

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 17 September 2003

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

## POLICE, STAFFING

A petition signed by 455 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to continue to recruit extra police officers, over and above recruitment at attrition, in order to increase police officer numbers, was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

## TORRENS RIVER

The **Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.D. HILL**: I am pleased to inform the parliament that the clean-up of the River Torrens has been completed following the spill of 15 000 litres of diesel in July this year. The spill caused havoc for local wildlife, killing 20 birds and leading to the removal from the Torrens of 165 birds for decontamination by the RSPCA. Nine pelicans were returned about three weeks ago, and all are reported to be safe and well. Three ducks have been released at Pinky Flat today, and the remaining 110 birds will return to their home this Friday.

The cost of the remediation following the spill is estimated to be \$200 000, although this does not account for the labour costs incurred by the EPA, Adelaide City Council, the RSPCA and the Department for Environment and Heritage. The government wants those responsible for this spill to be held to account. The investigations unit of the Environment Protection Authority is now finalising a comprehensive report on the causes of the spill, and a file will be sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions at the end of this month. The DPP will determine if TransAdelaide and/or United Goninan will be charged over the spill. I am advised that a report on the fuel delivery system at the site has already highlighted several deficiencies.

The government shares the community's anger that this diesel spill could happen. The most important task now is to prevent any repeat of this incident. Therefore, the EPA has commenced an audit of all industry along the River Torrens and its storage of hazardous waste. If industry along the River Torrens is not doing the right thing, it will be caught out by the Environment Protection Authority. The government wants industry to be scrupulous in preventing damage to the environment. That is why the government has substantially increased the fines available to the EPA for organisations or individuals that cause harm to the environment either intentionally or through their negligence.

Mr Speaker, I want to put on record the government's appreciation for the work done by and the dedication of all the organisations and volunteers involved in the clean-up, including the Adelaide City Council, the EPA, the Department for Environment and Heritage and the RSPCA.

## EDUCATION, PORT LINCOLN

The **Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. P.L. WHITE**: Yesterday during question time, the member for Flinders asked a question in relation to Department of Education and Children's Services planning in the Port Lincoln region and a report she believed had been prepared. The member claimed in a press release she distributed today that 'the report was completed last year at a cost of \$250 000; however, the minister has obviously not sighted it yet.' The member's assertion is incorrect. There has been no such expenditure. I can inform the house that my department has advised that, to date, \$48 535.79 has been spent on undertaking an investigation into schooling needs in Port Lincoln. That amount includes the salary of an officer who was tasked earlier this year with gathering information for the department on options for Port Lincoln's schools and kindergartens.

A preliminary draft was supplied for evaluation, and that evaluation revealed that further work needed to be done. Since that time, further demographic analysis and traffic studies have been initiated. Clearly, some preliminary work has been done on a range of matters associated with the potential impact of city redevelopment on education service delivery in Port Lincoln, but the proposals being discussed are a lot larger than just the delivery of education services. There are a wide range of other interests in Port Lincoln to be considered.

## LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr **HANNA (Mitchell)**: I bring up the first report of the committee.

Report received and read.

Mr **HANNA**: I bring up the second report of the committee.

Report received.

## QUESTION TIME

## WORKCOVER

The **Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition)**: My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. When did the minister first receive WorkCover's June 2003 quarterly performance report that late yesterday afternoon he admitted to the house having received?

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations)**: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I am not sure of the exact day, but—

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT**: I do not walk around with dates in my head of when I receive draft reports. That is not what I actually do. I do not walk around with those dates in my head. But, I am more than happy to get that date for the Leader of the Opposition. As I undertook yesterday, I will bring back further information to the house. I contacted the Leader of the Opposition before I did that late yesterday afternoon, and I provided that additional information to the house. In regard to this draft report which the leader seems

to be hanging a lot on, as compared to audited accounts which incorporate the actuarial assessments adopted by the board, the quarterly performance report is significantly less important. But, obviously—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question is a very serious question, as all questions are. I refer to the advice I gave to honourable members yesterday: if they want to have a conversation with another member in another place they should not attempt to conduct that conversation at cross purposes with the interaction that is going on between any other member and the chair and the whole house by yelling across the chamber. As I said, pick up those parts of your torso you consider to be relevant and go and sit beside the other member and put those parts down with you and have the discussion. The honourable minister.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** Thank you, sir. As I said, if it is of great importance to the Leader of the Opposition as to which day I received this draft report, I am happy to bring back that detail to the leader.

### NUCLEAR WASTE DUMP

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What is the purpose of the notice in today's *Advertiser* about the federal government's planned national nuclear dump and what can my constituents do to help stop Canberra's dump from being established near Woomera?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** Members in the house may have noticed on page 23 of today's *Advertiser* an advertisement by the South Australian government in relation to the public consultation process that the federal government must undergo before it is able to build a dump in our state. We were very keen to make sure that all South Australians knew that this consultation process was in place, and the small cost of around \$7 500 was—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** It is small compared to the \$300 000 that your federal colleagues are prepared to pay to advertise and promote this proposition in the state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The member for Davenport likes to be the cheerleader for the federal government's dump in our state, and I am happy for him to be that, but perhaps he would like to wait until I finish my contribution and then he can tell the house why he believes that a radioactive waste dump should be placed in this state. He might like to write to ARPANSA or to John Howard and put his point of view. This government would like the majority of South Australians who are opposed to the dump to take advantage of the opportunity. There are two things that they can do. The notice invites—

*The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Bright will withdraw that imputation. I heard the interjection. I do not often hear interjections, but I heard that one.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** Which imputation would you like me to withdraw, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** The one that the minister is lying.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** My words were, 'Tell the public the facts. Tell the truth.'

**The SPEAKER:** I heard 'Tell the truth.' I do not engage in debate, nor does any other Speaker in any other parliament. The honourable member for Bright will withdraw.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** To allow the proceedings of the house to continue, sir, if that is your desire I will do so.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member will withdraw without qualification.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The notice that has been published by ARPANSA invites South Australians to put in a submission in relation to the dumping of nuclear waste in our state. Under the federal legislation, the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA) must undertake public consultation about the health and safety of South Australians and the environment before it can issue a licence to allow the federal government to construct its dump in this state, or indeed anywhere else. I am told that that will include a public forum in Adelaide in December. As we know, South Australians are overwhelmingly opposed to this dump. The Rann government will always stand up for the views of South Australians and defend our state's position and our state's laws. The reality is that, under state law, the construction of a radioactive waste dump at Arcoona Station near Woomera is illegal. The federal government wants to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Methinks they protest too much, sir. The federal government wants to compulsorily acquire land because it is intent on establishing the dump in South Australia. It said the site was chosen because it is the safest place in Australia, but last week the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister, the Hon. Peter Slipper, let the cat out of the bag when he admitted that other sites in Australia could also have been found to be equally safe. In fact, Mr Slipper said:

It was possible that there were other sites in Australia, apart from the three sites mentioned in paragraph 28 above, which could have been shown to fully meet the stringent siting requirements set out in the NHMRC Code.

The proposed nuclear dump site—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens and the member for Davenport need to have a tete-a-tete side by side either within the chamber or I will offer them the opportunity to take that outside.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The reality is that the commonwealth has admitted that there are possibly other sites in Australia which may be equally as safe. Its whole proposition has been based on the notion that this site near Woomera is the safest place in Australia to store the waste. That has been blown out of the water with the admission last week by Peter Slipper. The public of South Australia have a right to know that, and a right to put their concerns directly to the federal government. They can do that by putting a submission in to ARPANSA, and the constituents of the member for Torrens can also do it, as can the constituents of all members in this place, by writing directly to John Howard and telling him exactly what they think.

I think the problem has been that the commonwealth has decided to put it in our state because we are a small state, the Liberal Party at a local level agrees with the proposition, and they are taking us for granted. So, it is up to the public of this state to say 'no' to John Howard's radioactive waste dump.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** On a point of order, sir, the minister quoted only one line from a letter from the parlia-

mentary secretary, Mr Peter Slipper. Given your previous ruling about tabling documents that are quoted from, I ask whether you will instruct the minister to table the complete letter.

**The SPEAKER:** So ordered.

### WORKCOVER

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister for Industrial Relations inform the house what is the level of unfunded liability of Workcover Corporation as stated in the WorkCover June 2003 quarterly performance report that yesterday the minister confirmed having received?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. As I have said before, in terms of the current status of the unfunded liability in the current circumstances, the most responsible thing to do is to use the actuarial assessments that are adopted by the board. It is not in the public interest for the government to speculate about these matters when more reliable information is available periodically.

Does the Leader of the Opposition want audited accounts? He is a former business person and well knows how to run a business. Does he want the actuarial assessments adopted by the board, or does he want figures from a draft report which may well be changed by the board? It is in a draft format and it may well be changed. The reliable information is the actuarial assessment that is adopted by the board.

Also, it is no secret, because I am on the public record as saying—I think I have said it in parliament and, if I have not, I have certainly said it publicly—that the figures for the unfunded liability may get worse before they get better.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** No, I have said that before. That is the nature of a long-term scheme, which Workcover is.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** I have a supplementary question. Will the minister now table the quarterly report which he has here in the house?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** No, I won't.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** On a point of order, sir, in answering that question, the Minister for Industrial Relations I think quoted from the quarterly report—

**An honourable member:** No, he didn't.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN:** Well, he was talking about the quarterly report, and I therefore ask him to table that quarterly report.

**The SPEAKER:** Was the minister quoting from the quarterly report?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** No, I wasn't, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister was not quoting from the quarterly report.

### SCHOOLS, BRIGHTON SECONDARY

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services state whether Brighton Secondary School choir is due to tour China, the previous trip having been postponed?

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** Yes. I am pleased to say that Brighton Secondary School choir will do so. The school and my department are putting the final touches on the tour itinerary, which will see the choir leave for China in November. The

government did commit to another trip to China for the group, once the health risk had abated, and that has now happened.

Last April, the Department of Education and Children's Services decided that it must bring the Brighton Secondary School choir back from a tour of China when the SARS epidemic was in flight. The decision was made after receiving upgraded advice from state, national and international health agencies, which clearly recommended that the tour to China be postponed. The advice was the most current information based on the existence of the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) and the belief that it originated in mainland China. The prime concern of the government of that time, which in turn directed the decision, was the health and wellbeing of those children. Now that the health scare is over, I am glad to announce that the government has delivered on its promise that this tour would go ahead. The department explored and pursued many options in trying to recoup funds lost due to the late cancellation. I pay tribute to Singapore Airlines for the assistance it gave in honouring unused legs of the journey.

Brighton Secondary School has an enviable reputation. As many in this chamber know, in music in general and in the choir work in particular—

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

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** It did indeed produce the Hon. Paul Holloway. I am not sure whether he can sing, but he certainly had the opportunity, having gone to that school. I have been told that a junior choir recently performed in Sydney, coming second in the secondary section, which is a remarkable achievement, and the Minister for Infrastructure tells me that in celebrating the September 11 memorial service in Adelaide the choir was beautiful. Other ministers were there also. The choir will be away for over three weeks and I am sure it will be a great ambassador for South Australian education during its travel. It will visit cities such as Shanghai, Beijing and Yuan (home of the terracotta warriors), and I know the house will join with me in wishing the students, teachers and others travelling with the group the very best of luck for the tour.

*The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** No, member for Bright, I am not accompanying the tour, even though I wish I could.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** By way of supplementary question, will the minister tell us whether her department will cover the costs of providing relieving teachers at Blackwood High School and Brighton Secondary School? There are other ancillary costs outstanding. Will she assure the parents of the Brighton Secondary School students that all costs will be covered, that they will not have to do any more fundraising and that the trip will go ahead without any further personal expenditure?

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** There was a question about Brighton Secondary School—did you say something about Blackwood as well?

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** Apparently there is a cost involved in—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Dr McFETRIDGE:**—allowing one of the members of Blackwood High School to go on the trip, and the cost involved in paying for his replacement at Blackwood High School is about \$5 000. There are other ancillary costs associated with putting on the trip again, which is a matter

between the minister's department and the school. I want some assurances that every cost—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked his question. It is not a debate.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** There were a few questions in there. I was not aware of the Blackwood High School connection, but I will find out about it for the member. The department is covering various costs—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Education and Children's Services does not require the assistance of the Minister for Infrastructure.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** There are costs associated with expenses paid by the choir up front and they have been covered. They will be able to have a successful tour. As to the Blackwood High School connection, I will find out and bring back a response.

### SKA RADIO TELESCOPE

**Mr O'BRIEN (Napier):** My question is to the Premier. What is the current status of the South Australian bid for the square kilometre Array radio telescope that could be located in the far north of our state?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** The South Australian government is working closely with the CSIRO on building the case for a site in northern Australia for this \$US1400 million project. The national project aims to develop the world's most sensitive radio telescope, which is 100 times more powerful than any current telescope in existence. The astronomical community is looking for the best location in the world to site the SKA, and South Australia is one of the bidders. A site at Murnpeowie Station north of Leigh Creek (or Mumpee, as the locals like to call it) has been identified as a result of work led by the Department of Business, Manufacturing and Trade with the assistance of several other government agencies.

I congratulate the minister for his leadership in this area. Our site has all the requirements of the International SKA Steering Committee, including the facts that it is exceptionally radio quiet, it has a low population, the area has stable land forms, the land is flat, there is low rainfall and it experiences few electrical storms. It will also have significant benefits in technological and scientific knowledge transfer.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

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

**Mr BRINDAL:** The house has currently before it the question of addressing questions without notice. Ministers have chances to make ministerial statements, yet the Premier seems to be reading word for word a statement under the guise of an answer to the question, and I ask you, sir, whether this is the appropriate use of question time?

**The SPEAKER:** I have noticed for several years that intelligent ministers who wish to be well informed bring with them what they anticipate will be the nature of inquiries made of them in the house during the ensuing day or so, and that there is no reason or rule which precludes that practice. However, I note that, more and more, ministers (perhaps because of the care and analytical skill of their advisers) seem to have greater quantities of such preconceived responses; and if, notwithstanding that, the Premier, or any other minister in such circumstances, could have made a ministerial statement, it might have been better if they had done so.

In this case, neither the honourable member for Unley, the chair nor any other member can anticipate what was in the mind of the member for Napier in the lead-up to question time today; and just because, coincidentally, he has made an inquiry of the Premier, for which the Premier already has some explicit notes, is no reason for the rest of the chamber or anyone else to be suspicious. The Premier.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Thank you, sir. I guess that, as Chairman of the state's science council, one of my roles is to educate members of parliament on important astronomical matters, and I will continue to do so. It will also, of course, have significant benefits in technological and scientific transfer. A meeting of the International SKA Steering Committee was held in Geraldton in July. The South Australian site was presented to the committee along with Western Australian and New South Wales proposals. Other sites being considered throughout the world include South Africa, the United States and China, with Brazil still considering its position.

All the Australian sites received strong support, and I would like to say that this is an area of strong bipartisanship, which I know members opposite will support. From an astronomical perspective, sites around latitude 30° south, such as Murnpeowie, look directly at the centre of our home galaxy, the Milky Way, and are therefore obviously preferred. A list of questions about the Australian sites is being prepared by the international steering committee, which will guide further work on proving up our sites.

The South Australian government is continuing to undertake research on the Murnpeowie site in supporting its bid and to answer the international committee's questions. These include:

- preparing the necessary legal framework to protect the site over the 100-year life of the telescope;
- further radio frequency interference work to confirm the silence of the site;
- looking at the opportunities for renewable electricity sources to power the SKA, including the hot rocks power concept for northern South Australia; and
- preparing a business strategy to ensure that South Australian companies can maximise any opportunities that arise from the project.

This is obviously a giant long-term project. The successful country probably will not be decided until early 2006. The strength of the Australian bid is in our natural attributes: the size of our country and our low population. The telescope's role will be to answer the big questions about the formation of the universe. It could also have a significant role in supporting deep space missions, including manned missions to other planets. I understand that members of the opposition, especially the member for Flinders, have been as excited as I and the Minister for Business have been about the prospects of South Australia securing this significant project. So, I look forward to continuing bipartisan support on our bid to secure the next generation of telescopes, 100 times more powerful than any currently in existence, to power the next generation of deep space research.

### MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier instruct the Minister for Industrial Relations to adhere to the government's ministerial code of conduct and advise the house today of the level of unfunded liability of WorkCover Corporation as stated in the June 2003 quarterly

performance report? On several occasions earlier this year, yesterday and again today, the opposition specifically requested that the minister provide details of the level of unfunded liability of WorkCover Corporation. According to points 2.6 and 2.7 of the government's ministerial code of conduct, 'ministers must provide information to the parliament when requested to do so' and, further, 'ministers are obliged to give parliament full, accurate and timely accounts of all public money over which parliament has given them authority.'

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I understand that the WorkCover Corporation reports to parliament in its annual report. An outstanding board has just been appointed to run the WorkCover Corporation, and we saw what happened under your tutelage. I believe that the minister has already answered the question.

### HILLS FACE ZONE

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** My question is to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning. What is being done to ensure that the residents of the Tea Tree Gully area are given the opportunity to have their say on the hills face zone review that is currently under way?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning):** I thank the honourable member for her question and acknowledge her keen interest in this topic on behalf of her residents. I suppose that the first, most significant step that we have taken to assist the public in having their say is to have actually generated a hills face zone report. Planning SA is holding a series of meetings to discuss that report and is receiving submissions both by post and on line until the end of the month. Many South Australians are rightly concerned about future development affecting the hills face zone and how this will affect our city.

The hills face zone Issues and Directions report encourages further discussion and comment about options for the future management of the hills face zone. It presents an overview of the hills face zone and its role in metropolitan Adelaide, identifies critical issues facing the zone and, importantly, proposes a number of management processes to deal with these issues in the future. Future options being considered by the hills face zone steering committee and now through this public consultation process include maintaining the status quo, that is, leaving councils responsible for both the policy and assessment environment.

The second option is an expert authority that is set up on a regional basis to do the assessment of the hills face zone and then finally an establishment of a hills face zone act. That is another of the options that are considered will do both the assessment process and also the policy development process.

I need to stress that the Issues and Directions report is not a final report. It is one that has been prepared to generate further discussions, hence the need for the public meetings. Initially three public meetings were scheduled. However, at the member for Florey's instigation, a further meeting is now being held in the Tea Tree Gully area, and that has been scheduled for this evening. Four public hearings on the report will be held in the evenings from 7 to 9 p.m. There was one on 4 September at the City of Mitcham chambers. There is to be one on 17 September, this evening. The member for Newland is concerned about this issue, and she will have her opportunity this evening for two beautiful hours at the City of Tea Tree Gully Council chambers to put her views and represent her community in the fashion in which she suggests

it should be represented. So, we look forward to seeing the member for Newland at the City of Tea Tree Gully.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** A further meeting will be held on 18 September at the Onkaparinga Catchment Water Management Board at Aberfoyle Park. I invite the community to be involved in this issue, a crucial backdrop to metropolitan South Australia and an important part of the world which serves to define the character of metropolitan Adelaide.

### WORKCOVER

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Further to the minister's statement yesterday in which he admitted being provided with a short list of five candidates for the position of CEO of the WorkCover Corporation, on what date did the minister first receive that list?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** I will be happy to get that date and bring that back to the member for Davenport.

### YOUTH, SOUTHERN AREA

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** My question is directed to the Minister for Youth. Minister, is the government developing any new services which support young people in the southern metropolitan area?

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice):** I acknowledge the member for Reynell's tireless efforts, along with those of the member for Kaurna, to make sure that young people in the southern region have access to resources and services. Just recently I had the pleasure of opening a centre which aims at increasing local employment opportunities for young people in the Aldinga-Sellicks Beach and surrounding areas. The Department of Human Services and the City of Onkaparinga have jointly funded the Aldinga-Sellicks youth enterprise centre called the Vault. The service aims to support young people between the ages of 14 and 25 years in the local area. The centre will be actively seeking members in the community to assist them with acting as mentors to young people to help them and support them in applying for jobs, being involved in training and education, and also making links between them and local industry. At this launch it was very important to see a number of people, particularly local business people, because they support the concept of this partnership between the state government, the non-government sector and also between local government.

Having had the opportunity to talk to people who work at the Aldinga-Sellicks Enterprise Centre, as well as some of the young people who are using that service, I have been really impressed to find out that this service is highly regarded. It has also been working very closely with a good initiative that I know that the shadow Minister for Youth, the member for Unley, also supports, where we have youth advisory committees in each of local government areas. I think I have reported in this house previously that all but one local council has decided to take up that challenge to ensure that there is a focus on young people at a regional level. The Aldinga-Sellicks Enterprise Centre is an example of where that partnership has been taken further, and it will result in education, training and employment outcomes for young people.

The Office for Youth and the various non-government youth groups are looking at ways of ensuring that young people not only become empowered and involved in what is happening in their community but also, as I said, gain employment and training. In particular, I compliment the young people who have put together the programs that are available. I also congratulate the Aldinga-Sellicks Enterprise Centre, which, as I have already said, is a great model of cooperation in the community. Again, my congratulations particularly go to the member for Reynell for her input and also to the member for Kaurana for his ongoing input not only as a local member but also as the Minister for the Southern Suburbs.

### SEX EDUCATION

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. As a result of the SHARE steering committee's recommendation on sex education in schools in or about June this year, a letter was sent to parents seeking consent for their children to participate in surveys and the right for parents to view the survey at an appointed time. Why have parents been denied the opportunity to have a copy of the survey?

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** The member for Bragg has not provided much information about exactly what she is claiming, that is, which parents have been denied which survey at which time. An evaluation is being done by La Trobe University on that particular program and I do know that—

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

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** The member for Newland should not comment on things about which she obviously knows very little. I repeat—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will answer the question.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** I repeat: La Trobe University is conducting an evaluation. I do know that surveys have been distributed at least in one school, and possibly other schools are at that point. I will question that particular school, or any other schools, which have distributed surveys. However, I do know that parents are asked to provide consent for their child to partake in the survey part of the program as well.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** I will have to find out whether there is any validity to the claims the member is making. She seems to be—

**Ms Chapman:** Have you read it?

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** Yes, I have read the survey. The member seems to be implying that a parent somewhere has been denied access to a survey in which their children are being asked to participate. However, I do know that they have to provide their written consent for the child to participate in the first place.

### JACOBS CREEK TOUR DOWN UNDER

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** Will the Minister for Tourism tell us how the government is promoting the 2004 Jacobs Creek Tour Down Under and what this year's event will offer?

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mawson knows he is on thin ice, and now he has drawn the blow torch in his direction. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism):** I thank the member for Norwood. We all know of her interest in cycling but, more particularly, her question goes to the heart of the opportunities for tourism with the Jacob's Creek Tour Down Under. The visitors who come to the event are of particular significance. Of course, there are the competitors and those people involved in the cycle race, but more important to our economy is the impact that the event has on our tourism numbers.

I am very pleased to say that from the time this government came into office we have recognised the opportunities for cycle tourism and therefore have promoted particularly opportunities to bring in visitors who will be involved in cycling events, as well as be spectators of the event. In the coming year we will be forming alliances with marketing groups around the world to package holidays that will include flights, accommodation and the opportunity to be either a member of the Club Tour Event or participate in the special events that we add on to this cycling race, which is now the number one event on the Australian cycling calendar.

The opportunities this year include the National Women's Criteriums, with women for the first time being involved in their own event; the veterans' race series for over 35s; the Men's Criteriums; the Be Active Tour, which takes the place of the Break-Away Tour in previous years; and the opportunity to be involved in the gala dinner which, this year, will be badged as the Legends Night.

Marketing for this event has already paid dividends in that last year we had 11 000 interstate and overseas tourists, which compares very favourably to the number of interstate and overseas tourists who come for the Clipsal 500 race. This year 100 European and Australian champion riders will compete in six stages over 735 kilometres. I am pleased to tell the member for Norwood—and I know she will be pleased—that we again will have a race start in Norwood. The events will include rides through the East End, from Norwood to Kapunda, Goolwa to Victor Harbor, Unley to Hahndorf, through the Willunga district and through both Adelaide and North Adelaide.

This event is of particular significance, and one of the main reasons for visiting France in relation to the Tour Down Under was the opportunity, as far as I am concerned to be interviewed on Eurosport by David Duffield, which interview went to 92 million homes—

**An honourable member:** Did you speak in French?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** Part of the time. I understand that the program sometimes has a patronage of 250 million viewers in Europe, because cycling is a major tourism event.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** I reassure the member for Unley that nobody was interested in the tourism minister, except they were fascinated to hear what Adelaide has to offer. They were not interested in me—I was promoting Adelaide, South Australia, our vineyards and the opportunities for tourism, because that is all that really matters.

### SEX EDUCATION

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What arrangement has the minister made to facilitate compliance with regulation 110

of the Education Regulations 1997 in respect of the sexual health and relationships education program being trialled in schools? If no action has been taken, under what authority has the principal exempted students' attendance in the program?

On 17 July 2003, the minister announced that in relation to the course referred to parents had the opportunity to give consent for their child to enrol and participate in the course rather than seeking an exemption from participating—namely, an opt-in rather than opt-out. However, regulation 110 of the Education Regulations 1997 provides only that a parent, by application in writing to the principal, may seek permission for exemption from attendance on health education courses specifically concerning sex education.

On 19 May 2003, Mr Alistair Dow, superintendent of the learning areas in the Department of Education and Children's Services, as recorded in the minutes, advised:

The department regulations state that such curriculum topics are opt-out rather than opt-in. But the department has changed this arrangement—

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** On a point of order, we have five minutes available to members for grievances after Question Time. Is this a question or—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier is quite right, but this is not a grievance: it is an explanation. I am following it in close detail.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** The quote was:

The department regulations state that such curriculum topics are opt-out rather than opt-in, but the department has changed this arrangement to comply with the minister's and CEO's commitment to have this course opt-in.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** One has to ask where the member for Bragg is coming from. We have had her stand up in this place and complain about the fact that the government has lifted the bar for access to this particular course. On one hand, we have her spending all this time going out there saying 'It's evil, it's evil,' changing her positions, and saying, 'Withdraw it, don't withdraw it; some parts are good; change it; withdraw it again.' She is all over the place, and now she comes into the house and says, 'We don't think it should be opt-in; we want it opt-out again.'

**An honourable member:** Where are you coming from?

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** Well, the member should understand. I know that the member is a lawyer, so I would have expected that she could read the regulations and understand them. Regulation 110 basically says that a parent has the right to write to a principal and request that their child not participate in such a program involving sex education. The regulation further states that the department shall not include that child if that happens. That is a minimum requirement.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** I do not have the regulation in front of me, but that is its meaning. I am familiar with that regulation, as I am familiar—I hope—with all the clauses in the principal act, as well as the regulations.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE:** I hope I am. The very clear reality of that particular clause in the regulation is that it is a minimum requirement. This government has raised the bar. This is a trial program and, for their children to get into it, parents have to provide their written consent. Under previous governments it was an opt-out provision. This government

has taken it further than the minimum regulatory requirement and required consent to get into it. So, the member is quite wrong when she says that there is some breach here, and her argument does not make sense. Here she is, after trying to run a campaign about whether or not we have sex education in our schools and saying that she wants the program scrapped, coming in here and saying that it should be compulsory and that everyone should be in it. This government has said that for children to get into it written parental consent is required. So, the member is not correct. I suggest that she think a little more about what she is saying, because the bottom line is that this government has raised the bar. How can she sit there and criticise that in the light of all that she has been saying? It is quite hypocritical for her to do so.

## AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** Will the Minister for Transport advise the latest news regarding the proposal to transfer control of air traffic control at Adelaide Airport to the eastern states? The safety operations at Adelaide Airport are of vital interest to every South Australian, but particularly to people who live in my electorate, some of whom live directly under the flight path of the airport.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** I thank the member for West Torrens for his question and his ongoing passion for this issue. The government's policy is to oppose the transfer of air traffic control from Adelaide to Melbourne. Air Services Australia is responsible for en-route air traffic control within terminal areas and airport control towers. Air Services Australia is a self-funding federal government business enterprise.

En-route control of all air space for which Australia is responsible has been consolidated into two control centres, namely, Brisbane and Melbourne. Terminal control units are responsible for air traffic control by radar within a 55 kilometre radius of an airport and are progressively being relocated to the Brisbane and Melbourne control centres. For example, the Canberra terminal control unit has been relocated to Melbourne and the Coolangatta terminal control unit to Brisbane. Relocation of Adelaide, Sydney and Perth terminal control units has been under consideration for some time. The federal transport minister had already ruled out the relocation of the Cairns terminal control unit because it would hurt the regional economy.

On 11 July 2002, I wrote to the federal minister to detail the state's opposition to the proposal to relocate Adelaide's air traffic controllers, and I wrote to him again on 3 June this year. The government's opposition to the relocation is based on the job losses to the state and the likely additional cost to industry to satisfy safety considerations. I am pleased to advise that the Air Services Australia board has now recommended to the federal minister that the relocation of the Adelaide, Perth, Sydney and Cairns terminal control units be deferred to some time between 2010 and 2012.

The board has recognised that the cost of undertaking the relocations in the face of entrenched staff opposition is too high, compared to the benefits that could be gained. Additionally, many of the benefits of relocation can be realised through better staff management without relocation.

Another factor in the decision was the substantial economic cost to the states of the loss of skilled jobs. This is good news for the state, and I reiterate my thanks to the member for West Torrens for his support of his constituents.

## SEX EDUCATION

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg):** Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise, with respect to the survey of students participating in the sex education trial in South Australian schools, who granted 'ethics approval' and 'research approval', and when will the minister provide copies to this parliament?

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** There is an ethics approval process that involves the department and any institution carrying out research with children, teachers, or employees of our department. I will supply to the house the names of the individuals who give such approvals.

## METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** Will the Minister for Emergency Services advise what steps the government has taken to address recruiting levels in the MFS?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services):** It is very important that we make clear what this government does to support our emergency services in order to make sure that they run as they should, particularly as the member for Mawson, who is not present in the chamber, was agitating last week in the media that there was some species of crisis and that there was a failure on the government's part to recruit, which will be shown later to be the most extraordinary piece of 'a whited sepulchre', which I think is the best biblical reference. It was also put that excessive recalls were causing crisis at the MFS. I can report that this financial year three drill squads will commence: one of 18 recruits commenced last week, and the next two are planned for January and April 2004, resulting in the employment of 54 new firefighters, filling all reasonably anticipated shortages that will arise.

The one small grain of truth the member for Mawson had was that there has for some years been a problem with recalls in the Metropolitan Fire Service. We had the failure of the previous government to properly recruit, and the other was that it created the most intractable mess when it came to promoting officers. We have had to recall people because the previous government wrecked the promotion process. After a lot of hard work on the subject, the first examination for the station officer promotion process was held on 9 September, and it is expected that approximately 40 senior firefighters will be promoted to station officer by December this year, again putting the service back on an even keel.

In addition, eight station officers will be promoted to district officer and three district officers to commander by April 2004, solving inherited problems. We have to do so much work as a result of what we saw under the previous government, which we can compare with its history in office. In 1995-96 it recruited no firefighters; in 1996-97 it recruited no new firefighters, but re-employed one previously employed firefighter; in 1997-98 it recruited no firefighters; in 1998 something must have gone wrong as it recruited 20; and, in 1999-2000 it was back to its usual form and recruited no firefighters.

**Ms Rankine:** No wonder he is not in here.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Yes, it is no wonder the member for Mawson is not here. It has been a long time since I heard from him. We heard from him only on talk-back because he thought I was out of the state—that seems to be his speed. Having answered it in the house, the member

having raised these issues on talk-back radio, the honourable member got a response from me. I am very grateful that firefighters, and in one case a firefighter's wife, rang up to set the record straight and put on the record, as ordinary participants in the service, just what a dreadful job the previous minister had done and how we were getting things right. I hope the member for Mawson enjoyed his recent talk to the Auditor-General.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Emergency Services has given his answer and the member for Schubert will be down with Port Power sooner than he would like to be.

## ELECTRICITY GENERATION

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright):** When he listens, my question is to the Minister for Energy. Will the minister detail to the house what progress, if any, his government has made in one and a half years to secure additional electricity generation to South Australia? The Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council states on page 3 of its annual planning report to June 2003 that:

There have been no new announcements by proponents of commitment to the construction of additional scheduled generating capacity in South Australia, resulting in a static supply situation.

Further, it states:

New sources of supply into the state will be required to maintain reliability of supply in future years.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy):** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr Williams:** You're all talk!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I have not said anything yet, but I am all talk, according to the opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** We are just counting your questions—it has been very dull. I am very pleased that, eventually, the opposition's spokesperson on energy has asked me a question. It was very interesting because, during the week, the honourable member was calling on a lot of his colleagues to retire. Members could forgive me for thinking that I thought he had retired, because it has been so long since I heard from him—it has been a very, very long time. But I did enjoy—and I am sure his colleagues all really enjoyed—his call for unity, and I have to look at the member for Morialta when I say this—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Infrastructure will sit down.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members will respond to the chair immediately. The member for Bright has a point of order.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** My point of order is, of course, one of relevance. The minister has been asked a very specific question. I know that he has done nothing for 18 months, but he now has a chance to reveal to the house what he has done.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has made his point of order. The minister will answer the question.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** We have worked enormously hard on achieving an interconnector with New South Wales,



something that I have pointed out before, and something about which the spokesperson should be embarrassed because it should have happened six years ago. And why did it not happen? Because members opposite wanted to privatise our assets, which it did disastrously. We all know about it. Members opposite did that disastrously, and to maximise the sale price they turned their backs on SNI, and now they have the gall to ask us why we have not got it. Well, if they had supported it when they should have we would have had it.

The truth is that we have been struggling with what has been universally recognised as a disgraceful regulatory system. Even the honourable member's federal colleagues have recognised the failings in the national regulatory system, and we have all recognised, every jurisdiction (everyone except the spokesperson), over and over, that the manifest failing is in transmission policy, so we have been working to reform that regulatory process. We were taken to court by a participant that they supported—the Murraylink. It was their project. It was the one they favoured over SNI.

We have been locked up in court with them ever since we sought the introduction of SNI. I have been talking to the interstate ministers on a regular basis. However, we cannot undo the history that they created for us, and we cannot override courts in this state, or in other states for that matter. We are tied up in that jurisdiction. We will continue to work in the interests of South Australia for SNI, but I will say that at least we are consistent about it. The opposition has supported it, then it opposed it, then it supported it and then it opposed it. I would like to know what the situation is now. Are members opposite back to supporting it?

Apparently the member for Flinders does. She says that she supports an interconnector now, paid for by the federal government. I am not sure which one she is talking about; I am not sure that she knows which one she is talking about. You see, you do not need an interconnector on the Eyre Peninsula because it is all part of South Australia. It is a small geographical fact with which the member for Flinders is struggling at present, but I am sure that we will get there. I make no apology for the work that we have done in achieving an interconnector. It should have been done six years ago by the opposition. We will continue working. In fact, I will be in New South Wales again on Friday with the interstate ministers trying to advance this thing, and we will not rest until we get a better system for the people of South Australia.

---

#### STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure):** I move:

That the Hon. D.C. Brown, Mrs Geraghty, the Hon. G.M. Gunn and Mr Hanna be appointed with Mr Speaker as members of the committee.

Motion carried.

#### RECREATIONAL SERVICES (LIMITATION OF LIABILITY) ACT

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I wish to provide some further information in response to the statements made by the member for Newland about the impacts of the Recreational Services (Limitation of Liability) Act 2002. The act provides the mechanism to limit a recreation service provider's legal liability for personal injury. The mechanism is designed to give some certainty to the provider as to what the law requires of him or her, and to the consumer, as to what safety measures he or she can expect.

The act is a response to the difficult public liability insurance environment. It is complementary to a package of amendments to the Trade Practices Act of the commonwealth, also intended to allow recreational service providers to manage their liability for personal injury. The act provides for the registration of codes of conduct about recreational services and for a provider of recreational services to register an undertaking to comply with a registered code. Once the code and the undertaking are registered, a provider may then enter into a contract with a consumer, modifying the duty of care owed by the provider to the consumer so that the duty of care is governed by the registered code, whereby the provider and the consumer agree that any liability of the provider is limited to the case where the injury is caused by failure to comply with the code.

This is specifically provided for in section 6 of the act. Once a code is registered and the recreational service provider and a consumer have entered into a contract, there is no entitlement to damages for any personal injury not owing to a breach of the code. In fact, section 7 of the act specifically provides that, if a consumer suffers personal injury, the provider is only liable in damages if the consumer establishes that a failure to comply with the registered code caused or contributed to the injury. This has the effect of eliminating claims based on negligence for death or personal injury except where they arise out of a breach of the code. It does not eliminate the need for public liability insurance, because it leaves open the possibility that a recreational service provider may breach the relevant code.

Under the act a person is able to submit a code of practice for a particular recreational activity to be registered by the Minister for Consumer Affairs. The code must set out measures that a provider of recreational services will take to ensure a reasonable level of protection for consumers who will participate in recreational activity based on those recreational services. Once a code is registered and has taken effect, providers of recreational services to which the code applies can then register an undertaking or undertakings to comply with the code. The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs' web site will register all codes of practice and all providers who have registered undertakings to comply with any codes.

The act is part of a set of responses by Australian governments and is also intended to complement recent commonwealth amendments to the Trade Practices Act, allowing an individual to contract out of a warranty implied by the Trade Practices Act that services will be rendered with due care and skill. The commonwealth's amending legislation varied the standard position under the Trade Practices Act by allowing a contract for recreational services to exclude or modify the statutory warranty that would otherwise apply. The commonwealth amendments were not intended to apply to anything beyond liability for death or personal injury arising from the supply of recreational services.

The South Australian legislation was intended to provide the framework in which contracting out could be managed in

an orderly way, so as to provide certainty both for providers of recreational services and for participants in them. Importantly (and I think this is an issue that the member for Newland has either ignored or not understood), the act relies on a very specific definition of 'recreational services'. The act defines 'recreational services' in a way that is substantially the same as the definition now appearing in the Trade Practices Act, and is intended to be read and understood in the same way. The term means services that consist of participation in (a) sporting activity or a similar leisure time pursuit or (b) any other activity that involves a significant degree of physical exertion or physical risk and is undertaken for the purpose of recreation, enjoyment or leisure.

The regulations made under the act contain a range of provisions that are intended to ensure that the requirements of the act are met. Specifically the regulations set out the requirements each code must meet as to form and content, prescribe the information that must accompany each application for registration of a recreational services provider, prescribe the form of a notice required by the act to be given to consumers before entering into a contract for the provision of recreational services, prescribe the size and content of notices to be displayed at entrances and access points to some places, and prescribe fees. To allow a recreation service provider to modify the duty of care to a participant in any activity is an important step, and it is appropriate that any code submitted for registration is subjected to detailed scrutiny so as to ensure that it contains suitable measures and standards. This takes time and resources.

The fees provided for in the regulations will achieve only partial recovery of the cost of assessing and registering codes and service providers. In the absence of previous experience with similar regimes, fees are set by reference to estimates of the time required to assess each application and the likely disbursements, and by reference to existing occupational licence fees.

Finally, let me highlight one feature of this debate which has not received its proper attention in the debate so far. It is not necessary for each and every club or association to have its own code and to incur the expense associated with its crafting and registration. It is possible for individual recreational services providers to register undertakings to comply with any code. Similarly, the act leaves it open to umbrella associations to register codes that their affiliated and member clubs and associations can adopt. If those affiliated and member groups register undertakings and comply with the requirements of the relevant code, they will receive the same protection as if they had registered their own individual codes. Despite the member for Newland's posturings, the government will not back down on its responsibility to protect the rights of injured people while ensuring that the public has access to adequate insurance at a reasonable cost.

### ROSEWORTHY FARM

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism):** I lay on the table a ministerial statement made in another place relating to the Roseworthy Farm.

### GRIEVANCE DEBATE

#### AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP DAY

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Today I wish to bring to the attention of the house—although I believe the government

should have done so—the fact that today is Australian Citizenship Day. I cannot understand why the Premier or the Minister for Multicultural Affairs did not make a ministerial statement. Citizenship Day should be celebrated by all members of this chamber, and we should do our utmost to promote citizenship. I fully endorse the federal Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs, Hon. Gary Hardgrave, who in his recent launch of the 2002-03 Australian citizenship promotion campaign, warned long-term residents that they are not Australian now, so they will not be afforded consular assistance as Australians overseas, as reported in the *Sunday Mail* of 7 September.

It is estimated that about 900 000 permanent residents in Australia have not taken out Australian citizenship. I estimate that there would be about 1 000 in my electorate of Hartley. I encourage other members to find out how many residents are not Australian citizens and encourage them to become fully committed to the Australian family.

I bring up this matter today to make people fully aware of this fact and that we should be all doing our utmost to encourage citizenship. I know that a couple of years ago the former premier had a special citizenship ceremony in this chamber which was very successful, and we had a lot of feedback about that. I note that this government celebrates lots of things but not Australian Citizenship Day. I took Australian citizenship as an adult, and I am proud to say that that was the best decision I made in my life. I feel honoured and privileged to serve as a member of this chamber, and I am honoured to be admitted to the Australian family.

Australia has welcomed people from all over the world who have settled, raised their families here and made great contributions to the cultural and economic life of our country. We have a wonderful multicultural society, with some of the best public health, education and social support systems in the world. We should show our commitment to our country by also taking up Australian citizenship. Members would be aware of my bill insisting that members of parliament in this chamber should be Australian citizens only. That would show some leadership and commitment. Citizenship application forms are available from my office, and I hope that other members would avail themselves of forms to become Australian citizens.

I would like now to commend and congratulate those citizens who recently received the centenary medals in my electorate. I attended both the ceremonies by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Alexander Downer, and Christopher Pyne, and I would like to congratulate those people in my electorate who received medals: F. Abou-Hamdan; N. Altus; M. Arthur; H. Bell, MBE; L. Caporaso, OAM; I. Crouch; K. Dix; J. Durden; Hon. Mario Feleppa; A. Gabrielli; K. Kelly; R. Kool; M. Lamb, RSJ; S. Liapis; G. Linarello; R. Lovell; S. Marshall; J. Moore; K. Penick; D. Reeves; N. Rossi; M. Sayner; G. Scalzi (it's not me); R. Sharp; A. Sommariva; M. Trewren; J. Wiskich; E. Zeidmanis; as well as Mayor Steve Woodcock, City of Campbelltown; Mayor Laurie Fioravanti, City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters; and Mayor Wendy Greiner, City of Burnside.

Time expired.

#### GOLDEN GROVE FOOTBALL CLUB

**Ms RANKIN (Wright):** Today I want to offer my congratulations to Jamie Sloan, Daniel Bourke, Paul Callaghan, Scott Charlton, Kym Dobie, Brendan Duffy,

Danny Grantham, Mathew Holloway, Phil Jordan, John Loechel, Ben Lyons, Graham Muscat, David O'Loughlin, Ben Pahl, Adam Peterson, David Pettman, Wayne Seymour, Jeff Stewart, Matt Thomas, Shane Trinnie, Bodie Williams and Bradley Stratfold. On Saturday, while South Australia was gripped in football fever, these young men won the first A grade grand final for the Golden Grove Football Club.

I was delighted with the score. On Saturday the score was 16 goals 17 points (103 points) to Brahma Lodge, 9 goals 9 points (63 points). My condolences go to the Brahma Lodge Football Club. They are a great football club, part of the northern suburbs and within the electorate of our Premier, who, I know, has supported them over very many years. Their getting to the grand final was a great achievement, but I have to say that I was delighted that Golden Grove took out the grand final. It is pleasing also to note that it was about this time last year—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens and the member for Waite will come to order! The member for Wright has the call.

**Ms RANKINE:** I note that the member for Waite has removed his Port Power scarf, too. It looked a bit new, so I wonder whether it is just because they are in the finals or whether he really is a Port Power supporter!

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms RANKINE:** Last year, I told the chamber about the A6 reserves winning the first ever grand final for the Golden Grove Football Club. I said that this would be a catalyst for the club and that they were looking towards more success in the future, so I am really delighted that this year they have won the A grade grand final. I was also particularly pleased that last year my son was a part of the support team when they won their first ever grand final. I also make special mention of Adam Wallace (who broke his collarbone during the season—in fact the previous game—and therefore could not participate), Daniel Jarod and Lee Mills, who were a very strong part of that team. The best on the day was Jamie Sloan, their captain. He also coached the A6 reserves this year and last year when they won their premiership.

Jamie has put a great effort into the Golden Grove Football Club, along with his father, who is part of the support team. They are out there every week, and I know that the club is also particularly proud of their efforts. Danny Grantham was also amongst the best players, as well as Graham Muscat, Jeff Stewart and Scott Charlton. I would also like to acknowledge the dedication and commitment of the coaching staff, John Economou, Jamie Sloan and Mick Grandy; the football manager, John Tiss; team manager, Steve Gilling; their runner, Chris Shenton; and trainers Paul Hunter and Andy Curtis. A strong team of volunteers in that club put in enormous efforts. It is a very young club. I think this is only its seventh year in existence, and something like 200 junior players are involved in that club. An enormous effort goes into keeping the club operational and encouraging young people in the Golden Grove area to participate in a very active and healthy sport.

I know that during the game Golden Grove led at every change. It was a particularly good game. Unfortunately, I could not stay for the whole game, but I certainly saw a large part of it. It was a very interesting game in very trying conditions. As members will recall, Saturday was a particularly windy, blustery, rainy and miserable day, so these young fellows did particularly well.

The A6s came in on a high this season with the A6 reserves' premiership, but they also had some difficulties. During the year, two of the young men in the club, Danny Grantham and Christian Griffiths, lost their fathers. It was a very sad time for the club. I know that these fathers strongly supported these young men. They were deeply proud of them, and I know that they would have loved to participate in the club and see them win their first A6 grand final. I know they would have been as delighted as I was and as the Golden Grove community are.

## FOXES

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I wish to raise a serious problem in South Australia, that is, the rise in fox numbers and the subsequent damage to our native fauna. The rabbit calicivirus was one of the most successful bio-control agents ever released in this country. It has brought the rabbit population across Australia down to very low levels, but the warnings of the CSIRO previous to the release of the virus have not been heeded. They warned that foxes would then become a major threat to native marsupial and mammal species, as well as our pastoral industry. Some governments across Australia have been very pro-active in this area, particularly in Victoria, but South Australia, the state responsible for the release of the calicivirus has not responded in such a positive manner.

It has been proven in many trials that the fox is a direct threat to populations of native animals such as bilbies, bettongs, numbats, rock wallabies and many more. Many of these species are under threat, if not facing extinction, in areas across South Australia. These trials have also shown that, with a reduction in fox numbers, populations of our native animals can recover.

The problem has arisen as a result of the dramatic decline of the rabbit population, and foxes have had their main prey taken from them. This has forced them to look elsewhere for food sources, including native animals, greatly exacerbating the problem.

When assessing the impact of the calicivirus, the CSIRO stated that increased predatory pressure on native animals will occur repeatedly from many sources. While assessing how a decreased rabbit population would affect predators such as dingoes, feral cats and raptors, it was the fox that caused the greatest concern. The research stated that the fox did not need rabbits to survive or to keep up their population levels. It was summarised that a fox control campaign would be needed to follow up the effect of the virus so as to protect vulnerable species.

I was pleased to note the comments of one of my constituents, Mr Jack Revitt from Williamstown, who has a lot of expertise in this area, about controlling foxes and doing an indepth study over five years.

When we have fox numbers to the extent we have—and we have approximately over one million—baiting is the only effective answer. The chemical 10.80 (known as 'fox off') has been in use for many years, and Mr Revitt believes that, used properly, it is still the best way of controlling fox numbers, especially if you understand how foxes behave. The problem is that 10.80 is an S7 poison, and since 1 July 2003 the state government has prohibited its sale to anyone unless that person has been accredited in its use. Accreditation can only be gained by attending a two to three day course, which

approximately 12 people have to attend and, of course, there is a cost.

Even though Mr Revitt is very experienced in using 10.80 and has maintained thousands of baits over five years, he will not do the course as it is too much hassle, and therefore his bait laying will be coming to an end. This is very concerning. Mr Revitt has killed or controlled approximately 6 000 foxes over the last five years, and foxes can breed very quickly. What will happen now? I believe many farmers will be just like Mr Revitt, that is, they will feel that it is too much hassle, too expensive and they will not continue baiting foxes. I think the solution lies with local animal and plant control officers, and I note the comments of an officer in my area, Mr David Hughes, in the local media this week.

I believe that our local authorised officers should be given the power to supervise the distribution of this S7 product, and give instructions to and supervise landowners in its responsible use. The chemical 10.80 is expensive, costing \$140 per box, which contains 120 baits. The Australian Wool Innovation (AWI) has apparently invested \$3.2 million in research to find something to take the place of 10.80, and it has come up with a product which only attracts foxes and dogs. I certainly hope that tests show that it works.

The problem is that foxes are rarely seen. They are a very cunning introduced species, a pest, and people often think that they do not have a problem. Ask a grazier who is lambing his sheep flock (with three month old lambs worth over \$100 each) or a chicken farmer whether they are a problem—members can imagine the damage a fox could do in one night. Ask a naturalist about how our native species are suffering.

I believe that shooting is still an option, especially on plains country where numbers should not be as high. Every fox taken out is one less to breed four or six more that year. I call on the government to help eradicate one of the most deadly threats to our state's biodiversity. After the reduction of rabbit numbers the fox has become an increased threat and action must be taken. Everyone agrees that the fox is the most threatening predator to small native species and we must assist land-holders in eradicating them.

### PARKING MACHINES

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** I have been contacted by a large group of people. It started off with one complaint and it has grown considerably, and it relates to the Adelaide City Council and its provision of ticketing machines for parking in the CBD. It has been brought to my attention that these machines do not accept 50¢ coins. This might not seem to be a large problem to members in this place, but I remind them that often people approach the retail outlets situated by the ticketing machines for change. In many cases, the businesses become fed up with giving change, so they refuse to do so and these people are unable to purchase a ticket. My initial response was that there is not much we can do about this because it is the way the machines work. But I did some research. I looked up the commonwealth Currency Act 1965, and section 20(3) regarding concurrent legal tender provides:

... in the case of any other coins [that is, non bronze coins]—for payment of an amount not exceeding five dollars or two pounds ten shillings but for no greater amount.

The act states that a tender of payment of money is a legal tender if made in coins that are referred to in the repealed acts and are of current weight.

So, according to the Currency Act 1965, if you wish to pay for any service using bronze coins it must be accepted up to the limit of 20¢ and if you wish to pay in silver coins it must be accepted up to a level of \$5. Adelaide City Council has ticketing machines which do not accept 50¢ pieces. I argue—although I am not a lawyer—that all fines distributed to people who have attempted to use 50¢ coins in parking meters are invalid.

**Ms Chapman:** You will be struggling.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** The member for Bragg says I will be struggling, but I will be writing to the Lord Mayor informing him of section 109 of the Australian Constitution—unfortunately, it is not section 303. Section 109 provides:

When a law of the state is inconsistent with the law of the commonwealth the latter shall prevail and the former shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid.

That means that the commonwealth act prevails, the Currency Act prevails, and therefore all fees and charges charged by state governments and local governments must be accepted up to \$5 by silver coinage. I am sure the council will make an argument based on the fact that the machines are not manufactured in Australia and do not accept 50¢ pieces and accept only round coins, but my constituents have a right to have laws enforced throughout the land, as provided by the constitution.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** No, thank you, I will not be doing that. And I will be arguing on their behalf that the Adelaide City Council reimburses all people who have received fines or expiation notices where they have attempted to pay using 50¢ pieces, which are legal tender, as long as the parking fee is lower than \$5 or 2 pounds 10 shillings.

I also want to touch on the Hon. Nick Xenophon's attempt to legislate to compel priests, once they have heard a confession in relation to paedophilia, to report to the proper authorities. I have been in the media today saying that I oppose that move by the Hon. Nick Xenophon. While looking up the Australian Constitution, I noticed that section 116 does not allow the commonwealth to legislate in respect of religion. I am not a constitutional lawyer, or a lawyer at all, but it says that the commonwealth shall not make any law prohibiting the free exercise of any religion.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** You are getting into deep waters here.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** I am. I suggest that if Mr Xenophon's bill was introduced into the federal parliament it would be unconstitutional and would not be allowed to be passed. I might be wrong, but I have checked the state constitution and it contains nothing protecting freedom of religion. I think that if we make priests go to court, we should make lawyers and journalists do the same.

### GENE PATENTING

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** I had the pleasure of hosting a seminar over lunch discussing the serious issue of gene patenting. I asked Dr Graham Suthers to come and address some members of this house and some personal assistants of members who could not attend. Dr Suthers was able to educate those who attended on the huge problem of gene patenting.

Over the years, patents have been issued for many things, in most cases for new innovations and inventions—and quite rightly so, because they protect the people who came up with

those new inventions and innovations. However, about 10 or 15 years ago some entrepreneurial person—whether he was a biochemist, a molecular biologist, or just an entrepreneur—decided that it would be a great idea to patent genes. Inside your body are billions of cells and in every cell is DNA which contains a code for everything about you—whether you are a human, an animal, a plant or a virus. The DNA determines your future and also your frailties and fallibilities.

The amount of things in your DNA that can go wrong is absolutely staggering. If you unravelled all the DNA in your body it would wrap around the whole of the solar system about ten times. I am not allowed to display it in this house; anyone who wants to look at the test tube that I have in my hand will see that it contains a small sample of DNA and, if you were to unravel it, there are 30 000 kilometres of DNA in this test tube. Such DNA is in your body, my body and my dog's body—everybody's body. It is very important to ensure that we protect the future of your DNA, my DNA and my dog's DNA. We have to ensure that people do not patent rights of access to that genetic material, the knowledge gained from that genetic material and the ability to use that knowledge to then do tests on individuals to see whether they are pre-disposed to diseases or whether they will be in some way vulnerable to an inborn error of metabolism, some familial cancer or, in more specific cases, heart disease, colon cancer, breast cancer and many other diseases such as haemophilia and thalassaemia. The list goes on and is getting bigger every day.

