

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 22 September 2003

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

LOCK END HOUSE

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr SCALZI: I believe that on 18 September I was misrepresented by the Minister for Infrastructure. In an answer to a question by the member for Torrens, the minister said this of me:

The member for Hartley says that we should have knocked down every building and turned it into open space, but of course that would have meant knocking down Lock End House.

Lock End House was vested in the ownership of Campbelltown council in the early 1980s and listed on the State Heritage Register. It is also on the Register of the National Estate. Stage 1 was completed in November 2000 with \$100 000 spent to stabilise the building, including new roof and timbers, drainage for stormwater, windows and door replacement. I believe that the minister has misrepresented me, as I have fought hard for Lock End House and, indeed, I had a photograph of it in my calendar last year.

RICHARDS, Mr J., DEATH

The SPEAKER: Sadly, I inform the house of the sudden death on Saturday of John Richards, husband of the *Hansard* Leader, Joan Richards. I am sure all members and staff of the house join me in offering sincere condolences to Joan and her family. The chair makes particular mention because, as members would realise, she is the manager of a division of the JPSC, most important to the functioning of this parliament and, therefore, the constitutional workings of government in this state.

WORKCOVER

In reply to **Hon. R.G. KERIN** (17 September).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The Leader of the Opposition can only be referring to the draft June quarterly performance report, as I understand that is all that exists at present.

The draft report was received in my office on 19 August.

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (17 September).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The list was sent to me on 31 January 2003.

ARTS SA

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (15 September).

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have enormous respect for Ms Massey's ability and her work over the two and a half years she has been at the helm of Arts SA.

Kathie Massey has been an asset to this Government and our predecessors in her role as Executive Director of Arts SA.

I was especially pleased with her role in the recent State Arts Summit and her vision of where the arts is heading. Therefore her resignation came as a shock.

Ms Massey has not expressed any leadership or vision issue with me either before, or since her resignation. At the time of her resignation, in a meeting with me, Ms Massey did comment on the current budget and the difficulties facing a number of arts organisations and Arts SA.

I pointed out to that there had actually been an increase in the last arts budget. Both in that meeting and since in the media Ms Massey has stated that her resignation is essentially a personal decision.

I wish her well in her future endeavours. Her letter of resignation is attached.

NATIONAL PARKS

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: At the Friends of Parks annual forum held over the weekend in the Riverland—in the electorate of the member for Chaffey—I announced a review into the state's national parks and reserves system. I am told that this will be the first comprehensive review of our national parks system ever undertaken. The first part of the review will focus on the legislation which affects our parks and which includes seven categories governed by three principal acts, including the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Indeed. The second part of the review will include an audit of all the state's parks and reserves to check that they have the right protection for their conditions. This will take some years to complete. The review will not downgrade protection for our parks. Indeed, it may be that some parks or areas within parks need increased protection. That may lead to different levels of protections within one park whereas only one category can currently apply. The review will set clear management plans with conservation objectives for each park.

The government intends to release a discussion paper into the governance of our parks around June next year. The Department for Environment and Conservation will coordinate the review, which will involve consultation with the community and stakeholders, including, in particular, the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council. The review will bring the protection of our parks into line with international standards set by the World Conservation Union (IUCN). The government wants South Australians to be a world leader in the management and protection of our national parks.

REGIONAL AIRPORTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Given the changed security threat that Australia faces, there are clearly concerns in the community shared by this government about the level of security measures in Australia's regional airports. At present, the federal parliament's Joint Committee on Public Accounts and Audit is reviewing aviation security in Australia. At the same time, ASIO is undertaking an assessment of the security threats for regional airports. The committee is examining the implications of a bill now before the federal parliament, which proposes to give the commonwealth power to declare any airport as a security controlled airport and subject to commonwealth security arrangements.

Cabinet this morning approved the South Australian government's submission to this review, and at lunch time today I sent it to the joint committee. I understand it will be posted on a commonwealth government web site. While our government recognises the need for continuing assessment

of national threats to airports, if that results in requirements for significantly increased security, our greatest cause for concern is the considerable expense of upgrading security and who will pay.

Our submission makes it crystal clear that the commonwealth must contribute where the cost of security is beyond the capacity of the regional airport or community. The safety of the travelling public must remain absolutely paramount, but, by the same token, it is vital that security upgrading does not jeopardise the viability of our regional airline services. The only airport in South Australia that is presently categorised under commonwealth government laws for protective security purposes is the Adelaide Airport. Responsibility for ensuring those protective measures—such as metal detectors, security fencing and so on—lie with the airport's owner/operator and is paid for through charges on the passenger's air ticket and airport passenger levies.

The South Australian government is now concerned that if the commonwealth categorised South Australia's regional airports under protective security laws, it has the potential to price regional airfares out of the market unless the cost is picked up by the commonwealth. This government believes it would be ridiculous to upgrade security in our regions to the point where no-one could afford to fly any more. I am sure the commonwealth government does not want that either. I am sure the commonwealth government is aware of its responsibilities to regional Australia. It is the view of state and territory governments that any necessary upgrading of security measures in our regional airports must be undertaken by the government which regulates and is accountable for aviation security—the commonwealth government.

It is well known that regional airlines are not financially robust. In the mid 1980s, there were 12 regional airlines servicing 28 communities in South Australia. Today, there are just four airlines servicing eight communities at Ceduna, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Olympic Dam, Coober Pedy, Kingscote and Mount Gambier. All four of these airlines—Emu, Airlines of South Australia, O'Connor and REX—are facing significant cost pressures. That is because regional airfares are much higher per kilometre than interstate services due to their smaller, less efficient aircraft and the inability of the airlines to achieve economies of scale. I am told that there is virtually no capacity to charge the regional passenger for expensive new security measures should the federal government decide to impose them on our regional airports.

Most regional airports are operated by local councils which do not have the resources to implement security measures at their airports. I am also told that to impose additional costs on regional airfares would reduce demand, make some of our air services non-viable and would lead to the demise of even more regional airline services. This would impact dreadfully in our regions which have already received a body blow from the collapse of Ansett. Many regional communities depend on these air services for access to health and other services, as well as business and tourism opportunities.

The South Australian government will not tolerate any move by the commonwealth to place the responsibility and cost of regional airport security onto regional communities and/or the states. It remains our firm view that aviation in this country must have a clear single point of accountability to ensure we have a consistent and effective security system in place and that that responsibility must remain with the commonwealth.

WORKCOVER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: On Thursday 18 September, the Treasurer indicated to the house that the government would bring forward a motion to facilitate the release of the reports prepared by SAFA and OGE about the WorkCover Corporation's financial risks and governance arrangements. Today I will be giving notice that I will move a resolution to facilitate the release of these reports. These reports make it plain that the circumstances that WorkCover now faces are as a result of decisions under the former Liberal government. I can foreshadow to the house that the reports make various findings, including:

One of the WorkCover Corporation's objectives is that levy rates are competitive. This was not a factor—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The house has given the minister leave to make a ministerial statement. The minister said that he is going to bring a motion before this house, and he is foreshadowing debate on that motion and detailing parts of the concept of that motion. I ask, sir, whether that is an orderly use of ministerial statements?

The SPEAKER: I am listening carefully to what the minister has to say. I point out to the member for Unley that at present there is nothing on the *Notice Paper*, and it is quite proper and, indeed, desirable that if ministers propose to bring a motion about a matter of utmost public importance (and the honourable member would know that this is a matter that has attracted substantial remark across the chamber, regardless of whether he shares my judgment), it is proper for the minister to tell the house beforehand—especially before question time—in order that honourable members of the opposition or, indeed, of the government itself do not waste the time of the house by questioning the minister about the course of action he proposes to take. It is in the interests of expediency that the minister therefore advise the house in the fashion in which he is doing. The minister.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: What I was quoting from one of the reports reads as follows:

One of the WorkCover Corporation's objectives is that levy rates are competitive. This was not a factor behind the reduction in the . . . average levy rate in 2001-02.

As a result of the SAFA and OGE reports, the government introduced the Statutes Amendment (WorkCover Governance Reform) Bill 2003. This government is taking action to make WorkCover more accountable and transparent by that bill. By providing a far more accountable and transparent governance structure for the WorkCover Corporation, the government will give South Australians confidence that the mistakes made under the former Liberal government will not be repeated.

The government is also taking action to make our workplaces safer and reduce the costs of workplace injuries, deaths and disease through the introduction of the SafeWorkSA Bill and a 50 per cent increase in the number of occupational health and safety inspectors.

The government is getting on with the job of fixing the mess left by the former Liberal government. Last week, the opposition sought the release of WorkCover's June quarterly performance report, which, as I advised the house at the time,

is still in draft form. I have contacted WorkCover, and I understand that WorkCover's June quarterly performance report will be finalised and released by WorkCover later this week.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: This week. Earlier this year, I advised the house of the last actuarial assessment adopted by the board, which indicated an unfunded liability of \$350 million. Subsequently, WorkCover released its March Quarterly Performance Report, which I again stress is unaudited and without updated actuarial figures. It estimated the unfunded liability at \$384 million. I anticipate that, as I have said before, the funding position will get worse before it gets better. As I have also said before, the most reliable figures are the audited accounts, which include an actuarial assessment adopted by the board.

WorkCover's June quarterly performance report will contain unaudited figures and will not contain an up-to-date actuarial assessment adopted by the board. The finalisation and release of WorkCover's quarterly performance reports is a matter for WorkCover. However, according to the advice I have received, under the former Liberal government:

- In 1999, the WorkCover June quarterly performance report was released with the annual report on 10 December.
- In 2000, the WorkCover June quarterly performance report was released with the annual report on 15 December; and
- In 2001, in the lead up to the election, the WorkCover annual report was released in February 2002 and the June 2001 WorkCover quarterly performance report was not released until 28 May 2002.

I understand that it is expected that the board will adopt an updated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley already knows that he is on short shrift. The minister has leave of the house to make a statement to the house. The house, having given leave, will hear the minister in silence.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I understand that it is expected that the board will adopt an updated actuarial assessment in October. In previous years, the WorkCover annual report, which contains the audited accounts and the updated actuarial assessment adopted by the board, has been released in December.

MINISTER'S REMARKS

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I apologise unreservedly to the house for interrupting the course of its procedures. I would only point out that I was somewhat inflamed because the minister was claiming at the time that under a previous Liberal government—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am explaining to the Speaker—that something had not happened until 28 May 2002. In fact, we had not been in government for several months at that time and that is why I felt the necessary outrage.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley knows full well, if he was listening to the statement, that it referred

to the period ending 30 June 2001, during which the now opposition was definitely in government.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Ms BREUER (Giles): I bring up the 49th report of the committee on stormwater management.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Social Justice. Is the minister aware of the submission of the Supported Residential Facilities Association to the Social Development Committee in June this year, and why has the minister not taken action to prevent the crisis? That written submission, which the President has agreed to my quoting in parliament this afternoon, states:

As part of our presentation on 2 July 2003, I will provide the committee with a list of private sector SRFs (Supported Residential Facilities) that may or will close within the next 12 to 24 months. That list includes eight facilities that are presently licensed to accommodate the 304 clients.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): I thank the deputy leader for his question. Yes, I am aware of that report.

ELECTRICITY, INTERCONNECTORS

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question without notice—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Mawson!

Mr RAU: Will the Minister for Energy inform the house of progress made by the government in respect of increasing South Australia's access to power supplies?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): I notice that the member for Bright is very pleased to be hearing from me again. I can understand that—he always enjoys my contributions so much. I advised the house last week that I was travelling to Sydney to meet the ministers of both Victoria and New South Wales. One of the things I have talked to the house about before is the deep frustration with the regulatory system that has seen our attempts to have a stronger interconnection with New South Wales tied up in courts now for several years, and with further legal action that is likely to take a year to resolve. This has been deeply frustrating.

The simple logic of the national electricity market in all common sense would suggest that stronger interconnection with New South Wales, and the nature of our demand profile in South Australia is such that we should have interconnection, but the regulatory system we inherited is so flawed that we have found it very difficult to achieve.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Bright says, 'Tell me about the supply in New South Wales.' I heard his contribution the other day about how its reserves were not as good as they were before. I could explain to him again the difference in demand profile, but the fact is that with Victoria we have almost synchronous highs and demand, while it is less synchronous with New South Wales, and the fact that we

use natural gas and they use coal, they have cheaper power and we have more expensive power, that their demands are high at different times—I should not bother because, having explained it to him a million times, he cannot take it in.

I am sure the member for Bright will be terribly disappointed as he hates good news, but in an agreement between the states we recognised the failings in the current system that had it tied up in court and recognised the need for both South Australia and Victoria as a joint region to get stronger access to the supply from New South Wales. It was an agreement to develop proposals for upstream works in New South Wales and Victoria to bring on stream an extra 200 megawatts from New South Wales into Victoria and for it subsequently to be available for South Australia. It is very good news we would have thought—and I am not surprised that the opposition has gone silent for once.

Also agreed was that we will change—and by telephone with Paul Lucas we have his broad support, but we need to work on the detail—the regulatory test that has so frustrated all reasonable attempts to upgrade our transmission systems. We are working on a new regulatory test, which remains the capacity for these protracted legal proceedings and reduces the numbers of matters that might prevent plant transmission taking place and which removes the current bias towards unregulated interconnectors in the national market—a very significant step forward.

The third thing that was a very significant step forward was the genuine commitment of the state ministers to resolving those differences that prevent us moving to a new regulatory system. We will be talking to the commonwealth about that again very soon. Again, this is a very positive outcome for the state. It is a way of getting past the impasse that has been created by a poor system in the courts. It makes extra capacity available in South Australia—something the member for Bright was bleating about but now does not seem interested in, because he is not interested in good news. The previous government gave us a wrecked electricity system in South Australia, and he has been out there carping on about why we have not fixed his pile of wreckage to the extent that he would like it to be fixed. So I am not surprised that whenever we do make a step forward he goes quiet and starts talking to his mate over there. What is his name? Lloyd Christmas. Harry and Lloyd Christmas. I am pleased to be able to report the good news for South Australia—I said that I would be going there, and we have brought the news back as quickly as we could.

SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Minister for Social Justice. Why did the minister claim today that only three supported residential facilities were under threat of closure when at least eight facilities have closed or are about to close? The minister has claimed today that only three supported residential facilities face closure. In April this year the minister released a report entitled 'Somewhere to Call Home' which lists 64 such residential facilities. Of the facilities on that list, released six months ago, at least eight have closed already or are planning to close by the end of this year. These include: Miramare, which has closed; Kiama, which is now an aged care complex; Port Elliott Residential Care, which closes at the end of October; Gracelands, which has been sold and closes at the end of October; Ellesmere Lodge, which closes on 26 November; Rose Terrace Hostel,

which has closed; Amber Lodge, council has approved it becoming a retirement village; and Sunflower Lodge, which closes at the end of December. There are others in the process of closing or where the property is up for sale.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): I thank the Deputy Leader for his question. As the general community and members here would understand, we do have a serious situation with regard to boarding house accommodation and also supported residential facilities. The issue that I am trying to deal with at the moment, along with the department, is how we can make sure—in consultation with residents who will need to find alternative accommodation—that we not only find appropriate alternative accommodation but that we also look at the options available to residents with regard to the particular issues they may have.

Members in this chamber would be aware of the fact that people who live in supported residential facilities quite often have a mental illness. There are a number of people in supported residential facilities who have different disabilities, who have complex needs and quite often do not have any family or friends who can assist them. So, this is a very complex matter. The point that I found most stunning is that this has been an issue for quite some time, and as I understand it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Infrastructure is out of order.

The Hon. S.W. KEY:—during at least the last nine years there have been a number of supported residential facilities that have closed down. What disappoints me is that I can find no or scant evidence that the previous government did anything about that. I think one of the reasons we have the situation we have now is because of the neglect under the previous government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Just last week, I arranged for the Deputy Leader to be briefed on the closure of a facility at Port Elliot. This facility is on very valuable land overlooking Horseshoe Bay and the property has been sold. I would say that the Deputy Leader would be very familiar with the closure of SRFs in his electorate, because they closed with regular monotony while he was in government. Loren closed approximately nine years ago, Seymour was bulldozed six years ago, and Clifton closed four years ago.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.W. KEY: In 1999, there were eight supported residential facilities in Victor Harbor, Port Elliot and Goolwa townships. Since then, five of them have closed.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Hon. Deputy Premier!

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The other concern I have is not that members in this house are not conscientious in their views about what will happen to people in supported residential facilities but that there are a whole lot of alarmist comments being made that I think do not help with the negotiations and the debates that we are having at the moment in trying to house people who are in immediate need of alternative housing. I understand that, when we look at the number of supported residential facilities that are under threat—and there is one in the electorate of Finnis that I have already mentioned, which is expected because the facility will be closed by the end of October—there is a priority there to try

and make sure that we do come up with alternative accommodation.

From information that I have, there are also two facilities that will close by the end of November, and there are a further five facilities that will close this year. So, depending upon the closures, alternative accommodation that we are seeking will be for between 90 and 192 people. To answer the Deputy Leader more directly: yes, I am aware of the supported residential facilities that are likely to close by the end of the year, and I know that there are some further facilities that are likely to close by the end of the financial year.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Attorney-General!

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I need to reassure the house that we are making sure that we are working across government on this issue first of all. We are working with the non-government sector, with local government, and particularly with the support of residential facility owners themselves, to try and make sure that we do have appropriate options of accommodation for people who are currently in SRFs and boarding houses.

UPPER SOUTH-EAST LAND

Mr SNELLING (Playford): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Will the transfer to the government of land that is required for drainage works in the upper South-East cause some landowners to pay capital gains tax?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for Playford for his question. I imagine that his interest in this is not as great as the member for MacKillop, who might like to pass on some of these pieces of information to his electors. The member raised the issue of whether capital gains would be inadvertently incurred on parcels of land that had been acquired by the government for drainage corridors during debate into the Upper South-East bill. The Hon. Caroline Schaefer MLC and the member for Unley also raised this issue. I undertook to ask the state treasurer to raise the matter with his colleague in the commonwealth and ask if the commonwealth would waive any capital gains tax in this instance.

The commonwealth treasurer has advised that capital gains tax is unlikely to apply if there is no change in title. The advice is reassuring for landowners because the government is implementing the vesting of land in a way that does not cause a change in title for those areas of the drainage corridor that are ultimately not required for the project. Under current arrangements, the Lands Title officers made a note of the government's drainage corridor interest on property titles that are affected by the legislation, and when the drains are completed a cadastral survey defining the precise area of land taken for the drain will be done and a certificate of title for that land will then be issued in the name of the minister. As there will be only one change to the title certificates after the drains are completed, there will be no need to transfer unwanted land back to the original owner, thus avoiding a situation that might invoke capital gains tax implications.

SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Why has the Minister for Social Justice sat on the report into the financial viability of supported residential facilities since April this year? About six months ago the

minister received this report, which apparently shows that these residential facilities receive on average \$27 a day to provide accommodation, three meals a day and support to residents to take their medication and for personal hygiene. When I raised the issue in June in parliament, the minister said that, once she had taken the matter to cabinet, 'I am more than happy to release these reports and make them public.' The operators of these facilities have been waiting for the report and a government response since April, and so a number have decided to close their facilities and sell the properties.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): The point the Deputy Leader has made about the fact that the report has not been released and that being why SRFs have closed down is a bit of a leap in debate. My understanding is that the Supported Residential Facilities Association is ably represented on the ministerial council and that the association itself has actually commissioned a financial viability report, as well as assisting and providing information for the Department of Human Services' report on viability. The issues that have been raised in the financial viability report are the very ones that we are working on at the moment.

I am of the view that it is important that the report be released, and I understand the question that the deputy leader is raising. This has been an issue for a number of years and, in fact, it was reflected during the estimates debate that the deputy leader understood the problem of supported residential facilities and boarding house accommodation. I am trying to come up with some answers and make sure that we do not only release the report saying, 'This is the problem.' I think it would be fair to say that supported residential facility owners, who are mainly private sector people, do understand clearly the issues to do with their financial viability.

A number of things have made this whole area of supported residential facilities and, to some extent boarding houses, more difficult, in that with the property boom going on at the moment a number of the facilities have increased in price and the owners are saying that unless they can get some correct support to provide services, because these are mainly pension-run facilities, then they are going to find it very difficult not to sell the facility or to close up shop. My major aim is to make sure that we have the answers, both in an interim way and in a long-term way, to make sure that these people are not left homeless and are not put in a more precarious situation than they are already in.

The other thing I need to say is that I think it is important not to develop a sense of crisis in an area that is actually being worked through and managed, because this will just make the closures and the problems a self-fulfilling prophecy. So, yes, I will be releasing the report, but I will be releasing it in a responsible manner with the measures both on an interim basis and a long-term basis that our government intends to take.

CLIPSAL 500

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. What is being done to ensure the safety of the patrons at the 2004 Clipsal 500 Adelaide event?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): The Clipsal 500 is an outstanding event.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Why is Jane not running it?

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier, otherwise known as the member for Semaphore has the call, not the member for Waite.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Because I am running it; I am a well-known motor sport enthusiast.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I thought we did well last year with the first race under a Labor government, a four-day event. This is the second event this year; we have had two races under this government and they just keep getting better. As I have said in a spirit of bipartisanship, it was good work by the former government which has been built upon by this government. The Clipsal 500 is staged pursuant to a contract between SA Motorsport Board on behalf of the government and the Australian V8 Supercar company, AVESCO. In order to fulfil the government's commitment to AVESCO, the board must construct a street circuit in accordance with national and international standards to receive a level two track licence.

As a result of a tragic accident in Melbourne in 2001 at the Victorian Grand Prix, at which a marshall was killed, a coronial inquiry was held to examine safety issues as they related to that race and motor sport. The board has implemented all the recommendations arising from the coronial review in Victoria, except for the issue related to the height of debris fencing surrounding the track. Recently, CAMS formally advised the board here in South Australia that debris fencing must be raised to a height of over four metres in certain sections of the track for the 2004 race to minimise the risk of injury.

At present the entire Adelaide track is covered with debris fencing 2.5 metres high. A review has been undertaken by the board's engineer, in conjunction with CAMS, to identify the high risk areas where higher debris fencing is required. The capital cost of meeting this requirement has been estimated at approximately \$1 million. The government has committed the additional \$1 million to enable the upgrade to occur to the identified track sections. I am pleased the member for Waite supports that, as he is always calling for us to spend money.

The government and the board are conscious of the fact that the safety of the public is paramount. The Clipsal 500 will continue to draw huge crowds and provide the state with substantial economic benefit—estimated at in excess of \$19 million for the 2003 event. It will be an outstanding race next year. I assure people that we will be having a bigger, better, more exciting race than we have had in the past. At this stage I am tempted to ensure that no Collingwood supporter is invited, and we will be requiring people to confess if they are a Collingwood supporter because, if we catch them at the race, look out: we will show them what choking is all about.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Given that the Minister for Industrial Relations does not know the estimated level of the unfunded liability of WorkCover, and that the Treasurer does not know the unfunded liability of WorkCover, will the Premier advise the house the estimated level of the unfunded liability of WorkCover at 30 June this year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): As the government has said previously, and I am happy to repeat it, what the government relies on is the actuarial assessment that is adopted by the board.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, sir. The question is specific to the Premier about his knowledge of the level of the unfunded liability of WorkCover. The Minister

for Industrial Relations cannot possibly answer for the Premier's mind.

The SPEAKER: The principle of unity in cabinet and its purpose is the basis upon which any minister may rise to answer a question put to the government, regardless of whether or not the honourable member making the inquiry has directed the question to that minister. Indeed, the records of this chamber are replete with examples, parliament by parliament, of where a question though directed to one minister has nonetheless been answered by another, so much so that I would be tempted to chance my arm to say that it would average more than one a year and that therefore it is appropriate for the Minister for Transport to respond on behalf of the government, even though I share the same curiosity as the member for Davenport as to the level of awareness of the Premier.

Mr HANNA: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Do you mean by that ruling to say that ministers cannot be asked about their individual level of knowledge about a certain issue?

The SPEAKER: The ministry can be, but the chair cannot insist, given the convention of cabinet unity, that a particular minister answer a question, unless it is explicitly relevant to work which that minister has undertaken to do on behalf of the chamber—and, in this instance, in the absence of any other information, the work that is being undertaken on this matter is being undertaken by the Minister for Transport, that is his senior portfolio, where he is otherwise the Minister for Industrial Relations.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a further point of order. Your logic is impeccable, but standing orders require that anyone who answers a question must address the substance of the question. The question was quite specific and included the fact that previously both the Treasurer and the Minister for Transport have been unable to answer the question in this house. If he can now answer the substance of the question, one wonders how and whether he misled the house previously if now he knows.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley has put a question to the chair which invites the chair to speculate about whether it was within the Minister for Transport's current knowledge, given the assertion made by the member for Davenport that, during the course of question time last week, the Minister for Transport did not know the answer to that question. Notwithstanding that, it is not improper for the Minister for Transport to answer.

Mr HANNA: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I refer to standing order 96 which essentially covers questions without notice. It says:

At the time for giving notices of motion, questions relating to public affairs may be put to ministers.

It does not say questions relating to public affairs may be put to 'the ministers', which would imply some kind of collective questioning. The wording actually implies that the questions may be put to specific ministers. I would ask you to go away, Mr Speaker, to reflect on that and to come back with a ruling. There is a very important reason of public accountability for the interpretation that I have suggested; that is, there may be a question about whether a particular minister, for example, was aware of a corrupt matter, a matter of overspending, or maladministration, matters which may not be in the knowledge of other members of cabinet, and therefore it may be very important to single out a particular minister to see whether there is a state of mind which reflects knowledge of

that maladministration or corruption. It is an extremely important issue and therefore I ask you, Mr Speaker, to go away and consider the matter more closely and to come back to the house with an appropriate ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell invites me to reflect upon the ruling I have made, and I have done so in the nanosecond since he sat down. The answer is exactly the same as it was when I answered the point of order raised by the member for Unley and the member for Davenport. The question does not require the Premier to disclose his state of knowledge about a matter which he had under investigation but, rather, I remind all honourable members, including the member for Mitchell, that 'ministers' is plural and means the collective, and might be better expressed in modern language as the 'ministry'. However, the Minister for Transport may have the information sought by the member for Davenport at this point in time, and his answer will reveal that. If he does not have that information, it is highly unlikely that the Premier would have that information in that the board does not answer through the Premier to the cabinet but by statute through the Minister for Transport through cabinet. The Minister for Transport.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: As I said in my ministerial statement, the government relies on the actuarial assessments adopted by the board. The reason why the government relies on those figures is that they are audited. The point I made last week and again in my ministerial statement today is that the June quarterly report is WorkCover's June quarterly report, which is currently in a draft format.

