What is national competition policy, and how did it come to be? I thought that was a question worth asking, and the answer is this:

National competition policy is about delivering benefits to the Australian community.

I was astounded when I read that. The passage continues:

The success of these reforms—
presumably national competition policy reforms—
has led, through the Hilmer report, to the establishment of this interdepartmental, intergovernmental committee.

They are referring to getting rid of everything that they deem uncompetitive. This group of academics (none of whom,

incidentally, come from South Australia; a couple are from Melbourne; one is from New South Wales; and one is from Queensland) manage this body that goes around pronouncing upon all manner of things throughout the commonwealth.

The way in which the national competition policy works very simply is this. This group of academics considers it their brief to go through legislation in all the states in the commonwealth and, in the case of the states, if they deem legislation not to be satisfactory, they penalise states by recommending to the federal government that certain so-called competition payments not be made. It is about as crude as you can possibly get in terms of a political instrument: you do not comply, you do not get any money. That is how it works.

What is the test that they apply? If the acts in the states are being considered, one would have thought that it would be logical to ask, ‘Is there something wrong with this act? If so, how can we improve it?’ However, that is not what they do. Their starting point is this: ‘There is something wrong with the act. It will be torn up. We will subject it to competition (as we define it, of course), unless you can prove to us that there is a good reason why it should not happen.’ In the law, that is called a presumption. In the criminal court, it is the equivalent of being told that you are presumed guilty until you prove that you are not. I am not sure whether it is on the balance of probabilities or beyond reasonable doubt that we have to prove that we have good reason—

An honourable member: Or beyond any doubt.

Mr RAU:—or whether it is beyond any doubt. However, the burden of proof is on us, not these bureaucrats. I thought I would find out what they were putting their considerable talents towards, and I discovered that, as we speak, around the commonwealth some 1 800 pieces of legislation are being perused by these people. My goodness, are they not doing some work! They have done so much. I could read the list of bills, but I will start with a few of them. They are looking at agricultural and veterinary chemicals, barley and, of course, the single desk there. I will not talk about that because I do not want to upset anybody and cause a problem. They are also considering the Architects Act. I am not a bad drawer and, presumably, I will get the opportunity, through competitive tendering, and so forth, to hold myself out as an architect, because of the anticompetitive element. You must have a degree, and you have to be registered, which is anti-competitive. Why cannot you, Mr Acting Speaker, be an architect? You should be.

They are considering building, children’s protection, the citrus industry, chiropractors, chiropodists, and cemeteries, for goodness sake! Is there a problem with cemeteries? Are we not allowed to bury people upside down, as one of my colleagues mentioned? All these things are having considerable intellectual horsepower applied to them, and we are being threatened with national competition payments if we do not say, ‘Yes, sir; no, sir; three bags full, sir.’ Something is going very seriously wrong.

I thought I would look for what they claim as some of their successes. As one of their initial starting points was electricity, I thought I would look at the annual report that was produced on 13 September 2002. They say this about electricity:

There is now a competitive national electricity market featuring the interconnected electricity grid, incorporating New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia and the ACT. Tasmania expects to join the national market in 2004.

Somebody please warn them! It continues:

One of COAG's main objectives for the fully competitive market is the ability for customers to choose which supplier they will trade with. This enables consumers to choose—

and this is very funny; I think they have a sense of humour—the cheapest electricity supplier and/or to base their choice on other factors, such as the quality of service or environmental factors.

This is the sort of material they are producing. I could go on for some considerable time about this institution and what it is doing, but it seems to me that a short summary might be this. Instead of wending their way through 1 800 bills around this country—interfering in our cemeteries, telling our architects what to do, looking into our chiropodists' shoes, asking our chiropractors whether they can crack a bone—why do they not get onto some real issues, such as the River Murray, and work out why we have all sorts of problems with tradeable water rights across the country, with no uniformity at all? Why do they not pick on a big nut such as that? Why do they not choose something like that which would be for the benefit of our country, instead of worrying whether chiropodists are doing a job that I could do (even though I am not a chiropodist, but I know where my toes are)?

The point must come where enough is enough. We have to change the presumption. The presumption is: if it is here now, there is something wrong with it and you have to prove it is satisfactory. That is completely wrong. I am happy to turn these individuals loose on water. Let them solve that problem, because nobody else has. If they are so clever, they are welcome to that problem. For goodness sake, when we get to our chiropodists, our chiropractors and our fruit and vegetable merchants, cannot we have a situation where this mob has to prove there is something wrong with what is going on, rather than our having to prove that what we are doing is satisfactory?

I do not think it is fair that we are subjected to what amounts to blackmail, where we are told to do things here which are not necessarily the will of this parliament. At the end of the day, we are elected to do a job—to represent the people in this state and make the laws. I think it would be very helpful for all of us if we were able to get on with that task without being interfered with from afar.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Today, I want to compliment the organisers of this year's Cornish Festival, the Kernewek Lowender, which was held in the week 17, 18 and 19 May. It was the 30th year that this festival was held. It is held biannually and, once again, it was a really great festival. The crowds certainly came from all over South Australia, parts of Australia and even overseas to support it.

For those who are not aware, the name Kernewek Lowender means 'Cornish happiness' in English. There is no doubt that it is a very happy occasion for all of us who participate. As the local member, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to participate on each of the key days. On the Saturday we have the inaugural procession through the streets of Kadina, followed by the official opening. This year we were delighted that Her Excellency the Governor, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, opened the Cornish Festival. The only dampener on the occasion was the fact that it rained on and off during that formal opening. However, thank goodness that it did not rain continuously and that the crowds were able to stay around. Her Excellency did a great job in opening the festival.

The Cornish choir sang some beautiful songs. A local lady, Kaylene Graham, sang several items. All in all, with the compere, Gerry Guerin, doing a wonderful job, it was a great

start to the festival. Over many years, I have taken the opportunity to formally do the furry dance on the streets of Kadina.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Yes. As members in this house would appreciate, I got some cheers.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I always wear the top hat. In fact, the top hat I wear was my grandfather's, which he bought in Germany before he came to Australia. It is looking much more worn now after wearing it at Cornish festivals, but I think, 'Well, what's the use of keeping a top hat in top condition in a cupboard somewhere? Why not wear it?' I am sure that Grandfather Meier would not be too upset that it is being worn on regular occasions, although it will need to be re-felted, and I may well have that done before the next Cornish Festival in two years.

Whatever the case, I want to thank my dancing partner this year, Mrs Jeanette Ireland. It was very good to be partnered down the street. Certainly, I have been dancing for many years now. I would simply encourage the younger ones to be in it and, whilst in the first few minutes you miss a heartbeat or two, once you get going, and the crowds are really behind you, it is wonderful to be part of the procession. You have the cheers and the good wishes. It never troubles me if I miss a step every now and then. Certainly, the President, Paul Thomas (who is also the Mayor of the Copper Coast Council) and his wife, Kathryn, have again done a wonderful job in preparing for this festival.

Basically, it takes a good two years to prepare for it. There are so many people to compliment. For much of the time Mr Graham Hancock had to oversee the festival, and I give particular thanks to him and his many helpers. That was the Saturday. On the Sunday, quite a few things were happening. We had the blessing of the waters. The cavalcade of cars was organised by Mrs Mary Jervies. Mary has done it for many years now, and I give full credit to her magnificent work. There were over 800 entries again this year in the cavalcade of cars. It has been a privilege for me to be a part of the cavalcade, courtesy of my parliamentary colleague the member for Schubert, Mr Ivan Venning.

The member for Schubert entered his 1912 Hupmobile for the fourth year. On the first occasion his wife accompanied him but, apparently, it rained. They were both fairly soaked, so Mrs Venning decided not to accompany him in future years. We have been very fortunate that the weather has been fine on each occasion—although it was a little windy on this last occasion. The cavalcade travels from Wallaroo to Moonta Bay to Port Hughes, back to Moonta and then down to Agery and Kadina. Unfortunately, this time, for the first time, the Hupmobile broke down. Whilst the first of the bad noises started in Wallaroo, we managed to get through Moonta but we had to turn off and it conked out shortly thereafter.

We would like to thank the people in the Land Rover who stopped to assist us—I believe they were from the metropolitan area. Having said, 'Can we help?' they gave us a tow to Wallaroo before we had further rescue work undertaken. The good news is that the problem is fairly minor. Simply, the axle came adrift from the drive onto the back wheel. It could have been a lot worse for a very old car, but compliments to Mr Venning on his car. It is a beautiful car for its time. That was the Sunday, and I should have mentioned that on the Saturday we also had the gathering of the bards. We were delighted this year that Grand Bard, John Bolitho, from Bude

in North Cornwall, visited and was able to conduct the ceremonies.

Not only can John speak fluent Cornish but also he is a great entertainer and singer. He loves to promote Cornish traditions and Cornish customs. I want to thank the many young people who participated, particularly the girls who participated in the furry dance and the young people who participated in the maypole dances on several days. I thank the many volunteers who served on the literally hundreds of stalls on the Saturday, Sunday and Monday. There was a magnificent heritage service at the Moonta Mines church. We were very privileged to be part of the 1 200 people present and, again, the Governor was in attendance.