People, companies, groups and organisations are getting the patents on these genes, and I understand 96 per cent of all genes discovered have been patented over the last 10 or 15 years. These patents will restrict people's access to testing to determine their own future. The social justice implications of genetic testing are huge. The environmental and agricultural consequences of allowing people to control what we do with these genes is huge. We need to protect the millions and billions of dollars that are being invested in biotechnical research, not only in Australia but all over the world, by allowing research facilities and universities access to this genetic material. That will not happen if these genes are allowed to be patented.

This is mainly a federal law issue. However, at a state level, I will be introducing legislation to ensure that the people of South Australia have access to the wonderful facilities at the Women's & Children's Hospital where they can discuss their situation with clinicians and have themselves tested if there is a familial problem with, in particular, breast cancer. The clinic at the Women's & Children's Hospital is one of the best in the world and is achieving fantastic results, and its work must be preserved. But, more importantly, the access of people to genetic tests should not be governed by their ability to pay for these tests. A test that is currently being undertaken at the Women's & Children's Hospital at no cost to the patients and clients would cost \$5 000 if the people who own the patent for that gene were able to enforce that patent in South Australia. That has not been tested yet. It has been tested overseas, and some governments have stopped testing. Where is the social justice in that, if you want to find out your chances of inheriting a terrible disease? It is an area that we need to concentrate on. Watch this space, Mr Deputy Speaker, on gene patenting.

### HILLS FACE ZONE

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** The Florey electorate office has had a long association with the Friends of the hills face zone

and Rural Living Zone group, beginning almost from the day I was elected in 1997. This is because of the very active committee of the group. They have been lobbying tirelessly, and I pay tribute to all of the members, particularly Mr Bill Murray who has been in constant contact with me and who, along with Mr Bill Thomas, recently visited me in the office with a copy of the excellent submission that the group has prepared for the hills face zone review which is gathering information and consulting with the community under the chairmanship of Mr Terry Groom, a former MP.

I have had the opportunity to hand a copy of this submission, together with other relevant information, to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning today, and I thank him for his answer to my question without notice today on this very important issue. I also thank his office for agreeing to provide an opportunity tonight at the Tea Tree Gully council chambers for the Friends to be part of deliberations. Although I have requested a pair tonight to enable me to attend the meeting it is not possible for me to get one. However, I do intend to drive out to the council chambers prior to the beginning of the meeting, which unfortunately starts when the house recommences at 7.30 p.m. I know the Friends will put a very good case to the meeting this evening, and I know that their arguments are very powerful.

I would like to point out a Letter to the Editor in *The Leader Messenger* of 10 September by the Friends' Chairman, Diane Pearce, in which she pointed out that the Minister for Urban Development and Planning's review specifically excluded any proposals for boundary changes or realignment of the hills face zone. It also informed readers that, despite the minister's stated intention, the Tea Tree Gully Council passed its own submission supporting realignment and boundary changes so that it might (and I paraphrase) 'find the real hills face zone' which it has, apparently, lost. This was done on the casting vote of the Mayor, which is a very close vote for something as important as this.

The Friends' vigilance has been constant over the years and, as the letter goes on to say, 'Hundreds of residents turned out a couple of years ago when the hills face zone was again threatened by development.' The hills are, as Ms Pearce says, the lungs of the city and they are in our keeping not only for our joy and pleasure at the moment but also for future generations to enjoy.

So, there is serious public concern about what seems to be a lack of protection for the beloved Adelaide Hills, spanning some 90 kilometres from Sellicks Beach in the south to Gawler in the north. As Bill Murray says, the hills face zone should be preserved and enhanced because making a wrong decision with a development approval means that we can never get that land back again.

The Friends' submission indicates clear preference for improving the current system, making sure that it is implemented and properly administered so that it has the potential to resolve the majority of issues affecting the hills face zone. The whole system could be strengthened by ensuring that moves to protect the hills face zone are not bogged down by bureaucratic processes that are hindered by long-winded arguments concerning resources.

Sustainable and appropriate development is always welcome, particularly when it pays heed to living happily and in conjunction with the hills area. I know that the Friends are calling for better control of regulations, seeking to have all development applications classified as non-complying so that the public and interested groups will be made aware of developments and of the ongoing status and protection of the

hills face zone, allowing them the opportunity to have a say and giving them the ability to comment. I know that so many of the Friends have made almost a life's work of protecting the wonderful rural environment that we enjoy in the Tea Tree Gully area.

They also point out that any costs for investigations into realignment of boundaries should not be borne by the ratepayers of the City of Tea Tree Gully—that long-suffering group of ratepayers, some of whom do not even have footpaths after 30 years of living in the area while other parts of the city enjoy much better amenities. I have pensioners in my own street begging for footpaths; however, that is another story. As the Friends point out, the costs for any re-evaluation should sit with the landowners and developers who stand to gain the most, and quite significantly either in the short or long term, when these changes might occur. Hopefully, the meeting will go well tonight. The residents will have their option to air every part of their submission's grievances, and I know that under the chairmanship of Mr Groom they will be heeded.

---

#### CROWN LANDS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

That this bill be restored to the *Notice Paper* as a lapsed bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

#### VETERINARY PRACTICE BILL

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

That this bill be restored to the *Notice Paper* as a lapsed bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (MINING) BILL

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

That this bill be restored to the *Notice Paper* as a lapsed bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

#### FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

That this bill be restored to the *Notice Paper* as a lapsed bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

#### AUTHORISED BETTING OPERATIONS (LICENCE AND PERMIT CONDITIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Gambling)** obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to

amend the Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill addresses two technical matters that have arisen with respect to the operation of the *Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000*.

Firstly, the Bill amends the power of the Minister to provide binding directions to the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner with respect to permits issued to bookmakers.

Crown Law advice has confirmed that the current powers under the Act are not broad enough to enable Ministerial directions to fully enforce the exclusivity provisions provided to the TAB in the Approved Licensing Agreement entered into by the former Government.

The exclusivity commitments provided to the TAB provide that no person (other than the licensee) will be authorised by the Crown to conduct a specified range of betting activities within the State prior to January 2017. The Minister is liable to pay compensation to the TAB if someone other than the licensee is authorised to conduct these betting activities. The compensation is equivalent to the diminution, if any, in value of the licensee in respect of the TAB (including the TAB licence) as a result of the occurrence of an otherwise exclusive event and is capped at \$43.5 million.

It is unsatisfactory that the government remain exposed to potential compensation claims from the TAB.

In particular the current provisions in the Act do not allow directions to be issued to the Commissioner with respect to specific conditions to be attached to permits, or to be issued at all with respect to permits on racecourses. These powers are required to prevent betting in relation to certain contingencies and what is known as "Indirect Walk In Trade", that is, bookmakers accepting telecommunications bets where the bookmaker has provided or otherwise subsidised the provision of the telecommunications device.

The Bill proposes to extend the powers of Ministerial direction to include the attaching of conditions to all permits. This will enable exclusivity commitments to be fully met.

The second matter dealt with in this Bill is to rectify a technical flaw in the current authority provided to Mr E V Seal to operate his 24 hour telephone sports betting operation.

Crown Law has advised that the current bookmaking permit provided to Mr E V Seal is invalid and it is necessary to provide a new authorisation to Mr Seal to enable him to continue his current 24 hour telephone sportsbetting operation. While a new permit could be issued to Mr Seal it could not be done under current legislation in a way that restricts the operations to telephone services or to sportsbetting only. Those restrictions are necessary to prevent breaching the exclusivity commitments provided to the TAB by the former government.

The Bill addresses this issue by inserting a new class of licence – a 24 hour telephone sportsbetting licence. Bookmakers conducting sportsbetting at specific times and places will continue to be licensed under existing provisions.

The Bill provides that, consistent with similar licences, the 24 hour sportsbetting licence would be issued by the Independent Gambling Authority. The Bill also provides the Minister with the power to give the Authority binding directions about the granting of a 24 hour sportsbetting licence. The Government will use this power to issue a direction to the Authority that this type of licence may only be provided to Mr E V Seal. This is consistent with the exclusivity provisions as set out in the TAB Approved Licensing Agreement. The government cannot allow a further 24 hour sportsbetting licence to be issued to another party without causing a breach of the exclusivity provisions and thus giving rise to compensation claims from the TAB.

This Bill does not expand gambling opportunities available in South Australia; it simply enables current bookmaker operations to continue and provides the Government with the necessary power to protect itself from events that may give rise to compensation payments to the TAB.

These legislative amendments were noted in the *Authorised Betting Operations Act* review tabled in the House on 4 December 2002. Other matters contained in that review are currently the subject

of on-going consultation with the racing and wagering industry and are expected to be brought to Parliament shortly.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

*Part 1—Preliminary*

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Commencement*

*Clause 3: Amendment provisions*

These clauses are formal.

*Part 2—Amendment of Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000*

*Clause 4: Amendment of section 3—Interpretation*

This clause inserts a definition of "24 hour sportsbetting licence" into the interpretation section of the principal Act.

*Clause 5: Amendment of section 34—Classes of licences*

This clause inserts a new paragraph (e) into subsection (1) providing for an additional class of licence, namely a 24 hour sportsbetting licence. The clause also inserts a new subsection (4), providing that the Minister may give binding directions to the Independent Gambling Authority regarding the granting of a 24 hour sportsbetting licence.

*Clause 6: Amendment of section 36—Conditions of licence*

This clause inserts a new subsection (5), providing that the Minister may give the Independent Gambling Authority binding directions regarding a condition attaching to a 24 hour sportsbetting licence preventing betting operations on specified days such as Christmas day or Good Friday.

*Clause 7: Amendment of section 37—Application for renewal, or variation of condition, of licence*

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

*Clause 8: Amendment of section 54—Licensed bookmakers required to hold permits*

This clause redesignates the present section 54 as subsection (1) and inserts a subsection (2) providing that section 54 of the principal Act does not apply to betting operations conducted under a 24 hour sportsbetting licence.

*Clause 9: Amendment of section 57—Conditions of permits*

This clause inserts a new subsection (3) providing that the Minister may give the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner binding directions regarding conditions to be attached to a permit.

*Schedule—Transitional Provision*

This Schedule provides a transitional provision allowing the Minister to invite, within 30 days of this measure coming into operation, a licensed bookmaker to apply to the Independent Gambling Authority for a grant of a 24 hour sportsbetting licence, and also provides that sections 37(1) and 38 of the principal Act do not apply to such an application.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 17 September. Page 70).

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** In my reasonable length of time in this house, this is possibly the most difficult contribution I have ever had to make. I do so because I believe it is a matter of great gravity. The Address in Reply is our answer as an opposition—the government's answer as a government—to the way in which this parliament will conduct itself in this session. It is about the responsibilities we all have and the plans that the government has for South Australia.

There is an overriding question about how this parliament will conduct this session of parliament and about the fitness of members of this parliament to remain members and of some of those members to attain higher office.

I would like to start my contribution by reading from the first page of the code of conduct for ministers in this government, from point 1.3. It says:

Ministers should be aware that, in addition to the laws that apply to South Australians generally, there are some laws that apply specifically to ministers. These laws as they exist (at the date of this

document) are listed in appendix 1. Ministers should familiarise themselves and at all times comply with these laws.

If we then go, as the code of conduct invites us, to appendix 1, we find on page 21 the Whistleblowers Protection Act 1993, which provides:

This act facilitates the disclosure in the public interest of maladministration and waste in the public sector and of corrupt or illegal activity generally and protects those who make such disclosures. It concerns all members of parliament as public officers whose activities may be subject to such disclosures and also designates ministers as the appropriate authority to whom the disclosure of public interest information must be made in section 5(IV).

I reinforce my point by quoting the objects of the Whistleblowers Protection Act, because there have been those who have said that the whistleblowers act is about protecting public servants. The objects of the act are quite clear:

The object of this act is to facilitate the disclosure, in the public interest, of maladministration and waste in the public sector and corrupt or illegal activity generally—

Specifically, paragraph (a) states:

by providing means by which such disclosures may be made.

So, it is not about protections only: it is also about disclosures. When we look at the section (and it does as the Premier's ministerial code of conduct rightly points out), we see that it says, 'Whom can you blow the whistle to?'. The most responsible group of people under the Whistleblowers Protection Act are ministers of the crown. It also provides:

For the purpose of subsection (3), a disclosure of public interest information is made to an appropriate authority if it is made to a minister of the crown.

So, we establish that under the Whistleblowers Protection Act anyone who goes to a minister of the crown has in fact blown the whistle on illegal activity, maladministration and such. In accordance with the objects of the act, under section 5 it provides:

If a disclosure of information relating to fraud or corruption is made, the person to whom the disclosure is made must pass the information on as soon as practicable to—

In the case of the police it is the Police Complaints Authority, but paragraph (b) provides:

in any other case, to the Anti-Corruption Branch of the police force.

I am not a lawyer. Most of us in here are not lawyers, but that is simple law in simple English, which I think I understand and which I think needs to be obeyed. I hope I do not need to remind any member of this house of the concept that the crown is always the model citizen. There is really no concept that the government can break the law because, as the crown has the authority at any time to come here and change the law, because the government and the crown sets law for the good of itself and its people, the concept of a government flouting its own law is anathema.

There is no concept that the crown can or should flout, violate or break its own law when, any day of the week, it can come here and ask this parliament, if any law not be adequate, to change that law. Yet we have here the statute law of South Australia, the Whistleblowers Protection Act 1993, referred to specifically in the ministerial code of conduct, and it is stated therein that every minister must obey this law. What could be clearer?

We then have to look at what has happened recently, and that is where great concern arises. I will not trespass on any matter that is before the courts, but I am going to discuss a process in detail. I will not canvass who may be guilty,

whether they may be guilty or why, but I want to discuss process because that should vitally concern this house. The process that was adopted (and we can find all this recorded in *Hansard*) was as follows: in November the Deputy Premier of South Australia on his own admission was told something which led him to believe that there may have been fraudulent, corrupt practice, abuse of office—call it what you want—something dishonest and irregular. That is covered by the Whistleblowers Protection Act.

I do not need to remind this house that the Deputy Premier is a minister of the crown and that the law of South Australia required him to 'go straight' or, as it states in section 5, 'must, as soon as practicable. . . 'to the Anti-Corruption Branch of the police force'. Did he do so? No! By his absolute admission, he went to the Premier of South Australia and said, 'We've got a problem.' In case I have missed something, the Premier is also a minister of the crown. We have one minister of the crown going to another minister of the crown on a matter that was supposed to go to the police Anti-Corruption Branch. Presumably the Premier of South Australia is responsible for the draft of the code of conduct and is therefore father of his party, leader, lighthouse and all the things a Premier always is by definition. He knows more than all the rest of us, and he should have gone immediately to the police Anti-Corruption Branch. The law requires it.

The doctrine of the crown as a model citizen demands it, and that did not happen for six months. Six months went by, and the member for Bragg stood up in this house and asked a fairly innocent question. I think she was somewhat surprised at the consequences of the question. None of us could have anticipated it. What did we hear? We got a ministerial statement that said very little, other than that 'we did do something and we certainly did the right thing, but I will report to you later'. We did that: we waited a few days and then we got a report. The report was still that 'we did nothing wrong, but we are taking further advice'. Why, if you are so certain you have done everything right, would you be taking further advice? You back your judgment and go with it. Nevertheless, the then Acting Premier—not Deputy Premier, but Acting Premier, who himself had been intimately involved in this matter—sought advice. He sought advice from whom? The Crown Solicitor! That was entirely inappropriate. I say to the house, tongue in cheek, that it was entirely inappropriate because the Premier said it was entirely inappropriate.

We have a statement from the Premier in which he excused going to the Crown Solicitor on the grounds that there was a business relationship between the Crown Solicitor and the Attorney-General, which is a bit of a worry because in itself that questions the integrity of the Crown Solicitor to give fearless and independent advice; but that is for another day. That was the Premier's reasoning, but it was not the reasoning of the Acting Premier and he, having thought he might be put in a tight spot by the member for Bragg, rushed off and said, 'What can we do?' He went to the Crown Solicitor, who quite obviously said, 'This is a matter of law: it must be referred to the Anti-Corruption Branch of the police force.' That procedure was then followed, with consequences of which we now know. I do not want to dwell on who has been charged or what might be the outcome but, when the matter was investigated by the appropriate authority, the appropriate authority considered it to be a matter that had enough substance to put it before a court of law and to issue a charge so that the matter could be clearly tested and either cleared or a different verdict found in future. It was not

a matter of no consequence or a minor matter, but a matter which will now occupy the time and resources of our legal profession and our courts. It is a matter which the police and the Acting Crown Prosecutor have deemed worthy of putting before our courts to test the guilt or innocence of a party.

It absolutely fulfils the requirements of the Whistleblowers Act, but those requirements were not met for six months by the senior government person in this state, by the then premier of South Australia. The requirements of the statute law of South Australia were not met, nor were they met by the then deputy premier of South Australia, and I say that that warrants the serious and undivided attention of this house. I would like to remind this house that many of the politicians who constitute membership of this house constituted membership of the last parliament, and I would like to remind them—especially some Independent members—of the standard they set for ministers in the last parliament.

We had a minister, a deputy premier and a premier all resign over various matters. The former deputy premier was put before a privileges committee because he said that he did not make a phone call. The answer was that he did, and he came into the chamber to correct the matter the next day. Actually, I think the fact that he made the statement was by consensus; that he actually made a statement that could have been construed to mislead the house.

Whether it mattered materially was the matter in question, but because of that, because he simply said to the house, 'I did not make a phone call,' and then he came and said, 'I did,' he had obviously misled the house for at least that period of time. He was found guilty and he resigned as deputy premier. We then have the then tourism minister for whom the perception was manufactured that she could have had a conflict of interest. There was no answering. It was just a build up, a gradual pressure (clever tactics, perhaps, by the opposition), that, perhaps, the tourism minister had had a conflict of interest, but when?

The tourism minister was held to have a conflict of interest over a decision made by a cabinet of which she was not even a member, and at a time when she held no office recognised by this parliament as conferring her any extra responsibility. In other words, as a private member—

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** No, I am just saying this to the member for West Torrens. I am not saying who was right or wrong. I am discussing with this house the standards it set itself. What then happened was—and I voluntarily admit this—that she resigned, but what perhaps is not generally known is that she voluntarily resigned because a number of Independent members had made it perfectly clear that if she remained a member of a government they would support a motion of no confidence in that government.

Now, it is very technical to say that the then minister for tourism resigned for the good of her own health: I think that she resigned more for the health of that government, because Independent members had made it quite clear that they would no longer continue to support the government if she did not. That was the bar they set for her. That was the bar they set for the Hon. Graham Ingerson. And then we come to the then premier about whom there was an inquiry. I do not know whether it was the member for West Torrens but someone said a few days ago that it said in the Clayton inquiry 27 times that he was dishonest.

The Clayton inquiry also stated that he had done nothing for personal gain, nothing for his own benefit. It said, and may have said rightly, that he did not fully and accurately



answer questions put to him and therefore it used the word 'dishonest'. It was not for personal gain, it was not for any benefit, but, if the word 'dishonest' is used about any premier, the premier does not last long and neither did that premier. He went because the word 'dishonest' was used about him, but no charges were laid. There was nothing irregular in the law, and that is the standard which this parliament has set not once, not twice but three times.

It is a standard not set by the Labor Party, although it was in opposition and fed on it, and I do not blame it; it was in opposition, it had a right to: it is a standard set by Independents. It is a standard which Independents have made an absolute welter of—the good, the noble Independents. Those who can be better and truer and more faithful than any of us because we happen to have an allegiance to a team and a party. The great judges of us all, the moral judges of truth and virtue, that is the bar they set not once, not twice but three times, yet now where is this great truth, where is this great demand for virtue? We hear clucking, we hear crowing, and I will not mention names, but the hypocrisy in this place—

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Well, the member for West Torrens says that we are going to have an independent inquiry. We may. What, may I ask you, rhetorically through the chair, are the consequences of having an independent inquiry, which may find a premier and a deputy premier guilty of something that is wrong two years down the track?

*Ms Thompson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I have read the Whistleblowers Act absolutely accurately. In fact, let me tell members something that I believe, and I am not a lawyer, but after this speech a great number of other people will read the Whistleblowers Act because—

*Ms Thompson interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Well, the honourable member might not but the Whistleblowers Act also lists as an authorised officer the Speaker of the House of Assembly, and when a charge is levelled against any other member of parliament, the Speaker of the House of Assembly is required by law to refer that matter to the Anti-Corruption Branch of the police force. And if I am standing here saying that I believe that the Premier and the Deputy Premier of South Australia may in fact be guilty of abuse of public office, it will be the duty of the Speaker, I believe, to report that matter forthwith to the Anti-Corruption Branch of the police and, if he does not, I will send a copy of my speech to the same branch because I would hate to prejudge or wrongly judge the Deputy Premier or the Premier of South Australia. This is why it is at issue. There may be an inquiry—

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I have only been going 10 minutes. It is interesting that the Deputy Premier should come into the chamber. I think that is very interesting. Welcome, to the Deputy Premier; I was developing my argument quite well. There is no argument to be had—

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** There is no argument to be had. The Deputy Premier—

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I would appreciate some protection, Madam Acting Chair.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Bedford):** Does the member for Unley require protection?

**Mr BRINDAL:** I do, madam, from that general cacophony, please.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Unley has a right to be heard.

**Mr BRINDAL:** I will not respond to the interjection; suffice to say—

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** The accusation was made: what about what we might have done? I just say this to the Deputy Premier: I do not think one transgression of the law in any form justifies another, and if he has any evidence that any member of my party or me, or anyone, broke the law or did something wrong he should release that evidence. I can tell all members—

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BRINDAL:** This house knows that I quite regularly get into trouble for all sorts of things, such as driving unregistered vehicles, and all sorts of things. I do not like it and I make a fool of myself sometimes, but I actually do believe in the rule of law and I think that nearly all members of this place do. We are not special in so far as we are above the law. We are as subject to the law as any other citizen, and if we fail in our duties under the law we pay the same penalty. I will not ask members to put up their hands, but I would not mind betting that there are not many over on that side or this side of the chamber who have not had parking fines, have not done all sorts of things, got it wrong, and simply—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** I have already, for the member for Bragg's benefit, mentioned people who are tardy in relation to registration. I will rip my clothes off and put sackcloth and ashes on again! I am not proud of the fact, but that was a personal transgression, and what I am talking about here quite seriously is a transgression against the principles of this house. It is a transgression against an office and a person holding an office, which is not personal. I am not out to get the Deputy Premier but I am out to see that the Deputy Premier and the Premier maintain the highest standards of probity and accountability. That is not a bar I set for them.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The chair is having trouble concentrating on the words of the member for Unley, and I am sure we would all like to be able to remember them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BRINDAL:** Let me ask the house this, while the Deputy Premier leaves. There remain a number of questions that need to be asked. Did the Premier discharge properly the duties of the office that he held as a minister and concurrently as Premier of South Australia?

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** On a point of order, I do not want to interrupt the member for Unley, but standing order 127, 'Personal reflections on members', says 'or impute improper motives to any other member'. I think the member for Unley is straying very close to accusing the Premier and the Deputy Premier of impropriety.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** We think so, too. The chair is very mindful of the fact that the member for Unley understands and will speak to the standing orders, and we will be listening very closely to his contribution.

**Mr BRINDAL:** The Deputy Premier is here. He can also, if he wants, dispute my next statement. My next statement is:

South Australians have the right to have confidence and trust in the integrity and honesty of their government.

I said he has the right to dispute that because I was actually quoting him, from 23 October 2001. Let me amuse the

member for West Torrens by saying that the matter on which he took a point of order involved not actually my words but a quote from the words of the Hon. Mike Rann, then Leader of the Opposition, in question time on 23 October 2001. I would be very interested, Madam Acting Chair, had you disallowed it, why the current Speaker had erred and you were so wise, because certainly, when Mike Rann asked it, it was not disallowed. It is not a matter of frivolity: it is a matter of serious weight.

I am not canvassing and will not canvass any matter that is before the court. But I am canvassing that in this matter process was not properly observed. I am disappointed that this debate is in some measure being deflected by who did what to whom, but I am not trying to canvass that; I am simply saying that we have a right in this parliament to see that process is properly observed. There are many talented people, Madam Acting Speaker, on your backbench. Many of them would make ministers.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Yes. In fact, I would dispute that they have their best 14 there now. If the Premier or Deputy Premier have done something wrong, they are human: that is fine. Let them resign, and there are other people on that team who can take their place. The Premier has said this; the Speaker has said this; I have said this; just about everyone says it, but I mean it: this institution is more important than any one of us. It is absolutely important and it will be here, hopefully, 500 years after we are not. And we cannot afford to accept standards other than the highest standards. If those standards have not been observed, then something is wrong. It has to be accounted for. It has to be answered and the process has to be moved on.

I remind the house that one of the reasons why the crown is seen as a model citizen is that it has all the resources of the crown to support it—armies of public servants, the legislation, everything to support it—and ignorance of the law is no excuse. Ask, if you go at 60 km/h in a 50 km/h zone, whether you would get booked. Ignorance of the law is not excusable, and there is no excuse for the Premier of South Australia not to have understood the law. There is no excuse for the Deputy Premier of South Australia not to observe the law. I believe that they may well be guilty of an abuse of their office.

I certainly believe that, if they are not guilty of an abuse of their office, they are certainly guilty of an abuse of the trust of the people of South Australia. This is the government and this is the Premier that promised open and accountable government. This is the Premier, the Deputy Premier and a whole lot of others—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** No, the member for West Torrens was not as bad as some of the rest—including the member for Elder who, day after day, came in here and made me feel small. I am only 5 foot 6 as it is, but they made me feel about six inches tall sometimes with their accusations and slurs against our integrity. Some of the members on the backbench might not realise this, although they will when they sit on the front bench, but it is a theatre in here. It is very difficult when someone is sitting opposite you telling you that you are dishonest, you are a crumb, you have no moral integrity and all sorts of other things that are part of the daily thing in here. Frankly, it is sometimes a bit hard to take, and it hurts.

If you are trying to do your best, trying to be honest, trying to be decent and you have someone slinging the mud across the chamber, as much as we all pretend it does not get through, it does. If you do not believe that, ask the Minister

for Transport afterwards. He will not say it to me, but I have watched him. You watch them. You watch us, and it gets through. Sometimes you try not to let it, but sometimes it gets through, and you can just see—

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

**Mr BRINDAL:** I've seen your face sometimes. You're not quite the old hard heart you pretend you are.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BRINDAL:** Yes, I know. You're a bit of a softie underneath, but we will leave that. Old marshmallow! Time expired.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** First, I want to acknowledge what I see as great work by Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson in her role as Governor of South Australia. I also want to acknowledge the excellent presentation, given that the Governor was absent for the address opening the third session of the fiftieth parliament, that Mr Bruno Krumins, the Governor's Deputy, very professionally and capably delivered to all members of parliament on the first sitting day of this week. I want to talk about the paper. This was a speech by the government: it is a government prepared speech that should be talking about the calibre of the government, the quality of the government, the innovation of the government and the capacity of the government.