I have already advised the house via my ministerial statement that, as a result of questions asked by the opposition last week, I took the liberty of contacting WorkCover to ask when it thought its quarterly report would be finalised and when WorkCover would be releasing it. The advice I received late last week, which I shared with the house today, is that WorkCover's unaudited quarterly report (quarterly reports are unaudited) will be released this week. However, when it is released, it is no moment of greatness—

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Standing orders talk about the substance of a question. There is absolutely no substance being addressed in anything the minister has said so far, because he has not addressed the Premier's knowledge, which is what the question was about. The minister is wasting our time even attempting to answer if he does not have that knowledge.

The SPEAKER: What the minister needs to do is to tell the house whether he has told the Premier anything different from what he has told the house. The minister.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No, I do not believe so. I made no secret of the fact, during question time last week, that I was supplied with a draft report, and that, when the draft report is finalised, it will be WorkCover's June quarterly report (unaudited) and will be released by WorkCover.

The SPEAKER: May I make it plain that I find that reassuring. The member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have a supplementary question. Can the Minister for Industrial Relations advise the house whether the Premier knows the estimated level of unfunded liabilities as at 30 June?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: How would I know—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Have you finished?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Have your little sarcastic laugh; have your little chuckle. We know your style. That's why they won't elevate you, mate; that's why they won't push you down the line.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the house would want the chair to reassure the minister that a prolix re-examination and re-presentation of the information already provided is not what is sought by the question. It simply asks whether the minister, who formally receives such advice, has told the Premier anything different from what the minister has told the house.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I think I answered that in the previous question.

The SPEAKER: I thought you did, too.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I do not believe that I have passed that information on to the Premier.

WRIGHT, Mr D.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question, without much notice, is to the Minister for Police. Does the minister approve of the involvement of SA Police in the exclusion of Salvation Army Captain David Wright from Baxter Detention Centre? Salvation Army officer Captain David Wright regularly provided religious services and comfort to prisoners in the Baxter Detention Centre. Last week, he received a notice from the immigration department (DIMIA) banning him from Baxter. In explaining its decision to ban Captain Wright, DIMIA refers to the Easter protest near Baxter and states:

South Australian police (SAPOL) advised that you were warned on three occasions to leave or face arrest.

The letter goes on to refer to an incident in August, stating:

SAPOL was present at the scene and we have been advised that you were later booked for using a mobile phone whilst being in control of a vehicle.

This is clearly a matter of government policy, not just an operational issue.

The SPEAKER: I disagree with the honourable member. The question is out of order.

Mr HANNA: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I seek an expansion of your ruling. Given that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question relates to the policy administered by the department of external affairs. Where operational matters for the police arise in consequence of the agreement made between the police and that department for the policing of those matters, it is still a matter of policy of the federal government or otherwise an operational decision of the South Australian police. It is not a policy for which the minister can be held responsible.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Can the Minister for Industrial Relations confirm that the estimated level of unfunded liability of WorkCover as at 30 June has not exceeded \$425 million?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): As I have said previously, the government relies on the actuarial assessment that is adopted by the board. The other point that I have made during the course of today, the ministerial statement and also last week, is that the draft report that is provided to me by WorkCover is unaudited and

its finalisation and release are the responsibility of WorkCover. As I said previously, as a result of questions last week I took the liberty of contacting WorkCover and making it aware of questions asked in this parliament, seeking its advice as to when the report would be finalised and when it would be released. As I said in the ministerial statement today, the advice that I was given is that WorkCover would be finalising and releasing its June quarterly unaudited report this week.

As I also said earlier, this is no moment of greatness because, as the government has said previously and as the opposition well knows, the expectation is that the figures will get worse before they will get better and, because of the nature of a workers' compensation's system with, particularly during the 1990s, a heavy reliance on redemptions and with the long tail that is associated with the payment of redemptions, the figures will get worse before they get better. As the house also knows—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Well, we will have to wait and see. The government will wait on the audited figures. As has also been pointed out to the house, as a result of the money that was taken out of WorkCover, the rebate and the reduction in the average levy rate, well in excess of \$100 million was taken out of the system when it should not have been. The house will see evidence as to the reasoning for some of that when I release the SAFA report and the OGE report tomorrow.

CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. What is the total figure for underspending in the capital works program for the year 2002-03?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I am more than happy to take that question on notice.

WRIGHT, Mr D.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Has the Minister for Police been briefed on the actions of South Australia Police in providing information to DIMIA regarding Captain David Wright, who was banned from the Baxter Detention Centre last week?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I thank the honourable member for that question. I do have a briefing because we were aware of the concerns of the member for Mitchell because he spoke about them on radio earlier today. My staff were aware of that and were quick to ensure that I was adequately briefed on the matter. I do not have a view either supporting or not supporting the actions of the police department in that it is an operational matter and any opinion I may have is not relevant, except that the police obviously have my full confidence and their actions in upholding the law are supported by this government. I will ensure that the house is informed about this incident and I will indulge the house with the response.

On 23 August 2003 three unlawful non-citizens were deported from the Baxter immigration detention facility. The Department of Immigration officials had requested police assistance due to strong intelligence indicating protest activity, with a possible blockading of the Baxter centre. Approval was sought and given by Assistant Commissioner Brown for Port Augusta police station cells to be used to house, on a temporary basis, three persons being deported. Each such request is considered individually and decisions

are based on the nature of the request, associated surrounding circumstances and the impact on police resources and operations.

Three persons were lodged in the Port Augusta police station cells at about 8 a.m. on 23 August 2003. They were in the custody of DIMIA and Australasian Correctional Management personnel. The three persons remained in the custody and under the control and supervision of DIMIA and ACM until they were moved from the police station cells at about 11.30 a.m., when they were transported to the Port Augusta airport and placed on aircraft.

Movement to the Port Augusta airport was via a police vehicle with DIMIA and ACM staff retaining custody and supervision of the three persons and all travelling in the same vehicle. The police vehicle was used due to protest activity, which was targeting ACM vehicles. I advise the house that police were not involved in the removal of the persons from the Baxter immigration detention facility or in their supervision and management at the Port Augusta police station. Section 5 of the Migration Act 1958 includes police stations and watch-houses as detention facilities under the act.

Specifically in relation to the matter raised by the member, one of the persons involved in protest activity on 23 August was Mr David Allen Wright—a Salvation Army officer stationed in Port Augusta. Mr Wright on one occasion deliberately parked his vehicle across the driveway, blocking the exit from the police station. He was cautioned in relation to this behaviour and warned that any repeat of it could result in his arrest. He moved his vehicle and did not repeat this behaviour.

When an ACM vehicle left the police station Mr Wright followed the vehicle out of Port Augusta and was seen to be operating a mobile telephone whilst driving. A Port Augusta patrol issued an expiation notice. During Easter protest activity in relation to the Baxter immigration detention facility, Mr Wright was shown in television coverage involved with protesters, which was broadcast nationally. I am advised that police did not provide information to DIMIA in relation to Mr Wright's having been reported for using a mobile telephone whilst driving or to his being warned at a protest. The information was readily available to DIMIA through its employees, who would have heard radio transmissions whilst in police vehicles or whilst in the Port Augusta police station cells.

It is not SAPOL policy to provide specific information to other agencies on such matters, but SAPOL cooperates with federal agencies in relation to the exchange of intelligence impacting on the security of detainees and the facility. It was common knowledge that Mr Wright was involved in protest activity on 23 August at the Port Augusta police station and that the vehicle he blocked from leaving that police station was an ACM vehicle. As it is an operational matter, it is not for me to do other than simply provide that advice, but the requirements, pressures and expectations on SAPOL as they relate to Baxter are difficult, and it would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the work of SAPOL in dealing with a very difficult situation. They do it extremely well and with the full confidence and support of this government.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY, EYRE PENINSULA

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Can the Minister for Energy guarantee that the Eyre Peninsula electricity supply network will not collapse this summer as a result of increased risks of some system network disturbances in the Whyalla area? The

Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council states on page 96 of its Annual Planning Report to June 2003 that:

As a consequence of location, network performance limitations affecting the Whyalla area reflected and magnified through Eyre Peninsula. There exists increased risks that some system network disturbances, whilst not impacting the Whyalla area greatly, could lead to system collapse of the Eyre Peninsula network.

Mr Speaker, you would be aware that this so-called network relies on a single, very old 132 kilovolt line between Whyalla and Port Lincoln to support an area almost the size of Tasmania.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): I would be far better placed to provide a guarantee of that nature if the previous government had not sold the electricity assets to the private sector.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Sir, let me make it absolutely clear, if they do not understand it. We do not own the transmission system. They sold it. We do not own that 132 kilovolt line because it was sold to the private sector. We have put in place a number of protections to make sure that the private sector is delivering to the people of South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is a red letter day, sir. Apparently the opposition has changed its policy—they now want us to buy ETSa back. At last they recognise their mistake. I have been waiting two years for this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport does not need to give the Minister for Energy assistance—he has enough energy of his own.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Thank you, sir. I have just been advised that it has not been sold: it has been leased—for a very long time. But while we have to endure a system that was sold by the previous government, we have in place a number of safeguards around reliability. I am sure the member for Flinders would know that upgrading transmission systems involves an application by the operator of the regulated asset to the ACCC. It is that asset, regulated by the ACCC, that is the subject of the report of which she speaks. However, I will certainly check with all those authorities. I again point out that what we have here is a transmission system that we do not own, leased for 200 years to the private sector by the previous government—not sold; of course we can get it back in a couple of hundred years' time—

An honourable member: We'll all be around.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Now they will want us to get the State Bank back! From the sublime to the ridiculous!

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The minister continually misrepresents statements made by other members.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I presume that the minister has completed his reply?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: All honourable members need to remember that hypothetical questions cannot be answered by ministers. Without wanting to be coach, for the benefit of members, I point out that that question might better have been framed in a more orderly fashion had it inquired of the steps that the government is taking to ensure that there will be no power failure this coming summer—not, 'can the minister guarantee there will not be'. It is hypothetical, in that no living human being—I will not go so far as to say divine providence cannot guarantee it—can make such an assurance.

I believe the honourable member for Flinders was probably wanting to know what the government was doing to minimise that risk. In any case, the question has been answered.

CENTRE FOR INNOVATION, BUSINESS AND MANUFACTURING

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development guarantee, given the government's announcement of the closure of the Woodville office of the Centre for Innovation, Business and Manufacturing, that all the office's functions will be transferred to the South Terrace office, and that there will be no further reduction in the centre's staff, funding or service provisions?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development): The answer to that question is very simple. It is No. 67. I understand that No. 67 is a recommendation of A Framework for Economic Development in South Australia, supported in a bipartisan way and therefore obviously supported by the questioner. Recommendation 67 states:

The government rigorously examine the functions provided by the former Department of Industry and Trade and now mostly carried out by the Department of Business, Manufacturing and Trade with the intention of achieving substantial restructuring and downsizing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: All I am doing is bringing to the attention of the house a recommendation that has been brought to the government by the Economic Development Board, with the full support of the echo opposite. My responsibility is to put that recommendation into effect. Before doing that, I have commissioned an independent study into how to achieve that objective and still deliver the services required to accomplish the first order objective, which is to triple exports—the opposition has conveniently forgotten that part of the recommendation. I will receive that report at the end of the month and I will make that report available to you, Mr Speaker, and to others who are interested. I will also take it to my colleagues in cabinet and at that stage we will make a decision as to where we go next.

That notwithstanding, the answer to this question is that I understand that members opposite support fully recommendation 67. If they do not, they had better tell me soon, because I am working on that assumption as that is what they have told the public. If they have changed their mind, they had better let me know, because that is the way I am going.

HOSPITALS, MOUNT PLEASANT

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Minister for Health ensure that the health department takes speedy and comprehensive action to remedy the current condition of the Mount Pleasant Hospital X-ray machine? I have been advised that the X-ray machine at the Mount Pleasant Hospital is not functioning reliably. Doctors are concerned about the potential for misdiagnosis and litigation, particularly in relation to road accident victims who require immediate X-ray prior to being airlifted or transferred.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Schubert for his question. I was unaware of the problems with the Mount Pleasant Hospital's X-ray machine. I will certainly look into it and bring back an answer as soon as I can.

WORKCOVER

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Industrial Relations disclose to the house the WorkCover unfunded liability figures, albeit unaudited, which he has received over the past six months? The Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Committee heard this morning that the minister had been provided with monthly reports from his observer on the WorkCover board and that those reports contained balance sheet figures, which included figures for unfunded liability.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): As I said earlier, as a result of questions that were asked in the parliament last week I contacted WorkCover and asked when it would be finalising its June draft report and when it would be released. I think I contacted it on Thursday or Friday, although I am not certain of which day. The advice WorkCover gave me was that it would be releasing the report this week. As far as the government is concerned, the sooner it is released the better because—as the government has been saying consistently for a long time, and anyone who understands the nature of a workers' compensation scheme will know—as a result of the policy position through the 1990s with an over-reliance on redemptions and what is associated with paying people to get them off the scheme, there will be a long tail. The government has said consistently for some time that the figures will get worse before they get better.

TAMAR WALLABIES

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What consultation will occur with land-holders adjacent to national parks prior to any release of Tamar wallabies in South Australia? The minister recently announced that Tamar wallabies causing damage in New Zealand will be captured and transferred for release in South Australian national parks. One of my constituents, who has 10 kilometres of fence line adjoining Innes National Park, has raised his concerns with me regarding the project. In fact, he said to me:

Currently I am battling a never-ending battle with kangaroos and emus along my 10 kilometres of boundary with National Parks. The problem is huge. Why would we want to spend thousands of dollars introducing another potential pest when the National Parks—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MEIER: He laughs at this farmer losing thousands of dollars a year from wallabies and kangaroos—

can't control weeds or the pests they have got now. Why is the New Zealand government agreeing to exterminate Tamar wallabies as pests, due to pressure from the conservation movement?

The SPEAKER: And I trust that they enjoy the freedom of the lawns of Government House when the time is appropriate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I see: I thought you were referring to members opposite, sir. I am very pleased to have this question put to me, and I must say that the migration to South Australia of a number of Tamar wallabies is the best import from New Zealand since the Premier came here some 30 or so years ago! What we are planning to do is bring back to South Australia Tamar wallabies that were made extinct in this state in the 1930s because of feral animals, particularly cats and foxes, which hunted them down and killed them off. No doubt, they were also helped by hunters.

The Tamar wallaby is a particularly small wallaby, about knee height, and when it is young it is very vulnerable to the hunting of feral predators, which is why it has not been seen in South Australia since the 1930s. We are embarking on a program to bring the wallabies back to South Australia. Fortunately, as a matter of luck, a former Governor of South Australia, Sir George Grey, who eventually became Governor of New Zealand, had a passion for native South Australian animals and placed these animals on an island off the coast of New Zealand where they have become plentiful and, indeed, are a pest. The reason they are a pest there is that there are no predators to hunt them down.

This program, to bring these Tamar wallabies back to South Australia, is strongly supported by the federal Liberal government and, in fact, your colleague the federal minister David Kemp supported this program I think to about \$100 000 worth of commonwealth benefits. Senator Amanda Vanstone was happy to be there at the presentation, applauding this new program to bring these wallabies back to South Australia. Yes, we will consult with local land-holders, but I am assured that the chances of this wallaby surviving in any part of South Australia will be with difficulty. For them to become a pest is highly unlikely, but we will certainly consult with local landowners about it.

We would like to place them in a national park where they are able to exist. We are planning to bring 100 of them from New Zealand: 18 have already come. They will stay in Monarto Park in quarantine for about six months. A small number will be kept there, so that there is some genetic material in case those that are eventually released disappear.

SHINE

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: On Wednesday last, the member for Bragg asked about a survey of students participating in the SHARE (Sexual Health and Relationships Education) trial in 15 government schools. Specifically, she asked about who had granted the ethics and research approval for the survey. I undertook to provide that information and now do so.

The Department of Education and Children's Services Research Unit, headed by Dr Magda Kvasnicka, approved the project evaluation of the SHine Sexual Health and Relationships Education (SHARE) project. The evaluation was reviewed with respect to protection from harm, informed consent, confidentiality and suitability of arrangements. Agreement from the principals of the schools involved was also required before the survey could be administered.

In accordance with protocols in the past, copies of research tools are not circulated in the community and are only on view at the school should parents wish to see them. This is exactly the same practice as has been in place for other surveys, including the National Schools Survey (which includes questions regarding sexual health knowledge and practices), conducted last year and approved for circulation by the former state (Liberal) government. Notification of La Trobe University's approval for the evaluation project to 31 December 2005 was given in June 2003 by the Secretary of

the La Trobe Human Ethics Committee, Ms Mira Junge, on behalf of that committee.

Members of this committee are constituted by La Trobe University and include a chair appointed by the Research and Graduate Studies Committee; a faculty representative; Chair of Faculty Human Ethics Committee; a postgraduate candidate; a minister of religion; the university solicitor; a health care professional; a medical graduate with research experience from outside the university; and a laywoman and a layman not associated with the university. Approval for the evaluation of the SHARE project was given to Ms Anne Mitchell and Ms Sue Dyson of the Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, La Trobe University. Dr Magda Kvasnicka, from the research unit of my department, provided the DECS approval and advised La Trobe accordingly.

The member for Bragg said in her address in reply speech last week that my department had declined to approve the program. This is incorrect. DECS did approve the evaluation proposal in principle, subject to some minor procedural changes. These changes were accommodated, and the research to be conducted by La Trobe University was approved.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

SLIM DUSTY

Dr McFETRIDGE: Last Friday, 19 September, Australia became a slightly worse-off place. Slim Dusty, the country music legend who typified the spirit of Australia, died aged 76. Slim Dusty was born David Gordon Kirkpatrick and his hits included, as every member knows, *The Pub with No Beer*, and one of my favourites, *Duncan*. Articles by Lisa Davies and Ray Chesterton in Saturday's *Advertiser* gave a very good cover of some of the history of Slim Dusty. With their help and as a result of my own personal knowledge, I will give a tribute to Slim Dusty.

He was a very great man. Slim Dusty had been battling kidney cancer for a number of years, and he leaves behind his soulmate and wife of 51 years, Joy McKean, his daughter, singer Anne Kirkpatrick, and son David. Slim Dusty was raised near Kempsey on the New South Wales Mid North coast and wrote his first cowboy song, *The Way the Cowboy Dies* when only 10 years old. What followed was 60 years of recording and 160 albums in all, notching up worldwide sales of more than 6 million. It is an achievement unmatched by any other Australian. His most famous song, *The Pub with No Beer*, at the time was the biggest selling record of any Australian. Slim Dusty was working on his 106th album when he died. Slim Dusty was awarded an AO and an MBE, and won a total of 36 Golden Guitars at the Tamworth Music Festival. He was the first Australian to get a gold record with *The Pub with No Beer*, and the first Australian to have an international hit when *The Pub with No Beer* topped international charts overseas. Slim Dusty's international fame increased when he was the closing act at the Sydney Olympics in 2000, singing *Waltzing Matilda* to millions of people both in Australia and overseas. Prime Minister John Howard paid tribute to 'a one-off great bloke in the proper sense of that expression and a great Australian figure and icon'.

In 1992, Slim Dusty helped create the Country Music Association in Australia and became the inaugural chairman. To mark 50 years of commercial recording, Slim Dusty

appeared at the Grand Ol' Opry in Nashville in 1997 by special invitation from the Country Music Association of America. On his return to Australia he received a special achievement award from the Australian Record Industry Association at the ARIA awards. Slim Dusty described his music as songs about real Australians, saying, 'I have to be fair dinkum with my audience.' Some of Slim Dusty's most famous records over a 60 year career included *When the Rain Tumbles Down in July* (recorded in 1945), *The Pub with No Beer* (recorded in 1957), and the one I particularly like, *Duncan* (recorded in 1980). Another of my favourites is *Leave Him in the Longyard*, which was recorded in 1998.

Amongst my collection of records and CDs at home, one of my prized possessions is a re-recording of 68 rare recordings of Slim Dusty's original Regal-Zonophone collection. I have on the insert a personally signed autograph from Slim, which says 'To Dunc—Slim Dusty—2000'. The insert to this CD contains an introduction by Slim Dusty, and I will read some of what Slim Dusty had to say about his music. The insert states:

I started singing during my school days. Called myself Slim Dusty 'for show work' when I was about 11. . . I began broadcasting with my mate, Shorty Ranger, from the local radio station 2KM when I was about 15. Dad and the radio station manager. . . decided that I should go to Sydney and audition for the one and only record company, The Columbia Gramophone Company. . . from 1942 through to 1945, I made five private (or custom) records and distributed them to many radio stations around the country with a fair amount of success. . . in 1946 I was asked to come back for another audition with the record company. The upshot was that I got by and recorded my first commercial records, six sides for the Regal-Zonophone label. . . I'm very pleased to have had so many requests for these make-up vintage albums. . . Most of these songs cover a lot of my young days and doings spent back in Nulla Nulla Valley. . . not forgetting all the love stories either. . . when I hear some of these old recordings now, I start to compare the equipment we used then with the massive amount of gear and gimmicks in the elaborate studios of today. I just sit and think and wonder for a while, and then start to feel very proud of all the people I've worked with over the years on these old songs. . . *Rusty It's Goodbye* is one of the first records Joy and I ever made together. The start of a pretty good team, even if I do say so myself. Other songs that stand out in my mind are. . . *Losin' My Blues Tonight*, *Must Have Good Terbaccy When I Smoke*—

Time expired.

WINDSOR GARDENS VOCATIONAL COLLEGE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I take this opportunity to relate to the house the achievements of students and staff of Windsor Gardens Vocational College. The college is involved in a long-running exchange program with Cheltenham College in Victoria. The exchange is an excellent opportunity for both schools to play host to interstate students. The 2003 exchange was the 39th for both schools and ran between 23 and 26 June. The exchange is not limited to a simple cross-border transfer of students: also, it is about three days of competition across a wide range of academic and sporting pursuits. The spirit of the exchange has traditionally been one of friendly but fierce competitiveness, and I understand that this year's exchange was no different with a pervasive atmosphere of sportsmanship and friendly rivalry.

There are a total of 23 events in which the students compete, including badminton, basketball, chess, debating, drama, football, hockey, indoor cricket, music, netball, soccer, table tennis and volleyball. I am happy to say that students of Windsor Gardens were equally well represented in both sporting and academic events and achieved excellent results in both areas. The prize at stake for each exchange is

the Exchange Shield—held by Cheltenham since 1988. It was the case that Windsor Gardens was particularly keen to amend the record as far as the shield was concerned. In what was a hard fought contest, Windsor Gardens prevailed over excellent opposition to ensure that the Exchange Shield would remain in South Australia. As it was the first win for Windsor Gardens in 15 years, members can appreciate the jubilation of staff and students in securing it.

Mention should also be made of the efforts of staff and students in coordinating this event. An extraordinary amount of work goes into putting the many elements in place to ensure a successful three days. Not only are there the three days of competition, but the exchange also includes a reunion dinner, which this year was attended by 350 people. In addition, students are actively involved in fundraising for the exchange, which helps with the cost of billeting the interstate students. This year so much money was raised that the school did not have to pay for billeting costs. Students were also actively involved in constructing banners, attending events during both regular school hours and into the evenings, and providing enthusiastic and vocal support.

As the foregoing demonstrates, the exchange is without a doubt an extremely proud tradition for both schools. However, the story would be incomplete without reference to another tradition that has developed as a result of the exchange. Several years ago, Cheltenham students appropriated one of Windsor Gardens Vocational College signs as a souvenir of their visit. As the bus drove away, they took great delight in displaying it to Windsor Gardens students. Thus, another friendly animosity was born. I understand that in recent years Windsor Gardens students obtained Cheltenham's mascot—an inflatable penguin—and brought it back across the border. Not only was the mascot stolen, but it seemed he had a taste for travel and very soon photos of the penguin in various locations in South Australia were sent to Cheltenham along with ransom notes. Where the penguin is at present is to some degree unclear, but I am led to believe that he has officially retired from his role following an unfortunate puncture incident.

This year Windsor Gardens enlisted the help of an inflatable brontosaurus named Boris as their mascot. As a result of conversations I have had with the school, I understand he not only fulfilled his role admirably but also remained unaccosted throughout the recent exchange and remains safely in South Australia. I congratulate Windsor Gardens Vocational College for its win, but I also make special mention of how valuable the exchange is, not only in providing students with an event to which they can look forward but also in fostering a sense of pride in the school and promoting the value of cooperation, teamwork and sportsmanship. Next year sees the 40th anniversary of that exchange, which was a wonderful achievement. I trust that it will continue to offer students, staff and parents the same wonderful opportunity and I look forward to a continuation of what is certainly a proud and valuable tradition.

MOONTA LAVENDER FARM

Mr MEIER (Goyder): On Saturday 20 September, I was privileged to have the opportunity to open the Moonta Lavender Farm. It is a new venture on northern Yorke Peninsula and one that I would recommend to any person interested in looking at the marvels of lavender or just wanting to visit the country to see a new venture. The Moonta Lavender Farm is owned by a Moonta couple, John and Jenny

Powell. I first called in on them some 2½ years ago when the first of their lavender had just been planted. They had some acres but little else. I can tell members that they now have extensive plantings of different lavender plants. They also have a children's nursery rhyme garden, a shop featuring crafts and lavender products and a dining area, and they sell plants.

It is a real credit to this couple who originally came to Moonta with the aim of retiring. They are certainly doing anything but retiring, in fact they are working flat out. Considering all the work that they have undertaken over the last few years, it is good to see that, at long last, there may be some returns. In fact, Jenny Powell said that the first shock she received was to be advised that a group of 100 people would be visiting the farm after the opening on Saturday. I am sure they would have welcomed them. There is a very minimal charge. I was very pleased to have the opportunity to open the farm. There is no doubt that this farm provides one more excellent tourist attraction for the area, and I have highlighted to this house previously that we have so many different tourist attractions.