On the Monday we had the Fer Kernewek at the Moonta Oval, preceded by a procession through the streets of Moonta. Again, it was a little rainy on the Monday and, in fact, by the end of the day, at about 4.30, the police announced over the public address system that winds of 100 km/h were approaching and that something needed to be done. That finished the festival fairly quick smart. I know that the Minister for Tourism had hoped to be there and that she was sorry she missed it. Assuming the minister is still Minister for Tourism in two years, I hope she marks the date in her diary here and now.

I hope also that she would see her way clear, again, to make some government contribution, because it was a little hard to find the money this time. I have highlighted that previously but I thank the minister for the support that she does give. It was a wonderful weekend, and I thank everyone who was involved. They were all volunteers and they worked darned hard. It was a very successful Cornish Festival and it is great that the Cornish traditions are upheld in South Australia, particularly in South Australia's 'Little Cornwall'.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I would like to take the opportunity to speak on a matter that has led to an unacceptable degree of distress and frustration for two of my constituents. My constituents, Mr and Mrs B, are now both receiving the age pension from Centrelink. Mr B has only just become a pensioner, while his wife has been on the pension for some time. On Monday, 12 May this year, my constituents arrived at my electorate office with a situation that if it were not so tragic could be regarded only as a comedy. At best, the situation could be regarded as a comedy of errors and at worst, and perhaps more realistically, it was another indictment of the manner in which Centrelink is operated by the federal government.

The 8 April was a highly significant day for my constituents as they were informed by Centrelink that they had become millionaires. One could be excused for thinking that my constituents were overjoyed by this news. As a result of their new-found wealth, Centrelink informed them that they would need to destroy their pension card and that they would no longer receive the age pension. Centrelink also kindly informed them of their new income level, which was a staggering \$2 871 594.46. Unfortunately for my constituents, this newly acquired wealth, which could have liberated them from Centrelink, turned out to be a mistake.

A very efficient Centrelink staff member at the Enfield office did a wonderful job in clearing up the matter, much to their relief. Again, one could be excused for thinking that this was wonderful news and that Centrelink had operated in an efficient and timely manner in resolving the issue for Mr and Mrs B. As they were about to find out, however, this was not the case at all. Just recently Mr B turned 65 and became an

official pensioner. He is quite a fit and well looking man and is looking forward to making a visit to his native country of Ireland and beginning what should prove to be an active retirement with Mrs B.

Mr B was greatly surprised and became somewhat annoyed when he was invited to drop into his local Centrelink office to sign a form which would enable him to be admitted to an aged care facility. Now, being quite distressed, Mr and Mrs B went to the Centrelink office at Enfield to clear up the matter. Mr B, as members can no doubt appreciate, has every intention of living with his dear wife in his home for as long as possible. He has no intention of moving into an aged care facility just yet. The explanation from Centrelink was that a new girl sent out the wrong form. Once that was cleared up, Mr and Mrs B crossed the road and went to a coffee shop for some morning tea in an attempt to recover from what had been a highly traumatic affair. While sitting in the coffee shop, Mr B's mobile phone rang. It was Centrelink calling and wanting to know whether he would like the forms to apply for admission to an aged care facility delivered to him.

That, unfortunately, was not the end of Mr and Mrs B's troubles. Given that he had just retired, Mr B took control of his small superannuation fund of about \$33 000. Mr B became extremely upset when, on 12 May this year, he received a letter from Centrelink wanting to know what he was going to do with the superannuation money he had received and where it was currently located—which is a reasonable request but, given the past difficulties, he became extremely worried following receipt of this letter. He was not sure whether the amount of money he now possessed meant that he would not receive the aged pension.

At this stage Mrs B became extremely concerned about her husband when she saw his state as a result of his dealings with Centrelink. She stated that prior to this episode he had always been a calm and rational person. Only after my office received a letter of explanation from Centrelink stating that they simply wanted to know where the money was being invested did Mr and Mrs B feel somewhat relieved. Unfortunately, this relief did not last very long. Mr B went to pay a bill from money in his bank account, only to find out that Centrelink had paid his pension into the wrong account, in his wife's name. The mistake on the part of Centrelink only exacerbated his already quite considerable frustration and also his bewilderment that such a succession of errors could be made by Centrelink.

The most recent blow came only last week when Mr and Mrs B were informed by SA Water that they were not entitled to SA Water and council concessions because, according to a letter from SA Water:

A recent eligibility check from Centrelink and SA Water has revealed that Centrelink has not confirmed the customer reference number shown above having entitlement to pensioner concessions. As a result, I regret to inform you that it has been necessary for SA Water to cease granting the pensioner concession from the date of the eligibility check.

The letter went on to say that the local council had also been advised of the situation. This, of course, was not true, and it can only be assumed that Mr and Mrs B, along with many other pensioners, received this notification because Centrelink has provided incorrect information or, in this case, failed to provide the correct information.

To assist another constituent just moments before Mrs B came in with her problem, I had rung the telephone number which was on the letter provided by the other constituent and was able to solve the problem quite quickly. All that was

required to sort out the matter was a letter to be sent from Centrelink to the pension cardholder, and they would send it to SA Water and the council, and the concession would be reinstated. However, in the case of Mr and Mrs B, that was not so.

The person at the Centrelink call centre when I rang—this was the second time—said she could not talk to me and knew nothing of the letter which had been sent. I put Mrs B on the line so that she could talk to the operator, and the conversation that I listened to was quite extraordinary. Mrs B was advised that, while a letter could be sent to her confirming that she was the pensioner, she would need to go home and get her husband to telephone to confirm his eligibility personally because of privacy legislation.

When I challenged this, I was told that this may have been because there was a notation on their file that information could not be provided to the other party. If this was the case (and Mrs B assures me it certainly is not), why did they put Mr B's money in Mrs B's account when they had clearly arranged to be paid separately for budgeting purposes?

I think it is absolutely staggering that a federal department with such an important role is subject to such a degree of error. Whilst arguments can be advanced that the sheer volume of people that Centrelink deals with means that errors are inevitable at some stage, the experience of my constituents stretches the boundaries of reasonableness. To see first-hand the frustration and anguish that was experienced by Mr and Mrs B—not to mention countless others who are socially vulnerable—is a harrowing experience. This causes a great deal of confusion and distress for the people involved, particularly when they are going back and forth. Surely Centrelink can do a lot better, because certainly the clients do.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today I again wish to talk about the conscience vote. Before members opposite get up to call points of order, as they did last time, I inform them that I will not discuss the substance of any bill: I will speak purely on the conscience vote and the government's insistence on public perception and its concentration on media spin and not getting to the substance of what it needs to do.

This is pointed out very clearly today in Tony Baker's opinion editorial entitled 'Shalt nots watering down Rann's vision', which states:

What has come to trouble me about the Rann government is that it is so negative.

Its currency is retribution, not opportunity. It deals in the 'Shalt Not' rather than 'What If'.

If we look at what this government has done, we see that that is very much what this government has been about. The article goes on to state:

This Premier wears law and order like a badge. But his law and order seems to be defined solely in terms of ever heavier penalties.

It reads well. But what does it accomplish? Any society contains felons who have to be removed from circulation for as long as possible.

But any civilised society also acknowledges and does what it can to foster the possibility of redemption.

This is a government that is so concerned with headlines that it does not deal with the real problem of law and order. This is the same government that is taking so much out of local crime prevention programs which have been proven to be successful, as has been the case in the Norwood, Payneham and Campbelltown council areas. We have a successful crime prevention program under the leadership of Andrew Patterson, but it has not been given the opportunity since this government came to office to continue its valuable work with

the community, the local Neighbourhood Watch, schools, Housing Trust representatives and other community bodies that have come together to make it a great success. This is a real disappointment and is clearly pointed out in Tony Baker's article today.

Returning to the topic of the conscience vote, I am very concerned that this government has allowed a private member's bill to go through this chamber and the other place without giving a conscience vote to its members. If the government does not want to allow a conscience vote, clearly, as I pointed out last time, according to the Labor Party constitution, I repeat:

On matters that are not subject to national platform or conference or executive decisions or their state and territory equivalent, the majority decision of the relevant parliamentary Labor Party shall be binding upon all members of parliament.

I accept that, but I refer to what the Attorney-General said on 27 April when he stood in front of Parliament House (and I quote from *Focus*, the magazine of the South Australian Festival of Light), as follows:

SA Attorney-General Michael Atkinson told the rally that Labor did not allow a conscience vote because 'no-one asked for it'.

I remember quite clearly that people at that rally said, 'Why didn't you ask?' No answer was forthcoming. I am concerned because, when I asked the Premier in the house on 2 April whether he had received strong representation from organisations, individuals and mainstream churches advocating a conscience vote for the Domestic Co-dependent Superannuation Bill, he replied, 'I'll check.' Later he gave me a written reply, stating:

I have received letters advocating a conscience vote on the Domestic Co-dependent Superannuation Bill. I have also received letters in favour of the Statutes Amendment (Equal Superannuation Entitlements for Same Sex Couples) Bill.