But of the addresses that I have heard since I have been privileged to be the member for Mawson, this is by far the worst. It is the weakest; it is the least in substance that I have heard; and I invite every South Australian to dedicate just 10 minutes to read it—because that is all it takes.

**Mrs Redmond:** It wouldn't take that long.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** As the member for Heysen said, it probably would not even take 10 minutes. Most of it is full of repetition and announcements that have been re-announced on two or three occasions. The balance of it is work that was either completed or in the process of being completed when the Liberal government was still in office.

I want to touch on a few of those points. Firstly, I want to come to the point where it talks about economic development. It amuses me that I pick up *The Advertiser* and see how kind it has been to the Premier of this state. About a quarter of page 3 is taken up by a press release from Premier Mike Rann about the so-called revival of South Australia. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time. Despite the greatest assistance that you might get from all elements of the media—print and electronic—the South Australia community is starting to wise up. The Premier says, with the help of his spin doctors, 'We've got to get a message across that we are the great economic managers. We have to get rid of the State Bank monkey that hangs heavily on the shoulders of the Labor Party. How do we do it? We reinvent the whole wheel, and we say that the sun shone only from March 2002,' when Premier Rann and his team came into office. What a load of nonsense!

They were very dark days when premier Rann was a senior minister in the Bannon and Arnold governments, and the Deputy Premier was the chief of staff and a senior adviser in those governments. They were very dark days, indeed. In fact, they were the darkest days that the South Australian community has probably ever seen. For the record, let us remember how dark those days were. The largest single corporate loss in the history of South Australia was the State Bank, and it was managed and enhanced by the Labor government of that day. It was not until over 10 years after

that that we saw a bigger collapse than that of the State Bank, the HIH collapse. In history terms, it is still the second largest financial collapse of any corporate body in Australia.

From there, from those dark days, with a lot of hard work, thanks to the community of South Australia and, I am proud to say as a member of the Liberal government during that time, to the Liberal government, history will show that the revival and the economy we see today has had nothing to do with this government. Nothing! In fact, it has done very little, except for announcing reviews and regurgitating law and order repetition two or three times and somehow miraculously managing to get media coverage on it two or three times. When I tried that on an occasion or two, I was told, 'Sorry, minister; we have already reported on that. We are not interested. What else do you have that is new?' It surprises me that for 18 months this government can get a repeat of something that in a lot of cases was actually either bipartisan law and order policy or, indeed, quite a bit of it was adopted by this government from our Liberal policies of the 2002 election. I do not begrudge them that, because if they are bereft of ideas and capabilities, why not take policy from the Liberal Party and adopt it?

However, the fact remains that there is no revival of the economy under this Premier and this government. It is a load of nonsense. The revival—and you can see it in every economic history book in this state—clearly started in 1997—only, I might add, four years after we were put in to fix Labor's mess. I hope that we do not have to wait until 2010 to have to address problems again similar to what we had to address then. Clearly, if you have a look at matters like WorkCover and the ballooning out of unfunded liability that this government is hiding—

**Mrs Redmond:** Keeping secret!

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** Yes—clearly they are already on the way to economic mess. I want to talk about a couple of other pieces of anecdotal evidence that prove my point on the fact that not only did the trend indicators show from 1997 that the economy was growing, but crosscheck them with the performance indicators from 1997 right through until now and you will see that what I am saying is correct. It does not matter what you do in government when it comes to trying to assist the economy; you will have very little impact in one or two years. It takes time to grow an economy, and it takes time to see an economy go backwards. What worries me now is that, whilst this government has come in opposite to what we came into in office, that is, whilst we inherited a mess, they inherited a strong growing vibrant economy. The worry for me is that we will see the reverse of that. The longer it is in, the more the chance there is of that happening, and we will be put back in again to pick up the pieces and fix the Labor government's mess. In its own document it says:

The government will work in partnership with industry and the Economic Development Board to develop an export strategy to build on the strong exporting performance of the past five years.

So, on page 13 of its own document it admits that the economy has been strong for five years. So, the revival thing again has been proven to be nonsense. Last week in my electorate we had a minister come down to talk to the business breakfast. That minister (Hon. Rory McEwen) was honest enough to admit, when it was put to him, that the economy did start to revive and did start to grow from 1997. I congratulate him for that. It is refreshing. He is not trying to say that the revival started last year, because he is not so stupid. He knows that it started in 1997. I wish that the media would get more balance and fairness into it and start to

expose this government on its weaknesses, and not fall into the trap of picking up a press release and writing a story because it suits the Premier.

I also want to talk about some other things that concern me immensely. First, I want to talk about the figure the government has accepted in this document, which is a recommendation that the state should aim to near triple our exports to reach \$25 billion by 2013. That is quite honourable. Indeed, it is a goal that I support and endorse, and so would all South Australians. It is a goal of the Economic Development Board. I hope that behind the goal there is a strategy to do that, because I have not seen that strategy. Perhaps it is not the strategy of the board alone to develop; perhaps, for a change, it is a strategy that a government should be adopting, like the strategies that we had called 'Charting the way forward,' public documents that we stick to through thick and thin. We did not get it all right, but I tell you what, we were the ones who, with our communities during that time together, got most of it right, and we are enjoying that today. That is why we are seeing economic growth and low unemployment; it is not for any other reason.

What concerns me is that we had specific plans like Food for the Future, and we were growing our exports. Forty-three per cent of manufacturing companies in South Australia were exporting when we left office against a national average of 13 per cent. That is the reason why the economy was going so well. We opened doors and supported export opportunities. We did not try to tax them out of existence like we are seeing now, with hundreds of millions of dollars of tax impost being announced just in this last budget by this government. You only have to look at the Bureau of Statistics economic figures for South Australia for the last quarter, where we see a 27 per cent reduction in export income, to see that this government has to start to wake up and be a lot smarter if it is going to maintain the status quo, let alone grow by 300 per cent, tripling exports to \$25 billion by 2013.

I will touch on a couple of other points. The first point is about this government saying how open, honest and accountable it is in all respects. On page 11 of this document—and I am again disappointed to see that the media has not picked up this—out of the blue the government states:

The government will introduce legislation to amend the approvals process for public projects by lifting the level of expenditure requiring cabinet approval and mandatory reference to the Public Works Committee from \$4 million to \$10 million.

I ask my colleagues how that is being accountable when it will no longer be mandatory for the Public Works Committee to look at projects until they reach a value of \$10 million, and not even cabinet colleagues will know what a minister is doing until that minister authorises a project exceeding \$10 million. I do not see that as a government being accountable.

Another area I want to touch on is infrastructure. I am very concerned about the lack of infrastructure investment in South Australia by this government. Infrastructure investment—underlining the word 'investment'—is a key for the future of South Australia. When the Liberal government came to office we were faced with a core debt of \$10 billion. It was not a fudgy black hole to which we have heard the Treasurer refer and about which he had to smile in this chamber one day when he knew that it was not a real black hole. It was a cost pressure, and a cost pressure simply sets your priorities for your budget bilaterals. That is all a cost pressure is, and we all have them in our own businesses—

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

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** Of course the Treasurer didn't, because he has never been in business, so he did not know. A black hole is a smoke screen, and all you have to do is work out where your priorities are. However, a core debt of \$10 billion is real dollars. Even for the Murdochs, Packers, Fairfaxes, Kennedies and Bushes of this world \$10 billion is real money. We had to manage our way out of that and we did. However, we also had to pick up run-down infrastructure. It took 10 years of hard work to build key infrastructure projects. The one project which we did not get up but which I wish we did is the airport. People have been working on that proposal for several years and it is now going to be built. It is very much overdue, but the Ansett collapse and, I might add, the lack of goodwill at the time by Qantas were the two reasons why it did not get up during our term in government, but most of the other core infrastructure projects we did pick up, for example, the Southern Expressway.

The Labor Party went to three elections saying that it would build a Southern Expressway, but it never did so. We did and we have a pleasure of driving on it now. Labor members can see the benefits that has had in real estate values, in opportunities for commuters and in economic development through investment in manufacturing, industry and agriculture in particular on the Fleurieu Peninsula.

The Heysen Tunnel through the Adelaide Hills is another of our successful projects. We never hear this government criticise the Liberal government's investment in the Convention Centre, do we? We never hear them say, 'Thanks to the Liberals, we are one of the top five cities in the world for convention tourism.' We do not hear them praising us for all those good capital works projects, such as the North Terrace upgrade—the list goes on—or even the smaller projects such as schools, and so on.

I look forward to a debate in March 2006 about what this government has done in the way of capital works for schools compared to what we did when we were in office. If this government does not get its PPP up, that is, the public-private partnership for the police station (it is a privatisation, I might add, which it said it would never do), we will not see any new police stations in their term of government. However, even if it does get the PPPs up—and we set that group up in Treasury and we support the PPP principle—I will still be prepared to debate with government members what we did regarding capital works for police compared to what they did.

I particularly want to talk about the south, because we had very limited infrastructure, even though we had senior ministers in Labor governments in the 1980s. We did see great capital works investment in tourism, roads, schools, hospitals and police stations in the south when we were in government. However, as I said, the south is continuing to grow, and 1 400 housing allotments are now being developed in Huntfield Heights in my electorate and in the electorate of the member for Kaurna at Aldinga. I might add that the City of Onkaparinga is getting walloped unfairly by the community because it believes that the council should be building capital works projects, but that is actually the core job, in every respect, of the state government.

I have seen a letter in response to the concerns of our community in the south, and in that letter minister Hill could not guarantee increasing one piece of infrastructure, even though there is so much pressure on existing infrastructure as a result of the new development. Clearly, we need an extension of the railway line from Noarlunga to Aldinga if we are to see an increase in development. We need a school in that area because the Willunga Primary School (in my

electorate) is zoned, and McLaren Vale school is bursting at the seams. The schools cannot take any more schoolchildren. Children living in the electorate of the Minister for the Southern Suburbs are travelling from Sellicks to Myponga, which is in the electorate of the member for Finnis (Hon. Dean Brown), and there is no promise of a school.

We hear the cries, just like when I was in government I heard the cries of the member for Wright, who said that we needed to build a police station at Golden Grove. I do not know where the member for Wright has been in the last 1½ years, but I have not heard anything about the Golden Grove police station since Labor came to government. We would have had that shopfront police station open by now. I would have had another plaque proudly displaying my name because, as police minister, I would have looked after the people of Golden Grove. They are in government and nothing is happening.

Prior to the election John Hill said, 'We need a police station at Aldinga. We need a 24-hour police station.' Guess what, we delivered a shopfront police station to Aldinga, and over our period in office we increased the police numbers in the Willunga Basin from two dedicated police officers and a part-time patrol from Christies Beach to 11 police, plus an administration officer. They are flat out. We need more police. We need police not only in the southern areas but right across the state. I say to SAPOL officers to whom I am committed and about whom I am very passionate, because I have been privileged to be the minister for police and shadow minister for several years, 'We will keep fighting for you.'

I know that police will be delivered before the next election, but they will be delivered for political purposes and not to help police officers who are stressed and overworked or, indeed, for the safety of the community. They will be delivered with fanfare in a budget just prior to the next election. Where is the Minister for the Southern Suburbs, the member for Kaurna, in supporting me and our community for urgent infrastructure? I say to this government that it should consider putting that development on hold if it cannot deliver the infrastructure at the same time. Why should our community in the south have to go back to what it had to put up with last time they were in office, that is, a lack of delivery, run-down services and no growth in infrastructure? We have enjoyed some growth in infrastructure in the last 10 years; we have caught up; but we are still tight when it comes to requirements, and we cannot afford to have an increase in population without additional infrastructure.

I will finish my contribution by touching on some portfolio areas. I have already mentioned police. Everyone in the Liberal Party will continue to do what they can to make this government see sense when it comes to increasing police numbers. I now want to talk about the volunteers and, in particular, the CFS and SES volunteers, because I know that they are extremely concerned at the moment. Why are they concerned? Because they feel that they are only getting lip service when it comes to their being volunteers. Some of them get invited to the Festival Theatre on Volunteers' Day, and I am happy to see. That follows on from our initial commitment to an Office for Volunteers and a minister for volunteers. I am also happy that Adelaide Cup day has been set aside as a day for recognising our volunteers, a day when the South Australia community, the government and the parliament can show their thanks and gratitude. But the volunteers also want some equipment, and it is not happening, and they are getting sick and tired of the rhetoric about a bigger spend in the Emergency Services Levy than when

the Liberals were in government. Because if, indeed, there is a bigger spend, they are saying to me two things: first, 'Where is it going, because we are not seeing it in the CFS or the SES?' or, second, 'I know where the spend is going; it is going into you-beaut fire trucks for woods and forestry.'

I understand that the trucks are worth \$600 000 to \$700 000 each and were built because this government said that the occupational health, safety and welfare of the public service paid staff—who may also be volunteers in the CFS—is paramount and they need those trucks to save lives if there is an intense fireball or something like that during a fire. That is fair enough, but the volunteers in the CFS are asking, 'Where is the retro-fit for our fire trucks (it will cost about \$50 000 to retro-fit them), or are they going to keep us out of forest fires?' Because, if it is good enough for paid people to have trucks with technology to protect them from intense situations in fire management, surely it is good enough for volunteers to have the same equipment.

And what have we seen now? We have seen a tele-marketing campaign started by the South Australian Volunteer Fire Brigade Association to raise money for niche equipment. I commend the VFBA for this initiative because, sadly, it has no choice. I hope it is successful and raises hundreds of thousands of dollars. But do members know that they are raising that money to pick up a program that we had in government that the current government said we were pork-barrelling with, and that was the emergency services grants program? That grants program was carefully put into place because we knew when the emergency services levy came in that some people, at least initially, may not be quite as generous in donating to volunteers as they had been previously because everyone would have to pay part of the levy and, therefore, some of the niche equipment that funds are raised for might be a bit difficult to finance. That grants program offset that, and many niche pieces of plant and equipment were provided to the volunteer organisations. Now, the VFBA has a program whereby people ring up asking if you will buy a lottery ticket for a car so they can buy for their brigades the stuff that was in the grants program.

So, I say to the volunteers that I very much understand your concern and the fact that you are feeling as if you have been neglected because, from what I can see, you are being neglected as volunteers. I guess people feel a bit warm and fuzzy when the minister writes an article in the SES volunteer magazine and in the CFS magazine and says how much he appreciates them, but I say to the minister: if you appreciate the volunteers, how about delivering for them? That is all they ask. Deliver a little bit for them. Procure some equipment and go and commission it. Do not go and extend the life of the fire trucks from 20 years to 25 years and ignore what the Coroner said after Ash Wednesday. That is not delivering anything for the volunteers. Get out there and show some leadership and spend the capital works money.

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

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** And, of course, as the member for Newland says, there is also an economic benefit because you actually spend some money in the community and that creates jobs.

This is where I finish on my final point, and I thank the member for West Torrens for letting me speak before him. That is appreciated, and I thank him. I want to finish on the point about jobs, where I started. Unless you are careful, unless you understand about business, unless you have your own strategic plan and, most importantly in government, unless you are prepared to get into the driver's seat and drive

your projects and your strategic plan, it will not happen. It is not happening now. The government is riding on the back of our strong economy. The revival started in 1997 after we fixed Labor's mess, and the architects of this town and this state are telling me their business is dead quiet and they are not seeing any tenders from this government. The bigger company businesses are saying to me, 'We are not getting a chance to tender on government projects.' I know what that says: they are the anchor for the growth of economic opportunity in this state and small businesses hang off the strong foundation of those companies, and that is how you grow an economy. That is how people have an opportunity to go out and buy an extra meal now and again and have some family time on a Friday or Saturday night at the local tavern or club. That is how they can buy the extra packet of biscuits for their kids and whatever else—shoes and all those things. It is because you have capital works projects happening, and it filters throughout the community.

This government is either inept, has no business expertise, or simply thinks it can ride on the Liberal government's revival after the State Bank collapse—it was a partnership revival with the South Australian community. Well, they cannot. I will tell you that they may not all see it now but I feel that the South Australian community is starting to see through it and, sadly, it has a government full of smoke and mirrors and a Premier whom I heard summed up beautifully on the radio the other day when he was called 'Mr Transparent', meaning that you can see right through him. That is what this government is: it is plastic, it lacks substance, and the South Australian community deserves better. And, while we are in opposition, we will put the pressure on it. But I say to the media that it is also the responsibility of the media to put fair and reasonable pressure on the government of the day and not to honeymoon them forever and let them roll into a second term to destroy an economy and a state that is doing better as a result of good government and partnership and deserves better than this phoney Labor government.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** I appreciate the comments of the member for Mawson about my allowing him to go before me. My usual grace and humility in this place has shown through again.

**Ms Chapman:** Let's not spoil it, though!

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** It is legendary. I was surprised to hear a Liberal member of parliament calling on a capital investment-led recovery and that we should spend more than we earn. I was a bit surprised.

First, I congratulate His Excellency Mr Bruno Kruminis, the Governor's Deputy, on his opening the Third Session of the Fiftieth Parliament and his remarks to the joint sitting of the parliament. In his speech he detailed quite a large number of government initiatives. I have said after every Governor's speech that I do not like the Governor being used for political purposes, whether Labor or Liberal. I think the idea of the Governor being independent is an important principle in our democracy, and I would do things differently and not have him read the speech.

Before I go to the main thrust of my address in reply, I will talk about the Public Works Committee. The government has announced that it will increase the threshold for mandatory reporting to the Public Works Committee to \$10 million. This is not something that I agree with. I believe in accountable government and I believe that the government should be subservient to the parliament: it is here to serve the parliament and the people of South Australia. Before members

opposite start thinking that I am somehow congratulating them for the way they treat the Public Works Committee, they should think again. The Public Works Committee serves a very important role in this parliament. It goes through government expenditure line by line. If we were to increase the threshold to \$10 million, I believe it would lessen the ability of this parliament to adequately look at government projects to see that we are getting value for money. I have done a bit of an analysis since May 2000 of the last 40 Public Works Committee reports—

**Ms Chapman:** How many have been this year, by this government?

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** The member for Bragg interjects and asks how many have been published this year by this government? That is not the issue I am talking about.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Perhaps she will let me finish, and then she can interject all she likes. In a parliament the size of ours, where we have 47 members in this lower house and nearly a third—or I think 10 or 11—of those members make up the executive, it is members' role as an opposition and as a government backbench to keep the cabinet accountable. If it were not for the Public Works Committee, the only process that major capital works would go through would be that of the cabinet. Forgive me for not being entirely confident in cabinet processes after the former government passed certain projects that it claimed had massive community benefit. Off the top of my head, some of those were the Hindmarsh Stadium and the Wine Centre. They were quite considerable, and I have here the official figures in relation to them.

I do not believe the Premier, in his bid to increase to \$10 million the mandatory reporting threshold for public works, is trying to deny the Public Works Committee the ability to scrutinise those projects. I believe the legislation will provide the ability to subpoena or call for those projects to come before the Public Works Committee, but it will not be allowed to defer or delay them—in much the same way that the Treasury redevelopment was treated on King William Street, where the Public Works—

**Ms Thompson:** That's right—the Memorial Drive tennis club redevelopment.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Exactly. The Public Works Committee will then be able to look at that and make a report, but it will not have the power to defer the construction of that work.

**Ms Thompson:** The Football Park redevelopment didn't come to the Public Works Committee, and the disability access couldn't be put in the right place.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** That is right—the Football Park redevelopment. I have gone through the projects involving expenditure of less than \$10 million, and if the government's new plan gets through then Central Power Station, which cost \$6.6 million, would not have been brought before the Public Works Committee. The North Terrace redevelopment, involving expenditure of \$8.1 million, would not have been brought before the Public Works Committee—

**Ms Thompson:** The Public Works Committee had a major influence on the eventual outcome.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** That is right; it did. Streaky Bay water supply augmentation, involving expenditure of \$7.8 million, would not have been before Public Works; and the Port Pirie Water Waste Treatment Plant, with \$6.2 million expenditure, would not have been before Public Works. I refer also the Heathfield Waste Water Treatment Plant,

involving \$8.9 million; Old Noarlunga Sewage Scheme; the Barossa water supply upgrade; Central North Adelaide Hills Water; Bionomics; Women's and Children's Hospital Day Surgery; Torrens Road upgrade; Rocky River Precinct—

*Ms Thompson interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** That's right. The Commercial Road upgrade or the Coopers relocation, involving \$7.94 million, would not have been put before the Public Works Committee. Also, the Le Mans track, costing \$6.8 million—

**Ms Thompson:** It enabled scrutiny of things that needed scrutinising.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** That's right. In this respect, I refer also to the Hope Valley Reservoir; the Mount Pleasant Treatment Plant; the Robe Terrace upgrade; and Queensbury waste water diversion. The projects that I have highlighted all involve expenditure of less than \$10 million but over \$4 million. Those projects would not have been brought before the Public Works Committee. As the Premier and the cabinet have already endorsed the EDB's recommendation to lift the threshold, I feel liberated that I can speak out against it, because there is no official Labor Party position on it as yet. However, there will be, and I believe that the Premier will get his way and will have his increase.

I do not believe the Premier is in any way trying to inhibit public works scrutiny. Rather, I think he is trying to endorse the EDB's recommendations to get the Public Works Committee and capital infrastructure off and running and get some capital growth in South Australia. I congratulate him on that, but I also say to the Premier and the government that as a member of the committee and as a backbencher I will be vigilant in making sure that during my time on this committee I will be asking that any project over \$5 come before the Public Works Committee for a report, because I feel that since our new chair, Paul Caica, the member for Colton, and I have been on it the Public Works Committee has been very good. No projects have been delayed or deferred.

**Ms Thompson:** The only reason for delay was ministers who refused to provide information.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** That is right. I was about to get to that. The current Liberal members on our committee—the member for Unley and the member for Schubert—worked quite well with government members. In fact, we leave party politics behind on the Public Works Committee and we work together to make sure that we can do the best for the state. As the member for Reynell said earlier, the only reason there were delays in the previous committee was not because of the committee members but because of government frustration. It was the executive getting in the way of the Public Works Committee, not the other way around.

If you have an executive that wants to frustrate a committee, a committee of this parliament, you get reports such as the Kowalick report and the Fahey report, when they made passing recommendations that they wanted to increase it to \$10 million because of government frustration. That frustration was not based on the Public Works Committee being unreasonable; it was based on the executive, the former government, being unreasonable. I see Public Works members flooding into the chamber. I see that the former premier, who was forced to resign because of being dishonest, wanted Public Works frustrated because he felt that the former chair of the Public Works Committee was not being loyal to his government—and was doing his job. He did not want the scrutiny.

I can tell you something about this current committee. We will give the current government scrutiny, whether it be Labor or Liberal. All members of our committee work for the betterment of South Australia. We work because we believe in the committee and we believe in our role in that committee. I do not believe—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Bedford):** Order! The member for West Torrens must be heard in silence.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. Again, your wisdom exceeds that of King Solomon.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I will defend you to the death.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you. Can I just say to the member for Bright that his party will be screaming about the increase to \$10 million. Members in his party will be the ones who will be raising the most opposition, publicly, to this move, when, indeed, it was the reports commissioned by your government that recommended it be increased to \$10 million. It is the frustration that your former government imposed on the Public Works Committee that is making it go to \$10 million. So, I will say to all former cabinet ministers: if you were to dare to stand in this place and object to it being increased to \$10 million you would be hypocritical. The former government has a lot to answer for. We will not be in government forever, and any future executive in a future government must have regard to this. I say that especially to the current minister who is on duty now. Maybe in 2012, if we are leading an opposition, maybe the Public Works Committee might be needed to scrutinise a future government, a conservative government, that wishes to misspend taxpayers money.

So I urge the current executive to reconsider this EDB recommendation. I will be arguing in caucus that \$10 million is not good for the Public Works Committee or this parliament. It might be good for the economy, it might be good for the current government, but, overall, I do not believe that it is good for the Public Works Committee or our democratic system.

**Ms Thompson:** It would not be good for the community if the North Terrace project had not been scrutinised.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** That is right. I have to say that often the Public Works Committee, after having a submission from a department, quietly goes off and speaks to the relevant minister. The relevant minister says, 'That is a good idea. I am happy to do that. That makes more sense.' We are the ones who put the public servants on the coalface, the ones who want these projects, under a bit of heat. We are the ones who ask the questions they do not like being asked. This scrutiny is good for government. It does not hurt economic growth. It does not impede—

*The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** If the member for Bright interjects, 'Why are we doing that?' Well, the member for Bright might ask himself, in a quiet moment of reflection, what would he do if he was the current minister? It would be \$20 million. It would not be \$10 million but \$20 million. Let us get the hypocrisy out of the way. I will not go on about that other than to say that I will be fighting that proposal in caucus every inch of the way and with every breath I have. I might lose, but it will be a valiant effort.

I now refer to the Australian Federal Police. It is a fine organisation that attempts to do the best work it can for Australians. I refer to an article in *The Advertiser* recently about the Australian Federal Police and the US free trade agreement. *The Advertiser* article, which was headed,

'Australia soft on piracy', quoted Bob Zoellick, a US representative who said:

... there were serious concerns about Australia's commitment to copyright breaches and piracy. The US movie industry estimates it lost \$US21 million [about \$40 million] last year because of video piracy in Australia.

Mr Zoellick said Australia's parallel importing laws, and a failure to take criminal action against pirates, was a major problem.

This is a US free trade agreement delegate. The article continues:

'A relatively low priority is assigned to intellectual property enforcement at both state and federal levels,' the report said. The Australian Copyright Act, its interpretation by Australian courts in certain instances, and the position taken by the Australian Federal Police not to pursue criminal prosecution where civil remedies are available have created costly and burdensome obstacles to enforcement. 'Civil remedies have not proven an effective deterrent to piracy. The report also said last year's Copyright Amendment Act was weak and failed to adequately protect measures and internet service provider liability.'

Mr Zoellick was quite critical of that. Mr Zoellick, a trade delegate for the US, negotiating a free trade agreement with Australia, had some pretty condemning words to say about our Australian Federal Police. It is not directed at the AFP or its officers but at its policy.

I will quote from a letter that a constituent of mine, Mr William Thomas, wrote to the Australian Federal Police. To give some background to what happened to Mr Thomas, I point out that he produced videos, one being on behalf of the Port Adelaide Football Club, the Port Adelaide Magpies. It was the Russell Ebert story. It was put on sale at Videomart. After my constituent was given the contract to make and produce the video, provide the covers, the cassette jackets, and so on, Videomart, or someone working for it, a Mr John Varga, used that footage and infringed copyright to sell the Russell Ebert story to the public, and \$5 was to be paid to Mr Thomas for every video sold.