Probably the one attraction that we have promoted the best over the years is Innes National Park because it is now the most visited national park outside the metropolitan area. Some years ago, the Yorke Regional Development Board highlighted the fact that with so many people visiting Innes National Park, it is up to Yorke Peninsulites to encourage people to visit their businesses along the way, and Moonta Lavender Farm is an ideal place for people to stop—completely voluntarily, of course. The attractions of lavender are numerous. Lavender has been with us, we believe, since Roman times, so it is far from new. However, in Australia it is a relatively new industry and there are many newcomers. The Australian Lavender Growers Association was formed as recently as 1995, and apparently there are over 300 members at present. The benefits of lavender are numerous, and I refer to an email entitled 'Lavender Farm, Tasmania' which states:

Lavender oil has a variety of uses. It can help with insect bites, burns and blemishes, is a powerful antiseptic and has many calming and balancing properties. Emotionally, lavender helps support a calm composure and self-expression. It reduces irritability, insomnia, nightmares, apprehension, panic attacks, stress, nervous tension and hysteria, and is balancing to the psyche as well as the body.

I think every MP should have some lavender oil with them by the sounds of this email, and in fact I can see the member for Florey holding up a bottle. In fact, I bought a couple of bottles of lavender oil Saturday after the opening—

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mr MEIER: All right; perhaps we will let others use it, too. There are many other uses for lavender. John and Jenny Powell have done a wonderful job in setting up their shop. It is amazing how many arts and crafts have lavender incorporated in them—things which I would not have thought of. Certainly I have to try some of their wares such as honey and jam.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. It is useless to have a bottle of lavender oil if you do not use it.

AUSTRALIAN PRIMARY PRINCIPALS ASSOCIATION

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I was wondering if you, sir, might be instructing the excellent attendants in this place to

put lavender oil in the airconditioning, but we will await developments on that matter. The member for Goyder might like to know about lavender chutney and a few other products he obviously has not yet come across.

I rise today to congratulate the South Australian Primary Principals Association, which, at the moment, is hosting a very important national and international conference at the Adelaide Convention Centre. The Australian Primary Principals Association holds regular conferences and this year the responsibility of hosting the conference has fallen to the South Australian chapter, which I am sure will have done an excellent job in organising a stimulating and exciting program for the conference participants.

I had the pleasure of representing the minister at a function to thank the various conference sponsors and I was very impressed by the wide range of people and organisations involved in this conference. I met people who were promoting various IT systems, playground equipment and canteen supplies. It seemed to me that people attended from across a whole wide range of areas that support primary schools promoting products about which we do not always think. It was an innovative approach from the South Australian Primary Principals Association to involve those suppliers in the conference, and I am sure that the conference program will be just as innovative. About 650 primary school leaders are attending the conference and they come from the public, Catholic and independent sectors from across Australia, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and New Zealand.

An exciting program is on offer and some of the education experts, community, business and industry leaders who will present key note addresses in the workshops include the following. There is Professor Alan Reid from DEST National Research Fellow—Professor Alan Reid is noticeable for his commitment to public education and the challenge that I have heard him offer to us all to think about the important community role that public education plays and the way it is currently under threat. There is Professor Loretta Giorcelli from San Francisco State University, Louise Bywaters from the South Australia Centre for Leaders in Education—a long-term eminent person in our South Australian education system. There are also: Professor Michael Apple from the University of Wisconsin; Professor Patrick Duignan from the Australian Catholic University; Professor Steve Van Matre, founder of the Earth Education Institute; Adam Spencer from Triple J; Maggie Beer from the Pheasant Farm; Greg Mackie from the Festival of Ideas; and Tony Sharley from Banrock Station. I think we can see that with these sort of presenters educational leaders will really be challenged to think about issues for the 21st century and will be well equipped to focus on the issue of building success in the primary years of education.

I would like to commend our minister for the focus that she has placed on the early learning years and the need to get those right, and the fact that South Australia now has the smallest junior primary classes in the whole of Australia. I was pleased to see that in some of the support programs associated with the conference participants were able to visit the Antonio Catholic School in my electorate, McLaren Vale Primary School and the Tatachilla Lutheran School. This was as an opportunity for them to see some of the excellent initiatives in our South Australian schools and, incidentally, visit our very important wine area. Every week, I see some of the leadership displayed in our local primary schools. I notice how the leadership can contribute to different emphas-

es and different values in different schools, and I commend all those leaders who are coming together to improve our educational leadership.

THOMAS, PROFESSOR T.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I rise to express to the house my very deep concern about a response to a question I raised with the Attorney-General during question time last week. Members might recall that I asked the Attorney why he had not corrected statements he had made to this parliament on 1 April 2003 concerning the professionalism of Professor Tony Thomas. I pointed out to the Attorney that, in fact, the inaccuracy of what he had said was raised in another place on 16 July and again on Monday last week, and yet the Attorney had still not corrected what he had indicated to this house.

By way of explanation, I want to go back to what the Attorney actually said. It concerns the Henry Keogh case, and I want to say at the outset that I am absolutely at one with the Attorney in supporting the conviction of Henry Keogh. I have no doubt about that man's guilt. I am not part of any conspiracy theorists group or any group trying to get Henry Keogh released. Indeed, I would like to get another truck to put around the place to put a big 'Why?' wherever they put a 'Release Keogh' banner on a truck around the place.

On 1 April, in the course of a long explanation about the nature of the allegations raised in various TV programs, the Attorney went through a lot of the evidence presented to the court. In particular, in relation to Professor Thomas, he made these statements:

Professor Thomas was not a forensic pathologist when he appeared on *Four Corners* and, I am told, had not carried out a post mortem investigation on a homicide case in South Australia. I am not sure of his current expertise in forensic pathology.

He then went on to talk about the findings of Magistrate Baldino in relation to the veracity of the forensic evidence by Professor Thomas in the Cheney case. I quote from the *Hansard* in relation to Magistrate Baldino findings, as follows:

I formed the distinct impression that the professor's views, opinions and hypothesis were not entirely impartial and independent. In this regard I am compelled to agree with the prosecution. . . that Professor Thomas was 'obviously not an unbiased witness'.

Magistrate Baldino went on to make further adverse comments about the professor's views. What happened subsequently to that was, after Magistrate Baldino dealt with this matter, it went on appeal. That was back in 1999, so it is something about which the Attorney-General should have been aware. What happened at the appeal was, having reviewed the evidence, Justice Mullighan found as follows:

There are very serious findings so far as Professor Thomas is concerned. He is a specialist in his profession and holds senior and important positions at the Flinders Medical Centre and the Forensic Science Centre where he is a senior consultant. He has a long history of working in forensic pathology overseas and in this state.

Most specifically, in relation to the findings of the magistrate, Justice Mullighan said:

The finding of the learned magistrate reflects poorly upon him—that is, upon the magistrate—

He [the magistrate] gave no reasons for his conclusion. He found that no suggestion of a lack of impartiality or independence or bias was put to Professor Thomas in his evidence and he further found that the opinions of the professor appeared to have been recounted in an entirely appropriate manner.

Justice Mullighan significantly goes on to say:

In my view, the learned magistrate erred in his dismissal of Professor Thomas's evidence. . .

It is a very serious thing, then, for an attorney-general to come into this place, some four years after those findings of the magistrate (which were specifically overturned) concerning this person whose reputation was, no doubt, quite badly damaged by an attack by the Attorney in this place under parliamentary privilege.

Not only is it bad enough that that was done, but on 16 July this year and again on 15 September (just last Monday) in another place it was brought to the Attorney's attention that he had erred in not telling this place the full story. The point I want to make is that, as a practitioner, if I went into any other court in this state and failed to tell the court what I knew in its entirety about a case—if I simply quoted what a magistrate had said without letting the court know that the magistrate's findings had been specifically found to be in error on appeal in another court—a higher court—that would be the subject of disciplinary action against me. My concern is that the first law officer of this state is, in this court, misleading us.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I point out to the honourable member for Heysen that remarks about the good standing or otherwise of any member of parliament cannot be the subject of grievance debate, and the last sentence of the remarks the honourable member made in that grievance debate was highly disorderly. It must be the subject of a substantive motion.

Mrs REDMOND: I withdraw my last comment, Mr Speaker.

REAL ESTATE MARKET

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): In the last session of parliament, some 10 weeks ago, I noted in a grievance that the Australian real estate market was substantially over-valued. This, I argued, posed substantial dangers for those South Australian small business operators with investor exposure to the residential market. The danger lay in equity evaporation. Put simply, a slump in the real estate market not only reduces prices but it also evaporates equity held in the property. This, in turn, increases the overall percentage of debt against equity for small business operators. A rise in debt against equity makes the raising of additional debt to finance business growth, or the day to day operation of business, difficult, if not impossible. In the intervening 10 weeks since making these observations, the Reserve Bank and the International Monetary Fund have issued similar warnings.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: They listen to you.

Mr O'BRIEN: They certainly do. Their desire is similar to my own—to see the heat come out of the market in a controlled manner such that equity evaporation is kept to an absolute minimum. What will be the extent of a downturn in the real estate market? Those like myself hope that it will be limited. However, the decision announced late last week by the Commonwealth Bank to slash 3 700 jobs (10 per cent of its work force) indicates to me that at least one bank is preparing for the worst whilst hoping for the best. I do not challenge the bank's claim that it has a program, which it has titled 'Which new bank?' and which is designed to overhaul its service delivery structure. However, what I do find difficult to accept is that this can be done by cutting to the bone the staff structure that does the ultimate processing work that ultimately delivers the services.

I have yet to come across any small business person who has not complained about how overworked and under-resourced business banking staff appear to be. This applies to all banks and not just the Commonwealth Bank. What I believe is happening is that the Commonwealth Bank is commencing a frantic process of cost cutting to cope with a savage downturn in the property market. Press reports claim that 400 jobs have already disappeared in the past month or so with another 3 700 to come.

Superannuation fund managers are also moving out of bank stocks to a position of underweighting in their portfolios, which is a sign of increasing nervousness at the exposure of the banking sector to the property bubble. My belief is that the federal government should have commenced the task of talking down the market at least 12 months ago. Instead, it has allowed what Alan Greenspan would describe as 'irrational exuberance' to get even further out of hand. In fact, even as late as last Friday, Treasury officials were, according to Sid Marris of *The Australian*, ringing journalists to censor the reporting of a statement by the Treasury Secretary, Ken Henry, in which Mr Henry described the housing market as a bubble, with the obvious implication that it may well soon pop.

The 'pop' may not occur, and it is my heartfelt desire that it does not, but why do we allow ourselves to even approach these boom-bust predicaments? Perhaps the reason can be found in the observations made by prime minister Ben Chifley in an address to the House of Representatives on 15 October 1947. In the address, titled 'Banking in the Public Interest', Ben Chifley stated:

I hardly need argue the importance of money and credit in a modern economic system. As the means by which resources are brought together in production, goods are bought and sold, and prices, wages, contracts and debts are determined, it plays a part as vital to the economic body as the bloodstream to the human body. No single factor can do more to influence the welfare and progress of a community than the management of the volume and flow of money. Mismanagement of money, on the other hand, has contributed to the greatest economic disasters of modern times—booms and slumps, mass unemployment, waste of resources, industrial unrest and social misery.

He went on to say:

. . . the great power of private banking in Australia has become concentrated in the hands of boards of directors comprising a relatively few men who are responsible for the exercise of their powers not to the nation but only to a limited number of people.

Time expired.

DRIED FRUITS REPEAL BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 149.)

Mr CAICA (Colton): I acknowledge the traditional owners and carers of the land on which we stand, the Kaurna people, and it gives me great pleasure today to rise and congratulate His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr Bruno Krumin, on his delivery of Her Excellency's

address. It does not seem 18 months since I stood here and was provided the honour of moving the adoption of Her Excellency's address to open the Second Session of the Fiftieth Parliament: it seems to me to have gone very quickly.

However, it has been a very interesting time since we formed government, and it has been particularly interesting for me as a local member. Contrary to the views of doom and gloom expressed by those opposite—and I think probably very much to their disappointment—the government is travelling well and is well supported by South Australians in its endeavours. Unlike the opposition, I will not be backward-looking today. It was sickening, to a great extent, to listen to those opposite ranting that, 'We did this,' 'We did that,' 'We did this better,' or 'We could have done this.' The fact is that they did not, and they will not have the opportunity for some time of doing what they profess they want to do. I am actually tired of their negativity—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA:—particularly the negativity of the person just interjecting. I am tired of their negativity, and we as a government are looking forward. The past 18 months has been significant in building a foundation that shall, in time, provide prosperity to all South Australians through the better delivery of health services, better education for all of our children, job creation, a social inclusiveness, and the outcomes that arise from a clean and safe environment in which to live.

We will achieve this, despite the impediments and obstruction of a backward-looking opposition that seems satisfied in not challenging our policies and legislation but simply opposing them. It is an opposition that I think has grown tired looking back and it must, of course, come to the realisation that every time it looks back from the position in which it is at that particular time, the distance becomes further from where they once were. I urge the opposition to look forward, start being a little more positive and start working with the government to the benefit of all South Australians.

As I said, Mr Speaker, it has been a very interesting time for me since my election to government as the member for Colton. I like my job, and I particularly like my electorate work, which has been, for me, to a great extent, an extension of what I have done previously. It would come as a surprise to those opposite who might not understand too much about the virtues of being a trade union leader that being the elected representative of a group of people of an electorate is an extension of the job that I previously did—that is, to look after their interests as best I can. Being a member of parliament is an extremely fulfilling role.

I also very much enjoy my Public Works Committee role. To a great extent I endorse the comments of the member for West Torrens and others who have talked about the very important function that this committee provides to the parliament and, hence, the people of South Australia. The Public Works Committee, as you would know, Mr Speaker, has such a diverse area of responsibility. One week we may be looking at a salt interception scheme, the following week we may be looking at waste water treatment plants and the following week we may be looking at schools, and there is a host of other projects that are important to the value of South Australia.

It is important to this parliament that proper scrutiny is provided to those projects by the Public Works Committee. It is one of the few committees that, through its legislative responsibility, provides for proper scrutiny of the decisions

of the executive arm of government. I am also somewhat concerned about the move to shift the mandatory reporting of public works from \$4 million to \$10 million. The monetary figure can be somewhat cosmetic, to the extent that it is just an arbitrary figure. If, for example, the government, in its wisdom, decides to shift the amount for reporting from \$4 million to \$10 million, as it has stated, I believe that it will also need to ensure that the provisions that still apply with respect to the Public Works Committee being able to report to the government and hold up projects must not be shifted from that \$4 million to the \$10 million—that is, that the Public Works Committee would still have the opportunity to call before it any project that the government is undertaking and those provisions of reporting would still apply irrespective of the increase in the figure from \$4 million to \$10 million.

I also believe that, contrary to the view that seems to be popular among some circles, it has never been the Public Works Committee that has been an impediment to the responsiveness of government. In my time, the Public Works Committee has not held up projects: if the truth be known, they are often held up well before they come to the committee. So, it is not the Public Works Committee that is an impediment to government responsiveness.

In addition, I would argue that the decision to go from \$4 million to \$10 million with respect to a referral to Public Works Committee is a decision that has arisen from reports that were commissioned by the previous government. That previous government was well known for its efforts to circumvent a proper scrutiny of its projects. I know you are fully aware of such projects, Mr Speaker—the Hindmarsh stadium, Holdfast Shores and the list goes on (even the old Treasury building). So, I would be very concerned about a government that looks at removing from the Public Works Committee the ability to scrutinise any project it so wishes and, indeed, to remove from the committee's area of responsibility the ability to hold up those projects, if the parliament saw fit, through that committee. It is a very dangerous precedent, in my view.

In addition, with respect to public works, as I said, we are as a government reacting to reports commissioned by the previous government—a government that circumvented the public works process by any means it saw fit. I would also be very disappointed if the government determined not to refer projects such as schools, which are in the public interest, to the Public Works Committee. I would also be disappointed if it was decided, for example, not to take into account the value of land that might apply to any project.

Again we will get a scenario like Holdfast Shores where it was determined that the value of land on which that project was being built, for all intents and purposes, was worthless. If it was worthless I would have liked a crack at it, because I would have paid a few more dollars than did the proponents of that project. I caution the government with respect to its intentions with regard to public works and to make sure it allows proper scrutiny to occur from here on in with respect to public projects and to endorse the words of the member for West Torrens that, 'We will not be in government forever, as sad as that may seem to some people.' In reality we are adopting recommendations from a previous government that were commissioned by a previous government to allow a circumvention of scrutiny which we will, at the end of the day, be the worst for when in opposition—if that makes sense.

I enjoy my job and very much enjoy my electorate work and my public works. I am a little ambivalent about my role in this place because, to a great extent as a backbencher, I believe that a cut-out effigy on occasions may be as useful as I have been. I enjoy my contributions such as the Address in Reply, grievances and other matters which, from time to time, I get the opportunity to debate. I look forward to working over time to being more active with respect to my parliamentary role in this establishment.

However, I do not like everything about my job. I do not like the destructive nature of the job. There is something very destructive about parliament to the extent that it can be vicious with respect to its exchanges between members on this side and the other side, where it would appear that people are out to destroy people on the opposite side of the chamber. That is not very conducive to delivering our service to the people of South Australia. In the fire service I worked in an industry where we relied on each other and achieved greater outcomes by working collectively towards the better good. I do not believe that that necessarily exists in this place.

Having said that, I very much appreciate the fact that I work closely with some members opposite, particularly in my committee role, to achieve much better outcomes than would otherwise be the case. It seems that there is a somewhat gladiatorial nature to the exchanges between people on either side of the house. When I used to coach young children at football I would say, 'Don't take your eye off the ball: no matter how hard it gets, don't take your eye off the ball and play the man—keep your focus on what's important.' I say that as an encouragement to people here as I do not like the gladiatorial nature of people setting out to destroy their opposition, not through dissecting, analysing or challenging policy or offering something different, but by and through actions that have no relevance to our core responsibility of providing good governance. We can all improve the manner in which we carry out our duties here in that regard.

We must remember that we are custodians of our position. I will not be here forever, which is sad. I have a responsibility, as does everybody else here, to leave this place and South Australia in a better position than we found it. I do not like that aspect of the job: the gladiatorial nature, the fact that it is destructive and the fact that people try overtly to destroy each other, not through challenging policy but through personal attacks. I followed with great interest the recent reflections of the member for Unley: shall I stay, shall I go, shall I stay or shall I go? Who can blame him? He has been here for over 15 years and, if what I say is correct—that there is a culture of setting out to destroy each other in this place—he has had to endure for that time the adversarial and destructive nature of the way politics is unfortunately being played not only in this house but in similar houses throughout Australia.

Not only have the member for Unley and others had to endure that attack that comes from the opposition side, but also he has had to endure to a very great extent members from his own side, who have consistently over many years set out to destroy him and hound him out of parliament. I like the member for Unley. I like the fact that he has genuinely worked hard on behalf of South Australians and in what he believes is the best interest of South Australia—and I can cite many examples of his best endeavours.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

Mr CAICA: I am sure the member for Waite would agree that the member for Unley's commitment during his time as the relevant minister and since has been extremely valuable

and in the best interests of South Australians. I do not expect that the member for Waite will take a point of order in that matter. He will agree in silence to that matter. I was very concerned during this period of the member for Unley's personal yet very public reflection that he would go. I was concerned that his decision to resign, or a decision by his party to dump him, would be this parliament's loss and hence a loss to the people we represent.

So I was pleased to hear that the member for Unley has decided to stay in politics, providing he receives his party's blessing. He is even considering a foray into federal politics. My sources in the Liberal Party—for a lack of originality, and unimaginatively, I will refer to them as 'my deep throat' in the Liberal Party—have informed me that there is a very good chance that the member for Unley could be successful, should he decide to go into federal politics. We here wish him the very best of luck. I, for one, would support any move by the member for Unley into federal politics. Why? Because I think he would much better represent the interests of South Australians than do the current bunch of federal Liberal members. I am also informed that there would be ample support for the member for Unley by his state colleagues in relation to any move by him to go into federal politics. In fact, I think some people would be happy to see him go, for the reasons I espoused earlier, namely, that people here would like to see the back of the member for Unley.

It seems ironic, if my sources are correct, that the member for Unley may have a crack at preselection for federal politics. That brings me to the question of what seat it would be. My sources tell me that it would be preselection for the federal seat of Sturt. It would be quite ironic if he was successful, given that the current federal member has, as I understand it, a very active interest—in fact it could be termed a previous role of interference—in the branch elections of Liberal Party preselected candidates. I understand that the federal member for Sturt has interfered quite regularly in branch elections and has tried to hound the member for Unley out of this place for the past 10 or 12 years.

Many years ago it was the member for Sturt who was able to assist in organising the numbers for the then member for Sturt, Mr Wilson, to that sub-branch, only to use those numbers against him subsequently and get preselection himself to the federal seat of Sturt. My sources say that the member for Unley will have a definite chance of winning preselection for the federal seat of Sturt. If he is successful in his current and overt attempts to stall and obstruct the full local plebiscite component for preselection being considered by the Liberal Party, the member for Sturt will prevail. However, if the Liberal Party in its wisdom decides to adopt a local plebiscite residential component, it will be the member for Unley's ticket to Canberra.

The member for Sturt, I understand, has attempted to knock off the member for Unley for the past 12 years and he will continue to do so. Perhaps the chickens will come home to roost. I am informed that the member for Unley may, if the Pyne gerrymander prevails, run as an independent. If he does he could well win, given the preferences he would receive as an independent candidate. In my view, it would be good to have, as a federal member representing South Australia in Canberra, a member such as the member for Unley who, as we know, would not be soft on the River Murray, would not sell this state down the river, and who would properly represent the interests of all South Australians. I wish the

member for Unley the very best of luck in his endeavours, and I hope that he will ultimately prevail.

I referred to my electorate in passing earlier, and I wish to restate that it fills me with immense pride to be able to represent the people who make up the Colton electorate. I may be biased, but in my view it is without doubt the best electorate in this state. There are a lot of things I could talk about regarding my electorate, but in the time left to me I wish to mention a few specific aspects about the electorate that I so enjoy representing. There are many outstanding schools and preschools in my electorate, and I involve myself with each and every one of those in any capacity that the school or preschool so desires. I like all my schools, although I do have a bias toward Henley High School in particular—as I know the members for Cheltenham, Enfield, Bright and Mitchell, as well as the Hon. Kate Reynolds from another place, do—because it is an outstanding school, and I will be talking about Henley High in more detail tomorrow during my grievance. However, it is not the only outstanding school in my electorate. Findon High School is an outstanding school, as is St Michael's School, while in the primary schools there are Seaton Park, Kidman Park, Fulham Gardens, Henley Beach Primary, Grange Primary and, in the Catholic education system, there are Star of the Sea and St Francis. There are also numerous preschools that are, in my view, second to none with respect to the preschools that we have here in South Australia. Each of those schools has outstanding students and, in particular, outstanding staff. But most importantly the one ingredient that underpins these schools and their success is the school community itself. By that I mean the parents and the caregivers because, no matter how hard a school might work at achieving proper educational outcomes, it must be ably supported and assisted by the broader school community, and that includes the teachers, the parents, the SSOs and everyone connected with that school.

It is going to be a difficult year next year in my electorate with respect to schools, because I have several principals who will be leaving at the end of the current school year. Meredith Noble will be moving on from the Henley Beach Primary School, as will David Adams from the Fulham North Primary School. Grange currently has an acting appointment, Maureen Forrest, and I hope that she will be successful in that permanent appointment. They have been without a substantive principal with respect to a permanent appointment for some time, but that will be fixed by the end of the year. And next year will be the last year for the outstanding principal we have at Henley High School, Lyn Wright. I wish all of those principals all the very best for their future and I know that to whatever school they are appointed, it will be to that school's benefit. I thank them for the contribution that they have made to schooling and education in my electorate.

What is it that I like about schools? We can talk to anyone and there is one constant in our lives—we are at school, we have been to school, we may be going to school—

Members interjecting:

Mr CAICA: That's right. We have left school, we once went to school or we have children at school. There is one constant there. I enjoy my involvement with schools and do not underestimate the importance that they play in ensuring that, as we progress from our school years, we become good citizens as a result of the excellent schooling we have been able to get here in South Australia.

I also have some great community centres in my electorate. Like schools, community centres play an important role

in the lives of people within my electorate. There are community centres at Findon and Grange, the Henley Over 50s Club, the Airport Over 50s Club and the Reedbeds Community Centre. The services and the activities that they provide to the broader community cannot be overstated. It may be all right for us, for most of the time we may feel that we are very gainfully employed, but these community centres provide activities for preschool students and, equally importantly, provide activities for people who are retired and who are going into their third age. I congratulate the role played by community centres in my electorate.

There are many outstanding sporting organisations within my electorate and I mention three senior football clubs: the Henley Football Club, the Mighty Sharks, which is directly in my electorate—a terrific football club; the Seaton Football Club, just outside my electorate, which plays in A1 amateur league; and the Lockleys Football Club, which is also outside my electorate, but my electorate is a feeder to those clubs. While senior football is very important, I get much more enjoyment out of the junior football component, because it provides activities, a competitive environment and an appreciation of healthy activity for younger people.

While on junior football, I mention the performance of the Henley Football Club's under 15s team which, this year, took out the Metro West premiership. I have a bias towards this team because my son happens to be in it, but this group, which has travelled from under 9s through to under 15s, has now played together in each of the seven premierships. There are half a dozen kids who have played in seven premierships. The only danger is that they might think that things like that come around too easily. So I will not mind if, next year, they do not enjoy the same success because, to be a good winner, you have to learn how to be a good loser. I also have—

Mr Rau interjecting:

Mr CAICA: The member for Enfield interjects about playing for the Power, and I know Port Power supporters would hate it now, but I am actually starting to feel a bit sorry for them. Maybe pity is not the right thing, but I hope that they do as well next year as the Henley Football Club and the Seaton Football Club have done throughout this last year.

With respect to other sporting organisations, my electorate has the Grange Cricket Club and the Fulham Cricket Club—both outstanding cricket clubs—and, again, I focus on the junior component of their operations because often with senior sporting clubs a lot of the players who represent them come from outside the district. Of most importance are the facilities that are provided to the local kids with respect to sport and activity, as offered by the clubs that I have mentioned. My electorate also has a soccer club, a baseball club and a netball club which provide both senior and junior teams in various competitions.