That is not the type of reply that a Premier who models himself on Don Dunstan should give. Don Dunstan would never have given such an answer. On legislation that dealt with reform, as in same sex couple superannuation, Don Dunstan would have given a speech. He would have stated why he supported such legislation. Today's Premier is silent. He does not even acknowledge that he has had strong representation. I know that he has, because I have a copy of a letter from one of the organisations to which the Attorney-General replied, stating:

Thank you for your letter of 12 March, 2003, to the Premier, the Hon. M.D. Rann MP, about a conscience vote on legislation before parliament. . .

How could he check if he handed over the letter to the Attorney-General? I am really concerned that we are not giving these sorts of matters, which should be bipartisan, which should be a matter of conscience, proper discussion. They are just pushed through the chamber without proper debate. If it is a conscience vote, put it before the Labor party room, get a position and say what was decided. Once they have decided, they must defend it in the house. How many members have spoken on those bills in this chamber? The member for Mitchell spoke to them before he left the Labor Party and the member for Florey spoke, as did the minister, the Hon. Jay Weatherill. Others have been silent, but why should they be silent?

For a Premier who spends a lot of time creating the impression that he is another Don Dunstan, I find it difficult to understand why he does not follow in his footsteps. I do not agree with everything that former premier Don Dunstan did, but I admired his courage, I admired his passion, and I

very much doubt if Don Dunstan, as premier, would have said to his deputy premier, Des Corcoran, 'You will not have a conscience vote on this issue.' I very much doubt it because, in those days, as was the case with Lynn Arnold and John Bannon when they were premier, the conscience vote in the Labor Party was valued, and members could express their conscience vote, as did the Attorney-General, for example, with regard to the 10-plant marijuana policy.

This Premier is silent on this very important issue. He cannot say that he wants a bipartisan approach, he cannot say that he is listening to the community, and then dismiss them, as he did with communications such as this. Des Corcoran would not have put up with it, and I cannot understand why members opposite are putting up with it, because I know that they want a conscience vote on this issue. The Premier knows that they want a conscience vote, but he is keeping quiet. If he believes in it, he should make a speech supporting those reforms.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise to speak on a number of issues in this grievance, but I will concentrate on the cuts to road funding in the last budget by this government and the impact of that on rural South Australia, especially the Far North of the state. I will also speak about some of the issues that have been raised with me about further cuts that might well be in the coming budget and my concerns about that. There are also a couple of positives that I will speak about, namely, the Glenelg trams, which the member for Morphett has already spoken about, and Gomersal Road.

I will begin by thanking the minister for resealing the area of Gomersal Road adjacent to homes that were within 100 metres of the road, because, as I raised in a grievance in this house previously, the noise from the road was well above acceptable levels to local people. The Mayor and the CEO of the Light and Kapunda Regional Council and I made a delegation to the minister, who was very receptive, and I am pleased to note that the resealing has been completed. I drove along Gomersal Road only last Wednesday, and I noticed a significant difference when my tyres hit the much smoother surface that is now on the road in front of those homes compared with the bitumen that was there previously.

I thank the minister for that and I hope that has significantly reduced the amount of noise suffered by those residents. I am sure that, if it has not, I will hear about it. It should have made a significant difference. There is still the matter of some mounding in front of a couple of homes, and I am aware that the minister has said that that is now in the court of the local council, so I will be taking up that issue with the CEO of the council in due course, seeking to have that work undertaken in this next financial year.

The reduction in road funding is of great concern in rural South Australia because, in last year's budget, some \$10 million was cut out of rural road funding, and that included the disappearance of the Unsealed Rural Arterial Roads Program (\$10 million), the loss of the Freight Routes Improvement Program (a further \$510 000), the loss of the Regional Roads Program (\$2.2 million), and the loss of the Far North road gang (\$1 million), of which you, Madam Acting Speaker, would be well aware.

With respect to that program, the Economic and Finance Committee of the parliament undertook an inquiry, and I will give members an indication from that inquiry of the figures for road funding in the Far North and what the projected figures are, as follows: in 1999-2000, the actual amount spent on routine maintenance in the Far North was \$9.616 million;

in 2000-01, it was \$6.11 million; in 2001-02, it was \$6.687 million; and last year it dropped to \$5.33 million. That continues to occur for the next four years, so \$4 million is cut out of Far North routine maintenance in the forward estimates for the next four-year period.

Until 2001-02, asset development of some \$3.146 million had been undertaken by the previous government in 1999-2000, down to \$2.329 million in 2001-02. However, it absolutely disappeared in 2003 and has not been reinstated in any of the forward estimates that the committee found. Again, that is of great concern, because this is the resheeting of these roads, and with the vast amount of tourist traffic that now traverses the Far North roads it can only mean that those roads will fall into greater disrepair. The member for Stuart is particularly concerned about this, and only the other day I had one of the hire car companies ring me and say that they will no longer hire cars or four-wheel drives to those people wanting to travel along the Balcanoona to Leigh Creek Road, as some 25 kilometres of that road is now in extremely poor condition with corrugations and desperately needing work. Yet this government has cut that road gang out of the Far North, which means that routine maintenance cannot be undertaken to the degree that it was before. Further, it has meant the loss of some 26 jobs (and that comes from the Economic and Finance Committee Report) in the Far North. We are seeing not only a reduction in road maintenance but also a loss of jobs in an area which can well do without that.

Those rural arterial road programs of which I spoke earlier are of great concern. A number of roads have either been reduced in their scope for sealing or have disappeared off the radar screen altogether. It concerns me when the minister says that he will look at reducing the speed limit to 100 km/h across the state. I wonder (and excuse me for being cynical) whether this will be an excuse to ensure that the government does not have to put in extra funding for the maintenance and upgrading of those roads. It is easy to say that we will reduce the speed limit on a rural arterial road or on those country roads and, as a result, then not have to put funding towards those roads to ensure that 110 km/h is a safe speed at which to travel on them.

I have had representations from Kingston in the South-East about the road through the Coorong and to Beachport. People are concerned about this very issue and suggest that it is just a smokescreen in terms of reducing the speed in order to ensure that the government does not have to put money into that road; they are extremely concerned about that.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As the member for Kavel says, there is a hidden agenda, and he is right. The government will avoid road funding by reducing the speed limit in certain areas, particularly on those sort of roads.

We have also seen some delay in relation to the third river crossing of the Port River. We saw only the other week the Treasurer coming out and saying on radio that it would be a fixed bridge. Suddenly the federal member for Port Adelaide, Rod Sawford, and the local community sprang to arms, and the Treasurer had to do a backflip of a degree of difficulty to say that he did not really say that it would be a fixed bridge—that it was always going to be an opening bridge. It was going to be fixed until he found that his local community would not support him. Many people rang my electorate office and said that they had always voted Labor but, if it took a Liberal person to get an opening bridge, then they would make the change. The Treasurer saw sense in listening to his own

people finally, but that was always the position of the former Liberal Government: that it would be an opening bridge. We are now delayed by some 12 months because of the machinations of this government in not getting on with the job, and that project is only slowly inching forward. I will be interested to see exactly what is in the budget next week in terms of allocation of state funding and tendering in this respect.

I am concerned that I have heard and been advised by various sectors that there will be a \$23 million cut to transport in next week's budget. That is on top of the \$10 million cut last year. That is not being responsible and flies in the face of road safety, about which this government speaks. For the black spot program, the minister said the other day that he will double the funding, but the figures do not add up. Further, a number of black spot projects in last year's budget have not even been started as yet this year. So, it is easy to roll over last year's programs into 2003-04 and claim them as new programs.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I will raise a couple of issues this afternoon in relation to my electorate. The first are concerns expressed to me by the Chairperson of the Eudunda Area School Council, Mr Stan Simper. He wrote to me on behalf of the school council on 12 May, indicating that there is an urgent need to have a full-time school councillor appointed to the Eudunda Area School. He says in his letter of 12 May:

At present, we have a teacher who carries out the role of School Counsellor being given time to carry out the role but not being paid as a School Counsellor. The teacher does a marvellous job, not only giving counselling support to 250 students but also initiating a range of supportive initiatives and programs. We are concerned that, unless he is paid as a Counsellor, we will lose him to a school where he is paid for the role he is carrying out.

He then refers to some of the key issues facing Eudunda and its feeder school, Robertstown, which are:

- Eudunda and Robertstown have been identified as low socio-economic areas, with many families having to deal with issues such as poverty, domestic violence, youth problems, single parent families, child abuse and neglect.
- A lack of public transport is a huge issue for residents of both towns, particularly for the elderly and for young people wanting to access employment and training opportunities.
- A lack of accessible support services for families, for example, for parenting and relationship issues, behavioural problems, and general counselling services. This has placed an extra burden on schools in the area having to deal with serious behavioural issues and the school staff being seen as de facto counsellors.
- A general lack of health facilities. There is no resident dentist or pharmacist. Medication comes from Kapunda. Residents can wait up to two or three weeks to see a local doctor. Child and Youth Health and Children Adolescent and Mental Health Services visit the town once a month.
- The Eudunda Hospital is mainly an aged care facility, although some acute beds are available for emergency. Residents need to travel to Kapunda Hospital for other medical needs.