Mr Thomas went into Videomart, having heard that these tapes were on sale there, and, seeing them with a photocopied cover, he spoke to the people who were selling them. One of them immediately went to the Federal Police and said, 'Yep, you got me, I'm guilty'. He went into the Federal Police office and said, 'I have been caught: prosecute me'. The other one denied it. The AFP then told my constituent that they would not be prosecuting because that was not its core business.

My constituent then went to the Hon. Ms Gallus, his local member of parliament, he being a member of her political party. Ms Gallus claimed that she would do something about it and would ask for a review of the legislation. There is a lot of history in relation to what happened then. Ms Gallus did not work to the satisfaction of Mr Thomas, and they had a disagreement; she then went on to state in the federal parliament things that were untrue about Mr Thomas, namely, that he was a bankrupt. On the record here I say that Mr Thomas has never been bankrupt.

The Australian Federal Police decision was then reviewed by the federal Ombudsman, who found inaccuracies in the report. However, there would be no request for the investigation to be reopened. The decision was based on a response to the Hon. Christopher Pyne in a letter he sent in the caretaker period in 2001.

Mr Thomas seeks some outcomes. He is seeking an act of grace payment for the loss and suffering due to the commonwealth's inability or inaction in prosecuting the people who had infringed his copyright, and he also asked for an ex gratia

payment. He asked, too, for the member for Hindmarsh, Ms Chris Gallus, to apologise in the parliament for calling him a bankrupt in relation to these matters. Unfortunately, the help of the federal Ombudsman did not support Mr Thomas, nor did the AFP. My constituent has done a lot of work and made a lot of FOI requests, some of which have been granted.

I refer to Mr Varga, the principal in the breach of copyright. My constituent gave his details to the Australian Federal Police. In a copy of FOI information that my constituent has received, the Australian Federal Police say, in an internal report, that Mr Varga's address and details are not known to them. Mr Thomas gave them the details of Mr Varga's whereabouts, where he lived and worked, and I believe Mr Varga is still in the telephone book to this very day. The Australian Federal Police say that they could not contact him.

Mr Thomas, my constituent, believes that the Australian Federal Police did not act on this because they feared a media campaign by Mr Thomas, which is reflected in an internal report released under freedom of information. I will quote the internal memo to the Australian Federal Police. It is a letter to Mr Bob Fisher, a federal agent, Australian Federal Police, from Mr Stuart Aldiss, federal agent. In his letter of 23 May 1996 he says:

Mr Thomas [my constituent] is known to the undersigned through previous dealings with him when seconded to the ASC. Mr Thomas appears to have a bee-in-his-bonnet fixation in relation to SA Video Warehouse and John Varga and is well known to his associate, Donald Brownline Fleming. Mr Thomas has well established media connections through his business. Should an investigation into this matter be considered, the investigator should be cautioned as to what is said in his presence. It may be misinterpreted, reported or used for media purposes.

I find quite outrageous wording like that against my constituent, who is simply trying to have the law enforced. The Australian Federal Police did not, in my opinion, deny that an offence had occurred. Indeed, the Russell Ebert story, *Crashes for Clashes*, was owned copyright-wise by Mr William Thomas, and that copyright has been breached. The Australian Federal Police know about this, but refuse to take action against the people for a breach of copyright.

I just say that my constituent Mr Thomas has lost over \$1 million in revenue. His business is not going well, although he is not a bankrupt, as Ms Gallus asserts. He turns to the federal government for assistance and he is told that investigating copyright fraud is not the AFP's core business. Given what Mr Zoellick (the US free trade ambassador) said to the *Advertiser* (which is a very good story) on 15 April 2003, and given that South Australia, through the Premier, is trying to increase our film industry, if the South Australian Federal Police will not take action as guaranteed to Mr Thomas under the federal copyright act, and our international allies and trade partners criticise us on our lack of action, surely the AFP must be given the resources it needs to prosecute these people who are ruining people's lives, and they are ruining people's lives.

Maybe because Mr Thomas is a small operator working on an SANFL club's documentary no-one cares, but if it was a 20th Century Fox movie I wonder whether there would have been an investigation. I wonder if it had been the latest box office release whether there would have been an investigation? I dare say that there would have been. I just think that my constituent, Mr Thomas, has been hard done by. I believe that he has been victimised, that he has been branded a litigious nut. He has been told by the AFP that he

has a 'bee in his bonnet' fixation. I believe that all those terms directed at him are offensive.

I think that Ms Gallus should apologise forthwith to Mr Thomas personally. The committee that reviews alleged misleading statements in the federal parliament in terms of a right of reply by members who are not in the parliament did not even meet to discuss Mr Thomas's allegations, yet the secretary of that committee, according to Mr Thomas, ruled that there was no case to answer. Ms Gallus was not even asked to appear before the committee to give reasons as to why she made those statements about Mr Thomas. It is an absolute disgrace. The only person who stood up for Mr Thomas during that period was the former Labor candidate for Hindmarsh Steve Georgiannis and Senator Nick Bolkus.

I am happy to take up Mr Thomas's cause. The Hon. Christopher Pyne is taking up Mr Thomas's cause; he is doing what he can. If the Australian Federal Police does not act, the movie industry in South Australia will not have the confidence to go about its business in South Australia because the AFP does not think it is its core business to investigate copyright breach. That is an absolute outrage. The AFP's core business should be investigating copyright breach; it should be investigating organised crime; it should be investigating breaches of the law that cross borders.

This is why we have an AFP. I am stunned at the resilience of not only the AFP and its stubbornness not to do what Mr Thomas wants but also I am very proud of Mr Thomas and the way in which he has stood up to federal government departments, the bureaucracy and the federal government. As I have said often in this place, Mr Thomas fits the definition of a true patriot: someone who is prepared to defend his country from its government. Mr Thomas will do all he can to make sure that the AFP one day investigates this matter. Hopefully, with a return of a federal government under Simon Crean, we will have an AFP with different priorities and it will prosecute people who breach copyright laws. Unfortunately, I do not believe that the current government will take any action on this matter.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr Bruno Kruminis, on his formal address at the opening of this parliament and praise him for his efforts in supporting our Governor, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson. Also, I thank him for the support that he gives us individually as members of parliament. I have been in this place for a while now and I have not heard a speech for sometime by the Governor with so little in it. I would have to agree with the member for West Torrens that it is time to change the policy of the Governor of the day reading out a speech which one can only class as political.

I think that the standing orders of this place ought to be examined to take out the odium and, to some degree, the embarrassment of an independent person, the Queen's representative, reading out a blatant political document. I found the particular document almost without any substance. It contained a lot of rhetoric, and I will make some comment about it. I am pleased to be following the member for West Torrens. It is not very often that I can stand in this place and say that I agree with the honourable member, but I agree with his comments about the Public Works Committee.

I cannot believe that a government that says that it is coming on strong on openness and accountability would turn around in its second opening of parliament and say that it intends to increase the level at which government expenditure comes under scrutiny from \$4 million to \$10 million. That is



just totally the wrong message. I cannot understand why the government wants to do that because you could say, 'Well, in the past, the Public Works Committee could have caused some delay.' At the moment, as members know, there are no works before the Public Works Committee.

As committee members we have spent our time preparing and training ourselves, getting the expertise and getting government departments to work through the process so that when projects do come before the Public Works Committee we can offer a very quick process and professionally expedite the whole system. However, since this government has been in power, the committee still has no new projects before it. I do not want to play politics. I accept what the member for West Torrens has said. I am somewhat stunned at this \$10 million issue, irrespective of what government has discussed.

I note that the Premier has just stuck his head in the door. He is now inside the chamber. I just hope that the Premier would rethink this \$10 million ceiling and revert it back to \$4 million understanding, of course, that the Public Works Committee can take upon itself any reference that costs \$4 million or less. What is worse, I believe that the government could take away that power so that we are unable to scrutinise anything below that figure. In other words, if the government does not allow the Public Works Committee the discretionary power to examine any project below \$10 million and above \$4 million it means that any project below \$10 million is forbidden to be discussed by the Public Works Committee.

I reiterate what the member for West Torrens has just said: this committee has been working in a very apolitical, bipartisan way. I certainly appreciate the chairmanship of the member for Colton. I also appreciate the other members who serve on the committee, the members for West Torrens, Norwood and Unley. I believe that we are there to do a job. Certainly, projects that have gone amiss in the past, such as the stadium, should always come under scrutiny. I understand that that stadium was a project of the previous government, and I will not run away from that. I just wonder what the Public Works Committee was doing at the time.

I would say to the Speaker and to the government: do not try to bring this measure into the house by legislation because it will not be carried. I have spoken to the Speaker already on this matter, because I am sure that the Speaker, as a previous presiding member of the Public Works Committee, would not support such a measure in two respects: first, the increase from \$4 million to \$10 million; and, secondly, removing the committee's discretionary power to examine any project it wishes. I am amazed that the government has suggested this. I believe that we are being hoodwinked and that it is a whitewash so that the government can sneak projects through without the scrutiny of the Public Works Committee.

After all, the government has the numbers on the committee to pass these things. However, as matters come before the committee all is revealed. Evidence is taken by *Hansard* and, if there is anything difficult, it is there for the public to read. So, if you have nothing to hide, you have nothing to fear. I challenge the government to remove this and leave the status quo. I will oppose this in the house, and I am confident that reason will prevail.

I have problems with the unfunded liabilities of WorkCover, a matter which even today in the house has been highlighted again. I am also very concerned that we still do not have a CEO for WorkCover. I would have thought that, after the embarrassment that the government went through in

the last session, by this session, after the long break we have just had, a new CEO would have been appointed; but, no. So, we try to find out what is going on and we ask for the quarterly report to be tabled in this place. And what are we told by this minister? 'No.' Just the simple question: 'Will you table the report, minister?' And what was the answer 'No.' How is this for open and accountable government!

Just reverting to the Public Works Committee again, I did have a list of all the projects that would have got through under this \$10 million category, but the member for West Torrens has already read those, so I will not put them in again. There are a lot of them, including Gomersal Road, which the member for Light would also like to know about. It had a final cost of \$6.9 million. That certainly came to the old Public Works Committee and is still on the record of the new one. Projects like that should always come under scrutiny, because there was a blowout in cost from \$4.4 million to \$6.9 million. However, we accepted the reasons why, and there is no argument at the moment.

Of the 40 projects that we considered here, 18 were valued at less than \$10 million. Of these 18, three were also ICPC projects. In addition to these 18, a further two were ICPC projects alone. The government has only to cut some of these larger projects in two and call them two different projects and they will then sneak under this \$10 million criterion and go through without scrutiny.

I support what the member for West Torrens said today, and this goes to show in a very public way that this committee is dinkum about what it does. I will not breach any confidence with the member for West Torrens or the member for Norwood, for that matter, or the chairman, Paul Caica. We have a job to do and we will do it.

In terms of education, I was very concerned that in the Governor's speech, on page 7 of an 18-page document, there are only four sentences in relation to the second largest department of government. They read as follows:

#### Education.

Education and training are central to the future development of the South Australian economy and community. For this reason, education is one of the highest priorities of my government.

Nothing new yet: that is two. Sentence 3 reads:

This year, there are smaller junior primary classes for more than 9 000 children, a new school leaving age of 16, new efforts to reduce truancy, and primary counsellors for an extra 32 schools.

Most of that was brought in by the previous government, especially the age of 16. The fourth sentence reads:

The government has also made permanent more than 1 000 school and preschool teachers.

Only four sentences in a document of 18 pages, and these are only motherhood statements, anyway. There is not a single new proposal for the second largest department in the government, second only to the Health Department. I think that is an absolute disaster. Of all the problems that I have with education, this is all that we can raise. I am amazed that that is all it rates.

Economic issues are raised on page 10 of the speech, and the government waxes very strongly about rebuilding the economy. Under Economic Development, the speech reads:

My government has a commitment to long-term, sustainable economic growth in South Australia. . . The government has accepted the recommendation that the state should aim to near triple our exports to reach \$25 billion by 2013.

The statistics reveal that the government is not achieving this. In fact, things are going the opposite way. In the figures from the ABS, the South Australian economic indicators reveal

that already, after just two years in office, the figures are going backwards. In fact, the current figure for June 2003 is down 27.6 per cent on the previous year. I can see this in my own electorate. You only need to walk around to see the confidence in which the previous government was held, when we tripled our exports in 18 months because of the huge increase in our export industries, the wine industry and the grain growing industry. Our government was flat out keeping up with it, with the provision of extra services to help communities, such as new roads, water and power.

But what has this government done? It has curtailed all the road-making projects. In the Barossa Valley, which I represent, a lot of the large companies are spending hundreds of millions of dollars. This creates jobs, commerce and exports. All these products have been coming from other states and been processed, bottled and exported out of South Australia. Since this government has been in power, we have seen no new road-making projects. Orlando Wyndham, to name but one, although I do not want to put any company in, has asked for better access to the main road, because when these big trucks pull onto the main road they drive across a railway line. We heard just last week what happened: a train hit a semitrailer because they were pulling across the road.

This crossing—Kroemers Crossing—has been under discussion now for two years, yet nothing has been done. You can understand companies like Orlando Wyndham, who have operations in three other states, when they have the opportunity to decide where the business goes, will suddenly decide, instead of it all coming to South Australia to be part of the Barossa's success, can and will divert it to Victoria or the Hunter Valley in New South Wales. This sort of thing compounds and spirals, and we see this confidence that has existed here for the last three or four years taking a hiccup. And that is exactly what is happening.

Before I came to this place I was a businessman. I probably still am in some ways. I think it is a very false economy to think that, in order to improve your business, you should stop spending, stick it under the bed and say, 'We will spend up. I will plant all my crop in three years' time. This year and next year I will not plant a crop, but I will plant it all in the third year. That is the big election year, the big taxation assessment year in business.' What you do not understand is that in the meantime the climate can change. The seasons change. Suddenly, although you have been saving your money, the economy goes down and things go very flat and, in the year in which you had decided to spend up, you have a drought. Suddenly, you have spent your money and there is very little beneficial effect.

All this is from a Treasurer who is hell bent on gaining that credit rating which, we must remember, his government lost in 1991-92. He is hell bent on getting back that credit rating. You might get it back because you have the money, but everything else has gone down around you and, when you do spend the money, it will never have the effect that you originally intended. I cannot understand the people who advise the Treasurer on financial matters. You do not curtail your spending: you chase the confidence that is there. Not only do you chase it, but you promote it, so that those areas that are running well can run even better. You push them, and in the meantime you get revenue from them via royalties or taxes, or both. But you do not put impediments in their way.

That is what the government is are doing now. The wrong message is being given, and this is happening not just with all these companies: it is also being done to local government, to regional development boards and to investors right across

the state. And that includes farmers. So many people have come to me in recent days and said, 'We have written letters, and it's like banging your head against a brick wall. Nothing seems to happen.' I certainly hope the government can triple its exports by 2013, because we will all enjoy that success. But the government in the meantime has started very badly, particularly in a year like this. How come this downturn? How come this figure of 27.6 per cent down?

The farmers are having a record year. The wine growers are going through continued success, irrespective of the Jonas out there. Right now the industry is short of shiraz grapes. The money and the confidence is still there. Why is it down to 26.7 per cent? I want the minister to tell me why this is. Given the way the seasons are, the prices and the dollar now being back to an area where we can manage it, why is it the case? There has to be some better realisation, particularly when you read the report of the committee the Premier set up—the economic think tank that came out with recommendations. He says the government has adopted all but one of them. However, one of those recommendations was that you spend the money and promote export industries. Where have you spent it? What is happening about the deep sea port? What is happening about the road? What is happening about the railways? How much money has been spent? Nothing.

Now we have the further impediment of this bridge. Nobody can justify the approximate \$30 million it will cost to enable this bridge to lift. Madam Acting Speaker, I do not know whether you discussed this in caucus or whether it was a decision by the Treasurer (the member for Port Adelaide), made off the cuff while standing there on the bank to make this bridge lift. You cannot justify \$30 million just to look after a few people in Port Adelaide.

I can understand that those people like to see the ships tying up at the old berth. However, it involves not only the initial cost but the ever-after cost of trying to program trucks and trains across a bridge which lifts. Also, when a railway line is broken because the bridge lifts, twice, you will have speed limits on it. There are a lot of other unseen complications because this bridge has to lift. It is only a couple of hundred metres beyond this bridge that ships will have to tie up. I can understand that organisations like the sailing club would be upset. However, it would be a lot cheaper to relocate them with new facilities on the other side of the bridge than have this bridge as a lifting bridge. I hope commonsense will prevail. Above all, by 2005, we must have a facility there that will be able to handle deep water ships. The minister for industries is here. I note that with all the bulk handling companies there is a lot of confusion out there. I understand that they have come to an arrangement to manage this new facility at last—and the minister smiles.

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** I believe they have, minister. If they have not, please let me know. I am happy to put this on the record, too. I do believe they have come to an agreement. If they have not, you should tell parliament about that, because I would be pleased to go down to South Terrace and relate that fact. I presumed they had. If they have not, we can sort it very quickly. We must remove all these impediments we have to achieving a new deep sea port. How can we compete and remain export competitive if we do not have access to these deep water ships? As several members would know, we went to the Pilbara on a joint Public Works/ERD Committee trip a few months ago, and we saw ships being loaded there. Every ship was a cape ship. None of those ships could be

loaded in South Australia, in any of the other ports. They could be only partly loaded in Port Lincoln.

What is the future of South Australia while we dilly-dally, shillyshally, muck around and play politics in this place, and also in the grower industries? While we muck around and do not have any leadership, in the end it will be the export dollar that will pay this big price. I hope that the minister and/or the Premier will show some leadership and show us the way and make us some progress. After all, it was the previous government that said that this shall be a port. It said that we needed it dug to a depth that could handle Panamax ships. For the extra cost of that lifting bridge we could dig the port an extra 2 metres deep, allowing us to three-quarter load cape ships—not only grain but container ships as well. I hope we can get over this impasse and get on with the job. However, the government seems unable to make progress on this matter. As I said to the minister before he walked out, I am happy to go down to South Terrace and stir my lot up if he is happy to stir up his.

I am very concerned that the Barossa even though still going strongly is battling many infrastructure problems. There is a lot of concern around the place that the place is not ticking over like it was. We are not seeing the public works coming into the area. We are not seeing the public facilities keep up the extra population. Our health facilities are certainly needing urgent attention, and our tourism infrastructure could do with a fillip. However, we are now relying on the successes of the past. Our roads and our health spending and everything the previous government did is now just being used up. I remind the government that the wine industry will carry this state, as will the grain industry. However, we must ensure that we remain competitive. That does not mean bad roads and rail, and no deep sea port. We have to get on with this job. I remind the government that its own report, the Champion de Crespigny report, mentioned—and they have ignored the fact—that it needs to spend the money and not sit on it. It needs to spend more money on infrastructure. What has it done? Nothing. The public works agenda tells you that.

It needs to encourage people and not discourage them by standing in their way. As I said, the Treasurer seems hellbent on his credit rating. I say go for your credit rating but do not try to do it in 18 months; try three or four years. In the meantime we will all be much happier and the state will be much better off. Yes, you might achieve it, but business will have lost all confidence and instead of tripling our exports we will cut them in halves. The issues still drag on, particularly the Crown leases issue. I am very concerned about that. I still have people ringing my office. 30 September is the deadline for this issue. I am saying to my constituents, 'You must apply now to freehold your leases, because if you do not the deadline will go past and you will pay the new higher fee.'

Madam Acting Speaker, I remind you that this legislation has not been before the parliament. What happens if the figures change? What happens if the money is different? Will the government refund the admin fee and all that? Will it? This is without precedent that we are now asking people to apply and pay their money when the legislation has not been through the parliament. It is the same with the water meters and collection of the Murray tax. It is an absolute joke. Indeed, that was policy on the run.

I want to speak very briefly on the Lower Murray irrigators. That is an ongoing issue. These people are both in my electorate and that of the Speaker; we have half each. There is heartache and distress there. There are fourth generation farmers who can see no way forward but to sell

their water allocations and walk from the property. I remind the parliament that, whatever happens, the state will have to regularly flood irrigate those lands to keep them from returning to waste saltlands. Somebody has to continue to do that regular emersion. Why not encourage farmers to stay there? I am concerned about that.

I am very concerned about the health run down. Again, very little is said in the Governor's speech—just platitudes. I am very concerned that, first, the Barossa hospital is no closer. I have a commitment from the previous minister that if the government was returned we would be seeing it—and the minister coughs. I will stand on the record as saying that everything the previous government promised has been delivered in my electorate, including filtered water. I have no doubt that the hospital would have been built. I am sure this government will build it, too, eventually because it will have no choice. However, it has to be sooner rather than later. In all of the hospitals in my area there is the problem of decaying equipment, and equipment and facility failure.

I have received a letter from Dr Alice Caseleyr, a medical practitioner who lives in the Mount Pleasant district and who is concerned about the inadequacy of the present x-ray equipment at the Mount Pleasant Hospital, and I have her permission—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Bedford):** Order! Would the member for Schubert like some protection?

**Mr VENNING:** I certainly would, Madam.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Consider it given. The member is entitled to be heard.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I remind the member for Bright and the Minister for Infrastructure that if they wish to continue their discussion they must leave the chamber.

**Mr VENNING:** I have only four minutes left and I would like to read this letter into *Hansard*. The letter states:

Dear Mr Venning

Re the Mount Pleasant Hospital x-ray machine

Recently it has come to my attention that the x-ray machine at our hospital is no longer functioning well enough to be depended—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot hear the member for Schubert, and that means that *Hansard* cannot hear the honourable member, either. I remind the chamber that *Hansard* must be able to hear.

**Mr VENNING:** I have only four minutes left to read this important letter, which is more to the point. The letter states:

Recently it has come to my attention that the x-ray machine at our hospital is no longer functioning well enough to be depended on when the doctors need to use it, for example, on road trauma victims before they are shipped down to the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

In many cases, it is absolutely vital that the specialist there have the basic medical examination from an x-ray before the patient arrives by air or road. Even in third world countries basic x-ray facilities are considered essential at outlying hospitals.

My understanding is that the replacement of the machine has risen high on the priority list but nothing has happened yet. The new one will cost at least \$45 000.

If anyone cared to sue the hospital because their health was compromised by the faulty machine, chances are the hospital would have to close down, as has been demonstrated by several recent cases where people have been given very large payments on far weaker grounds.

In your position, you may be aware of other sources of funds or pressures that can be applied before something catastrophic happens, as is inevitable eventually. Missed diagnoses, especially those caused by inadequate or faulty equipment, tend to lead to bigger payouts, as well as of course giving extra and unavoidable suffering to the

patient, and preventing the doctors from being able to make a proper diagnosis.

Thank you for applying your resources to this problem urgently, hopefully before there is any litigation. Please feel welcome to contact me at any time if I can be of use.

I often receive this type of letter. There should be no argument: this sort of equipment should be replaced immediately because it is critical medical equipment, but it does not happen.

In my electorate, many issues such as this are just being left. Every project the previous government had on the go beforehand has been stopped, even down to the funding for autistic children. I cannot believe this. Everything has been closed down and you have had to apply and work like mad to get anything back. It has been a one-way street, and unless it was urgent you had no way of getting it back.

Finally, I want to put several ministers on notice. There are several ministers—not all, but several—who are very poor in answering their correspondence. I am happy to read one letter to this house, and I would warn the Minister for Transport, the member for Lee, that, if he does not respond to my correspondence in a reasonable manner and in a reasonable time, I will read it to the parliament.

It is disgusting. I am sorry to do this, Madam Acting Speaker, but I feel I am derelict in my duties to my constituents when I am unable to give them a reasonable answer about matters relating to transport, and the Barossa Valley and my area generally have a lot of transport issues—

**The Hon. W.A. Matthew:** He just doesn't answer.

**Mr VENNING:** He just does not answer. I feel sorry for the staff because we ask them, and they say to send the new letter and they will acknowledge it immediately. We do not even get an acknowledgment either by fax, email or post—nothing. This has been happening for over a year. It is a disgrace.

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light):** I rise to support this motion and congratulate His Excellency Mr Bruno Krumins on his speech to open the parliament. A number of issues arise from His Excellency's speech, and the first one I would like to address is economic growth. The Premier made quite a point about the fact that economic growth in South Australia is bubbling along at a healthy rate. Yes, it is, and a great deal of it is certainly as a result of the good work that the previous Liberal government did in setting up the Food for the Future program. This was set up to encourage people involved in agriculture and viticulture to look at exporting their product.

Primary producers in Australia produce far more than our population requires and, as a result, we must export the majority of our product. We cannot be reticent about this. What members of the government and bodies representing producers must do—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Schubert is out of order!

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** —is ensure that they continually travel overseas to encourage other countries to buy our products and that they continually work with overseas networks to ensure that our product is sold at a healthy price. That is something that the previous Liberal government did, and the then minister for primary industries Rob Kerin, who is now our leader, did an excellent job developing those markets in association with industry in South Australia.

During the 1990s, we saw wine exports, for instance, go from some \$356 million per year to over \$1 billion a year. In areas where wine is grown in our state, for instance, the South-East, there is now a housing shortage. The Minister for Urban Development and Planning has released a PAR to address the problem of temporary accommodation for seasonal workers as a result of a housing shortage at Millicent and other towns in the South-East. This housing demand has been created by the development of the wine industry and the exporting of wine.

I congratulate the people involved in the wine industry because they have concentrated on quality. In the 1950s, many members in this chamber will recall that the Australian wine industry sold some pretty rough wine overseas and, if they look at the export figures to the United Kingdom in the 1950s and 1960s, they will see a dip because the rubbish we were selling overseas was not accepted. However, in the 1980s and 1990s, vignerons and winemakers decided to concentrate on quality, and we have seen the increase in demand as a result.

As I said, they are to be commended for it. However, this was all set up by the previous government, and if this government expects to continue the expansion of the South Australian economy and triple exports within the next, I think it was 13 years, it must have a plan, and I see no plan—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** The member for Heysen says, 'Yes, it is all in 10 years; it is down the track and they do not have to worry about it.' That is exactly right. I see no plan for working with industry to continue to develop the Food for the Future plan. I see no plan in respect of the manufacturing industry in this state to ensure that car exports, or whatever, continue to increase. I see no plan for identifying new industries that this government might want to assist or encourage to seek overseas markets. How does this government expect to triple exports over that period? It was identified in *The Advertiser* only the other day that there is no plan. This government will fail to triple exports if it does not put a plan in place.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Prior to the dinner break, I was commenting on the export market in South Australia and the fact that the government needs to develop a plan. I do not see one, and I think the challenge for this government is to develop a plan to ensure that we achieve what it wants to achieve for the state, and that is a tripling of exports.

I want to turn to an area that concerns me, and that is reference to the Public Works Committee. In all the time that I have been in parliament, the level of project that is referred to the Public Works Committee for scrutiny has been \$4 million. I am greatly concerned that this level has been increased by the government to \$10 million. This government went to the election in 2002 stating that it would be open and accountable, yet we find, just 18 months after its election, that it is doing exactly the opposite. It is closing off projects from either parliamentary or public scrutiny, and I think that is a very serious matter, and questions the government's commitment to openness and accountability. It means that the public, the standing committee of the parliament (the Public Works Committee, that does an excellent job) and parliament itself are denied the ability to assess a public works unless it is over \$10 million.