Some outstanding community services are provided in the western districts and within the Colton electorate: the Western Carers Association, Meals on Wheels, RSL and our churches. We have an enormous number of churches in the electorate of Colton, and they all are very good. I must also mention the wonderful community service that is provided by the lifesaving clubs. The Henley Surf Lifesaving Club is in my electorate, as will be the Grange Surf Lifesaving Club at the next election, after the redistribution. I hope and trust that it will be my privilege to be able to represent them after the next election. These organisations are terrific in what they provide to the people within the community but of more importance are the people who give many hours of their time,

volunteering to ensure that the clubs operate as effectively as they do.

I know that the Seaside Tennis Club, which I have failed to mention before, like all the other organisations, has a strong foundation of people who support it voluntarily through its various committees. The Seaside Tennis Club is, of course, the original home of Lleyton Hewitt and Alicia Molik. It has done its part in providing the services that I mentioned earlier, encouraging healthy lifestyles and sporting activity, which people can take with them in life. Of course, not everyone can become a Lleyton Hewitt or an Alicia Molik, but it instils in them a very good attitude with respect to healthy lifestyles and playing sports.

From my address to date, members might think that there are no problems in my electorate and that, of course, is not the case. There is a great concern about health services in my area; for example, the future of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. My electorate is a feeder for that hospital, as is the member for Enfield's electorate. What was once the Western Community Hospital, which was disgracefully abandoned by ACHA, has fortunately received a reprieve, because Elderly Care Homes, the purchaser, has leased the acute care component to a consortium of doctors. I, along with the people in my electorate, wish them all the very best of success in making sure that the hospital becomes a going concern.

I heard with interest the member for Napier's contribution earlier, and I know that within my electorate many of my electors are suffering from the property boom. It is a bit obscene for the federal Treasurer and the Prime Minister to say that the property boom is having only a positive effect. Clearly, it is not. First, it is excluding people from the housing market and, secondly, without an increase in income the capital value increases on your house mean that often people are now asset rich, income poor, with the adverse impact that has on their council rates and sewerage rates. So, it is not all wine and roses for everyone within my electorate. Many are hurting just the same as others.

That is why I am pleased to be part of a government that is setting in place the foundations that will ultimately provide a better quality of life for South Australians. With the foundation that our government continues to put in place, we are aiming high. We are aiming for a generational change, and I look forward to being part of this government and a member of this parliament in delivering the outcomes wanted by my constituents and, indeed, by all South Australians.

In conclusion, after 18 months it would be negligent of me not to thank my wife Annabel and children James and Simon and, indeed, my extended family for the support they have provided to me during these 18 months. It would be negligent of me not to thank my parliamentary colleagues for the support I have received from them. That includes those opposite, for the advice that they have provided me over these 18 months. I do appreciate it.

I would also like to thank the councillors within my electorate, the elected members to both the Charles Sturt and West Torrens councils, for their willingness to work alongside me in addressing issues. Most of all, I would like to thank those people within my electorate for their assistance and support, and I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I also rise to support the address of the Deputy Governor. I know that he gave it under some difficulty, having spent the three days prior with the

'flu. I think he did a sterling job in the circumstances. The member for Colton referred back to his days as a football coach. Indeed, he coached me at Henley High, and I am reminded of the values that he inculcated into the children that he coached. It reminds us all of the important role that volunteers such as the member for Colton and other football coaches play in the community in educating our young people about good values and about how to behave as human beings. There are many lessons to learn on a football field about supporting your colleagues. It is also about being able to cope with loss in a way that is not nasty but actuated by goodwill.

It is about ensuring that you are able to behave in a way that is focused on playing the game and not on the other player. The member for Colton spoke about focusing on the ball rather than on the man, and how he decried the standards that sometimes exist in this place. It is very important to acknowledge the role that leaders in the community, such as the member for Colton in his local community, play in shaping the characters of our young people. No doubt that is one of the reasons why the good electors of Colton chose him to be their representative, because they can see someone with good values, someone who has actually made a contribution in the community, and he has just reminded us of the importance of that.

I take this opportunity to refer to a couple of crucial issues that affect the electors of Cheltenham, one being the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I note that we are privileged to have in the gallery today representatives of the Public Service Association who, with me, attended a meeting in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital when we heard—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, the minister, with due deference, has been a very short time in here. I believe that it is disorderly to refer to people in the gallery, and I think the matter should be pointed out to him. This house does not make a practice of talking about people in the gallery, and nor should it. It is not influenced by such matters.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Redmond): If the member for Unley had not raised it, I was about to point out to the minister that it is disorderly.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I apologise to the chair for that breach of the order of the house. I was at a meeting at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital where the Public Service Association, through its representative Ms Jan McMahon, were ably and properly representing their members in seeking to establish some certainty about the future of the hospital. Of course, we had to endure under the previous government announcements and reannouncements and reannouncements of announcements about some potential future photograph of a plan for the QEH. We now under this government have the first serious blueprint through the generational health review for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and we now have seen a degree of certainty return to the lives of those who work at that hospital.

There is much to do at the hospital, but under the careful leadership of Mr Swan, Mr Baggerley, the minister and the chief executive of the Department of Human Services, the future of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is assured. Recently I had great pleasure in observing the upgrade of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the steps that have been taken to incorporate best practice in terms of hospital design into that building. It was very heartening to see the care that was taken to attend to the needs of the workers who have to use this institution and also, of course, of the patients who so crucially rely on the hospital for their welfare. Just small matters, such as the way in which gardens emerge from each of the wards,

which provides an opportunity for some peaceful reflection for seriously ill patients. It also provides an important area where they can exercise and begin their recuperation.

Nursing stations are placed in a way where they can supervise patients in a more easily accessible fashion. It includes small matters such as wet areas being associated with each of the wards, which assist with infection control and, finally, the various arrangements that have been made for negatively and positively pressured wards to ensure that infection control is carefully monitored. It was tremendous to see the way in which that work is progressing. The community will, I think, be thrilled when they see the investment that is being made in this part of the world. For too long people in this part of South Australia have had to endure conditions that are really inadequate for their needs.

We know that this part of the world, the north-western suburbs, has amongst the worst health status of almost any cohort within the whole of Australia. It also endures levels of income, of asset ownership and of education that make it amongst the lowest socioeconomically and most challenged areas in the whole of this country, and it is crucial that we take steps directed at improving the circumstances of the people who live there. This government has made a special commitment to the people of this area, not only through the resources that it has placed into the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and, through it, the North-Western Health Service, but also in relation to the urban regeneration of this part of South Australia in particular.

I will touch on a couple of other local issues that are seriously concerning the electors of Cheltenham. The first is the unfortunate decision that the South Australian Jockey Club has taken to put the sale of Cheltenham Park racecourse onto the agenda. Notwithstanding the commitments that we were given concerning their lack of intention to take that step, we now hear that it has been openly canvassed in the press that they intend to sell the racecourse. The government does not own the racecourse, of course, it is ultimately a matter for the South Australian Jockey Club.

As I understand it, they still have to persuade their own members before they take that step. Certainly, it is a step we do not support. The electors in this part of South Australia—in the broad north and north-western suburbs generally—are concerned at the potential loss of open space in this part of the world. They are concerned that it may be subdivided for industrial purposes. They are concerned that it may be subdivided for very dense housing development and, therefore, rob them of the capacity to enjoy a high quality open space. We will be strongly resisting the subdivision for industry, and we will be making a very clear representation, as far as we can, to the jockey club. Ultimately, if the jockey club is intent on pressing ahead with this matter, it may be that we will have to grapple with it within government. Certainly, the strong preference of the local community is to retain this area for open space.

I also take the opportunity to refer to a number of important institutions in my electorate, including Woodville Primary School, which is celebrating 125 years of public education. In 1870 the education board decided to build a school in Woodville. However, the school was not opened officially until 1878. The original school was only very small, with three rooms, and was in a building which now faces Port Road. A new administration centre has been constructed on the Evans Street entrance. Since this time, Woodville Primary School has been serving the western suburbs with quality publicly-administered education. The school also celebrates

of 50 years of education for students with hearing impairment, who have full access to all the school's learning facilities. The Woodville Centre for Hearing Impaired opened in 1953.

William Leslie was appointed the first headmaster of the school. He was formerly from the private school in Alberton. All his existing students followed him to Woodville, and other students came from smaller schools at Beverley, Findon, Cheltenham, Tenterden Village and Tom O'Shanter Belt—the former name for Woodville North. There was a total of 102 pupils in 1878—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Woodville North in fact. William's wife also taught at the school. Today the school has around 500 students. As was the focus of most schools in the early days of education, discipline was a major focus of the curriculum—and I know discipline is a matter dear to the heart of the member for Unley. Woodville is also recognised for being one of the first schools constructed in South Australia after the Education Act 1875, which made schooling compulsory.

Mrs Adelaide Miethke, a notable educational welfare worker in early South Australia, also began her teaching career at Woodville Primary School. She later earned a Bachelor of Arts degree, and went on to become the first woman inspector of schools in the South Australian Education Department—another first from the good electorate of Cheltenham. To celebrate the 125 years of public education at Woodville, the school is organising celebrations in November this year. One of the main events will be an old-fashioned picnic on Saturday 1 November. Members of the public and old scholars are invited to attend in their olden day finery. I am sure the member for Unley will be able to find something in his closet to wear on this august occasion.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, sir. Notwithstanding his comments about my closet, and I know this is a broad ranging debate—and I am very pleased for the people of Woodville—I cannot see how this touches on the Address in Reply in any way and no matter how wide-ranging.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Redmond): I will not uphold the point of order and the minister may resume his address.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, madam. In preparation for the 125 years' celebration, the school is calling on the community to help them piece together relevant memorabilia. Unfortunately, a few years ago, a fire in the school's administration block destroyed a lot of school records. The school is looking for documents, photographs and other materials predating 1992. With Woodville playing such a central role in the state's early public education system, no doubt there are many former students who have spread their wings widely and have gone onto great things. If members know anyone who may have something interesting to share about Woodville Primary School, please encourage them to make contact with Woodville Primary School or my electoral office. We are grateful for any support that may help the 125 years celebration take place.

I want to conclude on a vital matter, that is, the Rosewater Bulldogs. Currently, the Rosewater Bulldogs are in division 5 in the local amateur league. The grand final took place between Rosewater and North Haven—minister Conlon's former side, although I think they might have been called 'Presbyterian' in those days. I have it on good—

Ms Rankine: Did he play for them?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He did play for them. I have it on very good advice that they did not play like a side that was influenced by matters spiritual. They played a particularly aggressive brand of football, but I am sure minister Conlon will be able to shed light on that. Anyway, they played at Glenelg Oval a few Saturdays ago and, after a miserable afternoon, Rosewater triumphed over North Haven, 14 goals 9 points to 9 goals 6 points. They were the underdogs going into the match, but they played like winners until the final whistle and have now taken out the premiership. A solid working-class club, they are affectionately known as the Rosie Boys in our area, and, like their Port Adelaide peers, they have a tremendously proud tradition. They boast a number of luminaries, including Che Cockatoo-Collins, I think, and Brian Cunningham may have also passed through their team—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: In fact, going by the pictures on the wall inside the club, I am sure they did play there. Chairman Charlie Rumbelow has played a tremendous role in ensuring that the club's finances have now turned around. The club is in great shape. It is now a well-functioning club and it has also just picked up the premiership. In fact, they—

Mr BRINDAL: Madam Acting Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The motion before the house is the Address in Reply of the Lieutenant-Governor. Rosewater Football Club and the nature of the weather when the grand final was played is all very interesting, but I do not care how wide ranging the debate is, I fail to see what this has to do with the Address in Reply, and that is the motion before the house.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Redmond): I know that my response will be disappointing to the member for Unley, but I invite him to look at standing orders 118-127 which dictate that the Address in Reply is subject to the same rules of debate but there is no rule as to relevance. The minister is invited to resume his speech.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I now turn to a sadder topic, Port Power. Many of us were disappointed about the result on the weekend, but I want to say a few things about Port Power. While we might be disappointed as supporters, one needs to spare a thought for the players in the team, and indeed the coach. They would have had high expectations at the end of the minor round about what the final series would have held for them, and it must be a devastating sense of loss for them. Certainly, like all good supporters, I will stick with them through thick and thin. I do not care where they are on the ladder, whether they are top or bottom, I will certainly be providing my support to the Power and I am sure they will go from strength to strength.

Finally, I will refer to some other lesser known clubs which also make an important contribution to stitching together the social fabric of the electorate of Cheltenham. One club which has been doing fantastic things is the Woodville Hockey Club. The club is supported by a large network of volunteers, including players, past players and friends of the club. Woodville Hockey Club celebrated its 50th anniversary last year. It was founded by G.A. Phillips, a senior master from Woodville High School in 1952. The club was first admitted to A grade competition in 1955, and has been instrumental in the development of hockey in South Australia. The club amalgamated with Woodville Women's Hockey in 1978.

The club laid the first sand-based artificial playing surface in South Australia in 1986. The total membership of the club is around 300 people, aged between five and 75 years of age—clearly hockey is a game for all ages. Based in the Finsbury Reserve, Woodville North, this club stands strong in what has become an increasingly disadvantaged area. I spoke previously about the changes we need to make in this area in terms of not only renovating the area physically but also in building a community. Woodville Hockey Club strives to be a major hockey force in South Australia and works with the local community to encourage social and recreational participation in their support.

In conjunction with Port Adelaide and Grange, the club runs a local schools program with each club targeting schools in their area and offering coaching sessions to kids. Woodville conducted sessions at 10 local schools and coaching was provided to about 2 000 children. These programs ensure a ready supply of new players for the club. The club also embraces cultural diversity and has welcomed players from numerous cultural backgrounds including Aboriginal, Vietnamese, Polish, Dutch, Greek, South African, and Indian.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. I have taken your advice, and I now read to you the standing order you quoted to me. Standing order 128 states:

If a member indulges in irrelevance or tedious repetition of substance already presented in debate, the Speaker or Chairman may call the attention of the House. . . to that fact.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The Speaker didn't.

Mr BRINDAL: I am saying that standing order 128 implies that irrelevance is not the subject—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The Speaker did not call the attention of the house to it.

Mr BRINDAL: Any member may rise on a point of order. The Speaker then calls the attention of the house to it. That is the standard procedure of this house. You ruled that the rules about irrelevance do not apply to this debate. That is wrong; they do. I rise on that point of order. Standing order 128 does apply, and I ask for a correction of your previous ruling. What the minister is saying is irrelevant to this debate, no matter how wide ranging the debate or the previous practice.

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No, I didn't.

Ms RANKINE: On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, if tedium and repetition applied then most of the speeches given by the opposition would have been ruled out of order.

Mr Brindal: That is not a point of order.

Ms Rankine: Nor was yours.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has raised a point of order. It is my view that under the rules that apply to the Address in Reply the minister has not strayed out of the areas that he is allowed to address, because this debate is wide ranging. I have been listening to what he is saying, and he is not guilty of tedious repetition. The member for Unley may feel that it is tedious, but it has not been repetitive. Under standing order 128, as the member for Unley himself said, if a member indulges in those things the Speaker or the Chairman may draw the attention of the house to that fact, and I have not done so. I overrule the point of order and invite the minister to resume his speech.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is not surprising that the member for Unley finds it tedious for me to be talking

about a very disadvantaged area of this state and the way in which small community clubs play their role in trying to restitch our social fabric. It may be a matter of supreme disinterest for someone who comes from the privileged suburb of Unley to listen to some of the difficulties suffered by people in my part of the world, but we would expect nothing less.

I draw the attention of the house to an important award that has been given to a young man who was the team captain and premier league player in the boys' team in the club I just mentioned. John Thomas was recently given the award for South Australian Junior Aboriginal Sports person of the Year. Unfortunately, this club has had its difficulties. A vandalism attack and a fire in 2002 caused serious damage to the playing pitch of Woodville's home ground, causing the club a very difficult financial situation. The damage to the pitch was such that it looked as though the club may not be able to go on.

As testament to the strong community support of the committed volunteers, Woodville has managed to overcome this situation and recently installed a second-hand water-based pitch in place of the damaged pitch. The club sourced the pitch from Launceston at a total cost of \$150 000. Financial assistance from the state government and backing from the Charles Sturt council together with support from the club's fund-raising teams saw an army of volunteers lay and irrigate the new water-based pitch in time for the 2003 season. It was a massive undertaking, and it is a testament to the strength of the club.

The Woodville Hockey Club is determined to go on to much bigger and better things in its second 50 years. The committee, the players and the community involved in the Woodville Hockey Club represent all the virtues and values which we know are vital for healthy and happy communities. If we could bottle this success and determination and distribute it widely throughout the community, we would solve a lot of problems.

I need to draw the attention of the house to this part of the world because, whilst it may not be of great interest to some members, I think we should acknowledge that there are some parts of our city that do not receive a lot of popular attention in the press. They have tended to fall between the cracks in terms of the sorts of services that are able to be provided to members of our community. Pockets of real disadvantage exist in this part of South Australia. I am having discussions, on a regular basis, with the member for Enfield, who shares a group of suburbs which are collectively known as 'The Parks' and which represent some of the most challenged suburbs in our community. Indeed, it is only through a determined and whole of government approach that we will turn around the circumstances of those suburbs.

Whilst a redevelopment program is occurring in part of those suburbs—although I hasten to say not yet in the suburbs that comprise Cheltenham, namely, the Westwood project—to some extent that has really only served to highlight the degree of difficulties the remaining suburbs in that area experience. It has also tended to mean that, given this is a project which is of long gestation, many of the suburbs earmarked for development down the track are unlikely to receive any physical improvement to their circumstances until that project is fully completed.

We need to grapple with some of the difficulties that is causing in the area. The solution will not simply be by improving the look of the suburbs, although that is important; it will not simply be by improving health services in the suburb, although that will be important; and it will not simply

be about trying to better police law and order in those suburbs, although that would be important. It will involve all those things and also additional measures to strengthen and lift up these communities and neighbourhoods and, crucially, to show the people in those suburbs that someone does actually care about them. I know this is a challenge for the members for Enfield and Napier and a range of us who have pockets of quite devastating disadvantage within certain patches of our electorates.

It is difficult to raise these issues in a way that does not appear to be demonising or somehow stigmatising the people who live in these suburbs. However, I think we need to face up to the fact that, in many senses, these suburbs are under serious pressure and there are real questions about their viability. People living in these suburbs tend not to have access to the institutions or in terms of their capacity to verbalise what is happening to them. They do not have the sense of entitlement that perhaps goes with people living in other suburbs of the state who seem very well organised to complain about the merest inconvenience. They rely on their elected representatives, and that is why it is important that we give voice to their concerns. I can assure members that, in a public policy sense, this government is addressing their concerns.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, and refer you to standing order 125—'the use of offensive and unbecoming words'. Further, standing order 126 provides that that point must be made before any other member has spoken. I take gross personal offence to the following remark of the minister: 'I would expect no less because he comes from the privileged suburb of Unley.' I am sick and tired of hearing in this place members opposite making a welter of the fact that they represent disadvantaged suburbs when there are—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL:—disadvantaged people in the seats you, Madam Acting Speaker, and I and everyone on this side of the house represent, and I object.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Whilst I accept the member for Unley's passion about the issue and his correctness in stating that there are under-privileged people in all our electorates, there is no personal offence in what the minister has said. I therefore rule against the point of order of the member.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): It is sad to see the member for Unley—

The ACTING SPEAKER: I ask the member for Wright to wait for a moment. It has been pointed out to me that I should make the point to the member for Unley that it is offensive or unbecoming words in reference to another member to which the standing order applies and, for that reason, the point of order must be overruled as out of order. The member for Wright.

Ms RANKINE: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker, you have made some very wise judgments this afternoon. It is sad to see the member for Unley take offence at the word 'privileged'. I would have thought that the people of Unley would probably very readily accept that they are in a much more privileged position than people living in many of the western suburbs, and certainly than people living in the northern suburbs. It is sad also to see him take umbrage at the Minister for Urban Development talking about issues in his

electorate that are impacting significantly on his community, issues that have caused them some celebration.

Obviously, they take great pride in the achievements of their sporting clubs, and so they should, and why not; but also issues in relation to health, social inclusion and all of those issues that were addressed by His Excellency. I am particularly pleased to be following the Minister for Urban Development in my Address in Reply because I wanted to talk a little about Golden Grove about the Golden Grove development. The Golden Grove indenture has been finalised. On 12 September I attended a function, along with the Premier of South Australia, at which the Joint Venture chairman, Mr Ken Taeuber, officially closed the Joint Venture committee.

The development, for the purposes of the indenture and the Joint Venture, is now officially completed, with the construction of over 10 000 homes in that area—10 000 homes for ordinary South Australians. This was a magnificent achievement, and the quality of the development and the lifestyle enjoyed by residents is testimony to the hard work and dedication of all those involved, many of whom were involved at the very beginning and who maintained their involvement to the very end. I make particular reference to the chairperson, Mr Ken Taeuber. It has been a 30-odd year project for Ken and Mr Brian Martin.

The Golden Grove (Indenture Ratification) Act was proclaimed and came into effect on 20 December 1984. It was the first time that a government and private partnership was established to manage a major housing development in South Australia. The Golden Grove development has attracted national and international interest throughout its life, both in relation to the design and layout of the development and the unique and innovative approach to service delivery. In the early 1980s it was recognised that we needed to move away from the standard quarter acre block; that this 'one size fits all' mentality to building allotments was no longer appropriate, and it certainly was not sustainable.

Our lifestyle and housing needs were changing, and the Golden Grove development decided that it needed to reflect that. So, land was provided in a range of mixed sizes. There were allotments for cottages, villas, courtyard homes and standard allotments, as well as some high density units and, very importantly, for the first time in the Tea Tree Gully Council area, a significant stock of Housing Trust homes. The Golden Grove development was also the first development to integrate on a large scale new public and private housing. I must say that that has worked particularly well in that area.

The Housing Trust allotments were allocated prior to any land being put on sale. People knew where the Housing Trust allotments would be so that there was no nonsense and complaining that, suddenly, a Housing Trust home was next to them. It was certainly a much needed influx of public housing into the Tea Tree Gully area. The major focus of the development was housing affordability; it was about providing an opportunity for ordinary South Australians, families and young people to access their first homes. Certainly, the demographics indicated that many people came from areas such as Salisbury and Elizabeth, and they took on the slogan so successfully used by the developers: 'moving up to Golden Grove'.

One of the things that ensured that land remained affordable and within reach of ordinary families was that the legislation prohibited speculation. If you bought a block of land in Golden Grove, you had 12 months, I think it was, in which to commence construction of your home. If you decided you were not able to do that and wanted to sell your

block of land, you could, but you could not put it on the open market: it had to be returned to the developer at 90 per cent of the purchase price. So people were not able to speculate and developers could not come in and buy up large tracts of land. You had to have the intention of building your home there or you would, in fact, lose part of the money that you had paid. That ensured that families were able to access that particular area for homes. In fact, something like 70 per cent of the population in Golden Grove comprises families with children and over 30 per cent of the population is under 19 years of age.

The development has been very successful in a range of areas. It was certainly successful in introducing a range of housing types into South Australia. It was also very successful in creating a sense of community. Golden Grove, Wynn Vale and Greenwith are not just suburbs: they really have a sense of belonging to a community. The release of the land was very eagerly sought, and I remember the first few years of land release. In fact, they had to run lotteries to prioritise people choosing their blocks of land.

Services were planned for, and community needs were assessed and taken into account. Indeed, one of the very pleasant things about the Golden Grove development, despite the fact that in many patches it is very high density development, is that there are about 120 parks and gardens throughout the development, 60 kilometres of walking trails and bike tracks and 27 per cent of the project is dedicated to open space. That is in excess of double what is required in legislation for any development. So, it has certainly given the area a wonderful ambience. One of the large areas of open space that has been allocated is the 20-hectare site for the district sports field and it remains a very clear disappointment to people in Golden Grove that that still has not been developed for the purposes for which it was provided to the council.

Very innovative approaches were taken in regard to the provision of services—certainly in relation to education, with the sharing of specialist education facilities at the high school campus, for example, where one public high school and two private Christian schools share the same site and a range of very costly facilities, and that system is working particularly well. Students are able to access courses right across the campus and there is a lot of cross-campus involvement and interaction. Our primary schools are also on shared locations: there are eight primary schools and four secondary schools in the development.

In 1998, the International Real Estate Federation awarded the Golden Grove development the title of the world's best new residential development. That was a magnificent achievement for the Joint Venture, the Joint Venture partners, the Land Management Corporation and Delfin. In 2002, the Urban Development Institute of Australia gave it the award for the best master planned residential development. But the fact is that people really like living there, and that is the overall indicator of whether a development has been successful. I think, in large part, the project managers who worked in Golden Grove ensured that that happened. On many occasions, they took extra steps to accommodate the community. Indeed, I would like to pay special tribute to Kelvin Trimper, the Project Manager there for many years. Kelvin very often went above and beyond the call of duty in relation to not only the Golden Grove development but surrounding communities.

We have heard a number of addresses in this chamber about the Governor's speech and what this government

intends to do in the forthcoming term. In relation to education, Keithcott Farm Primary School was this year delighted to receive the funds it needed for its new gym. After 37 years Salisbury East High School is getting its first major upgrade provision of its new facilities, with its new tech studies and home economic centre. Madison Park Primary School, along with some other category 5 schools, received a primary school counsellor—a major initiative by this government and an indication that the education and wellbeing of our young people is important.

I also refer to class sizes in our schools. Under this government, in our most disadvantaged schools we will have an average class size of just 15.6 students. That is really important. The average reception to year 2 class size in state schools is now 20.4 compared to 26 students for every teacher under the previous government.

Another issue that has been raised during this debate and last week in the other house was in relation to the provision of a police station in the suburb of Golden Grove. The member for Mawson was saying in here last week that he had not heard from me about this issue since we came into government. I have to say to the member for Mawson that he summed that up in his own words. We are the government; I do not need to talk to him about that any more. I tried that, and it did not work. I spoke with the then minister on this issue numerous times. I raised it in the house and I asked questions on nine separate occasions, and I got nowhere. Why would I talk to him about it? He needs to realise that he is not in the government any more, and nor is the Hon. John Dawkins from the other house.

What I have to ask them is: are they now supporting me in my push for this for all those years between 1997 and our election, when I asked them questions, when I wrote to the minister and invited him to come out and talk to the people in Golden Grove? Of course, he did not come out there. He was asked to come out but did not turn up, did not come out and did not respond. Is he now supporting that proposal, because he did not between 1997 and February 2002? I would also like to know what the Hon. John Dawkins is doing. I know he came out to visit Golden Grove twice during the election. He walked through the shopping centre twice, but I do not believe I have seen him there since.