The Eudunda Hospital is an excellent facility and is well managed, and the people who work there give great service and are dedicated. The letter continues:

- Families need to travel long distances for services, e.g., 60 kms to Gawler, 30 kms to Nuriootpa and 20 kms to Robertstown and Kapunda. The closest Centrelink office is Gawler, which means that people on benefits have to travel 120 kms once a fortnight.
- Lack of day care facilities.
- Isolation is a major factor for many families, particularly those who are not part of the social fabric of the town.
- Increased employment opportunities in the wine and tourist area is attracting more families to the area, which has caused a shortage of affordable housing.
- A lack of organised activities for youth in the community other than sport.

We therefore have a great need to attract a skilled school counsellor. We ask you to support us by funding a school counsellor for our school.

I wanted to bring this matter to the attention of the house because they are real issues, and obviously similar issues apply in other parts of South Australia. As we are discussing and supporting the Supply Bill, which will mean the authorisation of large amounts of expenditure, it is relevant to bring these matters to the attention of the house. I hope that the minister and her staff will examine them. It is my intention to supply the minister with a copy of my submission.

Last Friday, I attended the seminar and conference held in this chamber which dealt with the problem of bushfires. It was pleasing to see so many people present, particularly the volunteers, who give such a wonderful service to the people of South Australia. Following the discussions, it is clear that the overwhelming majority of people who attended that forum were calling for some positive action to protect the community and to ensure that volunteer and other firefighters are not endangered through outdated, foolish and unnecessary laws. The stupidity that has continued to emanate from certain elements in the bureaucracy about the width of firebreaks can no longer be justified. They have been warned, and let me say to this house today: if nothing happens, and people are injured or affected, or if there were to be a tragedy, those people responsible will not be able to get away with it any longer. They have had the warnings, and experts here have pointed out to them the foolishness of their ways. To anyone who expects a fire fighter to go along a 5 metre firebreak and try to backburn or put out a fire, all I say is: you go first, because in many cases you will not get a second opportunity—because you will not be there.

The nonsense has gone far enough. What has happened is that we have stopped people from achieving hazard reduction by burning and grazing. Those sorts of silly laws that apply under the Native Vegetation Act and regulations have to be changed. Otherwise, people will be forced into a situation where they have to break the law to protect themselves and the public against the stupidity of ill-informed, insensitive bureaucrats. What will have to happen is that, every time people get into trouble, we will have to then bring to the attention of the house those foolish people who are administering the situation and harassing farmers and other land managers—and I would have no hesitation in doing so. I bring to the attention of the house the case of a farming neighbour of mine who put a decent firebreak on but who was hindered, harassed and victimised by those nasty little apparatchiks in the department. When there was a fire in the Gawler Ranges National Park, at old Paney Station, they went out there and put in a 31 paces wide break, but if a farmer had done that he would have been prosecuted. I do not disagree with doing it; it was commonsense, and I want them to maintain it. But let us have some commonsense apply over the rest of the state.

I say to you, Madam Acting Speaker, that there will again be huge bushfires throughout South Australia at some time in the future. We have large areas of native vegetation that have not had hazard reduction programs put in place in full; they have not burnt for a few years. Those areas in question will go up, and there will be tremendous dislocation to those local communities, tremendous cost to the taxpayers and danger to property and life as a consequence. We can take some positive steps, and we can apply some commonsense. I urge the minister (and the Premier made the right noises when he opened the discussions) to give people the oppor-

tunity and get on with it. We should not have any more of this negative attitude whereby we want to stop people from protecting themselves.

I believe that people who own land should be able to put firebreaks up to 12 metres along boundary fences and 10 metres internally. They have to be able to carry out, at the right time of the year, some controlled burning off. We did it in the past. I have lit up hundreds of hectares of vegetation of various kinds in the past, but we are not allowed to do that now. So, every time there is a fire, it will come in and those areas will catch on fire. If people were able to burn along the edge, as we were able to do in the past on a cool evening, you can get a 10 or 15 metre firebreak through there and have some chance of controlling it. You have blocks of scrub, which you do not hurt. If burning off Mallee scrub hurt it, there would not be any left in South Australia. It has all been burnt. In many cases, it allows it to regenerate. It does not do it any harm at all. That is why the Aborigines burnt it—so they could create feed for the native animals. We are doing it for other purposes, and to protect the public. The time for talking, for considering and for reports is over. It is now time for action. I urge the minister to get on with it as quickly as possible.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I move:

That the sitting of the house be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): My colleagues may have the notion that the parliament runs the state. However, that is certainly not the view of how it should be, according to the Public Service Association, if the General Secretary, Jan McMahon, is to be believed. In her published instruction to the current government she said:

Engage the public sector, treat it as an equal, an important partner and have a real go at once again making South Australia a national leader.

It is perhaps understandable that Ms McMahon was apparently unaware of the gains made by a Liberal state government, given her political bias. Figures from the latter months of the Liberal government show that South Australia's exports reached a record \$8.4 billion to July 2001, which is a 33 per cent increase, compared with the national average of 22 per cent. South Australia's exports of food products surged to more than \$2 billion. Figures showed a 40 per cent increase in food exports overseas, 20 per cent up on interstate, and a 9 per cent drop on imported food. Royalty payments for South Australian mining and petroleum products reached a record \$106.5 million in 2000-01, up 39 per cent from the previous year. South Australia's world-class Olympic Dam operation is now the world's biggest underground mine, and plans to expand. South Australia's credit rating improved handsomely.

In other areas, South Australia's economy was the fastest growing in the nation. Retail growth outstripped the national average, and unemployment was lower than the national average. South Australia had the highest ratio of health care workers in the whole of Australia, and our retention rate for secondary students was ahead of the national average. Anyone who doubts that the state is worse off under the Labor government and increasing union domination should speak to the people. My office is constantly dealing with problems and complaints arising from the government's

management—or 'mismanagement' is a more accurate word to use. Ms McMahon said:

Let's grasp the opportunity 2003 has presented and together make it the turning point for a better future.

If she means more of what we have already experienced under Labor, then 'better' does not describe the future for our state—although I suspect it may for unions, as they make their bid to gain back membership with the help of their union allies in the parliament, whose party takes a cut of each union due.

Funding for roads has been cut. The Liberal strategy to seal all unsealed rural arterial roads by 2004 was ahead of schedule, and a strategy to seal roads of economic significance was being implemented. That has been abandoned by Labor in its haste to get the funding back to where its voters live. Elliston-Lock was one of the rural arterial roads being constructed. Unfortunately, the government changed, with just 19 kilometres to be completed. This major highway, which is to connect the east and west coasts of Eyre Peninsula, has been a casualty of Labor bias. First the Minister for Transport advised that \$1.2 million had been allocated to seal 10 kilometres this year. Then the distance—and, of course, finance—was reduced to 4.5 kilometres.

The council was advised that the seal for 10 kilometres would be delayed to May 2003, so that the plant could continue in 2003-04 to seal the remaining 9 kilometres. That was sound economic management to cut down on time spent in shifting plant from one job to another. That also has apparently all gone out the window, because the Elliston District Council has been advised that the plant will relocate, do 4.5 kilometres of the road, then disappear again. In case there is any doubt about the minister's broken commitment, I quote from a letter written by the Hon. Michael Wright, Minister for Transport, on 22 August 2002, as follows:

I have been advised by SA Transport that the sealing of the Elliston to Lock road will continue in the 2002-03 financial year. A further \$1.2 million has been committed to the project, which will complete 10 kilometres of reconstruction. The project will be completed in the 2003-04 financial year.

As Elliston council's Chief Executive Officer, David Hitchcock, picturesquely said, 'Notwithstanding the issues of not completing the 10 kilometres as advised, it appears there is more flip-flopping going on than a dying carp on the banks of the depleted River Murray.' Will the minister try to wriggle out of his responsibility by passing the blame onto the Department of Transport, or perhaps to the Minister for Tourism?

Last year, the Minister for Tourism announced with great fanfare that this road would now be called the Sylvia Birdseye Highway. It is a good metaphor of the whole attitude of this government that it is more concerned about media perception and appearance than it is about reality. Only a Labor government could so proudly announce a gravel highway.

Then there is the sideways manoeuvring of funds allocated to specific projects. Let us now talk about education and the Ceduna Area School. The Liberal government budgeted \$5 million towards the first stage of the school's redevelopment. Without notice and without publicity, this was cut to \$3.9 million by the present government, thus jeopardising \$1 million of federal government money under the 2002 capital funding program. This \$1 million had already been received by the state government for the project. Twenty-five other school projects were similarly listed.

The federal Minister for Education took the unprecedented step of advising his department to withhold the further 2002 capital funding program payments until the state government provided an adequate explanation for the delays to school projects for which it had accepted funding.