There have been many times when projects have had a blow-out of costs or there were management matters and other concerns—and I need not mention that the government will know of instances when we were criticised when we were in government. By this action the Public Works Committee will not have access to those projects under \$10 million, and there are many of them. I only have to think of the education portfolio and the number of schools and major projects that fall between \$4 million and \$10 million—they are not the average school project: they are the major school projects. The maths and science school is one example and, of course, that would be above \$10 million. But there are a number of others that fall within those two figures that will now not be able to be looked at by the Public Works Committee. I think it is a major mistake on the part of this government and one that it may well live to regret, because the fact is that the public and parliamentarians will not have the ability to question the government on public works and to ensure that all aspects of those public works between \$4 million and \$10 million are open to scrutiny.

I turn to the government's infrastructure program. A few months ago, the Treasurer went to a public meeting, which I also attended, regarding the bridges of the third river crossing, and, to much joy and acclamation from about 300 people in the Port Adelaide Council chambers, announced that the bridges would be opening. But we found out afterwards that it had not been to cabinet and it was actually a decision, so we are told, of the Treasurer himself. We have heard nothing since. I would be very interested to know whether cabinet has signed off on the matter of the bridges being opened and the rail and road bridge across the Port River. I would be interested to know when tenders will be called. We have questioned the Minister for Transport in this house and are now told that it lies with the Minister for Infrastructure, yet all we are told is that it is progressing. I would be very interested to find out exactly where it is progressing, when it will occur and, also, why this is not a public-private project—one that could have been shared between the private sector and the public sector.

I am concerned also that the government decided to spend \$42 million of capital works money on the Glenelg trams and not go down the track of a public-private partnership. I have spoken with members of the Siemens company, who gave me a briefing on the style of trams and light rail that was an option for the government in the up-coming supply, and they mentioned that the Glenelg tramway would be an excellent project for a public-private partnership. I asked, 'What sort of interest do you think this would have?', and they said, 'Very strong interest from the private sector', basically because it is a closed line, it has very good patronage and the ability to build patronage further. And, without doubt, the fact of a new tram—which I fully support—will increase the number of people travelling on it on a daily basis, just because it is a new and modern tram.

Here was an opportunity for the government to use some private sector money in a public-private partnership and, thereby, save capital works funds for more schools, hospitals, police stations or whatever. But I guess the ideology of this government overlooked or ignored the commonsense and the good financial management that should apply to this. Their ideology is, 'We will not go down this path because we do not believe in public-private partnerships' and, as a result of that, we are spending government capital works money which could have easily been supplied, on my information, by the private sector. I think that is a mistake by the government and

a lost opportunity, and it shows that ideology drives this government rather than commonsense.

The Minister for Urban Planning has released a discussion paper in relation to the hills face zone, suggesting three options to residents and councils. One is that the position remain as it is, that is, that the hills face zone is controlled by local government. The second option is that an authority be set up which covers all local councils and that one authority will decide what is allowable and what is not allowable in the hills face zone. The third option is to introduce an act into parliament.

I have been approached by some vigneron in the One Tree Hill area after they attended the public meeting last week when the three options were discussed and they were able to have an input. The meeting was chaired by Mr Terry Groom, a former member of this house. They were very concerned because they were basically told that option one is not an option. So the current situation, that is, control by local government determining what will be acceptable in the PAR, is not an option. As I say, they were concerned that they got to the meeting thinking that this was going to be an open discussion on all three options, only to be told, 'You might as well forget about option one because the government considers it is not an option.' So that brings us down to two options of what will occur, and we will be interested to see the outcome of all the discussions and what is proposed by the government when that comes about.

The vigneron were very concerned that there is very good land available for the growing of grapes on the eastern face of the hills face zone (they are not arguing about the western face) but that they will be restricted quite severely in expansion of any vineyards in that area. They advise me that there are 900 acres of vines currently planted throughout the hills face zone. Most of those vigneron are concentrating on high quality grapes. Many of them are supplying the wineries for that high quality end of the market and would like the option of being able to expand those vineyards in the future. They are concerned that if the land is to be left as open grazing land—and many of the allotments, particularly in the One Tree Hill area, are around 10 or 20 acres in size—and people are not allowed to develop horticulture in that area, the land will become degraded, because they have been told that the government has no money to ensure that those areas are kept in a good condition, weed-free and that sort of thing. The government's aim of preserving that hills face zone might be achieved, but it will not be in a good condition.

I know about all the arguments in terms of the establishment of wineries in that area. We dealt with that when we were in government and put a restriction on that in the hills area, and I support that. However, horticulture needs to be considered in relation to where it may be expanded in conciliation with the way that all of us want to keep the hills face zone.

I turn now to transport. His Excellency mentioned the transport plan in his speech. I think this transport plan is a disgrace. It is a mass of glib proposals and predictions which have been put together but which mean absolutely nothing. The plan has no timeframes, apart from saying that all these things will be achieved by 2018. We have the RAA calling on the government to address the \$160 million backlog in road maintenance. We have the cutback by this government of some \$10.5 million in rural and regional roads. We have the cutback of \$1 million from outback road gangs. I am still getting letters about this, one only yesterday from a lady at

Yunta complaining about the state of the roads. She had also sent that letter on to the Premier.

The government is ignoring these issues. I received a letter today from a Mr Gunning on the Yorke Peninsula querying the reduction of the speed limit from 110 to 100 kilometres per hour on a particular road, and stating his belief that it was done only because the road needs some maintenance and the way around that is to reduce the speed limit.

We have no particular plan—this is purely a bit of ‘politic-speak’ put into a plan which really outlines nothing. And I am not the only one saying this: the RAA is saying it and the Motor Traders Association is saying it; in fact, all areas of transport have said exactly the same thing. The minister will say, ‘Well, this is just a draft.’ I think that in a draft you should be putting together a reasonable and sensible plan. There are factors in the plan that talk about people sharing cars in travelling to work—that was proposed back in the late 1970s by Don Dunstan and it did not work. We should have learnt from that, yet it pops up again in this plan. We have the suggestion that there should be bus-only lanes. I can see that working on Anzac Highway and Port Road, for instance, but if you bring it down to areas where you have only double lanes, such as Main North Road, Main North East Road and those sorts of arterial roads, you have closed off one lane to the mass of cars that come down that road, and that will only slow the travel time coming into the centre of Adelaide or its inner suburbs.

It does not make sense. It sounds great as a throwaway line but it does not make sense. There are no time frames in this particular plan where it says that: within five years we will do this, and we will attend to regional roads, and within ten years we will aim to do that, and by 2018 we will finish the plan. All of it just says that: by 2018 we will have repaired all regional roads, we will have caught up the backlog and we would have done a massive number of things.

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** ‘And we will love you in the morning,’ as the member for Davenport says. That is just not good enough. The RAA and everybody else in the community is saying that as well. It is a very weak plan and one which the minister obviously did not think through very strongly and one which needs a great deal more work to be a genuine transport plan. It shows a complete lack of vision by this minister, and a complete lack of commitment to transport in South Australia by this government.

I now address the matter of community safety and protection, referred to in the Governor’s speech. This government came to power saying that it was going to be tough on law and order. The only thing that we have seen so far about being tough on law and order is the increase of sentences. Increasing sentences is fine, but the fact is that the government has no control over what the court does. The judge will determine the sentence. The courts will determine the length of time a person stays in jail, regardless of whether or not the government puts life on every single offence that could occur. People are not going to get life; it is as simple as that. Yet this government would have us believe that it is being tough on law and order.

I wrote a letter to a lady today, one of my constituents, who was complaining about this. I said to her that I could recall a terrible case about two or three years ago of a woman who had been raped over a period of hours, had been physically assaulted and came out with a couple of black eyes, lost teeth and a fractured cheek bone. The case went to the court and a maximum sentence for the perpetrator would

have been 15 years non-parole. From memory, that person received nine years. I think it was five or six years non-parole. I questioned the Attorney-General at the time as to this case and he said the court will always set a sentence on precedence. The judge said that this was the worst case he had seen. If it was the worst case that he had seen, why did he not set 12 or 13 years rather than nine years? The reason was that the worst case before had a sentence of about seven or eight years, so he increased the amount to reflect a worst case. The government can set all of the longer terms of detention that it likes, but it is the court that will determine the length of stay in prison of a particular person who has committed an offence and is found guilty of that offence.

I will turn now to one very serious area that I am concerned about because of information that has been given to me, and that is police numbers, particularly in my local Gawler Police Station. I have been given information about the level of stress and the under-supply of police officers to this station and to other stations around South Australia. It is not only the Gawler police station. This government came to office and in their four-year budget plan there are no funds for even one extra police officer. The situation in police stations is this: if you have somebody who is off on sick leave, or off on holiday leave, or whatever sort of leave, whether it is for training or other purposes, there are no replacements.

The roster for the Gawler police station has five members on duty. Two weeks ago two were off on sick leave and another was off on stress leave, which leaves two people looking after the station, and there are no replacements. At the regional meetings where they have raised this as an issue and complained about it because of the workload it is incurring on those police officers, they are told, ‘You had better get used to it, because nothing’s changing.’ Yet this government is saying it will be tough on law and order.

To give a few examples, one member in the Gawler police station was working solo on the weekend from 0700 hours to 1300 hours and from 1500 hours to 2100 hours—no other member in the police station. It is an occupational health and safety issue in terms of anybody coming into that police station. This follows for Friday night, and Friday night in Gawler is very busy for the police because it is the night when the hotels of the town have a large number of patrons and a number of issues arise out of that early in the morning. It is also the time when people who work Monday to Friday come to the place station because they have business to do and only one person is there for that period. It is impossible in this police station now for a member to have a meal break away from that work environment on any shift.

The phone system in Gawler does not have a message bank or hold facility, so it keeps on ringing, even if you have someone you are serving at the counter and you obviously have to answer it. They have raised the issue with the department and asked for it to be replaced. That was 10 weeks ago and still nothing has been done. Even the Two Wells and Mallala police stations, which are single member police stations, have an answering service, so if they are out somebody ringing the police station can leave a message, but not at Gawler. It has been identified as a hazard. It has been reported to the IS&T branch, but they are still waiting for what must be now the very basics of office management.

Only one computer is set up for an interview or report taking. There is not enough room on the front desk to set up another computer, so when people come in to make a report a police officer cannot access another computer. The roster

for Gawler looks okay, but when you look at it you find that the people who are on stress leave or are away are not replaced, so two people end up looking after a police station which now serves a community of around 30 000 to 40 000 people. There are 18 500 people in Gawler but, when you take it out to Mallala, Two Wells and into the Barossa, as Gawler is a regional centre, they have to serve many more people.

The Mallala and Two Wells stations are often closed because the police officer there is out doing additional duties, so people come into Gawler. It is additional work from that area. The front office staff are unable to get adequate training due to no allocated training days and, if training is done, nobody replaces them in the police station, so the other members have to pick up the extra workload. It is terrible. When they take it to regional meetings, the answer from the regional heads is, 'Well, you had better yet used to it because it's not going to change.' This government will find that it has police officers and a Police Force that is under an increasing workload and stress, with increasing dissatisfaction with the way they are being treated.

Patrols are not taking meal breaks. They cannot take them because they are overloaded with work and they feel that they are undervalued. I am told they feel that they are just being used and are not being supported. This government must do something about this or it will end up with a Police Force under great stress and a larger number of police officers going out on stress leave.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** I rise to support the Address in Reply and congratulate His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on his fine speech in opening this session of parliament. I will take up some of the topics raised during his address and maybe express some views about them. I will start off with WorkCover, as it will be a real issue facing this parliament and the South Australian business community over the next 12 months and onwards.

Today in question time and in previous question times we raised a series of questions with the Minister for Industrial Relations about WorkCover and really got no answers at all. We know that the unfunded liability has blown out to something exceeding \$400 million and growing, on our estimate. It is a pattern that has developed in all the Labor states in relation to WorkCover. The New South Wales scheme has unfunded liability of some billions of dollars, and the same applies in Victoria. It goes to the competitive business structure, costs on business and confidence in investment in the state. We are up against not only Victoria and New South Wales but also Queensland and Western Australia for investment, so it goes to the confidence of the business community. The minister has been doing an ordinary job in relation to handling the WorkCover issue, which is why the opposition has raised so many questions with regard to WorkCover. We cannot understand why the minister is not paying far closer attention to a looming problem for the South Australian business community.

We note that the minister introduced legislation before the parliament was prorogued, but it has not given any indication during this session whether the WorkCover bill tabled previously will be reintroduced in the same form. It will be interesting to see what happens because that bill got scathing reviews from the public consultation process when released. It will be interesting to see whether the minister has listened to the public consultation process in relation to WorkCover governance, because that issue is very important to the

business community in this state. We will certainly be keeping a watching brief in relation to WorkCover.

Hand in hand with WorkCover is the occupational health and safety issue, and again the minister introduced legislation in the last parliament, put it out for public consultation, and there it sits. The legislation again disappears. This is on the back of the Stevens and Stanley reports into occupational health and safety, WorkCover and industrial relations. The government is about 18 months to two years into its term, has promised major reform in regard to these two areas and we have had two reports, two consultations on a bill and, ultimately, only a new board appointed for WorkCover in the past six to eight weeks—and that is it. In relation to the major reforms promised, talked about and talked up straight after the election about the government's putting its imprimatur on those issues, the minister appears stalled and has stage fright in regard to making decisions on those issues. The expectation in the union movement is that the minister will deliver some of the union agenda in relation to these issues, and no doubt it will be behind the scenes seeking its pound of flesh from the minister on reforms that they have proposed to the minister over time.

Some people might want to dust off the Stanley or Stevens reports and see some of the anti-competitive measures proposed therein relating to the business community. The Stanley report basically says that if none of his recommendations put up the cost of WorkCover too much it should reintroduce the journey vehicle accidents to be covered by the scheme. The whole report was done without any cost consideration, and there has been no release by the government of the costs of those two reports if they were implemented in their form as recommended. Nothing of any note seems to be happening on the industrial relations/WorkCover front.

As I said, the minister appears to be suffering from some form of stage fright in relation to those areas, and is certainly not across the portfolio. I think it is obvious to the house during question time that the minister really knows not a lot about not a lot in relation to occupational health and safety and WorkCover. What this all goes to, of course, is the government's vision for business. It is interesting to see, again, what the government has not done in relation to underpinning the South Australian economy in the business community.

Again, if one looks at another report—the Economic Development Board's report that is sitting gathering dust—the government has really said, 'We are going to have a report and the report will recommend a strategic plan.' We are approaching the two-year mark of the government and what we are really doing for economic development is developing a strategic plan. That might be all well and good while the property boom is on but, ultimately, if the property boom wears off—and it is more cyclic in South Australia than in some other states—what have you got to underpin the economy if you have not restructured it or progressed any measures in the meantime?

I think the big mistake that this government is making (and it may not show for a few years but it will show) is that it is not making the big decisions quick enough about investment so that the business community and the economy is continually restructured for the future growth industries. I think that, in future years, this government will regret its slowness to react to the opportunities with which it has been presented with the economy that is being delivered by a range of international and national factors. But we will see what

happens with the business community and the economy in future years.

I do smile when the government runs out and says, 'Look, we are anti-privatisation. We will not write out cheques to attract business and keep business here in South Australia, except, of course, for Mitsubishi and the Adelaide Airport.' Of course the government will write out cheques as appropriate; indeed, as did the last government. I do not think that anyone would be arguing that EDS, Motorola and other businesses brought here under the previous regime should not be here and that they have not been a positive investment for the state. I do smile when the government goes out with its rhetoric in regard to that.

I have found it rather ironic that in the fortnight period it was talking about not competing with other states for business investment it was the same fortnight that the state lost the Cricket Academy to Queensland, which did not sign the agreement about not competing interstate. That will be interesting. I will be very interested when Queensland approaches South Australian businesses and says, 'Look, we will offer you incentives to come to Queensland', to see whether the state government is really going to put up its hands and say, 'We are not going to compete.' The reality is that this little exercise was tried in America and it fell over.

The reality is that states do compete for business. They are natural competitive economies. They will compete and people will, for the good of their state, try to get businesses either to grow within their state or come to their state. It will be interesting to see how that little exercise turns out over the next ensuing period. I do want to touch on some issues in relation to radioactive waste. I guess that the parliament and, indeed, the people of South Australia are getting used to a series of half truths now told by the minister. The first one, of course, was the misleading of the house in regard to whether the government had received a recommendation about supporting a central repository.

The minister, unfortunately, had to apologise for misleading the house in that regard. That was the same issue on which the cabinet also received inaccurate information during that same exercise. Then we had the big statement by the government saying that this is the first time in Australia's history that the commonwealth has acquired land against the wishes of a state. Of course, it had to then admit that in actual fact it was not the first time that it had happened in the history of the commonwealth: it had happened previously, I think, in 1968 in Holdsworth, or somewhere.

Then we had the magnificent statement that we can fit all the radioactive waste into one 44 gallon drum. It was four cubic metres, or something. Later it emerged that the volume was a lot more than that. In the last fortnight the minister has been saying that Peter Slipper, the parliamentary secretary, has confirmed that other sites could have been used. For the interest of the house I will read exactly what Peter Slipper said because it is unfortunate that the minister has quoted one line out of about a four-page contribution, and I think put the wrong spin on it which, I guess, is the minister's prerogative, but he needs to be careful that he does not deliberately mislead the people of South Australia in his attempts to spin a line. Peter Slipper actually said:

I found that the decision to build a national repository was made in the 1980s, and the current project, which commenced in 1992, was the result of a joint decision by the commonwealth/state and territory governments in recognition of the risk to public health and safety of the existing inadequate storage arrangements. The commonwealth had undertaken a comprehensive and detailed study of potential sites Australia-wide. That study had identified a very limited number of

sites (three) which had been shown to fully meet the stringent site requirements under the NHMRC code. An approval for the construction and operation of the national repository had been given by the commonwealth Minister for the Environment and Heritage under the EPBC Act. A condition of the approval required that the commonwealth construct and operate the national repository on one of two sites, known as sites 40a and 45a. Site 40a is the relevant land.

Mr Slipper further states:

I found that it was possible that there were other sites in Australia apart from the three sites mentioned in the paragraph above which could have been shown to fully meet the stringent siting requirements set out in the NHMRC Code.

I break there because that is the line that the minister has been running, just that one line, which states:

I have found that it was possible there were other sites in Australia apart from the three sites mentioned which could have been shown to fully meet the stringent siting requirements.

Now, the minister stopped quoting there because it was convenient to the minister. If the minister had been telling the full picture to the South Australian community he would have read the next line, which states:

However, there was also a possibility that such sites could not be found, and that even if they were found they would not satisfy the criteria to the same standards as the three sites that had been identified.

So, the line the minister has been running, that there were other sites available that would have met the standard, is not what Peter Slipper necessarily said. My interpretation of what Peter Slipper was saying is that, yes, in theory there might have been other sites but they certainly would not have met the criteria. The fact that it had taken an 11-year process to find these three sites meant that the three sites left were the three sites that were available to the commonwealth. Ultimately, we have asked the minister to table the full document from Peter Slipper so that the house has the accurate record, but I think that the truth in that whole radioactive waste debate has been hijacked.

That is unfortunate, and we will continue to try to expose the government's half truths as they emerge. In my view, today's exercise of taking out a full-page advert in the newspaper was as much about promoting the Labor Party as it was about debating the issue. The other issue with respect to the environment portfolio is natural resource management. During the break I had the pleasure to attend a few public consultation meetings in relation natural resource management. From memory, it is about a 200-page bill which the government put out for public consultation, except for the levy.

The government is introducing a natural resource management levy and it consulted on everything but the levy. The chapter relating to the levy, chapter 5 in an eight chapter bill, basically was non-existent. There were a series of notes saying, essentially, 'This is what we think the levy might do, but we are consulting about how the levy is going to be collected and we will get back to you Watch this space.' The public was consulted about the integration of natural resource management, the board structures, the powers of the board and what natural resources might be included.

But when it came to the levy, how it would be collected, the structure of the levy and the volume of the levy, all those sorts of interesting issues about money, surprise, surprise, the government simply did not have an answer on it and was not consulting on it. So, the whole consultation process that has gone on for 18 months or almost two years about bringing in an integrated natural resource management system has been done, excluding anything about the levy. Having been the



minister at the time and had the pleasure of bringing in the emergency services levy, I know the amount of community interest there is in levies and how they are collected, so it will be interesting to see ultimately where the government goes on natural resource management. When you say to people, 'Do you want natural resource management to be integrated?', they all say yes, because it sounds good and it sounds logical, but everyone then interprets totally differently what integrated natural resource management means.

The mood at the four or five natural resource management consultations that I attended was not as supportive as the minister's public servants will be telling him. In fact, at one of the briefings there were only seven landowners out of a crowd of 69. The other 62 people were either public servants, board members or officers of the board. So, the minister was not really consulting with the land-holders whose land was going to be managed by this bill; rather, he was listening to the public servants or officers who might be administering the extra powers that would be given to them under this bill. It will be interesting to see where the government goes with natural resource management.

The other issue is that of crown lands. I think that the way the government has handled the crown lands debate is a disgrace. This was introduced in a budget over 12 months ago. To introduce a bill that retrospectively changed 15 000 contracts and increased the rental or added a service fee of some \$300 per annum to those contracts is a disgrace and has caused a lot of angst in the country community at a time when they could least afford a lot of angst, given that it was a drought period. However, when we asked the minister why he was doing this to drought-affected areas, the minister commented that the drought-affected areas were not covered by crown lands, only to have to come back and correct that later. The minister had to learn a very big lesson very quickly on the issues involved with crown land management, and even he realises now that he was snowed by his department at the time in relation to bringing in that bill.

What we have now, of course, because the government declined to debate the bill in the last parliament, is the situation where these 15 000 crown leaseholders have all been written to and been told that if they do not freehold by 30 September the freeholding costs will not be \$2 000 but \$6 000 per title, in effect. Because they do not know what the parliament is going to do with the bill, these people are now freeholding their land blindly because they do not know what the cost structure is. Ultimately, this is just a form of blackmail by the government. No government should be putting a deadline on people that it will offer freehold of their land unless it actually spells out all the rules. The government knows that the parliament will deal with the debate and set the rules, and it is only at that point that people should have to make the decision about freeholding in its final form, once they actually know all the rules.

Lots of people in rural communities are very disappointed with the way in which the government and the minister, in particular, have arrogantly gone about introducing this system of freeholding, because it does put the crown leaseholders in an untenable position where they have to decide whether or not they freehold their title without knowing what the rules are. The minister could have handled that issue a lot better.

We then get to the Murray River, which is the member for Unley's portfolio and not mine, but I make these observations. The government is making great play about its commitment to the Murray. My observation is that the state government's commitment to the Murray is reflected in the

fact that the only people contributing to the River Murray are the South Australian taxpayers, not the government. The government has introduced a new levy—something it said it would not do, of course. I remember the pledge card: no increase and no new rates and taxes. I guess they would argue that they did not say 'no new levies'. Anyway, we have the Murray River levy, and that will go towards this new joint commonwealth/state contribution.

The reality is that out of the state budget the state government is putting nothing towards that: not a cent. The only people paying it are the poor old taxpayers. All the state government has done to show its commitment is go to the average person in the street and say, 'We are so committed to saving the Murray that we will levy you your \$30,' whatever the figure is (I think it is \$20 million the first year and \$30 million every year thereafter), 'and we are so committed that we will actually take nothing out of general revenue. Not one cent. What we want to do is tax you, to levy you, and then ultimately put nothing in out of the budget ourselves.'

I have no qualms about a state government supporting River Murray issues: I think it is logical; we need to look after the Murray and improve it. But to go out there and beat the chest and say that this government is committed to fixing the Murray when out of general revenue they actually put nothing in themselves—they actually break an election promise to introduce a levy to spend on the Murray but put nothing in out of general revenue themselves—I think shows the shallowness of this government on that issue.

I look forward to debating the powers and functions of the Auditor-General's Bill if and when it is introduced to this place. It has been hanging around for something like 15 months waiting for the parliament to debate it. Now it has fallen off the *Notice Paper*. We are not sure whether the government will reintroduce that bill or, indeed, a substantially amended bill, but we will wait and see.

It was pleasing today to see the member for Enfield move in the Economic and Finance Committee that we have an investigation into the powers and functions of the Auditor-General, and we look forward to that inquiry in that committee.

I want to touch very quickly on some local issues in my electorate, some of which I have mentioned before. One in particular I want to touch on is the practice of the CFS and councils mandating that local residents who are building must put in firefighting equipment. I want to touch on this because I think there is an issue with it that we need to think about carefully. The CFS always tells us to decide whether we will leave home on the day of a fire and to decide early, not leave it to the last minute. If the fire is coming and you want to evacuate, make the decision early and go, or stay and fight the fire. But whatever you do, make the decision early.

When someone applies to build an addition in the Mitcham Hills, the application is sent to the CFS to ask it about firefighting requirements, and the CFS, through its Development Assessment Committee, sends a recommendation to the council about what equipment the council should recommend that the resident put in, and the council normally adopts that recommendation. It might recommend fire pumps, fire hoses and a water storage tank, for example. But it intrigues me that at that point the CFS local brigade is not told about the firefighting equipment being put in.

I have a constituent who spent \$3 000 putting in the equipment stipulated by the local council following the recommendation from the CFS: putting in the storage tank of

5 000 gallons, I think it was, putting in a firefighting pump and fire hose, and, when she rang the CFS to register it, the CFS said, 'We don't actually keep a register and we probably won't use the equipment, anyway.' The interesting thing about this is that my constituent has a particular physical condition which means that that person cannot turn on the pump specified. So, not only have they spent \$3 000 putting in the equipment that the CFS does not know is there and probably will not use, but also they actually cannot physically turn it on.

I ask the following question for the house to consider: if the resident is not going to stop and fight the fire, why are we stipulating that they put in fire equipment? If the resident, in moving into the district, says, 'I'm not going to fight the fire; I'm just going to lock my door and go,' why are we saying to them when they put on a pergola or a room, 'You must spend \$3 000, \$4 000, \$5 000 or \$6 000 on firefighting equipment'? Why are we getting them to do that if they do not intend to stay there and use it, and if the CFS is saying that there is no register? Indeed, in the local *Mount Barker Courier* the CFS was saying that it does not want a register of the local fire fighting equipment.

We have put in place a process where residents in the fire prone areas who are building on additions to their homes are, following a recommendation to the CFS, required by the council to put in fire fighting equipment, and then they do not tell the CFS that it is there, there is no register kept in the CFS or the local council. In my constituent's case, they have stipulated equipment that, because of a physical ailment, the person cannot even turn on. This person has spent \$3 000 on equipment that nobody will use. I am wondering whether there does not need to be a change in process and whether the council needs to recommend to the resident that, if they intend to stay during a bushfire, they should consider installing this equipment. It seems ridiculous if, for instance, an 80 year old person moves into the area but who has no intention of staying in the area in time of bushfire is then forced to install \$3 000, \$4 000 or \$5 000 worth of equipment that they have absolutely no intention of ever using. I raise that because I know that my constituent was absolutely furious that she had spent \$3 000 on equipment that she cannot turn on, that the CFS has told her it is unlikely to use and that the council does want to know is there.