This government is addressing law and order issues on a whole range of fronts. In Golden Grove a local committee has been established, and my office is an active participant in that local committee. We are working together with people from the hotel, the shopping centre, from the local schools with the police and with the Tea Tree Gully council in how we can address a whole range of issues in that area. In fact, the implementation of a dry zone just recently was one of the initiatives that came out of that committee.

We have done a whole range of other things in relation to law and order. I can go through a list of capital expenditure we are undertaking and certainly a whole range of things we have done in relation to offences. For example, we have done the following: removed hydroponically grown cannabis from the expiation scheme; introduced DNA testing of all prisoners; increased penalties for bushfire arsonists, which is a particularly important issue in Golden Grove and Salisbury; removed the immunity for paedophile prosecutions that are alleged to have occurred before December 1982; instigated an overhaul by Robyn Layton of the South Australian child protection laws; improved the rights of victims with the introduction of the Victims of Crime Act; and, increased South Australia's victim support service funding.

Millions of dollars have gone into general policing operation costs and for the police component of the new computer-aided dispatch system, for DNA testing, for operations of the call centre, for the purchase of a replacement police aircraft, for lifescan (the new fingerprint technology), and, for the renewal of the State Rescue helicopter contract. We are not resting on our laurels: we know there is more to do. It was particularly distressing adding Golden Grove last week when we had the nasty attack at the hotel and young Andrew Rankin lost his life as a result. The people of Golden Grove know where I stand on the issue of community safety and protection and I assure them that I will continue to lobby within government for permanent policing resources to be located in Golden Grove.

I will not waste my time any longer talking to the member for Mawson. All we got from members opposite was one promise after another and nothing eventuated. When they finally came to the last election and promised a shop front police station, we found that nothing had been budgeted for, so it was just hot air. They have no credibility in this area whatsoever. If I were them I would not embarrass myself by constantly raising an issue about which they should hang their heads in shame.

The Tea Tree Gully council recently had out for community consultation and input a draft document looking at the overall strategy and direction for the Tea Tree Gully area in the years to come—a draft strategic plan looking at the environment, lifestyles, community empowerment, active and creative community, the image of our area, life-long learning, economic development, asset management and a whole range of governance issues. I was very pleased to meet with the Chief Executive Officer and to write to him and say that in fact I supported the overall intent of their draft document, that it provided a good direction in which our community could proceed, but that there are a couple of things I thought were important and worth raising here and I would be pleased to see the council address them.

Water management is clearly a problem in Golden Grove and an issue that is very challenging for residents and the council. That is particularly so in relation to the state of the Murray River as it is at the moment and the understanding the community has that we need to conserve water and manage that very valuable resource in a very responsible manner. I have asked the council to consider establishing an advisory group of local residents, who have for some time indicated to the council that they would be very happy to work with it in relation to the management of our open spaces and water conservation issues. I would very much urge them to establish a local residents' group which could work in partnership with the council to help it to identify ways in which its targeted water reduction can be achieved, so that it is done in a way which retains the amenity of the community and also has community support as it implements those measures. I think it is really important to ensure that local community groups—local residents—have the opportunity to have their input in a real and meaningful way.

Certainly, the Tea Tree Gully council has gone through a process of looking at ways in which it could address the issue of reconciliation. After some considerable debate, the council agreed to fly the Aboriginal flag at the council chambers, and that was a very pleasing result. But I would also ask it to consider acknowledging the traditional owners of the land at its official functions. I know that that is not done at Tea Tree Gully, but I think that it would be very much welcomed by the Kaurna people. It is certainly something that the Salisbury

council does on a regular basis. I was very proud to see, for the second time at the opening of our parliament, official recognition of the traditional owners of the land on which the parliament stands, and I urge the council also to consider doing so.

I have spoken in this chamber on a number of occasions about the Salisbury campus of the University of South Australia site at Salisbury East. Members know its history—the sale of the site, and the fact that it has been sitting there for a number of years. I also spoke more recently about a very dark cloud that was hanging over the Salisbury campus child-care centre. Its lease was due to run out in 2006, and it was facing a number of difficulties. It was initially advised that it would be relocated as the developer came in and proceeded with respect to that site. It was then told that it could stay there, but it would have to pay commercial rates, which would involve something like \$80 000. That would, basically, be akin to bringing in the bulldozers and running over that child-care centre: it simply would not have been able to meet those costs. I also make the point that this centre is running at capacity. We know that places at child-care centres are at critical levels here in South Australia, particularly in the northern suburbs, and it is the only centre that has major facilities for children with disabilities. It was a centre that we could not afford to lose.

I was very pleased that Steven Norris from Lifestyle SA agreed to come out and meet with residents after I had approached him and conveyed the concerns of the local management committee. He went away and reconsidered his approach, bearing in mind that there had been a huge investment in that centre by both the state and federal governments and, more particularly, by the local community. I think there is no greater investment that we can make than in the care of our children. It is a well known and well researched fact that the environment surrounding our babies in the first two years of their life has a major impact on their life outcomes. I am talking about what and who they will be by the time they start school, when they leave school and when they are 30 to 40 years of age. It is a very important centre: as I said, the centre was one that we could not afford to lose. I was very pleased that Steven came out and sat and listened to what we had to say about the importance of that centre—a centre that provides an excellent environment in which our babies can develop, explore and grow.

We know that the sale of this site went ahead without either the university or the previous government putting in place adequate protection for the child-care centre. It was a scandalous state of affairs. I know that the Salisbury council was particularly outraged by what had happened. The responsibility for saving this centre fell fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the community and Lifestyle SA. Steven Norris came out to the centre on Friday afternoon, along with Coralie Chaney from the Pickard Foundation. Gordon Pickard had visited a couple of weeks earlier and had a look around the centre, and he sat down with parents and talked about it. They officially offered the centre a 15-year lease for \$2 a year. This was an amazingly generous offer, both in monetary terms and in terms of community spirit by Lifestyle SA and the Pickard Foundation.

As I understand it, the Pickard Foundation is going to take over ownership of that particular building and not only is it effectively getting a peppercorn rent but the external facilities of the centre are going to be upgraded. The foundation has also agreed to pick up a range of rates and taxes and operating costs of the centre. That is an amazingly generous offer and

I would have thought that, in the sale of that centre, some responsibility should have been taken by the previous government and the university to negotiate its protection. But they did not do it, and I have to say that I am very grateful—as I know parents are—that the Pickard Foundation has provided a lifeline to the centre.

There is no doubt that Salisbury has a very great sense of community that is the envy of many areas. It is an accepting and tolerant community, one that stands strongly together when the chips are down and fights for what it thinks is right. In saying that, I would like to pay tribute to the members of the management committee and the staff of that centre. They did not stand by and allow the demise of the centre, although they could have done that. Instead, they showed that you can make a difference, that you can have an impact on your community—all you have to do is be prepared to have a go. They actively engaged me, Lifestyle SA and the Pickard Foundation in positive discussion, seeking a successful outcome, and always stressing the need for this facility for the wellbeing of our children. They deserve a big thank you from both myself and the community in general, as do the parents of that centre, who provided support and backing to their committee throughout the process. It was a wonderful outcome, and I know everyone who was there on Friday, and all the parents, were absolutely delighted.

I will finish by saying the words of a song that I am sure all of us will know. They are, 'Happy birthday to you, happy birthday to you, happy birthday dear David, happy birthday to you.' It is our Clerk's 60th birthday today—many happy returns, David.

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just inform the house that there will be no half holiday. Congratulations to the Clerk, but no half holiday!

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I am responding to the Governor's speech on the occasion of the opening of parliament last week. In reality that speech is penned by the Premier's department to outline the intention of the government in respect of the coming session of parliament. There are three topics I wish briefly to address.

The first is in relation to the River Murray. There is some cause for optimism here, since the Premier has committed his government to pushing for a minimum 1 500 gegalitre per year flow down the river. That is for environmental purposes—indeed, that is the minimum that we need to keep the River Murray going in the longer term, and I trust that it can be achieved. If it cannot, then we can only look forward to the River Murray mouth closing more often and for longer in the future, as well as the gradual deterioration of the ecology of the river and riverbanks over the coming years. So, I hope that that flow can be achieved.

The next topic relates to proposals for water trading across the Eastern States and South Australia. It is fair to say that there is some divergence of views amongst the Greens about the desirability of a water trading scheme. I think the issue is that there is already water trading and it is a matter of how it is regulated. It is absolutely necessary that a certain amount of water is reserved for the environment which, in a sense, cannot speak for up for itself before the balance of water over and above that entitlement is made available for trading between irrigators and other users of the water. There are a couple of key elements to regulating water trading. One of them needs to be the elimination of speculation so that the only people trading water are those who need to use it and

those who will use it for some human consumption purpose or some productive purpose. This needs to be in addition to the amount of water absolutely reserved for the environment.

The other aspect is not just a matter of flow, but a matter of variability of flow. It is very nice for shack owners and people who live next to the River Murray to have a nice steady river at the same level throughout the year but, of course, that is a great distortion from the natural way of the river. The ecology of the river and the riverine environment depends very much on periodic flooding.

So, it is not just a matter of ensuring flows—and that 1 500 gegalitres a year is a good preliminary target for South Australians—but we also need to make further progress on the variability of the flow of the river. If it means removing locks and allowing controlled flooding to some extent then that is what we need to do, if we are at all concerned as a community about the environment around the river.

Secondly, I turn to the topic of mental health. This is a far grimmer picture. I have a couple of constituent families where there is a young man who has, at the very least, a borderline personality disorder, if not some recognised mental illness. The consequence of this is that these young men are time bombs just waiting for some sort of violent offence to manifest. I was particularly reminded of the plight of these young men, and the families that in a long-suffering way attempt to care for them, when there was such a fuss about a convicted felon escaping, or at least walking out of Glenside Hospital.

It is all very well to be concerned about people who have a violent past, who are able to walk out of places such as Glenside, but it seems to me there needs to be a much stronger focus on the people who have yet to commit the crimes which land them in places like Yatala, James Nash House or Glenside. There are probably, having spoken to health professionals in the area, just a few dozen men in this particular category. They are a special problem for themselves and society because they are not readily treated. It is a matter of managing their condition rather than curing it.

In the cases I am thinking of there is not only a violent predisposition but also a cross-over between the inappropriate use of alcohol or marijuana and psychiatric illness, or, at the very least, borderline personality, which, for practical purposes, is just about as serious as psychiatric illness, as the medicos define it. In these cases, I am aware that, when the men have been offered psychiatric treatment, often they will not attend the appointment, or they may attend the appointment having consumed drugs between appointments. The psychiatric view is therefore that these people cannot be appropriately treated in a psychiatric sense because there is an issue of drug dependency. If you talk to the Drug and Alcohol Services Council caseworker, they will say, 'We cannot really deal with the drug dependency issue because the person has a psychiatric problem.'

Therefore, these people fall between the cracks in the system. I know from my experience with these constituent families and with people with whom I have dealt when I was defending criminal clients in years past that these sorts of people generally end up either in Yatala or, if they are fortunate enough to avoid the criminal justice system at a serious level, in one of the city squares as a homeless person. Gradually their support network of family and friends evaporates because their threatening behaviour is so difficult to deal with. It is an indictment on our society and on past and present governments that we are not able to manage those

young people in a way that allows them and their family to live in dignity

Thirdly, I deal with the issue of the government's tough on crime policy, as referred to in the Governor's speech last week. The rhetoric is 'tough on crime' and, occasionally, ministers will add 'tough on the causes of crime'. However, we all know that it is not really a matter of crime reduction. The main plank in the government's tough on crime policy is the extension of sentences for certain crimes—where there are aggravating circumstances, gaol terms are lengthened.

However, we know from the research that this does nothing to reduce crime. The biggest deterrent to crime—particularly home invasions, burglaries, drug-related crimes and crimes of violence—is the fear of being apprehended, not the number of years for which that person might be sent to gaol if they are indeed apprehended and convicted. It is not a crime reduction policy, but I wish it were.

So much needs to be done for the care of young people who come from difficult homes that is not being done under this government. So much more needs to be done in terms of prison rehabilitation, so that people refrain from reoffending should they leave our correctional institutions. I acknowledge that some money has been applied in the last state budget to the rehabilitation of offenders, but there seems to have been quite a bit of confusion over the past few months about how exactly it will be spent—whether it is on sexual offenders, or offenders generally—and how it will be spent on particular programs.

In summary, it is not a crime reduction policy this government has: it is more a media policy. In political terms, it serves the purpose of retaining the loyalty of people generally in hard-core Labor electorates who have fear about crime in their neighbourhood. It is a way of behaving like a conservative, Liberal government—an economic rationalist government—but employing policies that do little for the people in those suburbs in economic or social terms, whilst enlisting their vote by appealing to their sense of fear and their desire for security. In that sense, it is a cunning, manipulative approach to loyal Labor voters in particular. It is the same sort of *modus operandi* which John Howard employs and which he has employed in respect of refugees and, more lately, in respect of national security.

Ironically, the Labor government is not just tough on crime, to use its own rhetoric, but it takes pride in being tough on lawyers as well. Time and again, the Premier, in radio interviews, has blurred the distinction between lawyers who act for criminal clients and people who are charged with crimes. It is a really important distinction because lawyers are trained, no matter in which field of practice they have expertise, to uphold people's rights. Time and again, for the sake of a tough on crime reputation, this government has seen fit to diminish the rights of the individual in our society. That is a shameful thing, and it does disturb me about where we might be heading.

But this government is not just tough on crime and tough on lawyers, it is also tough on the victims of crime. The victims of crime regulations, which the government introduced some time ago and which changed the way in which medical reports are obtained for victims of crime, effectively put the onus of obtaining specialist reports, in relation to injuries suffered in the course of a crime, back on the victim. Therefore, victims are being asked by their lawyers to fork out \$700 or \$800 a time for specialist medical reports, if those reports are, in the opinion of the lawyer, required to determine the level of damage to that victim of crime.

The regulations which I am talking about were disallowed by the parliament and then immediately reintroduced by the government. Just for good measure, the government reintroduced regulations in a way which effectively cut the fees payable for lawyers acting for victims of crime. So, because there were lawyers who said that this was not an appropriate means of regulating medical reports and their cost to the victims of crime fund, those lawyers and their clients were effectively punished by the government. The Attorney-General seems quite comfortable with this. I think the government, including the Premier and the Attorney, seem to be playing some sort of a deal-making game with lawyers acting for victims of crime by suggesting that if they cease resistance to the government's victims of crime medical report approach, which effectively puts the onus for payment back on the victims of crime themselves rather than the fund, they will allow the lawyers to have their fees reinstated to an appropriate level. At the moment those lawyers are working on fees which were set back in 1988. There are not many in the community who have their remuneration still at 1988 levels. Those particular rates, of course, are fixed as a maximum by law. This government, it seems to me, is not particularly tough on crime, but if they enjoy a tough on crime reputation, they are also tough on lawyers and tough on victims. The manipulation of public opinion through that particular publicity campaign is despicable. With those remarks I will conclude. I have tried to point out that the government is doing the right thing in some areas, and is failing miserably in others.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development): I rise in support of the motion before the house. I am privileged to hold a leadership position in my community of Mount Gambier and accept that I must respect the community's vision and work to achieve it. However, I cannot do this on my own. There are many leaders in any community—indeed almost everybody at some time, plays a leadership role—at work, in our sporting clubs, at schools, at church, in volunteer organisations, in service clubs, in economic development, on school and health boards, in the Country Fire Service, Metropolitan Fire Service, SES, on professional bodies, in neighbourhood groups and in conservation groups. In many ways people involve themselves by giving their time voluntarily to improve our community. Often, when we criticise others, we forget they are doing their best, and probably for nothing. What they need is our help—our support. I am paid very well to be a community leader. Other local government representatives receive very modest allowances to support them in their task. Beyond that, many hundreds of people who give their time do it without financial reward, often foregoing income from their businesses, and incurring other costs in performing their role for us.

We need to say thank you and offer our support to everyone who gives their time and skills to improve our community, to nurture it and to let it grow. I feel that we do not do this often enough or well enough. Obviously, we will achieve much more by working together than we ever will by working alone. There are many issues that the electorate has been working through together and, although they are complex and challenging, we are making progress. Water will always be an issue for our electorate and for our community at large. At the time the government introduced the Save the Murray levy I did a very poor job in selling the idea, yet I believe that we must all help solve the problem. We do not

want to leave problems as large as this to the next generation, as it is a problem for all Australians.

It is wonderful to see New South Wales, Victoria and the commonwealth now agreeing that we must act together, and we are now moving to create a \$500 million fund to turn things around. I believe that our levy at least played a part in triggering this process. Locally, the issue of water is very different. Our water comes from rainfall that is used by plants, evaporates, runs off into streams, swamps or drains, or soaks into the soil and recharges our underground aquifer. The water that ends up in our aquifer must be shared by all of us—urban users, the environment, industry, irrigators—and the challenge will always be how to divide up a resource between competing users and how to ensure that you have recharge in the first place.

We fund a catchment board through both property and water levies, and the board's key role is to deal with the issues of managing the water cycle in a fair and equitable way. We must support our board as it grapples with these complex issues. A wonderful example of where local leadership has turned an industry around and created sustainable industry that is considered a world leader is in our rock lobster industry. That industry was prepared to make tough decisions, even when there was considerable opposition, and now the professional and recreational users are enjoying the benefits. Further changes are being considered, and these will be debated as part of the review of the Fisheries Act. While this is happening, Minister Holloway has agreed to increase catch limits to be fixed for the next three years. I say 'Well done' to all those involved.

Our forest resources continue to underpin capital investment in the region, with Auspine, Carter Holt Harvey, Kimberly Clark Australia and Green Triangle Forest Products all expanding, along with smaller mill owners like Whitehead, McDonnells and Fosters. I believe that my fight to stop the previous government selling our forests has been vindicated. Without secure, long-term resource agreements, industries will not invest. As minister, I am presently reviewing the governance arrangements for Forestry SA. At the time Minister Armitage corporatised the forestry department, I argued for more local representation on the board, and I will reconsider this position once the review is complete, hopefully by early December.

Our forest resource underpins the largest single employment base in the region, and we must continue to expand the forest area and find ways to create employment and wealth locally. Blue gums pose a new challenge, as the resource is expanding rapidly and I do not believe we are prepared for the infrastructure demands it will create. The three tiers of government need to take seriously the road freight issues that are confronting us in relation to this new, emerging resource. I was able to obtain funding to look into ways of adding more value to blue gums, hopefully to create more local jobs, but we also need to act soon in relation to the broader freight and related infrastructure issues.

I am delighted to see that we again have a local TAFE director and that we are continuing to invest in our local schools. It was great to see stage 1 of Melaleuca Park school opened recently, and I was honoured to open the new Gordon Education Centre facilities. Money for Kalangadoo and Allendale East is included, but we must continue to press for more. Mount Gambier North school has been able to bring Acacia Street kindergarten onto the site, and that is a good first step for them, but things move slowly: too slowly, sometimes. McDonald Park is bursting at the seams.

Some things at Mount Gambier High have not changed since I taught there in 1972—interestingly, along with Harold Allison. The admin area is very old, tired and tatty and again the school has more enrolments than can be accommodated. Grant High School needs help, and hopefully Mulga Street will have a new car park soon, now that the minister has transferred land back to the city council. I thank the city council for their approach to developing shared infrastructure.

Before concluding this report on recent successes and new challenges for our schools, I must acknowledge the wonderful help that Julie Stephens, the neighbourhood development officer, has given to the east. The way in which that community has responded to her leadership and is now taking responsibility for themselves is nothing short of fantastic. Our police continue to do a wonderful job and it is great to see that, again, we have a resident magistrate in our community.

Health funding at Mount Gambier and our hospital, in particular, continue to challenge us. As much as we continue to fight for more money and face a federal government that refuses to even keep up with the CPI in the health area, we need to look at ways of expanding the range of health services. Interestingly, the federal government will take something like \$900 million out of the plan over the next five years. I will keep fighting for increased resources but, equally, I accept that once we are given a budget we must live within it. Overspending now creates further problems in the future. I garnered the support of minister Stevens in dealing with the accumulated debt of over \$4 million at Mount Gambier Hospital—something former minister Brown would not face up to. I am now putting pressure on her for more money, but I also accept we must live within our means. Equally, according to the Menadue report, there needs to be significant change to the way we spend our health dollars. The South-East Regional Health Board is proposing a clinical services plan based on the generational health review, and this will serve as a basis for our region's plans for the future. This plan will need to be much bigger than hospital funding and a circuit breaker to the present political blame game.

Lack of access to GPs and health and bulk billing means people present to the accident and emergency unit of the hospital for non-emergencies and then complain when they do not receive a timely service. Accident and emergency is not staffed for this purpose, but when people see no other alternative I do not blame them for turning up to accident and emergency. Equally, a lack of aged-care beds means that acute hospital beds are tied up for the wrong reason. These issues are federal and finger pointing at the state government and minister Stevens will not solve anything. It is unfortunate that the health issue has become so political and that some reporting has been so biased and selective, but I believe things are changing. There have been managerial and editorial changes at the *Border Watch*, and I think that is for the better. I believe the deep personal animosity shown towards me by the previous manager—not mutual, I might add—showed through in much of the reporting in the past. Hopefully, that is behind us and, equally, I hope that the Liberal opposition in this state stops the damaging political games they are playing—which may suit them but which could destroy a community's health system in the process. This is too big a price to pay but, again, I believe my appeals and those of other community leaders to the Leader of the Opposition to stop the stunts will bear fruit.

Equally, I believe the select committee into our hospital, mooted in the Legislative Council, must map out where we have been, where we are and where we are going, so that the

electorate of Mount Gambier will have the opportunity to see the facts first-hand rather than through media filters. The fact is that I continue to work to find solutions; and Dr Landy wrote to me at the time he chose to leave, thanking me for my efforts in helping to find money for the general surgeons, assisting with tax issues and gaining support for a second physician—all at his request. Equally, the select committee will expose the recent political stunts of the member for Barker, who is trying to use the Royal Flying Doctor Service as a political tool.

How sad to try to use a service such as the Royal Flying Doctor as a political tool at the very time many of us in the community are working very hard to raise extra money for that fine service. He recently fed selective figures to the *Border Watch* in an attempt to create the perception that the local hospital was in crisis and that is why there were 30 aircraft calls in each of the past two months. This was a total fabrication—all spin and no wash; all suds and no substance—but again that is the nature of our federal member, unfortunately. The true figures show that—

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know that it is wrong to refer to members in another place being another chamber of this place, but I cannot help but ask you, sir, whether it is orderly for the member to make such remarks clearly directed at an honourable member in another parliament. I am not sure whether it is disorderly, but I question whether it is orderly under the standing orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I heard it, the member was simply saying that it was in the nature of that member's behaviour. I did not hear him go beyond that.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I was making the point that it is very unfortunate when a federal member selectively feeds information to try to create a totally false impression, obviously with a long-term intention of destroying the health services of my community. We will be the big losers. Importantly, the call in the past two months to deal with health issues would never have been dealt with locally, anyway. However, why would he wish to spoil his story with a few facts? Anyone can play the blame game, but that will not improve our health system. We need to work together. We need to put our personal differences behind us and collectively focus on solutions. Our two mayors, our two board chairs and I are in agreement, and we call collectively on the community to back us in this matter.

Finally, I wish to make a few comments on my present role in the cabinet and my decision to accept a ministry. My first vote in this parliament was for a conservative government, but once it became obvious that that was not possible I, along with the other Independents, in the interest of stable government pledged my support to the duly elected government. That support is conditional, and those conditions remain. My agreement with the government clearly sets this out, and I have made that document freely available to anyone who is interested. If anyone wants a copy, all they need do is ask. I intend to call a public meeting early in December to report to my community in detail on what I see as the outcome of my first year in cabinet and whether or not I believe we are better off. At that time, I will also set out the contribution I have been able to make to the state and the departmental decisions, initiatives and actions I have taken, particularly as they relate to state-local government relations and to the regional impact on cabinet decisions.

I will also report at this time on the growth summit, the EDB and those recommendations for which I have responsi-

bility, noting of course that those recommendations have bipartisan support. I will also report at this time on the review I am conducting into the government's arrangements for Forestry SA. I was critical of the arrangements at the time minister Armitage corporatised the department. I now wait for the review before taking my views to cabinet. In conclusion, I indicate that it is an honour to represent Mount Gambier and its surrounding districts in this parliament. We are a rich and proud part of the state. Although we have faced and continue to face many challenges, we are certainly a state gem and will remain a shining jewel in the crown.

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

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): I rise to make my contribution to the Address in Reply in support of the Lieutenant-Governor's speech last week. In doing so, I will refer to the speech, which I know is a bit of a novelty during this particular practice of the parliament. In his speech, the Lieutenant-Governor referred to a number of areas of government by topic, and I will do the same. The first topic to which he refers is social justice and social inclusion, and he states:

The Board recently released its second report: *Everyone's Responsibility: Reducing Homelessness in South Australia*.

I agree that homelessness is definitely the responsibility of everyone in South Australia. As the local member for the Riverland, I want to put on the record my concerns that this policy be confined not just to the metropolitan area. We have an enormous number of homeless people in country areas who tend to be forgotten when programs are developed to try to resolve this issue. It is all well and good to look at the homeless issue and see it in Adelaide where it is very visible but to forget about what is happening in country and regional areas.

One of the difficulties we face is historic in that, after the deinstitutionalisation of our mental health services, a lot of people were placed in communities, not only in metropolitan areas but right around the state, but there has been a genuine lack of the support systems necessary to help these people, particularly in country areas. So, a lot of these people have not been able to make the adjustment from the institutional facilities that we had in the past because those support services are not available.

As a result, a number of people are living in less than suitable conditions; indeed, they are homeless. This is a real issue, particularly in areas such as the Riverland. Recently I was visited by the Combined Ministers Association in the Riverland, an organisation of ministers which crosses all religious persuasions. They are looking to assist in dealing with this issue from a collective perspective, which is really encouraging. I hope the government will support any initiatives that come out of the efforts of this group. They believe that this issue revolves around the fact that people who are homeless need an enormous amount of support to make the transition from homelessness into more acceptable living accommodation.