The completion date for Ceduna Area School was also blown out from September 2003 to September 2005. Once again, Labor has further disadvantaged the already disadvantaged. This is a school that was constructed back in the 1970s by a former Labor government from temporary demac classrooms.

It was interesting to note that \$2.26 million was allocated to a school in Norwood, which happens to be in a Labor marginal seat. I doubt very much that its needs are as great as those of Ceduna Area School. However, Labor governments are far better than Liberal governments in recognising where their best interests lie.

Then there is health. The government made much of its support for health, even though it cut \$24 million from the amount it promised for extra hospital beds. The capital works program was cut by 9 per cent, and city hospital funding increased 7.1 per cent at the expense of country hospitals. Country hospitals received only 2.4 per cent, which was less than inflation. Was this a demonstration of the government's promise to consult with rural and remote communities, like its promise for country areas to share appropriately in traineeships and skills development that saw the wind-up of FarmBiz and the cutting of shearer and wool handling courses, even though students had paid for their courses?

The government's claim of a black hole left by the former government was also proved false, because the last Liberal budget had a \$22 million surplus for the non-commercial sector. This was also highlighted by Labor's partner, Jan McMahon, who called for the Treasurer (Hon. Kevin Foley) to use the surplus to expand the public sector.

The government has had a windfall of hundreds of millions of dollars in stamp duty from the real estate market. In its 12 months in office, the Labor government has managed to change WorkCover's situation from sound to virtually facing bankruptcy. It is ironic that Premier Mike Rann and his minions are considering the sale of WorkCover Corporation assets to fund future operations. These are the same people who were loud in their public opposition to the sale of assets to reduce the State Bank debt, and who opposed the privatisation of enterprise to shift commercial risk from the public to the private sector.

The WorkCover situation is more serious than simply a sale of assets to prop up its operations. The unfunded liability has climbed from \$22 million at June 2000 to \$384 million at March 2003. This is only one of a number of issues that threaten to escalate into another State Bank crisis.

It is a worry rather than a consolation that Premier Rann was a minister under John Bannon. There are two options when income does not meet expenditure. One is to cut spending and associated services, particularly in country regions—and that is the approach of Labor. The other is to increase real income—and that is Liberal's approach. It is clearly demonstrated by Liberal support for aquaculture and the necessary research entailed in ensuring that development is sustained and environmentally acceptable.

The Labor approach was clearly demonstrated last year in its 20 per cent cut to the South Australian Research and Development Unit. Aquaculture has the potential to produce the essential protein needed by the undernourished people in other countries, thus getting them out of the cycle where

periodic starvation is a fact of life. The industry has generated millions of dollars of export revenue for the state, with the potential to increase exponentially.

The government's grandstanding on the environment is similarly unimpressive. Among those we have lost is our environmental health officer, whose territory extended to the Western Australia border, around the top of Spencer Gulf to Jamestown. Remote indigenous communities will probably be the ones to suffer most from this particular withdrawal of support.

I understand that the Water Catchment Management Officer is going, so the work being done on water conservation and the reclamation of salt-affected dry land will be seriously disadvantaged. The work being done (mainly by farmers) on Eyre Peninsula to reverse salinisation has been acclaimed across Australia, and has brought many interstate visitors to see for themselves what they can copy.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Like my colleagues on this side of the house, I would like to raise some matters of concern that I have with the current regime. First, I want to focus my comments on what I perceive as some quite glaring examples of improvements needed in education infrastructures in the electorate I have the honour of representing.

I want to refer to a couple of schools in particular, the first of which is the Woodside Primary School. I want to commend the Principal (Mr Steven Stark), the school council and the collective school community, because they do a tremendous job with what they have available to them. They have seen a quite significant improvement in the landscaping around the school, and this has all been done by volunteers who have been garnered by Mr Stark.

However, there is the other issue of the quite dilapidated state of the infrastructure at that school. I have previously highlighted in the house the need for some quite significant upgrades in the facilities at Woodside Primary School. I have also highlighted previously in this place one particular building the window frames of which have rotted away to such an extent that a small child would be able to place its hand through this hole in the window frame. Some repairs have been done, but they do not use that classroom that often. Plans are in the pipeline to have that building replaced, with another building to be put on the site to accommodate students' needs.

The school is going through the process with the department and the minister's office of looking at a significant upgrade in infrastructure, buildings and the like on that site. They have gone through the initial planning stage, and I understand that it is a reasonably inexpensive process which the school and the department undertake. They are currently about to embark on what is regarded as the feasibility study, and I understand that quite significant funding is required to enable that process to be undertaken. So, that is one school that is currently looking at a feasibility study process.

The other school which is in a similar situation is Birdwood High School, in the northern part of my electorate. That school has gone through the planning stages, and they now require funds to carry out the feasibility study process. The Birdwood High School community has been extremely patient for quite a number of years. The Hon. Kate Reynolds in the other place has been a member of the committee that has looked to facilitate the improvements at Birdwood High School. If you drive along the main street past the school, it looks quite nice a school. It has some nice buildings along the front facing the main street, but it is a bit like a Hollywood

movie set: as soon as you go behind those buildings, you see that the infrastructure is in quite a dilapidated state. I therefore urge the Minister for Education's office to adequately fund that feasibility study process.

The Oakbank Area School has recently been significantly upgraded over the last couple of years, and the minister attended the opening of the redevelopment last year, which I, too, was fortunate enough to attend. Some outstanding needs remain at the school—for example, the toilet facilities were not included in the upgrade. I have inspected those facilities with the principal, Mr Ray Marino, and they are in a very poor state of repair. I urge this government to adequately fund some improvements in the toilet facilities at the school. Similarly, I have inspected the toilet facilities and the infrastructure at Lenswood Primary School, and some urgent renovation is also needed there.

I rang the minister's office, and I spoke to the chief of staff. I recall that the government had an initiative in place, and a special fund was allocated for those schools that had issues with toilet facilities and so on. The chief of staff was going to get back to me with that information, but neither I nor my office has heard from the minister's office.

I now want to turn my attention to another issue of concern in my electorate—the need for continuing road infrastructure improvement. I have spoken about this previously in the house, and I will continue to do so until these matters are resolved. First, I will talk about Hahndorf's main street. As the house should be aware, Hahndorf is one of the major tourism icons in this state. However, the main street is old and narrow and is not coping very well at all with the vast numbers of heavy trucks that use it as the main transport corridor from north to south and vice versa. We see trucks carrying grapes from the vintage in the Hills and delivering grapes from the southern vales travelling to the north into the wineries in the Barossa. We also see the logging trucks from Mount Crawford using the main street of Hahndorf as the main corridor to the sawmills and to the facilities at Kuitpo to the south.

Last week, it was a pleasure for the District Council of Mount Barker and me to host the Minister for Tourism (Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith) and one of her staff to lunch in a very lovely restaurant in the main street of Hahndorf. We discussed several issues regarding the heavy vehicle transport through the main street and how it affects the tourism aspect of the town. As I said, Hahndorf is one of our major tourism icons in this state.

I also want to talk about the Onkaparinga Valley Road, which is the main corridor north and south through the electorate of Kavel. It runs from the freeway at Verdun, near Hahndorf, through towns such as Oakbank, Balhannah, Woodside, Charleston, on to Lobethal, Mount Torrens Road, on to Birdwood, to the Barossa, and so on. The previous Liberal government allocated significant funds to the continuing upgrade of that road. However, at the election last year when, unfortunately the Labor Party came to power, the work stopped. Some significant work still has to be completed on that road, particularly from Charleston through to the Lobethal-Mount Torrens Road intersection.

I urge the government and the Minister for Transport to look at this issue and to commence work in the very near future. Thousands of traffic movements occur along that road every day as it is the main north-south corridor through the Adelaide Hills.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to grieve on three matters. On the last day of sitting, I raised the issue of the Minister for Health tabling two letters in this parliament: one was sent on 29 April from Mount Gambier Hospital to the doctor concerning surgery on a patient who had to go to Ballarat; the other was the doctor's response to the hospital letter on 9 May.

I challenged the minister to table those two letters in this parliament as quickly as possible, and I did so because I believed that the account that she had given to the parliament on the previous day of sitting (14 May) was an entirely inaccurate account of why the surgery had not been carried out at Mount Gambier. Today, I again challenge the minister to table that letter in this parliament. If the minister does not do so (and I am referring to the letter on 9 May from the surgeon involved back to the minister), this parliament will believe what the minister has said to this house about those events.

From my understanding of what occurred, and I have spoken to the doctor and the patient, that account given to this parliament by the minister is entirely wrong. Therefore, it would be a grave injustice to the doctor and the patient if, in fact, that situation were not corrected; in fact, it is clearly a breach of the ministerial code to come into this house and give such a statement to the house. The minister may have believed that the statement that she gave to the house on 14 May was correct. The minister asked me to table the letter, but I do not have it. The minister is able to access the letter, because the letter was sent from the medical specialist to the hospital, and the minister is able to access that letter, because it sits in one of her incorporated government hospitals. I challenge the minister to bring it before this house.