The Coromandel Valley Primary School is getting its upgrade thanks to the commonwealth government. The state government decided not to put one cent into a \$1.2 million project at the Coromandel Valley Primary School. We think it might be the first time in the state's history that a primary school has had a \$1.2 million upgrade without any state money in it at all. Of course, the community is furious about that, but that is the decision of the government.

We are upset that the Eden Hills CFS station has been delayed by a number of years. Again, that project was deferred by this government. The member for Fisher previously talked about the lack of progress on Black Road which has been promised and promised, but still nothing has been delivered in relation to its upgrade. We were disappointed that the government cut in half the old Belair Road project from \$1.8 million to \$900 000. Of course, with the onset of all the traffic from Craighburn Farm and the Blackwood Park development which will increase the population of the Blackwood district by some 20 per cent, the lack of planning there in relation to traffic matters will cause major concerns long-term to the people of the Mitcham Hills. We are anxiously waiting for the government to confirm that the

Marion pool will go ahead as promised by the previous government. That will service—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The minister says that they are doing the sums right.

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** If the minister wants to interject, good luck to him. We are waiting for the government to announce—as no doubt it will—that the pool will go at Marion and not in the Adelaide area. That will naturally help the constituents of the Mitcham Hills which is essentially the major part of my electorate. With those few words, I have pleasure in supporting the Address in Reply.

Debate adjourned.

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure):**

I move:

That the house asserts its privileges, in particular that the freedom of speech in debates and proceedings in parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of parliament, and reasserts that principle in the matter of Niarchos and Snelling.

**The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I rise as someone who has been in this house for some time to say that I strongly support the privileges of this parliament. It is important that this parliament protects those privileges. This issue has been raised over many years in many different courts and venues, and it is something which I hold dear because it is a fundamental principle of parliamentary democracy under the Westminster system. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption resumed.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland):** In rising to speak to the Address in Reply motion, I acknowledge His Excellency Mr Bruno Krums and welcome his first formal address to the houses of the parliament. I also add my condolences to the motion of condolence on the death of Mr David Boundy who was a member of this house from 1974 until 1977 and acknowledge his service to this house, his community and to the people of South Australia. I offer my sincere condolences to his wife Erica, and to his family and friends. This government's intentions for the future, detailed during the opening of this Third Session of the Fiftieth Parliament, hold no surprises for the members of the opposition. There is nothing new that provides vision, enterprise, innovation or direction for the future. The government's claims that, during the past months it has continued to work to rebuild the state's economy, is not only hypocritical but totally incorrect, as—and I stress this—all members in this house would know.

The suggestion that it had to rebuild South Australia's economy would be seen not only by economists and industry but by the people of this state as posturing without substance. The economic indicators for the state have been on an upward spiral since as far back as 1997, slowly at first and certainly gaining momentum right up to and including the present day—all without this government lifting the proverbial finger to contribute in any way to economic growth. Two budgets have now been delivered by this government and, other than spending millions of dollars reviewing everything that could

be reviewed by the multitude of consultants we did not need to have, we have not seen one positive move to develop and implement any strategies, plans or strategic plans that would give some direction for government and its agencies to maintain the current state of the economy, let alone strategic plans and direction to continue to grow our economy.

The government says that it wants to see job opportunities grow for South Australians. You do not create job opportunities by slashing \$2 million from state employment programs which include cuts of 100 places from the government youth training program. However, then again, we are still waiting to see an employment policy developed by this government and, more importantly, implemented by this government. Nor do you create employment or improve health by slashing \$2 million from the dental health budget, which also means the government will successfully increase the waiting list for public dental work for up to three years or more.

The government is very fond of touting its support for Aboriginal people, particularly in welfare areas. However, the Aboriginal Housing Authority investing expenditure is slashed by this government by some 12 per cent, down to the grand sum of \$3.84 million. Crisis accommodation program funding has been slashed by 25 per cent, down to \$3.507 million. Of course, this is a government which prides itself on its social inclusion policies and which looks at developing socially acceptable programs and policies that assist the socioeconomic lower layer of people in this state. However, we also look at the fact that there has been no expansion of the South Australian transport subsidy scheme which would give existing users more than one round taxi trip per week, or admit people with other forms of disability such as blindness which prevent them travelling safely on public transport.

There has been no increase in state funds to shorten the growing waiting list for essential equipment such as wheelchairs, and there is still no increase in electricity concessions or reform of the concession system. The Liberal opposition has called on the Labor government to increase pensioner concessions when it carries out its quarterly budget review at the end of this month. This government has had a revenue windfall of some \$723 million since the beginning of last year. There is no excuse for this government to turn its back on pensioners while it hoards millions of dollars, which, predominantly, have been derived from the huge increase in property values. That money should now be returned to struggling pensioners.

At the beginning of this month, the shadow minister for transport brought to our attention further money grabbing actions of this government, which, of course, add to the litany of tax grabs that we have already seen directed at the pockets of South Australians. The shadow minister outlined the fact that people wishing to divide their properties will now be hit with a 21 per cent fee increase under the Labor government. People wishing to subdivide their properties of less than one hectare will be hit with a fee increase of between \$1 830 and \$2 215 if they do not leave enough open space as specified under the act. But that is not the end of it: the Labor government has also introduced a requirement for each partner in a building partnership to have a builder's licence. Previously only one person in a partnership needed to hold such a licence to cover the whole business. This is an increase of at least \$159 per building business. Once again, housing affordability is affected. The increased tax will affect every first home buyer and every purchaser of a community title development, and this just adds to the litany of broken promises by this

government, which, at the election, promised it would not increase fees or charges.

It has already increased stamp duty rates by up to 25 per cent, which hurts many South Australians and certainly discourages many first home buyers. In conjunction with a booming property market, stamp duty on conveyances collected in 2002-03 will be some \$152 million higher than the level budgeted for in 2001-02. This is an increase of some 62.08 per cent in conveyance stamp duty collections in just one year under this Labor government, which clearly is over and above any CPI increase. These increases will mean that hardworking South Australian families and young couples will struggle to buy their own home. The Treasurer and the Premier have attempted to point the finger in every direction but at themselves during the recent home affordability debate, yet, as we can see, once again, this Labor government is stripping South Australians of the right to afford the great Australian dream—and, as we all know, that is one's own home.

The Address in Reply allows us to deal with many issues. As this government does not have any great news to impart to the people of South Australia, other than the fact that huge tax increases still continue to occur and the impost on people right across this state will continue over the next few years of this Labor government (and I think the opposition has managed to detail many of these rorts), I move on to some of the issues relating to my responsibilities as shadow minister for recreation and sport.

In the first instance, I hold no great regard for the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, because, as a minister of the crown, he continues to refuse to give information to this parliament, and therefore to the people of South Australia, on any matter relating to the manner in which the recreation and sport portfolio is being managed or about the range of programs that receive taxpayers' dollars.

On almost every occasion, the minister refuses to explain exactly where the money on which he signs off on behalf of South Australians is being delivered. In many instances, it is extremely difficult to have respect for anyone who carries the authority of a minister of the crown, yet refuses to comply with a duty that he has to this parliament and to the South Australian people in terms of where the budget monies are spent.

Many different areas of sport have suffered under this Labor government in a short 18 months. We have seen events disappear from this state and probably never to be revived again. I will mention another extreme area where South Australia has lost one of its most successful sporting pieces of infrastructure. I would suggest that today South Australian cricket should be in mourning as we lament the loss of the world renowned cricket academy.

The academy, which expanded to become the centre of cricket excellence, leaves Adelaide after 16 years. It will now be located in Brisbane after a combined bid to Cricket Australia from private enterprise and the Queensland government. I can only wish them well in the next 20 years (the length of the contract), but I question whether Queensland would be celebrating had this state government taken the same responsible approach in relation to the centre of cricket excellence. The esteem in which other states held the centre was evident in the fact that eight bids were submitted to Cricket Australia.

But how and why did South Australia lose this world leading cricket centre, the envy of almost every other cricket nation in the world? Various reasons have been banded about

in the media as the reason Cricket Australia awarded the 20-year contract to Queensland. One reason given was the weather: Adelaide's weather has never been an issue in the past 16 years. Another reason was accommodation, but negotiation could easily resolve appropriate accommodation requirements. It is not as though Queensland could compete with the excellence of our facilities. The academy had the use of the picturesque Adelaide Oval, which is lauded as one of the most prestigious test venues in the world, complete with world-class test pitches prepared by world-class curator Les Burdett. The new Queensland based centre will not even have the use of the GABA, the state's test cricket venue, but will be housed in the lesser known Alan Border field. In all respects, in terms of history, facilities, track record, reputation and with the obvious advantage of being the incumbent, South Australia should still be the proud caretakers of the centre of cricket excellence.

The one reason Queensland will be the proud holder of the nation's premier cricketing development facility for the next 20 years is that the South Australian bid could never compete with a state in which the government realised the importance of the centre of cricket excellence and was prepared to put its money where its mouth was. South Australia lost the centre because the bid could not compete with a reported \$1.2 million government gift and a recurrent five year subsidy of \$1.3 million which enabled the winning Queensland bid to offer the same services at half the annual cost to Cricket Australia.

What did the South Australian Labor government offer? It offered a loan at commercial interest rates, certainly not as claimed by minister Wright in an *Advertiser* article that similar funding had also been offered to SACA.

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, the Minister for Infrastructure! The member for Newland has the call and is entitled to be heard.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** What mindless boffin could not get their head around the figures and offer an interest free loan over five years or 10 years, or even the length of the contract, and put South Australia into a competitive bid mode? Where was the Minister for Sport? Did he sit at the negotiating table to look at all the options, including encouraging various institutions to contribute by investment? We know the answer to that question: it is a resounding no. The fact that we could not compete financially shows the incompetence of this government—it is long on rhetoric but very short on action when it comes to keeping what was the premier cricket training facility in Australia.

Look how seriously England views such facilities. England is spending tens of millions of pounds to model its sporting system on what we have currently in Australia, and it has even gone so far as to institute its own cricket academy—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will come to order.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** —complete with former Australian wicket-keeper and former cricket academy mentor, Rod Marsh, to oversee the future development of its cricketing stars. We had all that already. We had it all here in South Australia. We had the focus of the cricketing nation turned towards Adelaide, not only for our world class venues but for the fact that the future of Australian cricket was being guided in no small part from a cricket centre based in South Australia. The academy has produced 31 Australian players,

including South Australian fast bowler Jason Gillespie, Shane Warne, Glenn McGrath, Brett Lee and the current Australian one day captain and possible future test captain Ricky Ponting, and is one of the reasons Australia has come to dominate world cricket. The Adelaide-based academy developed cricketers' skills to enable Australia to dominate world cricket over the past five to six years.

Specialist coaches were also called upon to assist with player development. In the past, former internationals Dennis Lillee, Ian Chappell, Mark Taylor, Ian Healey, Ashley Mallet, Terry Jenner, John Inverarity and Kerry O'Keefe have all shared their experiences with players at the cricket academy. The importance—

**Mr Koutsantonis:** What do you know about cricket? Have you ever played it?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I have, as a matter of fact. I nearly lost an eye playing it. The importance of the Adelaide-based academy was even recognised internationally, with players from India and Sri Lanka coming to Adelaide for specialist coaching. The academy is the driving force behind Australia's current on-field success and our future in the competitive arena of world cricket, and for this government to say, 'Well, we did our best; we made an offer and we provided some support staff', while a more professional government makes off with our cricketing academy is nothing more than a disgusting joke.

The latest travesty from our state government underpins a disturbing trend of turning a blind eye to our sporting heritage and future. The Adelaide International Horse Trials was saved only temporarily after public condemnation forced the government into an embarrassing backflip. But where to from here? This is a government which has threatened the future of the world-famous Interdominion carnival in this state because it does not have the business intellect to recognise the economic flow-on benefits to our state, nor the understanding of community service obligations of government necessary to support the social infrastructure that relates to the needs of a vast constituency of sporting communities in South Australia.

This is the government that for the past year has done absolutely nothing on any issue in any field except to either blame the previous government or claim it was not its problem. It is a government that has certainly proven itself to be much more interested in headlines than in the South Australian public. It is too late to save the cricket centre, and we only have to wait 20 years before we get a chance to bid again to have the centre here in Adelaide! This government should be deeply ashamed at how easily it can abandon the sporting future of this state. I can only hope that the next generation will not be reduced to reading in the newspapers about sporting successes in other states while sitting in their homes because there is no sporting infrastructure or events left for them to enjoy on a first-hand basis.

Knowing that the minister for emergency services and infrastructure, etc. is very interested in my speech tonight, I have decided that I will direct my remarks to one of the other issues that relates to sport, recreation and emergency services in this state. It was only recently that members of the opposition received a letter from the Surf Life Saving Association of South Australia, addressed to the Hon. Patrick Conlon, Minister for Emergency Services.

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I am happy to talk about stadiums at any time the minister likes but, at this stage, I am going to talk about Surf Life Saving, South Australia, because the

contents of this letter are extremely disturbing and I am quite sure that the minister sitting at the bench would be equally concerned—that is, if he, in fact, agreed with what is being said by Surf Life Saving. This letter is one of great concerns, and it urges the minister to take their concerns into regard—even to answer them or to give assurances that their concerns can be allayed and that this government is not going to completely ignore Surf Life Saving as part of the emergency service area. They are worried about their funding, minister. They appear to think that in the review that you have just undertaken you have not mentioned Surf Life Saving. They are really concerned that their membership did not appear to be included in the 24 000 career and volunteer members within the emergency services sector. Of course, their concerns are further heightened by that lack of mention of Surf Life Saving and/or its thousands of members within the context of the document released on 20 August 2003 entitled South Australian Fire and Emergency Management Commission—Commission Implementation Plan ('the Plan'). This plan apparently identifies that there will be an industrial and volunteer liaison committee, members of which will comprise senior representatives from all unions and associations that represent the interests of career and volunteer members of the sector. Is the minister telling me that we can tell surf lifesaving that he is ignoring them and that this review—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Newland has the call, not the minister.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** —has deliberately taken Surf Life Saving out of the terms of the review so that it will no longer support Surf Life Saving with operational funding? Let me read another excerpt from this very interesting letter from the state president:

We find our apparent exclusion, given the content of the 'Minute forming enclosure to' re: Government's Expectations of Emergency Services quite alarming. This document, amongst other things, states that in respect to emergency services 'The expectations of the government directly reflect the expectations of today's community'.

They go on to say:

The same sentiments seem to be conveyed in your speech to the house on 17 July 2003. We would be most surprised if the services provided by Surf Life Saving do not fall within the expectations of today's community.

They also say:

You will be aware, sir, that in addition to the thousands of volunteer hours providing beach patrols at Surf Life Saving Club locations, and mobile patrols in various forms, we provide educational and preventative programs right throughout the State, including programs along the coastline from Mount Gambier to Ceduna and to many inland rural centres of South Australia.

And they put the next little statement quite succinctly:

Whilst South Australia was the first state to formally recognise Surf Life Saving as an emergency service, other states have moved in a similar direction, without as yet introducing an emergency services levy.

Minister [they say], we have been unsuccessful in our endeavours to have you recognise our need for increased operational funding, as distinct from capital works funding for affiliated Clubs; our concerns about our future can only be heightened by what we foresee might arise from the legislative changes predicated on the implementation of the Plan. As previously foreshadowed, the financial accounts for the year ended 30 June 2003 will contain a dependency note, on our reliance for Government funding, as required by our Auditors, in accordance with relevant accounting practice. The Auditors of our affiliated Clubs will no doubt, in the future, attach similar notes to their financial reports.

Hopefully, our concerns are misplaced and this apparent oversight can be easily remedied and is not indicative of the

Government's attitude to the worth of Surf Life Saving in South Australia.

As the minister appeared to be so interested in my Address in Reply contribution, perhaps he could give me a nod across the chamber so that we can go to Surf Life Saving and tell them that their concerns can be allayed, and that the minister will continue to support them as part of the emergency services area, designated and recognised—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The minister is out of order.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** —for the important emergency services work that they do throughout the whole of South Australia.

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** The minister says \$1.2 million. That is good recognition? That is a damn good investment, minister, for the communities of South Australia to make sure that we have the protective nature of this particular emergency service throughout our state.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Scalzi):** Order! The member for Newland has the floor. Would the minister stop interjecting.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** It appears that the minister is not going to be quite as generous as we would hope. We have not been able to get that nod from him that the plan that came out of the review was mistaken in denying that the Surf Life Saving South Australia Corporation be recognised as an emergency service area for future budgets. This lack of recognition is quite disappointing to all of us. It will be tremendously disappointing to all the people of South Australia if any of these clubs have to close because of lack of support from this government, leaving people at a disadvantage and perhaps putting lives at risk because there is no requirement for these type of people to make sure that they are protecting not only our shores but also the people who want to use those areas and who may find themselves at risk from time to time. I find that quite unconscionable, minister.

**An honourable member:** And I find your performance disgraceful. How are we going?

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** We have about three minutes, sir, so I could can either take the minister to task for the next three minutes or I can move on to tell you that, in terms of the Attorney-General and his comments in this house today in a ministerial statement, not only has he continued to reveal his own ignorance of the law but also he has identified himself as being quite incompetent. I believe the minister at the bench might be quite insensitive, but in this instance this particular minister is quite incompetent.

The Attorney-General, the most senior of all legal officers in this state, does not understand his own laws which he has brought into this parliament and which are supported by this parliament. For that minister to come into this house, supposedly in answer to a question that I put to him the day before, when he had to think about the question—even though he had made a very definite statement about what he thought about the question—and seek legal advice, and then come back into this house with a four page ministerial statement to give me an answer to that very simple question, was quite remarkable.

Then again, we do understand that the Attorney-General does have a great way with words. The only problem is that

the words he has linked in this four-page piece of nonsense is just pure rhetoric. I thank him for his identifying so clearly what this particular act of law, the Recreational Services (Limitation of Liability) Act, actually means, but all it proves is that the Attorney-General had not a clue when he went in to the public arena and made a statement which misled the public of South Australia. In reiterating that particular statement to me he also made an incorrect statement to this house. But he did not have the intestinal fortitude to stand in this place and say, 'I made a mistake, and this is the answer.' Instead, we have four pages of absolute nonsense that just proves the total incompetence of this legal person, who should have known exactly what he was saying.

Debate adjourned.

### NUCLEAR WASTE DUMP: TABLING OF LETTER

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure):** On behalf of the Minister for Environment and Conservation, I table the letter referred to today in question time and ask that it be tabled by the speaker.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption resumed.

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** I rise to make just a brief contribution to the Address in Reply as there are some comments I wish to make, but I really do think that after a break of two months it would be much more sensible if we actually got on with some work straightaway, instead of having this talkfest for a week or two. Indeed, the member for Norwood put forward last night in a conversation what I think would be a very sensible approach, and that is for us all to write our addresses in reply and have them put into *Hansard*, without the need to read them. We could thus place our contributions on the record without the necessity of going through this laborious process.

Firstly, if I could beg the indulgence of the house for just a brief moment, I do want to place on the record my enormous respect for and gratitude to my parents, Frank and Eva Sim, formerly of Sydney. Normally, of course, I would have done that last year when I made my maiden speech. However, my father passed away when I was seeking preselection and my mother just two weeks before I gave that maiden speech. Even though it is still difficult now, I do want to place that on the record.

As to the content of the address, to which I now reply, I can only say that it reads like a work of fiction. It starts out after the first page or so by saying:

For the past 12 months my government has continued its work to rebuild the state's economy.

The plain fact of the matter is that the state's economy had been resurrected by the former Liberal government from a quite disastrous position and this government has been able so far to ride the crest of the wave generated by the former government. One need only look at the record, the abysmal record, of the now Premier when he was the minister responsible for employment to see just how disastrously the Labor government does manage an economy. I note that a number of other speakers have already referred to the SA Economic Indicators published by the ABS on 1 September this year, and I quote:

The value of SA merchandise exports in international trade dropped from \$797 million in June 2002 to \$576.6 million in June this year.

That is a 27.6 per cent decrease. If that is this government's idea of managing the economy and rebuilding the state's economy, I am just fascinated as to where they are going to take us. As to the idea that this government is working to ensure that those benefits reach people no matter where they live and work—in the city or in rural or regional South Australia—one only has to look at the specifics of the speech of the Lieutenant-Governor, or the last state budget, to understand what a misleading statement this is.

It is clear that the government has no interest in rural areas. It has decreased road funding, regional health, hospital funding, local crime prevention programs, and so on. Looking at the text under some of the specific headings, which is then filled with rhetoric, and not with proposed actions, I would like to go through some of the things in this speech that the Lieutenant-Governor delivered. First, we come to social justice and social inclusion, and on page 5 of the speech it states:

Major reforms are under way in our child protection and alternative care systems and the government will be moving to progressively implement recommendations from the Layton child protection review.

What does 'will be moving' really say? When will it be moving? 'It will progressively implement—over what period, and what recommendations? It does not say all the recommendations, just 'recommendations'—but which ones? The plain fact of the matter is that the health minister has had that document since January. It was publicly released in February and the government still has not issued any response to it.

On the area of health, the Generational Health Review is all very well, but again the government has not come clean and said which, if any, of the Menadue recommendations it will be implementing and when. On page 6 of the Lieutenant-Governor's speech the following appears:

There is a need to change the way health services are planned, delivered, organised and managed. The government will introduce in this session amendments to the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976 to accommodate these reform measures.

I have got news for the government: you do not get reform and outcomes just by changing one act to accommodate reforms. As for the Health and Community Services Complaints Bill, how dare the government trumpet this as a better system of complaints resolution! Make no mistake, I have no issue and no difficulty with the concept of this bill so far as it affects those receiving fees for providing a health-related service. I have no problem at all with having an ombudsman to whom those people who go to get paid services can complain, but to impose onto the volunteers in our community the same standards and obligations, to answer to an ombudsman, is designed to further this government's aims to damage and ultimately destroy our fantastic volunteer services in favour of a paid unionised work force. That is why the unions were represented by their peak body at the signing of the supposed pact with volunteers.

None of the volunteers in my community of Heysen who went along to the signing ceremony even knew about what was going on beforehand, and they all wanted to know why the UTLC was there and what on earth it had to do with volunteers. Certainly the volunteers in Heysen resent and resist this intrusion. It is simply inappropriate for a government to legislate that volunteers become answerable to an

ombudsman. I will go on resisting that for as long as I am in this place.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** I would love any support and recognition, but to suggest that it is appropriate, as this government has done, to give recognition to employers who allow people to go off and do volunteer services by simply giving them a certificate is not really helping them at all. It is not helping either side of the equation. In terms of education—

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs REDMOND:** ‘Education is one of the highest priorities of my government,’ said the Lieutenant-Governor in the speech. That is why it rates a whole eight lines on page 7 the Lieutenant-Governor’s speech. Let us look at the most recent issue and the minister’s mismanagement of that, the ‘teach it like it is’ manual for 11 to 15-year olds. In spite of significant public concern—

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs REDMOND:** Neither the minister nor the authors of the program were prepared to attend public meetings or face public questions about the introduction of that program. That was in spite of significant public concern. I am not a wowsler, and I am all in favour of there being lots of sex education in schools—I have no problem with that—but to target 11 to 15-year olds with some of the misinformation and the confronting scenarios in that program, without first giving parents a genuine understanding of what it contained, was simply an unacceptable approach for any government that claims to be open and accountable.

I refer to community safety and protection. I notice that the government has not used the heading ‘law and order’, but nevertheless it starts under ‘community safety and protection’ with the words:

My government intends to deliver the most significant advances to South Australia’s criminal law in three decades.

Forgive me, but although I can recognise that this government is delivering some far-reaching changes, they are, in nobody’s dictionary, advances. While I think the Attorney-General is an honourable man, a number of his actions in this portfolio have been offensive to the very idea of an orderly society.

To give but a few instances, in *The Advertiser* on Tuesday—yesterday—we see the heading, ‘Nemer appeal key to criminal justice’. I know that at the time it was the other Attorney-General—the one we had for a little while—who took action which the now Attorney-General could have corrected when he got back in the saddle, but did not. He seems to have lost any comprehension, if he ever had any, of the fundamental concept of democratic government, known as the separation of powers. For very good reason, the separation of powers is there to keep the legislature from interfering in the processes of the executive and the judiciary. What does our Attorney-General do? In complete contravention of that basic concept, and quite possibly also in contravention of the Director of Public Prosecutions Act, which is there specifically to guarantee the independence of that office, he demands that the Director of Public Prosecutions appeal against a sentence imposed as a consequence of a plea bargaining agreement which the Director of Public Prosecutions entered into.

It staggers me to think that the Attorney-General has been complacent and complicit in a number of other activities of this government, instead of providing the real leadership that

I would have expected of him. In particular, I refer to the matter of the contract with Mr Bruce Guerin. There is no doubt in my mind that that was a really bad contract and it was very detrimental to the government. Any ordinary citizen who enters into a bad contract to his detriment will, within certain boundaries, be held to the terms of that bad contract, no matter how harmful or ill-advised it might have been. This government, though, decided to introduce legislation for the sole purpose of avoiding its legal obligations pursuant to a contract properly, if ill-advisedly, entered into at an earlier time.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** So you’re against Lawson’s position on Nemer?

**Mrs REDMOND:** Exactly. I absolutely—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Why didn’t you have the guts to come out and say that at the time?

**Mrs REDMOND:** Because I was not in the country. Does not the Attorney-General consider how harmful ultimately it is to the whole basis of law in our state to suggest that any government of any persuasion can avoid its legitimate contractual obligations, as the model citizen it is meant to be, by simply passing its own law to get out of them? Luckily that matter has now been put to rest by being subject to a settlement, but I ask the Attorney-General to show some leadership in these matters in the future, because I have no doubt that matters of this nature will arise in future.

In a similar way, the Attorney-General has shown a total lack of leadership and courage when his government has taken a populist stance in overriding recommendations of the Parole Board. I expect that the Premier will be populist and I expect our Premier to pay scant regard to the fundamental issues, but I had hoped for more from the Attorney-General.

I also note in passing that the Attorney-General has reintroduced regulations under the victims of crime legislation. I understand that these regulations were disallowed during the last session, but the Attorney-General reintroduced them yesterday with, I gather, the only change being that he has now removed the very slight improvement in the costs payable to solicitors in conducting these claims. As one of very few practitioners left in Adelaide who would even agree to take on victims of crime compensation claims, I can say in all honesty (and I only charge my costs as a practising solicitor on a scale of costs, party-party basis) that the scale of costs, even with the increase that was to be provided—

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

**Mrs REDMOND:** Yes, but it is still inadequate.

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

**Mrs REDMOND:** It is still inadequate. Now the Attorney-General, possibly to punish those who came into the parliament and gave evidence, has reintroduced the regulations without the fee increase and, furthermore, what is left in the regulations is an intolerable imposition upon people who have been victims of crime—

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** On a point of order, sir, the member for Heysen has attributed improper motives to me in that I have apparently reintroduced regulations, she alleges, to punish people for giving evidence before a parliamentary committee. Not only is that untrue, but it is also an allegation that may not be made other than by substantive motion, and I ask you, Mr Acting Speaker, to require the member for Heysen to withdraw that allegation.