Many of these people suffer from mental illnesses and inevitably will have difficulty in finding private rental accommodation. Most of them do not have references. As a number of Housing Trust properties have been sold across the state (particularly in regional areas), there are not a lot of Housing Trust facilities available. It is difficult to put people into any sort of accommodation when they do not have the

life skills necessary to keep them there. This is a serious issue in not only the metropolitan area but also the country.

The second topic to which the Lieutenant-Governor refers in his speech is health. There are a couple of issues which I believe are creating huge difficulties in the area of health, particularly in regional areas. One of these is the ongoing saga with medical indemnity insurance. In the Riverland, we have been fortunate to have a Regional Health Authority: a board of local people who, for a long time, have had a vision. The members have changed but the vision has remained. There have been ups and downs in community support for where they are going, but they have stuck to it, and we have seen that vision evolve into a very good health system in the Riverland.

In fact, I think we in the Riverland are extremely lucky to have had the members of the Regional Health Authority who have supported the initiatives and stuck by them through hard times and not given in to public perception and particular interest agendas of different people who have wanted to derail the regionalisation process. As a result, we do not have a shortage of GPs in the Riverland; we have a full contingent of GPs across all towns, which is remarkable given the national situation.

In no small part, this can be attributed to the efforts of our general practitioners and their endeavours to attract GPs to the area, as well as the excellent work done by this team which has pulled together the Flinders University partnership with the Riverland—and that has certainly borne fruit. We now have doctors doing their third year of training in the Riverland, and nurses are doing their training in the Riverland, through the Flinders University. Attracting country people to undertake their studies in the country has certainly reaped rewards, and whether they stay within the Riverland or go to other country areas is not really important. It is just that these people have actually experienced country life and what it is like to be a GP in a regional community, and they have overcome the fears of that profession or of working in that environment, and that certainly augurs well for the future.

The medical indemnity insurance issue is one that has been plaguing our resident surgeons, who have made not only a lifestyle choice but also a decision to move away from their colleagues in the city and go out on a limb somewhat to practise in the country. These people need to be rewarded for their efforts, within the bounds of what the community is able to pay.

The other issue that concerns them is that of on-call fees. On-call fees for our general surgeons for emergency purposes over the weekend are paltry and they are certainly not what we would expect for people in their profession. At the moment, whilst our general surgeons have not widely publicised it, they are making an effort to have their case heard by not providing on-call services one weekend in three. The result is that, if there is an accident or an emergency requiring their services, those services have to be obtained through the Royal Flying Doctor Service and, of course, that is certainly far more expensive to the overall system than improving what is a very minimal on-call fee to accommodate these people.

Because our two general surgeons have to be on call every weekend plus every evening, that does not leave them a lot of time or opportunity to do what other families do, such as going away and enjoying a quality life outside their working environment when they have to be on call, and for a very

paltry sum. So, I believe that is something that needs to be addressed.

The other issue is the Generational Health Review. I commend Mr Menadue for the effort he put into that extremely extensive document. It will be very challenging for the government to embrace many of the ideas he has put forward. However, I am pleased to say that there has been a commitment from the minister that country hospital boards will be retained. Whilst there may be changing responsibilities, there has been a recognition by this government of the importance of country hospital boards and their contribution to ensuring that our communities continue to have ownership of their local hospitals.

The issue of regional amalgamations was also raised through the Generational Health Review. I am pleased to say that, ahead of the outcomes of the review, our regions are already working towards that end. They understand the implications and complications of the current health system, and many regions have been looking to amalgamate to shore up capacity in the future to ensure that they can be sustainable. It is commendable that people on those regional boards have that foresight and can see that change is necessary in an environment which is extremely difficult and in which it is politically uncomfortable to make changes.

Any change to the health system is often seen by the broader community and, in particular, the media, as taking away services when, in fact, I do not believe that is the intention of anyone in this place. Any reform that governments intend to introduce in respect of health is to try to get a better outcome for the dollars invested. We all recognise that there is an enormous amount of waste in the current system. Managing that change is important, and ensuring that our communities come along with it needs to be a consideration.

The next point in the Deputy Governor's speech referred to education, and I do have a little concern in that area. First and foremost, I commend the government for its effort to reduce class sizes. I will relay a particular circumstance within my electorate. One school that has experienced significant problems in the past is the Berri Primary School, which has an incredibly high percentage of transient students. The number of students who come and go from that school is quite high, and having large class sizes complicated that matter; indeed, it made it very difficult for teachers to be able to maintain a rapport with students within the class. I am pleased to be able to report that dropping the junior primary numbers at that school to 15 and 16 and the rest of the primary classes to under 28 has certainly made a huge difference.

Many parents in the area have overwhelmingly commented that they have seen a dramatic increase in the amount and standard of work by the kids. They have also noted a dramatic improvement in their children's behaviour, which is fantastic. In fact, many parents have commented that the improvement has been out of sight, which backs up all the research that has been undertaken in respect of education and smaller class sizes, particularly in the early years. I am pleased to be able to report that the Berri Primary School has had that kind of feedback. One issue of concern right across regional areas relates to temporary relief teachers.

We do have a number of temporary relief teachers. I believe that 76 are permanently employed across the regions; however, they are not necessarily in the right place at the right time. We need to be able to work through policies to accommodate bouts of illness. We all know that if someone

gets the flu and they are sitting in the staff room that the rest of the staff is likely to come down with it; so, how we deal with that, as far as the school is concerned, is particularly important. No-one likes to see classes split and students put into other classes because we just cannot get the teachers.

There is a wealth of experience and qualification in the community, and I think that it is important that we work towards working out a policy that can utilise those skills within the community. The other issue I would like to mention in respect of education throughout the Riverland relates to the old facilities. Most of the primary schools were built in the 1950s. There is a great need for significant investment in school infrastructure. I am pleased to say that projects such as the Glossop High School redevelopment to its middle school and the senior campus have been extremely successful.

We are currently in the process of working through the redevelopment of the Loxton High School, which is terrific. That commitment, which was given by the previous Liberal government, has been honoured by the now Labor government. I thank it for continuing to honour that commitment because that school has been lobbying for 30 years to have its school redeveloped. I will speak further about the Loxton High School when we come to the section on procurement. Also, this government has made a big commitment to improving administrative and toilet facilities right across schools. The benchmark has been set.

There are schools which meet the benchmark but which are really not up to standard, and that should also be looked at. I think that, over the three years of that program, the department should look closely at whether or not it is achieving the outcomes and ensuring that that is not where the investment stops and that those schools that are borderline get the investment as well. In that context I refer to the Berri school which, in my view, has substandard facilities. That school did not quite make the cut-off in the first round. I would encourage the government to continue that program and to consider looking at other schools that were just borderline.

Community safety and protection is a very popular policy direction from both the Liberal and Labor parties. In the Deputy Governor's speech, this particular government states that it is committed to honour its pledge on law and order to help South Australians feel safe in their homes and safe in the streets. I fully support that notion, but I would like to highlight that changing the laws deals with only one aspect of that equation. Resources need to be provided to back that up. In terms of the necessary resources, we need to look at three different areas: the resources available to the police to be able to apprehend all these potential criminals under the new laws that are developed in this place; the resources necessary to convict, and by that I mean prosecution services, and I have some serious concerns about the funding available for prosecution services; and, of course, the resources that need to be made available to punish and rehabilitate offenders, and by that I mean correctional services. So, there is a lot more to it than just introducing measures in this place. Measures introduced in this place are not much good if they cannot be enforced because there are not the resources to do so.

The other part of community safety and protection I would like to mention is the move towards tighter firearms control, and the Governor's speech identifies that the government will introduce amendments to firearms legislation to create stricter controls and to reduce the number of hand guns in South

Australia. I have seen the draft legislation that has come through initially, and it is currently being redrafted—the bill has been split—and we are looking at dealing with just the issues agreed upon at COAG, and the other issues will be saved for another day.

When we are looking at new laws in relation to gun ownership, it would be foolhardy for any government to take firearms away from law-abiding citizens who are doing the right thing and make it more difficult for them to retain a firearm which is used for competition or at their local club. That drives people underground and makes criminals of people who are not necessarily criminals. I caution those who are drafting the legislation that, although there is a bigger picture and the police require more powers to apprehend bikie gangs and other people, we should not put offside those in the community who are doing the right thing and who have reluctantly complied with many of the other arbitrary laws that have been put in place and have not resulted in less crime.

I note that the Minister for Infrastructure is nodding his head and agreeing, and I am pleased to see that because I think it is important. If we are to change laws, let us make sure that it is directed at reducing crime and is not just stuff that will look good on paper for those people who do not like guns.

The next section in the Governor's speech refers to economic development, and I will spend a little time on this because economic development, particularly in the regions, is very dear to my heart. I would like to paint a picture, first, of what is happening in the Riverland at the moment—and by 'the Riverland' I mean also the Upper Mallee, and I hope that members realise that a big part of my electorate is also the Upper Mallee. The grain and livestock industries are looking really good this year after a particularly tough time last year. We had a very difficult period when the drought affected the income of many farmers and created great concern for the future for many people in the Northern Mallee. But it appears to be bouncing back after the worst drought on record with what could be a well above average season. In saying that, I touch wood, as you do for every statement you make that predicts the future. A very small part of the crops were unable to get established early due to heavy winds and they will not yield anything of value, but the majority is promising.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs MAYWALD: It is absolutely brilliant. In fact, the crops are looking as good as, if not better than, the year previous to the drought which, in the Upper Mallee, was a sensational year for us. Livestock sales in recent weeks have brought record prices, which is fantastic, but that goes hand in hand with the fact that we have had a drought and livestock numbers across the state are at an all-time low. The supply and demand factor has contributed greatly to this. Reports on grain prices sound promising and it would be terrific if we could combine good yields with good prices—which is a rarity, but it would be nice if it could happen—and it will certainly help the rural community bounce back. The economic outlook for the Northern Mallee looks very promising. If we can secure a bit more rain to finish off the season, it would be fantastic.

I make reference to the Mallee Sustainable Farming Group, which is holding a field day at Alan Buckley's property, south of Waikerie, this Friday. The Mallee Sustainable Farming Group is a huge success story in respect of a project that has assisted farmers and moved farmers to more

sustainable practices. There are a lot of cynics out there, but last season during the drought you could see the demonstrable benefits of adopting new practices; for example, one neighbour who was using new practices retained their top soil during the heaviest winds whereas another neighbour who was not saw the rest of it go to Victoria or other places. The Mallee Sustainable Farming Group has been working extremely hard. It has a program that involves having some core sites around the different Mallee areas. Those core sites do the trials on new methods and, if they are proven in the small trials to look as though they will be economically viable, they are taken out to the focus paddocks around the state. Those focus paddocks are owned by farmers. If neighbours can see that it is working, then they are more likely to take up the new practice, because it reduces the risk factor for them when they can see it working.

The wine industry is looking really good at the moment. We have had some issues regarding the water restrictions which have created an enormous amount of angst within the community. Most of it has been based on the fact that there is such uncertainty about what it all means and how it all happens. There was no lead time or preparation, and when it actually hit, nobody knew what it meant. The problem with that is that people see their livelihoods on the line and they feel vulnerable. When you feel vulnerable you tend to make rash decisions, and that is not in the best interests of the state in the long term.

Although it is too early to predict the likely yield figures, we have good reason to believe that the Riverland wine grape growers can look forward to a good vintage in 2004, and they are looking forward to it with renewed optimism. The fact that the Murray-Darling Basin catchment area has received encouraging rainfall in the past few months and the fact that restrictions have been eased has added to the optimism. I have good reason to believe that there could be a further easing of those restrictions within the next few weeks, given the current circumstances across the region. I look forward to that announcement. Any further restriction will certainly ease the pressure on growers.

There remains a keen awareness of the need to continue the work that has begun to enable fair and equitable measures to be implemented quickly and with minimal disruption when the next extended dry period occurs. The Riverland wine grape growers and the Riverland Wine Industry Development Council are working together with government, scientists and other industry organisations such as citrus, almonds, stone fruit and the like to ensure the region builds on its reputation as Australia's leading region in terms of irrigation technology and management practices. One of the underlying reasons for grower optimism is that a majority of wine produced in the Riverland these days is of such a standard that it is preferred and needed to satisfy export markets. Export growth has continued at a rate in excess of 20 per cent per annum and is forecast to do so again next year.

If there is a risk facing the industry, it is simply that there have not been enough new plantings in recent years. This flies in the face of those who said a couple of years ago that the level of plantings was too high and that there was going to be this huge bust. Those who were sitting back in the wings, looking at and analysing all the information available—including me—could say with quiet confidence that that was not the case. There was a huge opportunity for wine of the standard grown in the Riverland. The wine that is grown in the Riverland fits into that price category that people are preferring, and 85 per cent of wine consumers

drink wine that is in that price bracket. I would prefer to be producing in that range of the 85 per cent rather than the other 15 per cent.

The Riverland produces 60 per cent of the state's wine grapes and has increasingly done it better year after year. If there is a risk facing the industry it is simply that there have not been enough new plantings, as I mentioned before. Those new plantings will require new land, new development and new water transfers into the region, and that brings me to salinity issues. I have some serious concerns with the way that the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation has decided to implement Principles 53 and 54 of the Water Allocation Plan. Principles 53 and 54 refer to the salinity impacts on the river. The department has determined that it is all a little bit hard and, if you do not have salinity mitigation by salt interception schemes, there will not be any more development. This is taking the easy way out and there needs to be a whole of government approach to it. We have a state food plan that is seeking to increase to \$15 billion our food production by 2010. The Economic Development Board recommendation, which has been supported very enthusiastically by both sides of this parliament, seeks to triple our exports by 2013. This also complements the federal plan to double the number of exporters in the same time frame.

All of this is great, but if we do not have the countryside, or regions within the Riverland, which is one of our most productive areas, to undertake that development, we are in for serious problems in meeting those targets. The department has determined that the only way in which land will become available for development is if it can be backed up through some salinity measure supported by a salt interception scheme. I believe there are a number of other ways we can look at mitigating our salinity impacts, and we need to take a whole of government approach to it.

The Office of Economic Development should be involved in those discussions and not just the department of water, which is a regulating authority. It is not an economic authority and it is certainly not taking into consideration any of the economic imperatives that have been put in place by the EDB, the food plan and the state's economic development goals and targets. There is a serious deficiency across government that needs to be addressed.

The next item in the Governor's speech is procurement. I will talk about procurement because the Loxton High School development is under way as we speak. It is terrific to see this school being redeveloped. It has taken 30 years for this school to get the funding approved. It was approved in 1998 and here we are in 2003 and work has just commenced. In that process is \$485 000 worth of fees to DAIS for its contribution. DAIS has a process—and I am not singling out individuals here—which inhibits the progress of projects, such as the Loxton High School redevelopment, to the extent where, when we get to the stage of building it, we are so far behind budget because the dollar has gone up, as has the cost of building.

At the beginning of this year we had to increase funding to that project by \$800 000 from its original \$3.2 million, and now we find that we are having to reduce the works by \$200 000 to come within budget. If we had built that project within two years of when the original funding was applied, we would have been able to get to the project as developed within the original funding. We are now talking an extra \$1 million to do the same project, which is absolutely appalling.

In respect of the procurement issues, the government states that it is committed to procurement reform to ensure best practice in government tendering and contracts. I hope it will do that because it is atrocious that we can see such delays in projects getting off the ground but also such incredible blow-outs in the cost. It seems that the taxpayer is being ripped off throughout the whole system and \$485 000 in fees to DAIS in the process concerns me greatly.

The next issue is the arts—a very valuable area in which we need to invest. However, I was disappointed that there was no reference at all to the country in the opening speech. I highlight to the government that the investment should be spread across the country and city, and facilities such as the Chaffey Theatre need to be upgraded before they fall so far behind that they fall down and we will be looking at a new program to rebuild. I refer also to the Berri police station and the courts facility. That is something that has been on the drawing board for a little while, and I hope that it will be considered favourably by the government for an investment project in the not too distant future.

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

Sir, thank you for the opportunity to address the speech of the Governor's Deputy, Bruno Krumins. The speech, of course, addresses the broad sweep of the approach of the government, but tonight I would like to take less than the fully allocated time to talk about how the process of government affects us at a local level, not only as a minister but also as a local member. Those who have had the joy of being a minister know that, while it is a great privilege and honour, it does take you away from your local electorate more than you probably would like (particularly when your margin is about 3½ per cent—but more than you would like, in any event), in respect of the people there. I would like to take this time to recognise some of the work that goes on in my electorate, and mention a few highlights.

One of the things I would like to talk about is the collocation of the Townsend School and Kilparren Teaching and Assessment Unit with the Ascot Park Primary School. This has been a matter with respect to which I have been involved in lengthy discussions over a period of time. It is a project with a total allocation of funds of \$4.5 million and a time line for completion of June 2004. It is a collocation of the three schools, and it will be a unique development—I am not sure that there would be many in the world of this nature. Many people would not know, but Ascot Park primary is already, I think, the only gymnastics focused school, certainly in Australia. It has produced many Australian champions and competitors in the Olympics and the Commonwealth Games. To be collocated with those two special needs schools, I think, is a very unique outcome.

Those involved in the project who have made this possible deserve recognition, because it has not been an easy ask. In particular, I mention the chairperson of the school council, Chris McArdle; Principal Vince Mulkerin and Deputy Principal Tony Trimboli; all the school council; the school reference group; and John Gregory from the department. I have attended a number of meetings down there. At the most recent one, it was perfectly heart-warming to see the commitment of all those people I mentioned and the local parents, not only to getting a good outcome for their students but also for the very warm acceptance of the collocation of the very special needs schools there. The appreciation of the value that that will add to the experiences of both groups of children is

a testament to the very good nature and good sense of those people.

Also on the subject of schools, in May this year I was able to visit the Westminster School and address the senior school assembly. I would like to mention some of the highlights there. When I was there, unfortunately, I was not able to view the construction of the sports and swimming centre (I think it has now been opened). That was a \$4 million project for a new complex comprising a gym, a sports hall, a 25-metre, 10-lane swimming pool and a learn to swim pool. I offer my congratulations to Westminster School and my apologies for not being able to go because of cabinet commitments.

I would also like to recognise St Bernadette's School, Pasadena High School and the Ascot Park Primary School for their involvement in the Wraparound Project. Nine schools are involved in the project, three in my electorate. It is a joint commonwealth and state project.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is a shame that the member for Hartley wants to keep talking, when we are talking about the good work that people do in schools.

Mr Scalzi: I always do.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: And he won't stop, but that's all right. He sits that far back, I can barely hear him, anyway. The project is aimed at increasing the participation for young people who may be experiencing difficulties in their personal or schooling life. It is a very worthwhile project and, as I said, it is run jointly with the commonwealth. I congratulate those schools on their involvement. I would also like to congratulate the Edwardstown Primary School and commend it on its involvement in the 'Go plastic bag free' trial—something that I know, sir, is close to your heart. Edwardstown Primary School, which is an excellent school, is about to start selling custom-made calico bags at Castle Plaza in support of the 'plastic bag free trial' which will be monitored by the state government, as announced by John Hill on 16 September 2003. As the house would know, each year 670 million plastic bags are thrown away by South Australians, and it is very good to see—along with the government initiative—this initiative by a local school at the local level. I am sure that the people of Elder and the people who shop at Castle Plaza will enthusiastically pick up the initiative.

I note with sadness that one of the things that has occurred due to the relocation of Kilparrin and Townsend schools with Ascot Park Primary is that Plympton Flyers Little Athletics is now relocating to William Light School in the member for Ashford's electorate. I will be very sad to see them go. They have been a feature of my electorate for a long time, and their volunteer parents have put an enormous effort into assisting with coaching, supporting timekeeping, officiating and catering. I thank all those committee members, and in particular the president Chris Barron and the secretary Gary Brown. Around November 2002 I attended the Sun Smart Regional Games, which is an annual interclub competition. They have done a fantastic job and we will miss them, and I wish them all the very best in the future.

I briefly acknowledge the volunteers who play a very large role in the Elder electorate and community. We all know that so much would not be done without these people. Neighbourhood Watch is very active in my area, and as a government we are grateful for that. I would also like to recognise some individuals, including Val Dangerfield for her contribution and dedication to promoting positive ageing. She is a tireless worker not only for the Edwardstown Pensioners' Associa-

tion but also for the Ascot Park Pensioners' Association, and there is very little that she will not do.

I also thank Malcolm and Betty Bollenhagen from the Active Elders Association; and in particular I warmly thank Joan Herraman, OAM, who has finally given it away as a local councillor. She has been at it for ever and ever—she is an outstanding individual and not only for her service to Marion council and the community. Many people do not know that Joan Herraman previously worked with Mother Teresa and the poor of India. She is a person of enormous generosity of spirit.

I also thank Daryl Percy, John Peterson, Betty Humphries and Bert Haynes for their service to Neighbourhood Watch. John, Darryl and Bert devote much of their time to coordinating and producing the newsletter in their respective areas. It is a difficult job that they do week-in week-out. Finally, I recognise Adelaide Campus Life, which is a very well respected youth organisation located in Melrose Park with a volunteer base comprising, I think, up to 100 youth workers. It provides recreational activity for disadvantaged youth and is a highly valued contributor to the community, and valued greatly for giving some of those youths an opportunity to do positive things. We should recognise them for that because so often our young people do not get a great rap. I wanted to quickly put that on the record, because as a minister it is not always easy to spend as much time with the good people of Elder as I would like.

I would like to briefly discuss the broader sweep of the Address in Reply, and express my tremendous disappointment at the contribution of the opposition in this debate. Having overheard most of the speeches of members opposite and read the rest, I would make one recommendation. If they are really serious about the future, perhaps they could get into a coalition and make the member for Chaffey their leader and the member for Heysen their deputy. Then they might have a future. They certainly do not have a future on what we have seen. Frankly, in their response, they demonstrate themselves to have absolutely no idea. We knew they had no idea as a government and they certainly have no way forward as an opposition. I was amazed by the sheer disorder of their approach to the Address in Reply debate. There was only one constant through it and that was that it was very negative, whingeing and carping. I point to the contribution from the member for Waite, who managed to be critical—and this indicates a very confused state of mind—of the report of the Economic Development Board and its recommendations. He dressed it up nicely, but I am a bit confused. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow treasurer went to the summit that endorsed these, stood out the front and got their photo taken with the recommendations, but now apparently there is some criticism.

One of the criticisms is that it is not going to be independent because it has got too many former Labor leaders on it. One, of course, is Mike Rann and the criticism was that we added Mike Moore, the former Labor leader in New Zealand. That is the criticism: it will not be independent. There is a huge phalanx of people from the business community, and from other walks of life, but it is not going to be independent because we dare to have on it someone who has been associated with the Labor party. One of the people criticised is Mike Moore. What does he do these days? Where does he work?

The Hon. K.O. Foley: He was with the World Trade Organisation.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He used to run the World Trade Organisation. I would have thought that was a reasonable qualification for being on the Economic Development Board. Apparently not: he is tainted because he used to be associated with Labor somewhere in the world. This is small-mindedness.

What we tried to do, with the Economic Development Board and with the summit, was to create a vision for the future that could be picked up by both sides of politics—a brave thing to do. We appointed people who could not be associated with our side of politics. We appointed and have used people from the Liberal party—former Liberal members.

Mr Meier: You used them.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, we did use them, and we make no apology for using them because it is in the best interests of the state that we get a broad bipartisan approach to our economic future that everyone can pick up. But, no, the member for Waite says, 'It is no good. I do not like the recommendations. There are too many Labor people on it.' That is such small-minded negativity.

I am not surprised that he cannot agree because they cannot even agree amongst themselves. The member for Waite is saying that one of the things wrong is that we use debt to create infrastructure. He says in his speech that that is wrong. The trouble is, about two hours earlier, we were getting criticised by the member for Heysen because the Deputy Premier, the Treasurer, will not do that.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, I think she has got the right approach. She does agree with the Economic Development Board. She has got that right, which is why I have suggested that she should probably be the deputy leader of the coalition team. But, she was criticising the Treasurer for not opening the purse strings to use some debt to create infrastructure. Until they can sort out their own confused minds, they are not really going to present us much of an opposition and they certainly did not do that in their contribution to this Address in Reply debate.

The only reason I am standing here saying this now is that it was so very disappointing for them not to come up with a single idea, or a single way forward, except to whinge and carp and not even do that consistently. Maybe they could have a little team meeting and work out what it is they want to complain about.

We had the member for Newland whinge that Labor had lost the Cricket Academy. She did not bother to check with SACA and find out that when SACA came to see us, and told us what they needed from us—to help them compete to win it—that we provided it. We were accused of offering a loan on commercial terms. I would like to get an offer of a loan at the terms we offered, unsecured, myself. But there was no attempt to discover the true situation; just a bit more carping and whingeing. I am surprised, because I have noticed that they are back to doing what they do best.

Not only have they not given the consistent approach to us, but I noticed the contribution of the member for Bright. The member for Bright has decided that he also agrees that they are not a very good opposition. In fact, he has a list of about six or eight of his colleagues who he suggests retire immediately to make way for someone else—someone as bright as he is, no doubt! At least I have some support. The member for Bright also agrees that they need some new talent and new blood—of course, he is not one of them.

However, once he suggested that six or eight of his colleagues should retire, he went on to say that they should

also have greater unity. I must say that I did have a giggle about that. The member for Bright suggests that, first, they should retire half their team and, secondly, that they should have more unity. He is prepared to be united with those he likes and is certainly prepared to get rid of the rest.

I could not help but giggle recently at the opposition, which is apparently struggling under a massive debt from running very bad legal cases—and we know about those. They did not like the fact that they did not win the election. They thought it was unfair, so they ran a legal case and, after spending a lot of their money, they discovered that indeed they had lost the election and that they had to be in opposition.

They had to raise some money, so they got Stephen Baker, who was one of their few decent treasurers through that whole miserable period of their government. Naturally, he got the sack after three years of hard work to be replaced by—wait for it—the former member for Bragg (Hon. Graham Ingerson). This is the mob in government that sacks Stephen Baker to make way for Graham Ingerson. You really have to think that that shows a great sense of humour. However, they put him in charge of fundraising for the Liberal Party but, three months later, they sacked him to make way for Legh Davis. If I were Stephen Baker, I would never go near this mob again; were they to give him a third job, they would sack him to make way for Humphrey B. Bear! At least we can be grateful to them because, if this is the way they recover internally, with Legh Davis in charge of fundraising and Wayne Matthew in charge of party unity, I do not think we have a lot to worry about at all. It is very disappointing.