The second issue I wish to raise is that this Labor government is about to impose an 11 per cent stamp duty on all medical indemnity contracts from 1 July. That will have a huge impact on the cost of medical indemnity in South Australia. I will not go into all the details as to why this is suddenly occurring, except to say that there was a mutual organisation (the Medical Defence Association of South Australia) where the doctors, because they were members, were able to access medical indemnity without paying stamp duty. Federal legislation changed that. The federal government has asked the state governments to make sure that stamp duty does not apply to these medical indemnity contracts. The South Australian government has, in fact, declined to abolish stamp duty on these contracts.

The Treasurer has the power to do so. They have been arguing this case with Treasury officials for quite some time. They have sent a letter to the Minister for Health but have had no response, and I am talking here of both the AMA and the Medical Defence Association of South Australia, which cover about 95 per cent of all doctors in this state as far as medical indemnity is concerned. This will mean that, from 1 July, the premiums for medical indemnity will increase by about 11 per cent. What will that mean in dollar terms? It means that an obstetrician would be paying about \$6 000 to \$8 000 in stamp duty to the South Australian government that they have not paid previously.

Also, it means they will be paying stamp duty on the GST component of this. It is a tax on a tax. What it means most of all is that, when we get sick and see a doctor, we will be paying a higher fee to that doctor because, quite naturally, the doctors will have to recover that substantial amount of stamp duty tax that they are now paying to the South Australian

government. When one looks at it, one sees that the 11 per cent is more than twice the stamp duty paid in some of the eastern states of Australia, and that in itself is a very large amount. The Medical Defence Association of South Australia (or its insurance company) pays stamp duty on reinsurance of the risk—it has done so in the past and, quite rightly, it should. But my concern is that the impact of this 11 per cent stamp duty tax will now adversely affect very significantly the cost of doctors getting medical indemnity.

There is one other factor, namely, that some of the doctors who are approaching retirement age are, as a result of the high cost of medical indemnity now, considering opting out and retiring early. In fact, one survey amongst specialists suggested that up to about 25 per cent of those specialists might retire early because of the high cost of medical indemnity insurance. Therefore, the doctor shortage we have in Australia (and certainly within our state in this case) will worsen as a result of this 11 per cent stamp duty being imposed on doctors here in South Australia. The AMA has asked the government to drop the 11 per cent stamp duty tax, and I do likewise, because it is a very unfair imposition on doctors. It is a windfall gain for the government.

The third matter I wish to raise relates to the actions of the EPA. We know that, because of the low flow within the River Murray, water levels have dropped very dramatically in my electorate around Goolwa. Three marinas are now facing enormous difficulties. The water level is so low that approximately half the boats at the marinas are unable to use the marinas because they are sitting on the bottom of the river. Of course, we know that, although the level is likely to rise marginally during the winter, it will drop even further.

I want to take up the case of one of those marinas, the Captain Sturt Marina, which applied and paid the fee to the EPA for approval to dredge the marina, and it did that in January this year. As of late last week, the marina still has not had a reply from the EPA, and I believe that is appalling. Here are exceptional adverse consequences due to the low flow in the River Murray, the marina has paid its fee to the EPA, it has sent emails to the EPA, I have written to the Minister for Environment, and there has been no answer whatsoever. I hold the Minister for Environment responsible. He is the only person I can hold responsible in this parliament.

If this is what the EPA's being independent of a minister is about, I can only say that it is appalling behaviour. I believe that any government agency, whether or not it is answerable to this parliament, has an obligation to ensure that it answers correspondence in a fair and reasonable manner. In this case, the EPA, after three months, has not even had the courtesy to come back with a 'yes' or 'no' in terms of the excavation. In the meantime, people's livelihoods are being put seriously at risk.

The marina also asked—as it will be dredging only a small amount each day because it is very difficult in a marina—for an exemption from the daily \$250 fee that the EPA is asking for. This will mean that the marina will have to pay a fee of about \$10 000 for the dredging of this marina, which it will not be able to afford. I raise this issue because this is only one of many cases where the EPA in the next few months will have to give approval for dredging in the lakes and in the lower reaches of the river. It is absolutely appalling that the marina must put up with this sort of bureaucracy and slow response from the EPA.

Other letters of concern have been sent to me lately about the behaviour of the EPA and, if it is to be answerable to this

parliament and not to a minister and be entirely independent, I will use this parliament to highlight the inappropriate behaviour of the EPA. It appears that, without community consultation, the EPA has granted to SA Water the licence to continue to put effluent water into the Eden Valley River for another 12 months, which is appalling.

Mrs HALL (Morialta): I would like to discuss one issue that is particularly important to the residents of my electorate of Morialta and, I believe, in a wider sense, to the state of South Australia, and that is the relocation of the Magill Youth Training Centre, which is located in my electorate. The issues surrounding this facility are complex and have a history which, I am sure, members of this chamber have heard me and others mention over a number of years.

Sadly, one issue of real concern—and, obviously, it is of concern right now—is what we know to be the nimby syndrome. For years, previous governments have attempted to relocate this facility. On a number of occasions land has been found and agreed to, and we get right to the last stage of finalising the negotiations. After months of negotiation, residents surrounding the existing land that has been agreed to (in many cases by the local council) suddenly protest and another solution must be found.

One issue concerns the amount of dollars involved in the relocation, and another involves planning issues. I believe, most importantly, that the issues surrounding the relocation of this facility involve the future options for young juveniles, that is, what sort of future they will have or be provided with and the prospect of—as we have read in the paper in the last few weeks—some of these juveniles (called clients these days) sharing a facility with hardened criminals who probably have little chance of rehabilitation. I believe that is one of the great disgraces with which this government is faced.

In addition to the condition of the clients are the working conditions and enormous numbers of occupational health and safety issues concerning staff and the social workers who work with these young clients. I believe it is an issue that should concern every MP in this chamber.

We have seen, over the last few weeks, selective leaking of the content of the 2003 budget. Tonight, I want to outline some of the history of the issues surrounding the Magill Youth Training Centre. As I said earlier, it has been well documented in this chamber over the years but, in particular, we know that the previous government sought on a number of occasions to purchase land and relocate it. When the Liberal government left office in March 2002, following negotiations between previous minister David Wotton and previous minister Dean Brown, land had been purchased for about \$750 000 at Cavan and \$22 million put aside in forward estimates to provide for the relocation of this facility.

Over the last 12 months or so, I have asked numerous questions of the government about its future, and I believe it is a very sorry story of procrastination. The first action that I am pleased about took place just two weeks ago, following a question that I asked of the planning minister. I received a response thereto from the social justice minister, who is with us in the chamber this evening. It concerned the three derelict houses that are located on the northern edge of the facility. I said that winter is coming and there will be associated problems involving squatters, used needles and their proximity to the Rostrevor junior school and the number of residents who use the main road. This is a huge problem, and I asked whether the houses in question would be either upgraded or demolished. Last week I received a letter from the minister

and am delighted to report that the minister said the houses in question will be demolished in the very near future. My understanding is that that demolition is due to take place in the next couple of days.

However, my concern is a report in the newspaper on Friday 16 May, the headline of which read 'Juveniles at risk from changes to gaol system'. It is a very selective report that should be of concern to everyone, and I am sure it will be of concern to the residents of Morialta. It states that juvenile murderers will serve their sentences with young people who are on remand and serving time for minor offences under the proposed shake-up of the state's gaols. The article goes on to talk about the intention of this government to sell three prime prison sites to enable a new juvenile training centre in the northern suburbs to proceed. It talks about the sale of the Magill Training Centre, the Cavan juvenile centre and a parcel of land near the Cavan site which had been earmarked as the replacement site for the Magill Training Centre.

I understand that the public service unions and the social workers involved in a number of these facilities are very angry that this could lead to young juveniles coming into contact with hardened prisoners during prisoner transfers in the centre itself, and I certainly understand and have recalled on a number of occasions Public Service Association General Secretary Jan McMahon calling on the government to scuttle its proposals involving this relocation of the Magill site.

We all acknowledge that the Magill site is a prime residential area and, certainly, my memory tells me that the land value was estimated to be in excess of \$24 million, which would provide some capital injection for the relocation itself. I am unaware of the value of the other two facilities.

However, I am concerned that consistently since May of last year I have asked a series of questions in this chamber about the process that would be involved and the timing involved in the relocation of this facility. As I have said, until just two weeks ago the answers I got were at best evasive. There were numerous offers of briefings which were not followed up and not acted upon. However, toward the end of last year I asked about the government's intentions of proceeding under the PPP model, as we know the public/private partnership model. Certainly, earlier this year, Treasurer Foley said that the government had not formally engaged any consultants in relation to this proposal, but was in the process at that stage of engaging a consultant to assist with the analysis of the feasibility of this project.