**Mrs REDMOND:** I did use the word ‘possibly’, but in order to not take up the time of the chamber unnecessarily I withdraw. What is left in the regulations is an imposition upon people who have been victims of crime—the very

people whom this government says it supposedly will help and make feel safer in their homes, by setting particular regulations as to when and whom such victims may see to obtain medical reports in relation to their injuries.

So much for helping them feel safer in their homes and safer in the streets. This government is making it harder not easier for victims of crimes who have suffered personal injury as a result of a criminal act to obtain compensation or even find a lawyer willing to handle their case. I do commend to the Attorney the very sensible suggestion that, instead of having a strict scale of fees, we simply put the applications onto the standard scales that apply in the Magistrates Court or the District Court according to the size of the claim being made. That would be a far more sensible system that might end up with more than, perhaps, two lawyers being left in Adelaide who are prepared to take on these claims.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** There are at least six law firms doing it.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Scalzi):** The member for Heysen has the call. Will the Attorney refrain from interjecting.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker. I was interested, however, to note that the government 'will also introduce for the first time a comprehensive range of prison-based rehabilitation programs at a cost of \$1.5 million per annum'. It was interesting because the Attorney-General has made it very clear in his comments to this house that, in spite of wide international and national evidence to the contrary, he does not accept that such rehabilitation programs are effective.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Well, we will see who is right. We are spending the money, you wouldn't.

**Mrs REDMOND:** As to economic development and infrastructure, I was one of the very few backbenchers privileged to attend and participate in the Economic Growth Summit in April. I enjoyed the summit. I thought that it was a worthwhile exercise. I admire and respect Robert Champion de Crespigny, but I do have a couple of brief comments about it. First, the government cannot have it both ways. Clearly, our current Treasurer is adamant that he is not going to release or even loosen his very tight hold on the state's finances. He wants that AAA rating, and that is that.

He wants to be seen as the world's best Treasurer, and he has got the idea that to achieve that you never spend any money. Now, quite apart from the fact that that very idea is wrong in itself, it is also quite contrary to the very first finding of the Economic Growth Summit that it is time for us all, as a state, to get over the State Bank, draw a line in the sand and recognise that there is such a thing as good spending. Good spending by governments relates largely to infrastructure: not nonsense like that wasteful Women's Information Switchboard about which I continue to complain.

I congratulate the government on the new Adelaide Airport. I note that the groundwork was largely done by the former Liberal government. I hope that the plan comes to fruition, but I do congratulate the government on that. My other comment on the Economic Growth Summit and the government's response to it to date is that it is a clever electoral ploy, isn't it, to set targets for 2013—ten years on, well after the next election. It seems to me that, from its lack of positive action, this government's plan is simply to do nothing; to set a wonderful sounding set of targets, tripling exports in 10 years, but do nothing because it will not be accountable for years.

But I refer again to what is actually happening already in those figures I already indicated at the beginning of my comments, that we have gone from \$797 million in merchandise exports in June last year to \$576.6 million in June this year. With respect to agriculture, food and fisheries, I note that the government plans to introduce legislation to regulate the cultivation of GM crops; and, again, in his speech, the Deputy Governor said:

Its aim is for Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula to take advantage of their unique situations of being discrete, separate cropping regions with the opportunity to elect for GM-free status.

I am still looking into this issue of GM crops. I have not yet reached a final position, but I have figured out already that there is just no point in the international scheme of things in trying to pretend that your little area is GM free. Either the whole state, or preferably the whole country, is GM free or it is not, but you are not going to be able to sell overseas on the basis that your little patch of SA is GM free. Trying to suggest that in international markets just does not make sense. I do not believe that anyone here has yet considered all of the intertwined issues relating to GM crops—the issues of ownership of the intellectual property, the patents and the possibility that companies like Monsanto could effectively end up owning the world's grain, all of the world's crops; the issues of intermingling in transit, in silos, in shipping, and so on, of GM and non-GM foods.

And I know that the United States is still grappling with the liability issues regarding protection of non-GM growers from so-called infection by GM crops. There are a lot of issues about GM that simply have not yet been addressed.

*Mr Rau interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** I have not reached any conclusion, as I said. The member for Enfield is commenting that members on my side on the committee were in favour of it. They may well have been, and I think that a lot of people will come to a very sensible conclusion that may not necessarily be the same as mine. I am still looking into it, but I still have some concerns—not health or environmental concerns so much as the marketing concerns. That is where I believe the real issues are. I think that we have a lot more work to do and I would like to see a lot more cooperative work within this parliament to address those issues sensibly.

With respect to environmental sustainability and energy, the River Murray is clearly the most fundamental and concerning issue of our time in this parliament. I was involved in the debate on the River Murray Bill last session to a very high level, and I remember the government repeatedly reassuring us that it had consulted with local government. Well, I have spoken to a number of councils since then, and in particular to a number of planning officers, and not one councillor to whom I have spoken was aware of the fact that their council had areas within the River Murray protection zone or of its effect on their planning obligations.

They simply had not been told anything about it—not the councillors, not the mayors, not the planning officers. No-one had been told anything about the River Murray Bill. In terms of sustainability—

*The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** The member for Bright just commented, 'Did you see anything about that'; well, the heading was there but that was all, member for Bright. I did not see anything about sustainability mentioned. My belief is that, instead of playing around at the edges, the government should be taking a far more visionary approach—any government of any persuasion. We should be looking ahead 25 years so that



25 years from now our houses in this state are built to an environmental standard: not a thin shell with no verandah, no room for trees and the need for air conditioning. We should be aiming to make every house self-sustaining as to its energy source, its water, its waste disposal and everything else, and we should be thinking about those things now.

I went to the Property Council lunch last Friday and the opening comment on the Draft Transport Plan was, 'As long as you are a pedestrian, a cyclist or disabled it is probably a fine plan but for the other 95 per cent of us it is a farce.' That is probably a pretty accurate comment because I notice that the RAA issued a response. In its document, the RAA states:

The RAA acknowledges that SA's Draft Transport Plan is a 'first step'—

that is the good part, boys—

but considers that it sorely lacks detail. By not providing sufficient information it has proven impossible to assess how government intends to implement the broad strategies and objectives contained in its draft plan. The RAA is concerned by the clearly overstated contribution that alternative modes of transport are awarded in the draft plan.

Funnily enough, probably the pedestrians, cyclists and disabled referred to at the Property Council lunch. The RAA's document further states:

Additionally, lack of any reference to the National Highway System, the level of federal investment required within SA over the next 15 years—

and I will support any move by this government to try to address the issue of the inequity of the funding given by federal government to this state, which is based neither on the number of people in the state nor the amount of roads in the state: it is based on some historical formula that has come out of the mist that no-one in Canberra can explain. I will support any attempt to get us an equitable level of funding. The RAA's document further states:

... transport links of strategic importance from a national perspective and AusLink and its implications for our state are regarded as major oversights. Of greatest importance is the need for government to satisfy the community that measures proposed to address shortfalls on the metropolitan road network will provide motorists with satisfactory levels of service for at least the next 15 years.

That was the RAA's response. I also received a response to the Draft Transport Plan from the Civil Contractors Federation and the Committee for Adelaide Roads. That reads:

The draft SA Transport Plan, unveiled over the past months in response to the government's pre-election promise, is a major disappointment and will do little to stimulate economic growth and reduce traffic congestion. . . SA is the only Australian state that does not have a transport strategy to guide future transport decisions and investment in infrastructure, so there is an urgent need for this plan. However, the government's draft plan is little more than a series of targets and contains very little detail.

That is what they said about transport. As for the arts, we need only look to the resignation in the last month of a prominent arts director, Kathie Massey, the outgoing CEO of Arts SA, and we need only look to the government's stated intention—which it backed away from, admittedly—to put money that had been specifically set aside for the live music industry into the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra. I am very sympathetic to the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra. I am a great supporter of them: I love them. But to propose to take money that was specifically set aside for live music and, in a supposed sleight of hand, give that to the ASO was preposterous. At least the government did back away from that plan.

The government's failure to address the issue of WorkCover payable at the moment by live music venues is another glaring failure of this government to support the arts in any real sense. Everyone knows that if you are an employer then you pay a WorkCover levy, but to suggest that a live band coming into a pub or club or any other live music venue is in any sense of the word an employee is nonsense. For the government not to take the appropriate steps to simply address that indicates a complete failure, in my view, to come to terms with anything near the appropriate approach to the live music industry.

I was interested in the last little while to read the *Public Sector Review*. I should have expected that a Labor government would actually get some pretty positive reviews in the *Public Sector Review*, but it starts out with its first article being very anti-government because of the government's failure to provide sufficient funding for staffing for FAYS, despite the reports that the government has received. It goes on to talk about the Generational Health Review, describing it as a framework towards real health reform but pointing out that any change has to be supported by the funding levels required. In fact, the entire magazine, as I went through it, contained article after article that really took the government to task for its failure to back up any of its rhetoric and any of its promises with any real action.

As I said before, the government cannot have it both ways. It is an easy cop-out to say, 'We are going to set all these targets for 2013 because that is our economic growth target.' What that means is that you do not have to do anything before 2006, when the next election comes along. But I doubt whether, first, the economy will keep going strongly enough for the government to get away with that and, secondly, whether it will work at the end of the day, and whether the public will actually be content to sit by while the government does nothing in real terms. It has been fine to have 135 recommendations, and if I were a person new to government I would want to get my head around a lot of issues before embarking on decisions, but after 18 months, two budgets and 135 reports and reviews later it is time for this government to stop burying its head in the sand and start to make some real decisions, and stop just riding on the crest of the wave of the economic benefits brought about by the excellent economic management of the previous (Liberal) government.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright):** I rise to respond to what I believe is the fourteenth opening speech of parliament that I have had occasion to be involved in from a Governor or their representative. On this occasion I congratulate the Lieutenant Governor Bruno Krumin on his address. It is the first time that he has given the opening speech to the parliament, and I believe he did so with the dignity and professionalism demanded of such an occasion. Regrettably, that dignity and professionalism has not extended to the content of the speech that was crafted by the government, nor indeed to the way in which it has conducted itself of late.

We have seen this government become one of rhetoric, broken promises, lack of credibility, budget cuts, plenty of tough talk, many reviews but, indeed, very little action from what is now a heavily distracted government—and distracted for a series of reasons. We have seen the break-out of what has been termed by the media variously as the Atkinson affair, the Ashbourne affair and a variety of other titles, which clearly has weighed heavily upon the government and will continue to do so as those matters continue in another forum.

We have also seen the continuing saga that has become known as RaffleGate develop and further distract the government, and it is still further distracted by continual infighting, which has become a hallmark of the Labor Party in this state and which at this time is probably at its most vicious, in no small part due to the two scandals that I mentioned earlier.

It is interesting that, with the opening of this session of parliament, we have seen the member for Croydon return to the front bench as Attorney-General while, at the same time, the Premier has resumed the sitting short one very senior staff member in the form of his senior adviser Randall Ashbourne, due to that individual's involvement in the Atkinson or Ashbourne affair. This is an involvement that the Premier is endeavouring to lead us to believe he knew nothing about. I am going to sit patiently and wait for all the processes to occur, be it through the courts or through the investigation that the Premier has now finally succumbed to, after that process is completed.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bright needs to be very careful about not intruding into matters that are before the court.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** I thank you for your guidance, sir, and I am being very careful not to do so. I will wait with interest for those processes to be completed. Some may call me a cynic, but I will be interested to see just exactly how much the Premier did know. We have also seen the continuing evolution of the RaffleGate issue involving Senator Bolkus from the federal parliament and, indeed, our own Minister for Gambling. A variety of questions have been asked in this house in relation to that matter and, every time the issue is raised, the story changes. The story continues to change, and we have found the Minister for Gambling continually stonewalling this parliament. He has refused to undertake an investigation, but there is a series of issues that must be responded to.

All these things combine in a rather unsavoury manner, yet we have a government that came to office on a platform of openness and accountability. That was a key plank of the Labor government's election campaign, and almost every day since its coming to office we have been told of its commitment to transparency. Yet in reality its actions are demonstrating quite the opposite. We have seen part of that through this opening of parliament and the Governor's Speech.

I was particularly concerned to see the government's touted approach to public works, by lifting from \$4 million to \$10 million the value of works that are to be referred to the Public Works Committee. That gives many members cause for concern, because it provides an opportunity for the government to reduce the scrutiny under which its public works are held.

It may be that the government can reasonably go back to the time when the \$4 million limit was set, and it may be that the government can apply an inflation factor and lift it somewhat. I confess that I have not been through that exercise yet, but I doubt very much that it would lift the limit from \$4 million to \$10 million. With a Labor government in power, in view of its previous track record, I for one am not comfortable seeing public works proceed without the most detailed careful scrutiny of those things that are before them. I was heartened to find that that view is held not just by the opposition. Indeed, we have heard one government member rise in this place tonight—the member for West Torrens—and express his concern about the process. From the nodding heads around him at the time, it is clear that, while they have not been vocally supportive in this house, they share that

view. I wish those members well as they tackle the Premier in the caucus over this very important issue.

I want to focus briefly on the portfolio detail for which I am responsible as it was detailed in the government's program through the opening speech. I have responsibility as a shadow minister for energy for minerals and petroleum. I was most concerned to find absolutely no positive mention whatsoever in the opening speech in relation to those portfolios. When one considers the import of the energy industry in this state and to our way of life, and the import of mining and petroleum, one would expect that a focused government that was professionally managing the affairs of the state would focus on those matters. However, when one looks at the way in which they embarked upon the budgetary process perhaps I was being a little too hopeful that the leopard may have changed its spots.

I refer, firstly, to the mining portfolio. Indeed, during the budget estimates process, I took the responsible minister (the Hon. Paul Holloway from another place) to task over the approach this government has taken to the mining industry. I started by referring to the government web site. The government has a web site that is available for all South Australians to access, and it has on that web site its achievements. Before the budget estimates process, I looked at the government achievements, and I expected that there would be some mention of its achievements—at least as it had put them—in relation to the mining industry. I was absolutely horrified to find no mention of a positive nature of the mining industry. Indeed, I looked very hard to find that mention. I looked at the economic development area on the web site. However, there was no mention there.

Some may call me a political cynic, but I thought, 'I wonder whether there is any mention in the environmental section of the web site?' Sure enough there was—but not of a positive but a negative nature. There were mentions of things under headings such as 'acid leach mining inquiry', 'Beverly uranium mining improved practice', 'Congee Lakes protection', 'Gammon Ranges National Park protection from mining', 'Great Australian Bight Marine Park Conservation Zone', 'uranium mining—safer handling and storage' and 'uranium spills'. There were a whole range of negative attacks on the mining industry and of endeavours to reduce the area of the state that is available to mining and exploration. However, there was absolutely nothing positive whatsoever about an industry that contributes \$2.2 billion annually to the state's economy.

I asked the Hon. Paul Holloway point-blank if he had failed to meet his government's and his department's objectives in view of that lack of highlighted achievement. He insisted that he had not, but could provide the committee with any convincing material to the contrary. After that, I would expect that we would have seen the government—at least through its opening address for the starting of this parliament—try to turn the tables somewhat and try to at least demonstrate that it supports this industry that generates \$2.2 billion annually into our state's economy. Regrettably, we have not seen that; rather, we have seen a continuation of exactly the same attack on the mining industry. Indeed, those attacks are scattered throughout the speech. For example, on page 5 of the opening address, it states, in part:

The government is honouring its commitment to hand back the 21 000 square kilometre L-Shaped Conservation Park to the traditional owners in the State's north-west.

That has all sorts of ramifications for land access and mining. As the government embarks on that process I, for one, will

ask questions about the consultation that has occurred with the mining and petroleum industries and the way in which it is going to occur so that exploration, mining and drilling is not impaired in any way, shape or form.

As we move further through the speech, on page 15 the government continues the matter that I raised earlier in relation to its website and Coongie Lakes. It states:

The government will also introduce legislation to protect from mining the most environmentally important part of the Coongie Lakes wetlands in Innamincka Regional Reserve, in the State's far north-east. It will also create a new 27 900 hectare National Park over the core of the Coongie Lakes wetlands which will exclude all mining operations and grazing.

This is a very important area for a number of reasons. There is no doubt that, in part, there are some wetlands areas that are important to protect. Equally important is the prospectivity of the area for petroleum and gas. That area is of vital importance to the state. In its totality, it makes up part of the extended region of the Cooper Basin or Moomba gasfields.

Embarking upon a process of limiting exploration in that area could be significantly to the state's detriment. It is possible to be able to protect environmentally an area whilst at the same time laterally drill underneath that area. The Minister for Environment (by now) would know full well that it is possible to extract petroleum and gas from an area without drilling directly from above, by drilling as much as a couple of kilometres or more away and then laterally drilling into that area: in other words, drilling underneath some of the areas about which there may be concern. Of course, that concern is on the surface. I, for one, will intensely question the government over its plans for this area to ensure that it does not deprive the state of an important petroleum resource which is needed to fuel our industries and our economy. I am sure, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you would agree that this is a particularly important region of our state.

I turn briefly to the energy component of my portfolio. I was initially pleased to see that the energy portfolio gained mention. On page 14 of His Excellency's address to parliament there is a heading 'Environmental sustainability and energy'. As my colleague the member for Heysen indicated earlier, there is not too much about sustainability there other than the headline. I can assure you, sir, there is nothing there about energy apart from the headline. The headline went in. Perhaps there was in a draft version something about energy, but it has gone.

In view of this government's track record, it is hardly surprising that it has gone, because only today in this chamber we heard an abysmal answer to a question by the Minister for Energy. Initially, in his usual way, he was flippant and tried to dismiss the question asked of him by me in relation to what he had actually achieved in 1½ years as minister to increase the state's baseload capacity for electricity. Initially, he was flippant, and then, in his usual way, the old Labor Party caucus bullying tactics came into play, and then, when he was drawn into line by the Speaker, the only thing he could come up with was that he had been trying very hard to get an interconnector built to New South Wales.

In case he had not thought about it too hard, I was asking what he had done to increase the capacity in South Australia. We have seen a very serious report to 30 June handed down by the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council which has highlighted that this state will have serious electricity problems in the future if our capacity is not addressed properly, and simply challenging issues through the courts will not solve the problem. Thank God it was a Liberal

government that was in power when the Pelican Point power station was built. We know Labor would not have built it. In fact, the now Treasurer and Deputy Premier actually opposed the construction of that power plant. Had that plant not been built, there is no doubt that our state would have faced rolling blackouts and rolling electricity shortages certainly in the summer before last and possibly even in the last summer.

For the minister to claim that he is doing all that is humanly possible to expand our state's electricity capacity, particularly that needed for our peak load, by going through the court process and trying to get an interconnector built to New South Wales is absolute arrant nonsense. If he believes that is an intelligent response to that question, then God help South Australia, and woe betide that which will befall us as our electricity supplies start to fall into peril at the hands of this minister, who is certainly not handling his duties with the level of competence that one would expect on such an important issue. Clearly, his whole government does not regard the issue as being one of importance because they did not give it anything other than a headline in their speech that was written for the opening of the parliament.

I also wish to turn briefly to the issue of financial management. On page 4 of the opening speech, I note that the government says that it has good financial management amongst its highest priorities. That is a very noble quest and, indeed, one would hope that all governments have good financial management as one of their highest priorities, but what we have seen in this house this week, particularly through the appalling contribution of the Minister for Industrial Relations, has been nothing other than an abdication of ministerial responsibility in relation to the issue of WorkCover. Question after question has been asked by the opposition since Monday, and the minister continues to duck, dodge and weave to avoid answering questions about what is now starting to amount to be a very serious blow-out in the level of WorkCover liabilities. It almost brings back memories of the old State Bank days.

I was sitting in the house as a member of the Liberal opposition when the Bannon government, with the now Premier Mike Rann as one of its ministers, was losing hundreds of millions of dollars through the State Bank debacle. In fact, the now Premier was so sure that there was not a problem with the bank and so sure that they had a very competent chief executive in Tim Marcus Clark that he used the time of this parliament to move a motion condemning the Liberal opposition for its attack on the bank and highlighting what he called the professional managerial experience of Tim Marcus Clark. Is it any wonder that we now have problems emerging with the financial management of our state, and particularly WorkCover Corporation, when the lead minister, the Premier, believes that the person who took the State Bank, the state's economy and the state's finances down the drain is a wonderful entrepreneurial banker?

I do not believe the Labor government has learnt from its past mistakes. In terms of its management, its openness and accountability, we have also seen some abysmal failings. It is worth reflecting on the following facts. At present, the government has not answered 131 questions from Liberal MLCs. There were 63 unanswered questions from Liberal House of Assembly MPs during 2002, and another 50 questions have been asked during 2003 on which we are waiting answers. Also, 115 questions asked by the Liberal Party during the estimates committees during 2002 remain unanswered, as well as an additional 90 questions from the estimates committees in 2003. Adding up all those figures,

there are 449 questions in total that had not been answered by this government prior to the opening of parliament on Monday. Of course, that list has now been added to.

I know that you, Mr Speaker, were particularly insistent that this government, to which you have given your support, ought to be open and accountable. I put to you, Mr Speaker, that it is not acceptable that 449 questions that have been asked of this government in the 1½ years in which it has been in office have remained unanswered. Some ministers go further than that: they do not reply to their correspondence; they treat members of parliament—at least opposition members of parliament—with nothing but utter contempt. I highlight the Minister for Transport, who, I think by unanimous agreement of all opposition members, is the worst non-answerer of correspondence in the parliament. He simply does not return phone calls; his staff do not return calls; he does not answer correspondence.

By way of example, I put on the floor of this house a very important issue that the minister just has not attended to. It relates to a \$60 million shopping development at Hallett Cove in my electorate. The development is to be undertaken by Con Makris, a well known property centre owner and developer in South Australia. To enable that development to occur, it is important that roadworks be undertaken. Those roadworks were certainly known in the early stages of planning to the former Liberal government, they were communicated to the Labor government and, at officer level, this government indicated it would be supportive of the funding for that development to occur. That has been renegeed upon.

I have made numerous phone calls to the minister's office, and I have spoken to his senior staff. In frustration, they have said that they have passed on my messages to the minister. That is all they can do: they cannot make him return my call, and they understand the frustration. So, clearly, this is common practice. In talking to my colleagues on this side of the house, I believe they would support my assertion that this is common practice by the Minister for Transport. He just does not respond to his duties.

The risk with this project is a serious one. There is every risk that, if this money is not forthcoming from the government—and we are talking about an amount of approximately \$2.3 million—the developer will walk away. I am putting this issue on the record with the full knowledge of that developer. He has put this to me and is happy for it to be raised publicly. He will walk away and, in addition, he will take more funds with him—more than \$200 million earmarked for development projects in South Australia that will go. They will go while there is not a government in this state that is responsive to the needs of development. I believe that would be a tragedy. I am sure, knowing your strong view, Mr Speaker, and support for business, you would equally agree that that would be a tragedy.

So, I now put on the record in this house that the Minister for Transport has not returned phone calls and he has shown no regard at all for this project. If that does not get a reaction from the minister, perhaps I will need to see you, Mr Speaker, to determine how we can get ministers to be responsive to elected representatives who are bringing forward issues in this parliament, or directly to ministers, on behalf of their constituents: that is, as I know you, Mr Speaker, would argue, our duty to perform. However, it makes it very difficult when you have ministers—in this case, the Minister for Transport—who simply do not appear to take their duties seriously.

I can understand that the minister is embroiled in a lot of problems with WorkCover, and he certainly has not been answering questions here. Even if the minister delegated the responsibility to one of his staff to follow it through, I would be satisfied with that if we could extract a satisfactory resolution. Or perhaps, Mr Speaker, that minister and others are tied up with the numerous reviews and summits that this government has embarked on—excluding, Mr Speaker, your own Constitutional Convention, because I would not want anyone to confuse that with this issue. We have seen this government undertake more than 135 reviews, and it has held an additional six taxpayer-funded summits. This is a case of review ad nauseam—1½ years in government, 135 reviews, crises now emerging in WorkCover, crises in education, problems in transport, problems in tourism, energy matters not being attended to and a mining industry that is problematic. This government is showing all the signs the Bannon government showed. But I will say one thing: they are showing those signs some seven years earlier than did the Bannon government. This government is already starting to fall apart at the seams.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** The member for Torrens might not like that fact. I would encourage her to use her influence within caucus—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Torrens will have her opportunity another day. It certainly will not be today if she carries on in the way in which she is. The member for Bright has the call.

**The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW:** Thank you for your protection, as always, Mr Speaker. By way of illustration, we only have to look at exports. On the opening day of parliament in this place in his ministerial statement the Premier said that he wants to sign up South Australia for a near trebling of our exports to \$25 billion by 2013. He did not provide any detail: he just said he wants to do it. He has a long way to go, because it is actually going in the reverse direction, and the Premier only needs to look at the latest ABS statistics to see what is occurring. The latest South Australian economic indicators released by the Bureau of Statistics in September 2003 reveal that in the past 12 months the value of exports in South Australia has declined by 8.9 per cent. If we take a comparison between June 2002 and June 2003, there is a 27.6 per cent decrease. That is alarming. If the Premier reckons he will increase it but gives no detail and, in actual fact, we have a reducing export situation, we, indeed, have a serious problem that has to be addressed before we can get anywhere near the Premier's so-called aspirations.

But when we look at the dire state of our economy, our employment and our exports when the Liberal Party came into government and consider the fact that the employment minister in the Bannon Labor government was Mike Rann, who is now Premier of this state, one cannot have too much faith that there is any capability at all on that side of the house, certainly from the leader, in formulating a plan, let alone delivering the change that is necessary. The Liberal government in our time in office actually tripled exports but, in fairness, we had a low base to work from because of the very low level to which Labor had run the state—the high unemployment rate, under-utilised infrastructure, poor commitment to improving infrastructure, and virtually no commitment to long-term strategies such as the state's highly successful Food Plan that, of course, was delivered by a Liberal government.

So, I face this new session of parliament with intense interest, but we are facing a government that has no forward direction and no plan, and is focused on many issues that are anything but the important daily processes of government as it works through the Atkinson-Ashbourne affair and the 'rafflegate' affair, and as it comes to grips with its internal infighting.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the house do now adjourn.

**Mr SNELLING (Playford):** I report to the house that I am the other party in proceedings listed before the Adelaide Magistrates Court in which Mr Nicholas Niarchos has applied for orders for an issue of summons to witness to compel me to give evidence and produce all documents naming or identifying the applicant as one of the anonymous 'Gang of 14' relevant to the bringing of an action by the applicant for defamation. I propose to conduct myself in a manner consistent with the Speaker's ruling.

Motion carried.

At 9.56 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 18 September at 10.30 a.m.