We are going to get on with the business of being the government and of restoring the finances, which the Treasurer has done so ably and which is being recognised in the real world—where the opposition does not live—and we will continue with the hard work. I am very pleased to see encouraging signs in the economy. As the Premier has said, if we can get behind the report of Robert de Crespigny and the Economic Development Board, I am sure that community leaders and business will do the same.

We would like the opposition to embrace the report, but it is insignificant and it does not really matter whether it does or not. However, I hope that perhaps the opposition will listen to the shadow spokesperson on party unity, the member for Bright, and that they will get some new talent; perhaps then we will have some people who will recognise the advantage of a united approach to growing this state again. It is with pleasure that I offer this contribution on the Address in Reply.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): In rising to make my comments on the speech from the Lieutenant-Governor, I point out that I will speak only of those promises that I am proud to say that the government is keeping in my electorate—and there are many. However, in view of how much time we have this evening, I will restrict my comments to those matters that are of particular importance to the seat of Adelaide.

First, there was the promise that we would reopen the Sturt Street school. I do not think many would question my argument that, at a time when city residency numbers were rising, it was sheer madness for the previous government to even contemplate closing a school, when there were increasing numbers of children in the city; indeed, six children lived in my street who were of primary school age when it was closed. They were forced to go elsewhere because the previous government shut one of the best schools in dealing with multicultural education, with migrant education and with

forming schoolrooms in an innovative way to cope with children from different backgrounds and to give them a creative and inspirational start in their life.

I am pleased to say that our government is opening the Sturt Street School again. It will once again be a demonstration school, as it was in the century before last, in fact—a demonstration school leading the way in birth to 8 year old's education, giving them a start in a multi-cultural way, but particularly a start that is aimed towards the Greek community and Greek language education. We are very fortunate that South Australian Greek Community Inc., has been able to support this school, as it has done through many years. In fact, throughout the 30s, 40s and 50s there were large numbers of Greek children going to this school and living in the community. The campaign to reopen the school was, of course, led by local residents, the local Save Our School group and also the South Australian Greek Orthodox Community Inc., who worked assiduously with the Education Department to reopen the school with a focus on Greek education. Not only will there be Greek taught during the day, but the after school programs and weekend programs in Greek language will be, again, bringing back the Greek community to the city. I am very proud that this will occur at the beginning of the next school year.

In talking about our Greek heritage, it is also worth remembering some of the other promises made before the election which are being kept specifically to give support to the community values and needs of the City of Adelaide and North Adelaide and, indeed, Prospect and Walkerville. I think it is fair to say that throughout the metropolitan area, our Adelaide Parklands are regarded as iconic. They are the one feature which marks our city out as different from any others around the world. We remember the last government's attempt for us to have a city in a car park, rather than a city in the parklands, and its attempt to have a development bill for the parklands which would have allowed the clearance of non-complying uses to be replaced by 90 per cent of those developments. In fact, it would have been a mechanism for redeveloping the parklands with buildings rather than green, open spaces.

One of the measures used by the last government was a major project's device by which planning rules could be circumnavigated. How else could they have built large leisure centres, expanded the footprint—unnecessarily, I might say, because a similar building could have been built across the railway line—of the Convention Centre and, of course, built the now discredited Wine Centre, in a way that would otherwise not have occurred, I believe, with the sort of legislation that is now being proposed.

As you know, minister Hill has gone through the process of an Adelaide Parklands Working Group which has made a report to both him and the Adelaide City Council. It has produced significant recommendations that will clearly protect the parklands in a way that they have never been protected in the past. The recommendation that I particularly support is one that would:

- a. Exclude the operation of the major developments and projects provisions of the Development Act 1993 (section 46) in relation to the Parklands and;
- b. exclude the operation of the crown development and public infrastructure provisions of the Development Act (sections 49 and 49A) in relation to the Parklands.

They are two very important measures in stopping further alienation of the Parklands. In addition, the recommendations require definition of boundaries but particularly:

... the development of a strategic planning framework that would both recognise the council's management and directing role, as well as that of the government and the broader community. It would provide a management plan framework for the Parklands which will allow these strategies to transfer the provisions requiring council to prepare community land management plans for the Parklands, from the Local Government Act to the new Adelaide City Parklands Act and require the preparation of a management plan for each government reserve within the Parklands.

This is particularly important because it puts an onus on the state government to recognise that the 25 per cent of parklands which are which are under their care must have a management plan and that any surplus area should be returned to parklands use. This, in itself, will be a great step forward because the many alienated hectares of parkland under government control have been left over many years. There needs to be a recognition that they will be returned when they are surplus to requirements and, on top of that, turned back into parklands for common use.

The other issue that is of significance to the residents of Adelaide and, indeed, to my whole electorate is the provisions that the government has in place for heritage conservation. Minister Hill, again, has released a document called *Heritage Directions: A Future For Built Heritage in South Australia*. Whilst we have 1 300 local heritage listed items and about 300 state heritage listed items, there is some confusion about the provision of the two heritage sets of regulations. This heritage directions discussion paper floats the idea of whether or not there should be one heritage list for easier understanding by the community but, most importantly, will find methods by which the criteria for heritage listing can be redefined through amendments to the Heritage Act, and there can be more effective incentives.

Those incentives are ones that the government has often talked about as a disincentive for heritage listing, and we are looking at ways of having effective incentives as well as conservation orders for possible offences. Of particular significance is the recommendation within this report regarding whether or not heritage listing should be voluntary. One of the measures that is bringing about the destruction of the city of Adelaide in some significant order is the concept that an owner of property should allow that property to go through a series of tests and examinations but then have the right to say that, if they do not want to have a listed building, they can prevent its listing.

This is clearly one of the measures that has allowed much of Adelaide to be destroyed, and it is even true that some properties in the ownership of government and of local government have had listing formally objected to through the local heritage listing system, which has allowed government and local government to make high levels of profit by demolishing buildings that have clearly been assessed as having heritage potential. That matter of having voluntary listing for heritage buildings is clearly one that I would not support. I particularly suggest that we would not have voluntary road rules or voluntary parking or kerbside usage rules, so it is really extraordinary that we should allow property owners to prevent listing of their buildings.

Indeed, you might say that, once the process has gone through and the testing and assessment of the buildings for listing has occurred, it would be quite right and proper for those listings to be formalised. It is clear to see that the matter of heritage listing is only partly independent of the matter of planning controls. It is relevant that at the moment a PAR is going through government assessment related to some very significant changes that the Adelaide City Council proposes;

in particular, a deletion of the plot ratio requirement and an elimination of non-complying height limits.

This is an extraordinary move in the planning process and, whilst we have less than adequate heritage protection, this as much as anything else will see not only increasing demolition of low-scale buildings, many of which might have been heritage listed if their owners had not objected in the last round of listing, but will also allow for overlooking, over-shadowing and even complete enveloping of buildings by newer developments that can then occupy the air space above them. So, that matter is one of significance, and I am encouraging members of the public to attend a public meeting on Sunday 19 October between 2 p.m. and 4 p.m. at the Christ Church Hall, Jeffcott Street, North Adelaide, where the matters described in the heritage directions put out by minister Hill will be presented to them in time for them to make a submission before the closing date for this public consultation.

I encourage all those people who enjoy the present ambience and building shape and style of Adelaide to come to this meeting. In fact, it is true that in my portfolio there is a degree of advantage in a city that has a heritage streetscape appearance in terms of built form and scale, and the tourism attractions that has are clearly quite specific. That is because in fact it adds a sense of place, a sense of authenticity and a sense of difference that is valuable for all tourists who want to travel somewhere that has a sense of place rather than a sense of mediocrity and consistency with every other built form in the southern hemisphere.

The third issue that I raise is the issue of matters arising around the Sturt Street re-opening. I suggest that this is part of our built heritage and community heritage values and it mixes education as well. It is a matter about which I have some passion. I commend the opening to everyone and welcome enrolments in the school as soon as possible.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I thank the government for keeping the debate going and for giving me a pair last week.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I do thank you for giving me a pair last week. I want to talk about where I was in the past couple of weeks, and this gives me the opportunity. I had the pleasure of visiting Auckland, New Zealand, and South Dakota and North Dakota to look at a number of issues that are important to South Australia. Let me say at the outset that I believe members of parliament have a responsibility to travel in order to educate themselves and to meet with elected representatives from a wide range of systems and to discuss with their officials how they handle things. As important as we may think we are in South Australia, we are a very small identity in a large, fast-moving society. You realise that when you visit the United States and see the capacity which that country has to produce agricultural products and to do it on a scale that is hard to believe, unless you have been there. When you meet representatives of some of the companies involved, and realise the capacity and influence which they have on an international basis, then the information which you gain must be of benefit to you as a member of parliament. It is unfortunate that from time to time people set out to denigrate members of parliament who travel. I do not think ministers are doing their job unless they travel to keep abreast of what is taking place; and I do not think members of parliament are doing their job unless they keep themselves abreast of what is going on.

The issues about which I was particularly concerned included genetically modified crops, balanced budgets and citizen initiated referendums, as well as a number of others.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: In my view it would be the greatest mistake that could be made in this state. From what I learned in the United States, they have destroyed the budgets. If you want to destroy the health system then go down that track; you will achieve it and you will do more harm to the underprivileged.

I will take the member through it in detail in a moment, but I want to say I had the opportunity, first, to visit New Zealand. I went there because I wanted to learn something about the accident compensation commission which they operate. I do not want to go through another traumatic time, like I had at the end of the financial year, when the citizens of Port Augusta, in particular, were placed in the situation where they could not have their babies delivered there because no medical practitioner was prepared to deliver them. I understand the difficulties the medical practitioners were facing—and we cannot blame them—but we have created a situation where the average citizen was placed in an untenable situation. On top of that, the Pichi Richi railway and the Peterborough steam train were closed down. In relation to the health issues faced by my constituents at Port Augusta and elsewhere, no-one living in a decent society should be placed under that kind of stress. If the system is in such a poor state, then it is time this parliament had the courage to do something about it.

When in New Zealand, I had the opportunity to meet with Mr Richard Worth, the shadow attorney-general, who is one of the foremost legal representatives—and he is known to the Premier. He said that the system they now have in New Zealand is far superior to their previous system, which is the system we have in Australia. That came from a conservative high-ranking lawyer, and he gave me a book so that I can read about what is happening with torts and things in America. I am looking forward to furthering my interest in this particular subject because only again this morning—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The system they have where you cannot sue people for negligence. It may not be the perfect solution but it is an option, because only this morning in my constituency the pony club and the Mount Remarkable council found out that they will not be able to operate because they cannot get public liability insurance; and the children who want to paddock their horses cannot get cover either. What sort of nonsense is this? This system which operates in New Zealand and which may have some impediments is worth looking at. If I have gained nothing else from my visit overseas, I have gained some knowledge of this scheme, and I believe that a committee of this parliament should give urgent attention to that scheme to see whether it is possible to introduce it into South Australia to prevent what is taking place here.

I understand that I could step on the toes of certain members of certain professions. Obviously if you do not upset someone from time to time, you are not doing your job properly, and so I make no apology if one or two members of the legal profession are not happy with me. The other—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: In the next few weeks you will. In New Zealand, I met with representatives from Tegeles, a large grain importing company. They explained in detail their policy that they will not buy any product that is genetically

modified, and they want a paper trail to ensure the product they are putting on the market is GM free. It made me think very carefully that we need to move with caution in this particular area.

The other matter which I looked at very carefully and about which I had discussions was the New Zealand electoral system. From my discussions, I would suggest to this house and people in this country that we never go down that track because it is an absolute fiasco. I had discussions with members of parliament and with the director of the National Party in Auckland and, at the end of the day, for goodness sake, people should look at this matter rationally.

The difficulty in New Zealand is that they do not have an upper house and this was a compromise. It is a very bad compromise, it is not good for democracy, and it would be a disaster. Anyone who recommends that version or an amended version should have a cold shower because it is of no value to the democratic system. I thank the Mayor of Auckland for his hospitality, help and assistance during my visit. I had discussions with the electoral officials who run the election for the Auckland City Council. One of the sensible things they do a few months out from election is advertise and conduct seminars so that people who are interested in standing for the council understand what it is all about, what is expected of councillors and what sort of commitments are involved. It is a very good process which should take place in South Australia.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The existing staff can check out the candidates and see whether we like them or not.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, I don't think we can go that far; I don't think that's democratic. However, the candidates should be aware of what the council's roles and responsibilities are and they should have an understanding of what is expected of an elected official. I believe my visit there was not only productive and interesting but created a degree of interest which I believe we need to follow up.

I then went on to look at where the United States is at with genetically modified crops. The economy of the states I visited depend greatly on agriculture production. They are sparsely populated: South Dakota has 750 000 people and Nebraska 1.7 million. It is true to say that there is a general acceptance in the United States of genetically modified crops, particularly in those areas that do not export. Many people do not understand that they are eating genetically modified potatoes and tomatoes. Feedlotting of cattle is a huge industry in the United States: huge quantities of corn are fed directly to live stock. The overwhelming majority of corn and soya beans are produced using Roundup Ready. If anyone knows anything about agriculture, it is enticing to farmers to sow a crop and spray it with Roundup. It is a most interesting concept and has been widely accepted by farmers. I am advised that bio-varieties accounted for 75 per cent of the corn acres planted in South Dakota in 2003. In comparison, nationally only 40 per cent of the acreage was seeded with herbicide resistant bio-varieties.

The real question that is currently being considered is where they are going to go with genetically modified wheat. Corn is basically grown for animal consumption. The majority of wheat is for human consumption and export. One of the difficulties confusing this whole debate is that many people have doubts about the involvement of the chemical companies: in particular, Monsanto. In the United States, most farmers have to buy their seed from seed companies. Therefore, those companies have a captive market. There is some suspicion that these companies want to sell more seed

and that there will be incentives to buy more chemicals. That is not correct because if you only have to spray with Roundup you will actually be using fewer chemicals and doing less tillage.

Currently in South Dakota there is an arrangement between the university and Monsanto in relation to the development of Roundup Ready wheat. This is a most significant step, and I believe it is being watched carefully. In a brief conversation with the Minister for Agriculture today, I suggested that it would be wise for his officers to go over there to be brought right up to the mark on this, because in the spring of 2002 approximately 35 acres of Roundup Ready wheat for research trials had been planted in the United States. It represented a very minor fraction of the amount of wheat that is planted there.

I understand they have already destroyed some of the seed which has been grown because there is an arrangement between the United States, Canada and Japan that they will not agree to the release of Roundup Ready wheat until the three agencies in the United States (the Food and Agriculture Authority, the Department of Agriculture and the EPA) agree that it is safe to do so and have the concurrence of the same bodies in Canada and Japan. There is no point in moving ahead of public opinion, and it would be a disaster if countries went down that track and did not understand that you have to take the market with you. It is generally accepted that there will be a change in attitude in Europe when they develop some plant varieties which are genetically modified and which would be an advantage to them. There is ongoing discussion between governments in relation to that matter.

It is unfortunate that there has been a very poor job done of selling the system. People do not understand and the issue has become clouded, and emotive and quite mischievous arguments have been advanced by groups in the community that are not really sticking to the facts. I think that in this country and this state we would be wise to take a cautious approach. If we do not, and once we go down this particular track, I believe there is no turning back. Therefore, we have to be very sure that we are able to have market acceptability. One of the things that concerns me is that it would be very difficult to have a dual system, because you will eventually get it all mixed up.

The Hon. R.B. Such: It would be impossible.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, it would be impossible.

Mrs Redmond: You have to have either one or the other.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That's right. At this stage, in the United States it is clear that you will have only genetically modified corn and genetically modified soya beans. The figures put to me is that they estimate there is an advantage of perhaps \$21 an acre in growing those products. So, there is a real incentive, and the house should remember that there is a highly subsidised agricultural system in the United States, which is something we cannot imagine in this country. Even in a country where farmers are subsidised not to fail, they still have this particular advantage.

Let us look at some of the arguments put to me. It has been estimated that the global population will increase by 38 per cent from 5.8 billion in 1998 to 8 billion in 2025, and the available prime agricultural land will remain about 1 per cent of the world's land mass. There are some suggestions that a large amount of agricultural land will be developed in Brazil, which is not currently being developed. Life expectancy in the world will rise from the current 68 years to 73 years. Additionally, as standards of living improve, meat consumption and therefore the demand for feed products will increase.

It has been put to me quite clearly that one of the best ways of increasing production is by using this technology. Most people talk about Round-Up Ready crops, but I also saw first hand crops that had been developed as disease resistant where grubs, etc. no longer attacked corn, because it had been genetically modified.

In these field trials, they were actually taking a preventative step to have 20 per cent of the fields sown with non-GM crops so that the grubs would not build up a resistance to GM crops. One real concern that was put to me was that if we go completely down this track, there is likely to be the development of plants not susceptible to Round-up, particularly in what they call volunteer crops and which we call self-sowing crops, and that is an important feature. I was assured that there are other chemicals; well, that may be true but, of course, we have to be very careful with the rate at which we continue to use chemicals because we could do long-term residual damage to the soil and, of course, that could get into the food stream. We must be very careful in that regard.

I think that, at the end of the day, the debate in Australia will revolve around what we do with wheat, barley and those other major cash crops. A great deal of information is available, but I really do believe that officials from this state and this country should be going across to South Dakota, talking to the state university and to the people involved in producing this wheat because a fair bit of information is available. The people to whom I spoke were very keen to pass on the information. I had intended to visit North Dakota but, unfortunately, this particular variety of flu that is going around is pretty virulent. It slowed me down a bit, and I did experience—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That is a pity.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It was a pity. I came back a couple of days early because I did not want to experience the hospital system in the United States. No doubt it is very good.

Mrs Redmond: It is very expensive.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is right. I decided that I would come back home. I was well treated by the medical profession but I have to say that, having been used to our system here, the charges are quite interesting. It was \$140 for the first appointment.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It was \$140 for the first consultation.

Mrs Redmond: US.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: US dollars, and \$86 for the second appointment; and for some cholesterol tablets, \$130 for the prescription.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I think that there are other reasons; however, that is an aside. I also looked at citizen-initiated referendums in the United States. South Dakota was the first state in the United States to have this initiative, and when it had the initiative it was a very sparsely populated part of the United States and there were very poor communications.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Don't take any notice of them, Gunny.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: If the honourable member is not interested, could I say to her that she would be better off concentrating on looking after her own electorate instead of taking the lackey from the office in Port Augusta up to Hawker, but we will deal with that on another occasion.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Rau): Order! The member for Stuart should stick to his very interesting speech.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That was the first state of the United States—

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, if the honourable member does her shopping at Harrods, I don't, but that would be what one would expect from her. When South Dakota initiated this at the beginning of the century, the place was very sparsely populated and the means of communication was very difficult. It had a 10 per cent threshold. Today it is very easy to get a 10 per cent threshold.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Hang on a minute; it is not quite as easy as that. You are now seeing questions on the ballot dealing with the budget, which will have a very significant effect on the ability of the state to provide services to its citizens. That is what has happened in California. I would say to anyone who is promoting this particular concept, just—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It was 64 per cent at the Constitutional Convention.

Mrs Redmond: Just ask them in California.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You ask them in California and ask them in other parts of the United States.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What if they are voted out?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, most people, if a plausible argument is put to them and they are then asked whether you should reduce tax, will vote yes, because there is no-one under the system to put the alternative point of view. If you are going to knock 20 per cent off the revenue of a state budget, how are you going to deliver the services? The 10 per cent is far too low.

In Nebraska, where they also have this initiative, a question which consists of 2 600 words will go on the ballot. It has been organised by the gambling industry. Because they do not have poker machines in that state and they are surrounded by states that do, the gambling industry organised a lot of signatures, and this question will be put on the ballot. It could get up, because the terms and conditions of operating these machines are being set by the industry, not by the legislators. That is the sort of silly predicament that this process puts in place, and it ties the hands of the legislators.

One of the difficulties, of course, is that they are not full-time legislators. The legislators meet for only 40 or 50 days a year. They all have other jobs because they are not paid enough to be permanent, so, therefore—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: So, I say that it would be a most unwise course of action to go down this particular path because, although it is a plausible argument, the consequences are very serious. My view, which has been reinforced by my visit, is that, if the people of South Australia do not like the current crop of politicians, they can vote them out and get new ones. That is what democracy is about.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That's what they did at the last election.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: They will probably do it to some of you at the next election, but that is by the by. The system that we have allows people to object because citizens-initiated referenda are too easily taken over by well-organised pressure groups with the financial resources.

The final matter I want to talk about is balanced budgets, and in both states they have balanced budget legislation. In Nebraska there has been an ongoing debate between the

Governor and the legislators because, if the budget gets to 3 per cent in deficit, the legislators are required to rectify the problem. So the Governor put certain recommendations to the legislators, and they rejected it. He wanted to cut expenditure, they did not want to do so, so they have had an ongoing debate and discussion. At the end of the day, the legislators overrode the power of the Governor and increased expenditure, even though property taxes in that state are very high.

This stops governments having nest eggs, and it also stops them spending today and putting it on the Bankcard, letting the next generation pay for it. The other thing is that, if they get to 10 per cent in surplus, they have to do something about it. Therefore, they cannot pork-barrel, and I think it is a course of action we need to look at carefully.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Pork-barrel?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Pork-barrel, yes—playing Father Christmas in certain electorates. Finally, I had the opportunity to meet and sit with people who hand out the farm assistance money. In my wildest dreams, I never expected that any government would hand out thousands of millions of taxpayers' money. I suppose that, when you have a system that has such high property taxes, there needs to be some balancing up. How much longer will people get paid if their crops do not yield a certain amount or the price falls? For how much longer will they get cheques from the government? Some of the biggest operations are getting huge cheques. It appears to me that taxpayers in certain parts of the United States must be very tolerant people to continue to subsidise. It is hard to understand why it is going to continue. In conclusion, we have a system to assist farmers in this great nation in having single desks for wheat and barley. What I saw in the United States makes it clear that we should maintain it.

Mr SNELLING (Playford): Last week the Hon. Nick Xenophon proposed to extend mandatory reporting of child sexual abuse to priests hearing confessions in the sacrament of penance. I rise somewhat reluctantly, because I suspect Mr Xenophon is not entirely serious with his proposal but that, instead, this is another of his bids for publicity. I am reluctant to add fuel to the bonfire of Mr Xenophon's vanity. However, to allow the opportunity to pass without an articulation of the arguments against mandatory reporting in this very restricted area would be remiss.

My objections are twofold: first, it would be a violation of the separation of church and state and the implied guarantee of freedom of religion in our constitution. Secondly, such a law would be unworkable, placing an obligation on priests they would be duty-bound to ignore. The separation of church and state is predicated on certain privileges on which the state does not intrude. To have a system of mandatory reporting for priests hearing confessions is to make the priest an agent of the state. It would turn the priest from intermediary between God and man to that of state informer. This is not the first time this has been attempted, and I doubt that it will be the last.

Why, indeed, stop at mandatory reporting? Why not allow the bugging of confessionals? Maybe priests should caution penitents upon entering the confessional that anything they say can and will be taken down and used as evidence. Supporting Mr Xenophon, Dr Freda Briggs said:

Although there is obviously a fuss, priests are not in any situation that is different from that of doctors.

The point that needs to be grasped is the incommensurability of a sacramental relationship and a clinical one. There is difference between the doctor-patient relationship and that of a confessor and his penitent. The latter is a sacramental relationship and to reduce it to some kind of therapeutic exchange in which the rights of the child can be dragged in as a mantra for state intervention is rampant secularism at its most dopey. It is not within the competence of this parliament to interfere in the terms and conditions under which churches exercise the sacraments, and any attempt to do so would be doomed to fail in the High Court.

Mandatory reporting for confessors would place on them a legal obligation they would be unable to comply with. His Grace the Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide was right to say that his priests would rather go to gaol than obey an abhorrent law. Such sentiments are shared by the Catholic and orthodox hierarchies. Mr Xenophon has a lack of familiarity with the confessional that surprises me. Most Catholics who go to confession have their confessions heard behind a screen so that they cannot be identified.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Most Catholics don't go to confession.

Mr SNELLING: They are not obliged to, but most do. Someone with as serious a sin as the molestation of a child is almost certain to have their confession heard in this manner, particularly if they knew the confessor was bound in law to report them. Secondly, and perhaps more often than not, even if the priest sees the penitent, he does not know that person. I prefer to use a confessor at the cathedral who I either do not know or do not know well. Most Catholics that I know who avail themselves of the sacrament of penance do the same.

Under Mr Xenophon's bill is the onus on the priest to discover the identity of the penitent? Should he follow him from the church and take down his vehicle's registration number? How far does Mr Xenophon think a priest must go? Mr Xenophon seems to be under the illusion that a priest identifying a penitent is straightforward. On the contrary: it would be highly problematic and, aside from all other considerations, place undue burdens on confessors.

My main point is this: the seal of the confessional is a sacred trust that cannot be broken. Canon 983 of the laws of the Catholic Church states:

The sacramental seal is inviolable. Accordingly, it is absolutely wrong for a confessor in any way to betray the penitent, for any reason whatsoever, whether by word or in another fashion.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Has any priest been struck out for violation?

Mr SNELLING: I don't know. This law is extended to anyone who overhears a confession accidentally or, if one is used, to an interpreter. The penalty is set out in Canon 1388, which states:

A confessor who directly violates the sacramental seal incurs a *latae sententiae* excommunication reserved to the Apostolic See.

This means he is removed from the priestly ministry and excommunicated, no matter what pressures—legal or otherwise—may have been brought to bear. Even then, if Mr Xenophon was successful, any priest would be unable to comply with the law and would have to defy it. Priests lacking the strength to defy the law in such cases would simply be unable to hear confession.

This proposal would not result in a single extra case of pederasty being reported. All it would result in is the gaoling of priests. If the Hon. Nick Xenophon wants to play Madame

Defarge as the bishops and clergy of the Catholic, Orthodox and Anglican dioceses are taken to gaol, he is a braver man than me.

As an aside, if forcing compulsory notification of pederasty, why limit it to that? As heinous as it is, there are crimes as serious or more serious—murder, for instance. One has to ask whether Mr Xenophon is entirely ingenuous when his proposal limits compulsory notification to the one crime of child sexual abuse. His argument is that of zero tolerance for child abuse. A confessor who maintains the seal of the confessional does not tolerate child abuse any more than he tolerates any of the sins he might hear.