What I am concerned about is that if this is indeed the way the government is going to proceed then we are going to have to go through this process all over again and the time frame is going to be pushed out by at least a couple of years. Quite frankly, if any member of this chamber were to visit the facilities that exist out at the Magill Youth Training Centre, they would be absolutely shocked, because the facilities out there are nothing short of a disgrace. It is a facility that was built in the 1970s and, with all the complexities and time problems concerning this, it really is an appalling mess. The prospect of both the people working there and the clients themselves having to deal with these issues for years into the future is just appalling. I very sincerely believe that the clients and the workers at this facility deserve better; they do not deserve to have to go through more years of waiting. I understand the government not wanting to spend money on upgrading the existing facilities, but there would not be one person in this chamber who would want to have any associate of theirs either working at or having to live in the facilities provided. What concerns me is that, although this government

is very big on the rhetoric of how important child protection is, this is an example of where it surely is scandalous.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I would just like to make a brief contribution. I know the member for Schubert is anxious. I refer to Black Road, which is the boundary of my electorate and also the boundary of the member for Davenport. Finally, after a long time—longer than an elephant's pregnancy, which is a fairly long time—we are going to get an upgrade of Black Road. The City of Onkaparinga is putting in approximately \$1 million and the Department of Road Transport \$3 million.

Unfortunately, between the planning of a few years ago and last Wednesday night, a few things seem to have slipped off the plan. I have written to the minister about those omissions, and I will highlight them tonight. I believe that, if you are going to upgrade that very busy road, which carries approximately 13 000 vehicles a day, you should do it properly and not simply do a nip and tuck cosmetic job. The old plan was for four lanes, but the community are happy to have only two lanes. They also want adequate street lighting and traffic lights, particularly at the junction of Glenalvon Drive and Black Road. They also want a roundabout, either at the junction of Manning Road or the nearby junction of Oakridge Road.

Those facilities would help break up the traffic and assist people living in the side roads adjoining Black Road to enter Black Road with safety. Otherwise, there will be a continuous convoy of cars in both directions which encourages people to try to sneak out onto the road, making a very dangerous situation. I implore the minister to take on board these requests. Our area does not ask for a lot, and I am sure the member for Davenport would be supportive of my request because I know what the people of that area want. The people in the southern part of his electorate were, up until the last election, in my electorate.

I also ask the government to reduce the speed limit as the road reaches Sturt Approach, which comes off Black Road, to the east of the planned roadworks. I argue that that road, which enters the electorate of the member for Davenport, is very dangerous, given the current speed limit of 80 km/h on Black Road and the slip lane provided for traffic to enter it. While it is not in the scheduled upgrade, it does adjoin it, and I ask that the minister, through his department, address that issue, as well. I do not want to see a family waiting in that slip lane harmed as a result of someone travelling at 80 km/h along Black Road as they near the junction of that road and Sturt Approach.

Another issue that is of interest to me is technology high schools, and I urge the government to introduce them, a mark 2 version of the old technical high schools. This has been a hobbyhorse of mine for many years, and I have been lobbying the Premier, the Minister for Education and Children's Services and the minister responsible for further education. Technology high schools encompass advanced electronics, robotics, and modern technical and trade training. I know that the Department of Education and Children's Services is not flush with funds, nor is any government department, but one possibility would be to put them under the umbrella of TAFE. The TAFE campus at O'Halloran Hill has excellent workshops and classrooms that could be used as one of the sites for a technology high school. The other suggestion is to have one in the northern suburbs.

I have written to the federal minister, Brendan Nelson, who is very supportive, and he has written back to me saying

that he will support the funding of the high schools if the government agrees to introduce them. I have written back to Brendan Nelson asking whether that means extra money or within existing provision, and I am waiting for an answer on that. Irrespective of that issue, I believe that we should have technology high schools. They would be first-class institutions.

Although not exactly the same as the New South Wales model, they would follow that concept, and young people would literally queue up to get into them. We are talking about young people using their hands and their head in a way that is not catered for in the current comprehensive high schools, and I do not believe it ever will be, because comprehensive high schools try to be all things to all students, and that is just not realistic or feasible, given the cost, for example, of providing advanced computing resources and advanced machinery of one kind or another.

It would be a great thing if the state government looked at implementing and introducing technology high schools in this state. They would get great acclaim in the community and, importantly, it would give many of our young people a greater opportunity to develop their skills in a whole range of technologies, leading to a worthwhile career.

Another matter of interest is the SHARE program, which is the Sexual Health and Relationships Education Program in schools. I have supported it and I continue to do so. It is a trial program. No child takes part in the program unless the parent agrees that their child can participate. Rather than saying 'child', I should call them young people, because it targets years 8, 9 and 10, and by that stage most of them are a minimum of 13 years, so the ages range upwards of that. Despite criticism by some people who are ill informed, the program does not promote homosexuality; nor does it promote sexuality. What it does promote is awareness and understanding of relationships and an understanding of human sexuality. For people to say that it has a bias towards homosexuality and encourages people to be lesbians and so on is absolute nonsense and is totally inaccurate and misleading. People who should know better have quoted from the teachers' resource book, trying to make out that some of the reference material available only to the teachers is part of the curriculum and it is not. Parents in state schools have always had the right to withdraw their child or not have their child participate in a sensitive program such as this.

This program has been developed, in terms of involving parents through focus groups, on an extensive basis. It was developed in conjunction with La Trobe University. It was funded by the previous government, so I am somewhat perplexed to find people in this house and in another place attacking the program in the hope of short-term political gain; they are harming our young people. We have one of the highest teenage abortion and pregnancy rates in the western world—something of which we should not be proud—and the only way we can tackle the issue is to make young people aware of the risks and consequences of their behaviour.

For anyone to suggest that the program promotes promiscuity, homosexuality or any other type of sexuality is completely untrue and misleading. I urge people to look at the program with a fair and open mind, remembering that it is a trial and will be reviewed. It is being offered only in selected high schools, and students are included in the program only if their parents agree and if the parents themselves participate in the parent information sessions, which are part and parcel of that program. As a community we should be mature enough to tackle the issue of human sexuality and make sure

that our young people are properly informed so they can make wise decisions and not go down the path of ignorance perpetuating one of the highest teenage abortion and pregnancy rates in the western world. I do not think anybody wants that, and I am surprised that some of the critics of the program are not applauding the fact that we are trying to reduce some of those unacceptably high rates of teenage pregnancy and teenage abortion.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): It is a great idea that the house is continuing during a meal time. We should do that always, particularly on issues such as this with members debating grievances or private member's bills. It is a great idea. I want to raise a very important matter affecting my electorate. South Australia's rich and diverse primary industries are the backbone of the state's rural trading and way of life, and the development and encouragement of new ventures is a duty of the state. That is essential in ensuring that primary industries remain progressive and utilise new technologies and practices. Perhaps even more important is the protection of jobs in rural parts of South Australia, which in turn secures local economies and standards of living.

My electorate enjoys one of the widest varieties of primary industries of any region in our state, ranging from broadacre farming to our world famous viticulture enterprises and less well known ventures such as fruit and nut orchards. Many areas traditionally used for cropping and grazing are now being changed into orchards. I find it heartening to hear of a new business enterprise that involves some element of change from conventional primary practices to the production of new crops or breeds. It demonstrates that rural communities still possess initiative and preparedness for hard work. However, it is not so heartening to hear that those who strive to make their mark in a new industry are misled and/or mistreated by government bodies whose primary function is to foster the development of regional growth and expansion.

I have been contacted by a constituent of mine who has endured such conduct from the Murraylands Regional Development Board. My constituent purchased a wheat property, with the intention of establishing an almond orchard costing \$6 million at Walker Flat, upstream from Mannum on the Murray River on land that you would say was not exactly pristine. It is away from the river—in fact, quite a distance from the river.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It is a great skiing spot, as the Treasurer says. The project is to be completed over five stages, with the first stage now being completed. The infrastructure costs involved with the project total \$1.5 million, with power expenses alone—that is, connection—costing \$232 000. It is forecast that, upon completion, the orchard will employ at least 12 people, which is without question a boon for the local area, particularly an area like Walker Flat. I am sure that members present, in particularly those opposite, acknowledge the significance of such a project and the value of government support for such projects.

It was a cause of great alarm to hear from my constituent that apparently the Murraylands Development Board has taken back earlier undertakings regarding financial grants for the almond project. With the considerable costs associated with this project I have already mentioned, the project was launched with assurances that an application for a grant would bring government support to fruition. However, upon submitting the application, my constituent was told that any financial support would only go towards government

associated costs such as electricity access. This feedback was a major impediment for the project, with financial reprioritisation and restrictions required to ensure the project stayed afloat. My constituent was then advised that an interest bearing loan of \$100 000 could be arranged at a rate of 6.8 per cent. All I can say is: big deal! Interest from the government's purse! This proposal makes little sense, seeing as how a loan of \$100 000 could be arranged anywhere with a bank for 6.4 per cent. This clearly demonstrates an unwillingness to work towards healthy development within primary industries and is absolutely shameful.