To suggest that churches that maintain such a seal are soft on pederasty, as Mr Xenophon and Prof. Briggs imply, is a wilful misrepresentation of the position of the churches in this area. Mr Xenophon's bill is inherently unworkable and a violation of the constitutional guarantee of freedom of religion. It goes without saying that all parliamentarians are concerned about pederasty and its victims, but the means do not justify the ends.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I bring to the house a matter of Velo Cardio Facial Syndrome (VCFS). This material has been written for me by the President of the VCFS Foundation of South Australia, Mr Raymond Tanner. I do so because I think that most people in the house—like me, in fact—would not have heard of this syndrome. As you will find out, it has only fairly recently been identified, but it is the second most important syndrome after Down syndrome. I think that it is often worth while bringing to the attention of the house medical issues such as this, and particularly what action might need to be taken to help to improve the understanding of people within the community as far as this syndrome is concerned. I will read from material that has been prepared for me. I have spoken to Mr Tanner: I believe that he has set it out very precisely, and I am willing to accept the sort of description he has given, although I stress the fact that he is not a medical specialist.

Velo Cardio Facial Syndrome is the second most common genetic disorder after Down syndrome. However, due to its complexities, the syndrome was only initially identified by Robert Shprintzen and others in 1978. It is not known what causes VCFS. However, the syndrome is a result of the deletion of a small segment of the long arm of chromosome 22. VCFS affects one in every 3 000 people and, as the words suggest, those affected by VCFS may have one or a combination of problems associated with the palate, heart and facial abnormalities. There are another 180-plus abnormalities, including additional major problems such as learning difficulties, speech, bipolar, schizophrenia and motor skills. Because the syndrome has only recently been identified, many adults may not realise that they may have VCFS. In the case of Raymond, for instance, he was not aware that he had VCFS until his second son, Andrew, was diagnosed with the syndrome 10 years ago. At the time, Raymond was 43. He was also to find out that his first son, James, who had complex heart problems, had died from the syndrome 17 years ago, when he was nine days old.

One of the most frustrating things for parents in bringing up children with VCFS is the lack of knowledge of the syndrome in the following areas. Firstly, in the medical area—general practitioners, medical specialists and hospital staff. Parents need to provide advice on a regular basis to professionals in these areas as to what VCFS is about. In

most cases, parents feel that they have more knowledge about the medical condition than many of the medical specialists from whom they are seeking answers.

The second area is education—and I am delighted that the Minister for Education and Children's Services is here, so she is able to hear this. Many children need one on one training in the classroom, and many schools do not have the resources to cater for this, or the understanding of the problems associated with educating a child with VCFS. As a result, parents seek to have their children educated in private schools, in particular, those that cater for children with special needs.

The third area is the lack of financial support and recognition from both federal and state government organisations, in particular, Centrelink. For example, the new Centrelink carer allowance form to obtain financial assistance does not make allowances for children who have VCFS. The fourth area is the lack of family support due to the child's being diagnosed with the syndrome. Once the child has been diagnosed with VCFS, many parents do not advise other family members or friends, due to the syndrome's complexities.

Although Mr Tanner has only touched the surface about VCFS in what he has written about it and its impact on those who have been affected, either directly or indirectly, by the syndrome, I hope that by my giving this speech in parliament, more people will have a better understanding of what VCFS is about. I realise that the government has various priorities in its budget; however, the government should promote the issues of VCFS in the education and health systems so that parents of VCFS children do not always have to struggle to get their message across. Another thing about VCFS is that there is a very strong belief that many children who have learning difficulties may also, unknowingly, have the syndrome. If people require more information on VCFS they can access the main web page, which is www.vcfsef.org or www.vcfs.com.au. Otherwise, people can contact Mr Raymond Tanner directly on his mobile on 0414-578-785 or on his email, tanner@arcom.com.au.

I want to thank Mr Tanner firstly for taking an interest in contacting me—and I know that he has also contacted the Minister for Health and raised the matters with her—and for preparing this material for me to present to the parliament. I again stress that people can contact Mr Tanner as President of the VCFS Foundation of South Australia at 45 Southbound Avenue, Aberfoyle Park 5159, and I am delighted to bring that information to the attention of the house as part of this Address in Reply.

The second issue I wish to touch on in this Address in Reply speech is that of supported residential facilities. It is a matter I raised publicly yesterday and also raised in three questions in parliament today, and it is also a matter I have raised previously—particularly during estimates, I think, last year and again this year on 24 June. Let me go back a little: I was minister responsible in this area for, I think, a total of 3½ months only, but during that period the plight faced by supported residential facilities was brought to my attention—in fact, I have a number of them in my electorate. I visited some of those and talked with other operators here in Adelaide, and I realised that they were facing an increasing financial plight.

Supported residential facilities come under South Australian law—in fact, an advisory committee reports to the appropriate minister—and by law can take only up to 85 per cent of the gross income of the resident involved. Most

of these people are on a disability or some other pension and may receive modest rent assistance from the federal government, and on average only about 80 per cent of that money is paid towards the supported residential facility. That means that on average about \$27 to \$30 a day is paid to these facilities, and that is a very modest amount when the organisation is providing accommodation, three meals a day, support to help maintain the personal hygiene of the residents and support to help these residents take their medication.

About 60 per cent of the people who are residents of SRFs in our community have mental health problems, often chronic and quite serious mental health problems. They are people who will probably never be able to get a job, and if they do have a job for a period, they invariably drop out of employment. They are people who, in many cases, have lost contact with their families and have very few friends. They are the most vulnerable within our community and they are the people whom we need to be helping most of all. In December 2001, in fact it was a month or so before that, I initially identified with the Department of Human Services the need to give financial support to the residents of the SRFs so that they could receive some sort of recompense for the additional support they needed, for their medication, personal hygiene and other factors. They could then pass that financial support on to the SRF operators for those particular services. In that way, it would help to make the SRFs more financially viable and at the same time would guarantee the necessary support that the residents needed.

As a result of that, a major meeting was established with the SRF Association in December 2001. \$3.5 million a year was identified as uncommitted money from the rent subsidy that the state government had discontinued in Housing Trust homes—there was a trail to those funds—and was available for distribution as support that we could use in this way. At the time I said that the rent subsidy money could be directed to providing a more targeted support for those people who needed it. If ever there was a group who needed it, and who were very vulnerable within our community, possibly facing homelessness on the streets of Adelaide, then it is this particular group.

It disappoints me that it has taken so long for this government to prepare a detailed financial report. There have been two reports: the first, which I have received, was released in April, and concerns the condition of these homes. That report is called 'Somewhere to call home—supported residential facilities, the sector, its clientele and its future'. The second report that was prepared looked at the financial viability of SRFs. That report has not been released, despite repeated requests to the minister to do so. I raised that matter in parliament again today and quoted where the minister said she would release the report but only when it had gone to cabinet.

In fact, the minister for Social Justice has now had the report for almost six months. She has not released the report, and it would appear that there has been a period of great stagnation as far as the action of the government on that report is concerned. As a result of that inaction, operators of SRFs are now becoming extremely frustrated. They perceive that there is inaction from the government, because the government has done nothing so far, in terms of giving assistance or support, in the now 18 months it has been in office. They perceive that it is going absolutely nowhere and, as a result of that, eight such SRF facilities have either closed their doors or are expected to close by the end of December.

That means there are about 190 people who are residents of these facilities, or have been, who are out there looking for alternative accommodation. They will find it extremely difficult to find that accommodation in another SRF, because the amount of accommodation available through SRFs is rapidly in decline. Based on some indications, a further 350 positions could be lost within the SRF area within the next 12 months, unless action is taken very quickly by the government. That really is a shame. It is a blight on the government that it is willing to put the most vulnerable people into the even more vulnerable position of having to fend for themselves without secure accommodation, without help for their medication and without help for personal hygiene, and certainly without help in terms of meals.

If that occurs, the likelihood is that the government will pick up a substantially higher cost. If these people were accommodated in government accommodation, it is estimated it would cost the government \$20 million a year. If they received the ongoing additional support that they need, it would cost the government about \$25 million a year. At this stage, the government puts no money, effectively, into these facilities at all, except for a very small number which, going back to the 1970s, received some support for a select group of people with mental health problems. The rest of the sector—approximately 1 500 people—receive no support whatsoever. It appears that the actions of this government are going in exactly the opposite direction to its election promise that it would halve the number of homeless people in the community. The number of homeless people will substantially increase as a result of government inaction.

Today, in question time I gave details to the parliament of at least eight facilities (and I have named them) that have either closed or are expected to close by the end of December. In most cases, those facilities are either now being used for other purposes, such as an aged care complex, or are being closed and the property is being sold off. Clearly, whilst yesterday the minister was trying to claim to the media that this was all due to a rise in property values, that is not the case at all. These operators want to continue to provide this service, but they are losing money, and the financial studies show that to be the case. Because they are losing money and because the government will not do anything about it, they have no option but to close their doors.

If \$3.5 million a year was spent—and that money was there and earmarked by the previous government ready to be spent to support SRFs—it could well be financially viable for the SRFs to continue to provide the service and the care for these people. However, it appears that the government is not willing to make that commitment and, as a result, it is likely to pick up a far greater cost. As I said, the cost of the government's picking up the total cost of accommodation would be approximately \$20 million a year, with another \$5 million for support.

I was surprised to hear the minister claiming on ABC Radio this morning—and I have the transcript—that only three such facilities are about to close. In fact, the evidence is that eight have closed, or are about to close.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: No—I have the transcripts. They are not government transcripts: they have come from another service. They very clearly show that the minister claimed that only three facilities were about to close. Today, in question time I was able to get a commitment from the minister that, first, she knew about the submission made in late June by the Supported Residential Facilities Association

to the Social Development Committee; she acknowledged that. Therefore, one has to ask, if she acknowledged that she knew about that submission which indicated that eight facilities were about to close, why did she go on radio and counter that by saying that only three of these facilities were to close?

What was the honest answer? Was parliament misinformed today, or was the public given a very false picture indeed in terms of the information given this morning on radio, when the minister claimed that only three such facilities were about to close? I think the minister has some explaining to do about the huge difference between what she said on radio this morning and what she acknowledged in the parliament this afternoon when she was pressed on the issue. The facts are that what she said on radio this morning was plainly wrong. I think the minister should come in and correct that, in the interests of the public of South Australia.

My concern in this, is that we have action at last, from this government, so that this government does put some money into the SRFs, so that they do get support and so that about a further 1 500 people are not suddenly turfed out onto the streets to become homeless and to suffer from inadequate care and inadequate and late action from the government. I will continue to support the case of the SRFs very strongly indeed. I hope this government responds very quickly to the plight which they currently face.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Firstly, I would like to congratulate His Excellency, Mr Bruno Krumins, the Governor's deputy, for his remarks on the opening of the third session of the 50th parliament. In his opening statement the Governor's deputy highlighted what we all want—a state that has a greener and cleaner environment with a revitalised River Murray. Of great concern to everyone is the health of the River Murray. There is no doubt that, since being elected, the Rann Government has taken a great deal of action to save the Murray. We have begun to deliver what is needed to improve its health, to save the Murray. Not only have the Premier and the environment minister shown leadership in taking urgent action, they have fostered partnerships with politicians at both state and federal levels and from the rainbow of political persuasions, to gain an agreement on the action needed to save our river. Our government has, quite rightly, demonstrated goodwill to many and varied users of the Murray.

The River Murray is one of our greatest natural resources. We know the plight of the once mighty Murray. A low environmental flow and a rise in salinity rates has caused our river to die. Our government has tackled the critical issue of water flow by succeeding in winning an agreement from other governments, state and federal, for a \$500 million rescue package which will see more water being returned to the river over the next five years. We have already tackled the critical issue of the mouth of the Murray by having hundreds of thousands of cubic metres of sand removed, with the aim of removing 400 000 cubic metres so that the mouth of the river does not close over.

We have certainly tackled the very difficult but necessary issue of raising the much needed funds to deal with this serious problem. The Save the Murray levy is a commitment we all make to work together, to help save our river. We know our state relies on water from the Murray and the quality of the water. To achieve this, we must work together nationally to once again have a healthy and mighty River

Murray. It will take some pain and a change of practices, but we have no choice.

I would like to pay tribute to the schools in my electorate which work hard to ensure that our young people get the best educational opportunities they possibly can. The principals, teachers, staff and a number of volunteers work exceptionally hard and are extremely dedicated in their endeavours to educate their students. Being able to participate in the schools is something I find extremely rewarding. It is interesting to watch the students pass from year to year and to see them grow into mature teenagers and adults. It is exciting to know that one is able to participate in that growth, even if only in a small way.

Windsor Gardens Vocational College is one of my many schools—and I spoke about them in the grievance debate today—they have extremely dedicated educators, staff, parents and volunteers. The Twilight Program run at the school is an example of the commitment made to our young people. While the participants of this program may have left school for a number of reasons, the college's concern for their welfare has not ceased. This program helps to regain their self-esteem and get back on the track of learning. It provides support through the many difficulties young people face. The Minister for Education came to the school to see the Twilight Program working. I know she was very impressed with how it works and the value it has to these young people. My primary and junior primary schools are also a pleasure to work with. Northfield Primary, Hillcrest, Gilles Plains, Hampstead Primary, Klemzig Primary and Dernancourt schools are all committed to working for their students. Each has something special to provide.

Time does not permit me to mention all the schools this evening, but I would like to talk about Hillcrest and Klemzig Primary Schools, which have a wonderful program for hearing-impaired students. I have a great interest in the support they give, as I have a brother-in-law who is deaf, and when I look at the way they work with their students and the care they give I am continually impressed. I spent a morning with some of the littlies at Klemzig and watched the teachers working with the children in their care and the challenges they faced. I believe that these young children will have opportunities in their future because of the attention and care they are given at school.

Hillcrest Primary is another school that provides educational opportunities for its hearing-impaired students as well as the hearing students. I know the commitment made by the teachers to give their young students the best education they can. During the debate over the Cora Barclay Centre I was extremely disappointed in a number of the comments made by the opposition, which gave the impression that children who are hearing-impaired and who did not attend that particular centre were not getting the best support and opportunities. Those remarks were offensive to those schools, because Klemzig and Hillcrest provide excellent programs for hearing-impaired students.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member for Bragg says that no-one suggested that they didn't.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Thompson): The member for Bragg is out of her place and cannot be heard. Member for Torrens, I suggest that you continue.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I might just say that extreme offence was taken. As I said, those remarks were offensive to the schools, because those schools provide excellent programs for those hearing-impaired students, programs that are run

through the state public education system and are up to date with excellent facilities and dedicated, caring families.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member for Bragg says there are different circumstances. I would be quite happy to go into detail with the member for Bragg about the differences.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes, but there are different types of sign language and different types of hearing impairment, and the differences that were being talked about were actually intimating to people that students in our public education system who are provided hearing-impaired programs are not getting the same level of opportunity as they would at another centre, and that was most offensive. I think it is an exceptionally sad state of affairs when we have hearing-impaired students used as a tool for a political points-scoring exercise, and I am extremely sorry that this occurred, because I know that students who attend our state schools greatly benefit from the time they spend at those schools. I would like to give my thanks to the dedicated principals, teachers and staff and the volunteers for their wonderful efforts and genuine care for the students in their charge.

I would also like to commend the significant effort of Robyn Layton QC in conducting the child protection review. I support the recommendations of this comprehensive review of one of the most important concerns in our community, the protection of our children. A number of recommendations have already been put in place by our government, including the allocation of additional funding for extra counsellors in our primary schools. This is a direct response to the recommendations made in the child protection review. I welcome the additional counselling resources in the Dernancourt Junior Primary School in my electorate. I would also like to thank the school counsellors in all our schools, whom I found to be extremely dedicated and caring professionals who provide much-needed support for our children.

Many people in our community cannot believe that children go to school without breakfast, but in many cases our kids do go to school without any sustenance. It does not necessarily mean that children are not being properly cared for, and there are many reasons why this may be the case but, as we all know, children are unable to give their full attention to learning when they have an empty stomach. It can have a tremendous impact on the development of their basic skills and ability in their early years, which can lead to long-term problems. This dilemma has been faced by a number of schools over many years.

The basic necessity of food also provides the opportunity for students to learn new skills. In my electorate, three schools—Gilles Plains, Klemzig and Northfield primary schools—have shown the initiative and taken the challenge to introduce a breakfast program. When the principal of Northfield Primary School, Sharon Broadbent, asked me to help with the program at the school, I was more than happy to do so. Northfield Primary School introduced the breakfast program in response to a number of children who, the teachers realised, did not have anything to eat before they went to school. The teachers became aware that sometimes children did not have lunch in their lunch boxes; and the children often displayed poor concentration. As Ms Broadbent pointed out, learning is very much about being able to concentrate on something other than your tummy rumbling.

With the tremendous support of the North Eastern Community Assistance Program and Woolworths, the breakfast program is up and running and well attended at

Northfield Primary School. I commend all those in this combined effort who put the program in place to assist students at Gilles Plains, Klemzig and Northfield to help those students get the most out of their education. I also point out the interest demonstrated by one of our local radio stations, 5AA, in particular Leon Byner, who took this issue to the airwaves. The transcript shows that the station had an unprecedented number of calls about school breakfast programs—clearly showing the great concern in our community about this very important issue which can affect our children.

Another event held at Northfield Primary School was the visit of Her Excellency the Governor, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson. I thank the Governor for graciously agreeing to come to Northfield Primary School to celebrate their 50th anniversary. It was a momentous occasion and Her Excellency's presence made it all the more special. The Minister for Education and Children's Services also attended, and this added to the excitement of students, teachers, staff and parents, and a vast number of past students. It was a wonderful day and the culmination of many months of work and planning. Each class was decorated and special people came to speak to the children—sports athletes brought their medals and the police and fire services were there—and the children treated us to a number of delightful events. I congratulate everyone involved, especially Sharon Broadbent (the principal) and the school counsellor, Lee Scafe. I doubt the children will ever forget the event—I know I certainly will not forget it.

I now focus on transport and safety issues. I was pleased that in his opening speech the Deputy Governor made reference to significant progress in many areas of transport, particularly the finalisation of South Australia's first transport plan in 35 years. In my electorate we have had to tackle many transport issues at a local level. Over the years I have raised these traffic issues in parliament and written many letters to the ministers over the years. I was extremely pleased that the Minister for Transport took up my invitation and made time to see for himself the range of difficulties our community has had to deal with.

I focus on one of our local schools regarding this issue. The Ross Smith Secondary School took an initiative to deal with the serious and dangerous crossing on Hampstead Road. I find being able to work through the myriad of challenges of our schools very rewarding and satisfying. Ross Smith Secondary School has a band of dedicated educators and staff, and members of the school council have committed themselves to ensuring that the students are given every opportunity. The school asked me to help with its safety issue, which was a transport matter. The difficulty was that students who had to cross Hampstead Road were often at risk from vehicles speeding through a pedestrian crossing. Unfortunately, drivers' running the red light have become quite common. The signals were being ignored and, as a result of the many trucks and extremely heavy vehicles using the road, it was a matter of time before a student was seriously injured, if not fatally injured. I received a letter from the chairperson of the school council, Robyn LeCornu, seeking my assistance to resolve this problem. I asked the Minister for Transport to look at how we might be able to resolve the matter. The minister recognised the dangers and, after the Department of Transport investigated a number of options, we were extremely delighted with the solution. Well inside the time frame we were given, and beyond our initial expectations, an overhead signal was installed which is

clearly visible to oncoming traffic. We are most grateful for the minister's attention to this problem and I thank him for giving us his support so promptly.

Another issue which we have been tackling for a number of years is the turn right signal on Thistle Avenue, Muller Road and North-East Road at Klemzig. This was a very dangerous intersection and, no matter how we tackled the problem, we were not able to achieve a resolution, even after we had sent a petition to the parliament. Finally, we now have that turn right arrow and that has certainly made a great difference to the people who use this intersection. The other matter we have been tackling is a bus service, and I am really pleased to announce finally that, after a meeting with Michael Wright and the department, we will now have the Northgate bus service (292), which will commence on Sunday 5 October and which will make good a longstanding commitment to the residents of Northgate.

I also congratulate the Enfield Horticultural Society for yet again another successful show. While the weather left something to be desired, the show was well attended and the displays of potted plants and flowering arrangements were extremely beautiful. Everyone had worked very hard to make it such a wonderful event, and the skills of the members of the society are of an extremely high standard, with each creation in the flower arrangement section showing how artistic these members are. I certainly learnt how dedicated some members are when I was advised that one member rose at 2 a.m. to pick the blooms being entered and judged that day. I was told that 2 a.m. is the best time to pick them as it is the coldest part of the day. I certainly view that person as having a great deal of commitment.

On 2 September, the member for Finnis said that forensic offenders should not be kept at Glenside but should be kept at James Nash House. His comments caught my attention because James Nash House is in my electorate and I thought the comments were rather odd because, in a letter dated 13 November 1998 to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, the then minister wrote:

I have asked the Department of Human Services to ensure that Glenside is available in future situations when James Nash House is temporarily fully occupied.

Then on 25 January 1999, the then government accepted a recommendation from the former minister that Grove Close at Glenside be converted at a capital cost of around \$150 000 to provide a short-term solution to accommodation shortages at James Nash House.

So, forensic patients have been accommodated at Glenside since 1999 under a decision made by the member for Finnis, the then minister. When the member for Finnis said on 2 September that they should not be accommodated at Glenside, he forgot to mention that it was his own idea in 1999. I was a little confused about that because certainly the minister contradicted himself. For the record, when the member for Finnis was the minister for nine months during 2001 and 2002, as I understand it, 299 patients left Glenside without approval. Of the 299 patients who left from open care, I think six came from Brentwood and one from the forensic ward. It is important to remember that Glenside is a 365-bed psychiatric hospital with just 30 closed beds, that is, 20 in Brentwood and 10 in Grove Close. In the majority of cases, what this would appear to mean is that patients left the hospital without the agreement of management. They were not locked in a secure section because obviously they were not considered to be a threat to the public, per se. People are, of course, looked after for their own safety, and it is a

matter of getting the balance right. Clearly, minister Stevens is doing that—and certainly doing it far better than we have seen previously. I thought I would put that on the record.

In this session, our government will bring to the parliament a number of initiatives that will benefit South Australians. I look forward to seeing them passed through the houses and implemented. We have worked hard since being elected to government, and we will continue to do so to ensure that the people of South Australia are served by representatives who have a solid grasp of the present and a vision and framework for the future.

In closing, I wish David Bridges, our hard-working Clerk, a happy third 20th birthday. He looks so well, that it must be true that one gets better with age. Happy birthday, David.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Will the government clarify when we will present ourselves to the Lieutenant-Governor?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Thompson): I am advised that that is not likely to happen before 16 October. Members will be further advised.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Why under our standing orders will it take so long? From my history in this place, we have normally done it on the next day or the day after.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am advised that there is no suitable time available at the Governor's convenience.

QUESTIONS, REPLIES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I rise to explain a delay in answering parliamentary questions about Associate Professor Tony Thomas. The Hon. Angus Redford in another place posed these questions on 16 July and 15 September. The member for Heysen also mentioned those questions and raised them again during the grievance debate today.

There is nothing sinister in the time taken to compile answers to the initial questions. Moreover, the delay should not be seen as suggesting that my predecessor, the Hon. Paul Holloway, has done anything untoward. Indeed, he did as he undertook to do: that is, investigated the matters. At the crux of the Hon. Angus Redford's questions and the assertions by the member for Heysen is the suggestion that I have acted improperly, contrary to the government's Ministerial Code of Conduct, when in a ministerial statement about the murder of Anna-Jane Cheney and the conviction of Henry Keogh—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Thank you. The member for Heysen just said that she absolutely supported my ministerial statement on that. The suggestion is that I made assertions about Associate Professor Tony Thomas that were deliberately misleading. Although I concede that my assertions could be construed as misleading, I deny that I deliberately misled the house or members of the other place. I had the content of my ministerial statement checked by several people before presenting it. I am not aware that anyone queried the content, including the comments that I quoted from Magistrate Baldino. I did not know about Justice Mullighan's comments. Had I known, I can assure members of the house and the other place that I would not have quoted

Magistrate Baldino's remarks about Associate Professor Thomas.

Mr Scalzi: Baldino.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Baldino. I sat next to him at mass yesterday, so I should know how to pronounce his name. Magistrate Baldino did make the statements that I quoted. Justice Mullighan reached a different view and, as the Hon. Angus Redford has pointed out, concluded that Magistrate Baldino's findings were very serious.

Justice Mullighan stated that he could only speculate on the reasons for Magistrate Baldino's statements about Associate Professor Tony Thomas, because the magistrate did not give reasons for his conclusion. Justice Mullighan noted that Associate Professor Thomas's impartiality or independence was never challenged in cross-examination. He ruled that Magistrate Baldino had erred. In making his ruling, Justice Mullighan summarised Associate Professor Thomas's impressive curriculum vitae. I apologise for not including Justice Mullighan's ruling in my ministerial statement. I simply was not aware of the ruling.

Since I made my ministerial statement, I have read Associate Professor Thomas's curriculum vitae several times. Much of it, by its very nature, is meaningless to me personally, so I have asked for an explanation. Some of the delay the Hon. Angus Redford mentioned on 15 September can be explained, because my predecessor and I have been waiting for that explanation.

I have received some information of which I wish to check the veracity with Associate Professor Thomas himself. I do not want to find myself in a similar situation, having to explain statements that I have made in this place. This, I strongly suggest, is an appropriate course to take if I am to

answer fairly the questions as they relate specifically to Associate Professor Thomas's expertise.

Associate Professor Thomas is currently overseas and is not due back until near the end of this month. As I said, he will be given an opportunity to comment on the information I have been provided. In the light of the error in my previous ministerial statement, this, I contend, is a just approach.

In the meantime, I apologise to members of the house and the other place that I did not refer to the remarks made by Justice Mullighan. I reiterate that I simply was not told about them. I do not agree that my statement was deliberately misleading nor do I believe that I have breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

I intend to present a balanced view on Associate Professor Thomas's credentials as soon as practical. I trust that the Hon. Angus Redford and the member for Heysen will bear with me while I follow the course I have outlined. Surely, the Hon. Angus Redford would rather the answers to his questions on Associate Professor Thomas were accurate. Finally, I apologise to my predecessor, the Hon. Paul Holloway, for any embarrassment caused by the delay in staff from my department preparing answers to the Hon. Angus Redford's questions.

COOPER BASIN (RATIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 23 September at 2 p.m.