There are further complications. Under the former Liberal government's sound management, my constituent was advised that water could be allocated to the project. The project had been budgeted with this in mind. Now, under the direction of this Labor government, my constituent has been told that no water is available. It cannot be allocated, and it cannot be leased. Another 100 acres of trees are to be planted but no water is available. Coupled with this, it is a fact that the plantings from stage 1 are now at a period of rapid growth that requires considerable amounts of watering, but no water is available. My constituent has been advised that the government is simply waiting for it to rain and that will literally wash away all the problems. If it does not rain, 20 per cent cuts in allocation will be implemented. This is the case all the way up and down the river to the border, and all the way downstream to the lake: rural and regional industry is being put on hold by the Labor slash and burn approach to primary industries funding.

I hope to speak to the minister involved in this, and I hope this 20 per cent does not apply to industries such as this, because this water is critical. I hope that the minister will enable certain critical industries to have certain dispensations in relation to the 20 per cent across the board cut. The criteria required for a grant have been changed dramatically and without any justification. Since Labor has come to government, rural and regional South Australia have suffered, and this is just another example of what Labor thinks of people living outside Adelaide and its—Labor's—sphere of interest. It is most distressing. However, we must give hope to people like my constituent, and anticipate that delegated bodies such as the Murraylands Regional Development Board somehow find a way to carry out their function, despite the best attempts of the government to prevent it from happening. I inspected the orchard a few weeks ago, and I was most impressed. It is a very professionally laid out project. The almond trees are doing very well. It is grossly unfair that governments give people an expectation. The project begins, the money is spent, and then the expectation is not delivered. That is unfair and untenable. I agree with my constituent that he has been unfairly dealt with, as he was put into a lot of financial difficulty as a result of this project.

In the few minutes I have remaining, I want to raise the issue of the loss of the Barossa wine train. I am concerned that the train has stopped running. I question why this is the case. I would have thought that the minister and others would make some public comment about that. The Barossa wine train has just stopped, apparently because of insurance costs. I really want to know why. Is it just because of insurance? I have also heard that the government is considering extending the Gawler express into the Barossa. I plead with the government to at least, on a trial basis, extend the Gawler train into the Barossa, particularly the express train travelling to Adelaide. I think the government will be surprised at the result and the patronage that the service would receive. I will

be contacting the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Tourism in relation to this matter and, hopefully, we will see the rebirth of the wine train very shortly. I know that there are buyers for it.

I also want to raise the issue of poker machines—and we had the discussion in the house today about North Adelaide and the poker machine fiasco and the cap. In my electorate there is a small town called Palmer, and the most important business in town is the Palmer Hotel. It does not have poker machines. People are trying to save Palmer. The hotel owner is doing all he can to put Palmer back on the map: it is a great little town. The hotel is the centre point in Palmer, and the owner wants people to have a social life and to put some heart back into the town. But, because there are no poker machines, people drive straight past the Palmer Hotel, 17 minutes down the road to Mannum, where there are pubs and clubs with poker machines. What chance does Palmer have to save itself if it cannot get any poker machines in the hotel? As you know, sir, poker machines in a little place like Palmer mean a social life. It means that there is some activity in the town. It means cheap meals for the citizens, particularly the older citizens, and it means an activity, so that people can stay in their home town without driving down the road.

It concerns me that North Adelaide Football Club can obtain a dispensation. If that is the case, why cannot the small community of Palmer? I cannot see any difference. The licensee in Palmer has my full support with respect to this issue. I called there last week to see him, and he is very upset about it. Unless he can get poker machines in the Palmer Hotel, it will not exist. If the Palmer Hotel goes, that is the end of the community of Palmer—another small community down the drain, which is very sad. Certainly—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: You voted for a freeze.

Mr VENNING: Certainly, when we vote for a freeze, as the Treasurer has said, there is always someone who gets caught. There is a committee to adjudicate on issues such as this. I hope that the committee will adjudicate, and that the Palmer Hotel will be granted the right to have poker machines.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I would like to pay tribute to a couple of clubs in my electorate. The Mitchell Park Sports Club has been in existence for a long time, and it serves the residents of Mitchell Park and the surrounding areas very well—not only the playing fields, but also the facilities offered by the club house. I would like especially to mention Leanne Parker, who has been running the club for at least a few years now. She has done an excellent job in maintaining the life of the club. There are, of course, a lot of affiliated sports clubs, and I will not go through them all. One of the remarkable features about the club is not only its vitality but also the fact that it is able to achieve this without gaming machines. That makes it quite extraordinary these days, when almost every licensed premises that can do so has those gambling machines.

I would also like to mention the Marion Sports and Community Club. It has seen a few changes in the last year or so. In terms of the infrastructure, there has been a major redevelopment of the entrance and, after lengthy negotiations with Marion Council, and with the assistance of government funding, the committee has been able to manage the development very well and it is now a much more welcoming and friendly approach to the club.

I would like to pay tribute to the long and fruitful chairmanship of the committee of John Allen. He is being replaced

after about 10 years in the chair by Daryl Gray. Daryl Gray has shown the same enthusiasm for the club. I was sitting with him at the head table of the Marion Cricket Club presentation night recently, and it is great to see that as chair of the club he is involved in a number of the functions related to the various affiliated sports clubs; I think there are about 17 clubs affiliated with the Marion Sports and Community Club. Another recent change was the retirement of John Cadd, who was a very effective and able manager of the club. He was replaced by Terry Zajec, who had previously been Treasurer on the club committee. I am very confident that with his financial background Terry will be able to continue the good work in managing the club and enabling it to grow even more.

If the government had a couple of million dollars to spare it could be put to very good use in developing the sports precinct on Sturt Road at Marion. It is home not only to the Marion Bowling Club and the Marion Sports and Community Club but also Souths basketball club. I am very proud to be associated with the Souths basketball club but, regrettably, they are forced to work miracles on two old basketball courts in what is effectively a barn of a building. They really have enough players and teams to warrant four courts, they are so busy; and there is a vision for that sporting site whereby numerous clubs could be combined, the site rationalised to some degree and perhaps a basketball stadium rebuilt closer to the existing clubhouse. I would like to see that in my time in parliament, but I know these things take many years to progress.

I turn now to a different topic, and that is the question of the government's so-called law and order campaign. It is a misnomer, because I believe that what we are really debating is crime reduction, whether the populist measures introduced into the parliament by the government and whether the rhetoric actually do anything to reduce crime. That is what we all want: we want a reduced crime rate. I am indebted to the Law Society and in particular people such as Marie Shaw QC who have done a lot of research and prepared some very insightful submissions into this issue. I did not take the opportunity to refer to these submissions in particular when legislation was recently being dealt with before the house, but I would like to make some points of general application. I will quote from submissions of the Law Society in relation to the proposed criminal law changes. I am referring to a draft, but I can see that it is substantially a finished product. It states:

In the 12 month period from March 2001 to March 2002, the South Australian imprisonment rate increased by 1.7 per cent (the highest increase in Australia), but the crime rate has continued to increase. That is, the increase in imprisonment rate had no positive impact on the crime rate. South Australia's imprisonment rate is above the natural average. This is to be contrasted with Victoria where a Labor government adopts policies aimed at reducing the imprisonment rate. Victoria has the lowest imprisonment rate and crime rate in Australia. Victoria's imprisonment rates are consis-

tently the lowest in Australia, 42.2 per cent below the national average. Victoria's spending per capita (per head of Victorian population) is the lowest in Australia at only \$39.52 per head of the population compared with almost twice that in New South Wales (\$71.09). South Australia's is \$68.16.

In 2001-02 the overall Victorian crime rate decreased by 4 per cent. In the category of drugs, there was an overall reduction of 10.7 per cent. . . In 2001-02, for the number of recorded offences, crime in Victoria decreased by 2.8 per cent. This was the largest decrease in recorded crimes since the mid 1990s.

I will draw some conclusions at that point, without quoting further. The fact is that there is no scientific basis to suggest that locking more people up for longer will reduce the crime rate, and reducing the crime rate is what we all really want. However, the government seems to be insisting that it will win votes by vilifying not only criminals but also their lawyers.

In defence of lawyers, and I am a legal practitioner myself, I sincerely believe that the basic principle underpinning the work of the criminal bar in Adelaide is the protection of people's rights. No matter what a person has been accused of, they have a right to a fair trial. That is the basis of our justice system. If we have the Premier and the Attorney-General seeking to erode that principle for political gain, we are straying into very dangerous waters indeed. The Attorney-General knows this, and he knows what he is doing. When he has been questioned in radio interviews, he does not come up with any convincing explanation as to why these measures are being undertaken. It is sufficient for him to say that it is being done because it is popular, and that the government said it would do it, and that is that.

It is not really good enough, particularly for an Attorney-General. More to the point, it is wasting money. It aims to put people in prison for longer, and it will very shortly necessitate the building of at least one new prison. That is money that should be spent on health, education and all those other social services which the people of South Australia really want.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ROAD SAFETY REFORMS) BILL

The Legislative Council insisted on its amendments Nos 1, 3, 4, 15, 17, 27, 33 and 35 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

GAMING MACHINES (EXTENSION OF FREEZE ON GAMING MACHINES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 7.09 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 27 May at 2 p.m.