

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 20 October 2003

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

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the *Notice Paper*, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 1, 12, 17, 22, 23, 50, 60, 67, 71, 123 and 130.

HELEN MAYO HOUSE

In reply to **Mr GOLDSWORTHY** (25 September).

The **Hon. L. STEVENS**: There are no plans to reduce the number of beds in Helen Mayo House at the Royal Adelaide Hospital Glenside campus, nor any plans to close the ward.

As part of the reforms to Mental Health Services, all service models of care are being reviewed to ensure the delivery of high quality care that best meets consumer and carer needs. This includes reviewing mental health services, such as Helen Mayo House at Glenside campus, to identify resourcing needs, appropriate functioning and to ensure that service delivery practice reflects national and international best practice.

The review of services will be undertaken in consultation with mental health service providers, consumers and carers.

CHILD'S BIRTH

In reply to **Hon. DEAN BROWN** (18 September).

The **Hon. L. STEVENS**: The question asked by the Hon. Dean Brown on 18 September 2003 in fact relates to two separate and distinct cases. I will firstly address the issues raised in relation to the Coroner's recommendations following the death of Jayden Trimboli.

A number of changes were implemented by the Women's and Children's Hospital immediately following the death of Jayden and prior to the inquest. These included the installation of a new foetal monitoring surveillance system, with predetermined visual and audible alarms that require staff acknowledgment, confidential and individual staff log in and audit trails, and routine CTG observation by primary care midwives. In addition, midwifery standards in relation to prostaglandin gel inductions were reviewed in line with medical evidence to provide case specific frequency of maternal observations and CTG monitoring timeframes based upon clinical indications.

As a result of the change already implemented, the Coroner made only one recommendation to the hospital at the conclusion of the inquest. The Coroner recommended that the patient should be advised in general terms how to read a CTG trace and/or to recognise the importance of an alarm and summon staff accordingly.

After reviewing its practices, and the effects of the changes already made, it was the view of the Women's and Babies Division at the Women's and Children's Hospital that this recommendation held severe limitations, given that the interpretation of a CTG is essentially a technical skill best practiced by staff in attendance. Furthermore, when the interpretation of a CTG is described into literature, it forms a detailed text of hundreds of pages in length. By incorporation of the new foetal monitoring surveillance system, as well as more constant and consistent staff monitoring during inductions, the hospital is confident that the reason for this recommendation has been overcome.

The second issue raised relates to the delivery of a baby on 4 September 2003. I can advise that an investigation into this matter is currently being undertaken by the Crown Solicitor's office on the instructions of SAICORP and the hospital. A highly regarded, interstate, independent medical expert is assisting the Crown Solicitor's office with this investigation.

I am advised that legal representatives of the mother have lodged a claim with the hospital in September. This is currently being assessed. This therefore precludes further public comment on this matter until a proper assessment is undertaken.

A communication process has been established with the mother and her solicitors to keep her updated throughout the investigation process and to advise of the investigation outcomes.

I can confirm that the hospital's loss adjuster has not interviewed the mother. I believe that this reference refers to a meeting between the mother and the Consumer Complaints Coordinator where the mother expressed her concerns regarding the delivery of her baby.

Upon a preliminary examination of this case, I am informed that it bears no resemblance to that of the death of Jayden Trimboli, as was referred to in parliament.

HOSPITALS, FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

The **Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. L. STEVENS**: Last Wednesday, 15 October 2003, the member for Morphett asked me a question about a specific medical case at the Flinders Medical Centre, at the emergency department, and I undertook to have that matter investigated. Last Thursday, 16 October 2003, the member for Finnis asked me a question about a specific case at the Flinders Medical Centre, and I undertook to have that matter investigated. It has long been the practice that, after questions are raised without notice concerning specific cases, the name of the patient is provided confidentially to allow the investigation to proceed.

In my answer to the member for Finnis on 16 October, I specifically asked for further information 'straightaway' to allow me to look into the matter, because the emergency and outpatient departments at the Flinders Medical Centre treat over 310 000 people a year. Neither the member for Morphett, nor the member for Finnis, have provided the names of the patients they were representing. A check in my office indicates that no correspondence providing this information has been received since the questions were asked. As a result, I have been unable to initiate these investigations. It seems that these matters were important enough for the opposition to raise during question time but not important enough to provide me with a name. This is not the first occasion—

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order, the member for Schubert!

The **Hon. L. STEVENS**:—that the member for Finnis has delayed providing vital information on matters he has raised during question time. If the member for Morphett and the member for Finnis genuinely want these matters investigated, other than raising them for political purposes, I invite them to walk across the chamber and give me the names. The names? No names.

QUESTION TIME

POLICE NUMBERS

The **Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition)**: My question is to the missing Minister for Police. When will the minister take the action that is needed to meet the commitments of the government's position on law and order by providing additional resources to South Australian police, who are now calling for increased funding? Last week, the minister restated the government's commitment to what he said was a strong law and order platform and was critical of the former Liberal government's record in this area, despite the fact that the last significant recruitment of police occurred

as a result of the Liberal budget of 2001-02 when 200 extra police were recruited.

In *The Sunday Mail* on the weekend, the head of the South Australian Police Association called on the government to match its tough talk with extra officers. The association's President, Mr Peter Alexander, was quoted as saying, 'It is ridiculous to talk tough if you don't resource the organisation to deliver the outcome.' He said, 'This government, in two budgets, has not delivered.' Mr Alexander went on to say that the only recent real increase in police numbers was in the final days of the Liberal government when 200 extra officers were added.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I apologise to the house for not being here when the question was asked. I had other matters to which I had to attend urgently. I do apologise.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Very few things are more important than questions, member for Waite, but sometimes other matters must be addressed.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am sorry, member for Waite, what was that inane interjection? Mr Speaker, can I say this? Fancy this lot opposite having the audacity to question this government about police resources. Only one government in the past nine years has run down police numbers, and it was the former Liberal government of which the Leader of the Opposition, for the vast majority of that time, was either a minister, deputy premier or premier. I mean, honestly, for this Leader of the Opposition to have the audacity to ask this question is just amazing. Let us remember.

I am advised that as at 30 June this year there were 3 770 full-time equivalents in our police force. In 1997, about the mid point of this government and when the Leader of the Opposition was a senior minister—wait for this number—I am advised that there were 3 410. On my advice, that is 360 full-time equivalents fewer than at 30 June this year compared to 1997. That is what we are dealing with: a Liberal Party which, in government, ran down our police force.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek your ruling on the police minister's selectively quoting years and not giving the full facts, because police numbers were higher under the previous Liberal government.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order, but I have to tell the member for Mawson, as he well knows, that this is an epidemic that knows no difference between either side of the house. The member for Reynell.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, I had not finished. I do apologise.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The important point is that when reference is made by Mr Alexander or quoted by Mr Kerin about 200 being recruited by the Liberal government, let us remember when they did it. For the vast bulk of their time in government, they ran the numbers down. As I have quoted, at one point, on advice, the numbers could have been as much as 360 fewer. In the year running into an election, lo and behold, out comes a recruitment campaign to recruit police. Talk about opportunistic and hypocritical! In our last budget, as this house has been told time and again, we allocated many millions of dollars for new police stations and millions of dollars for anti-terrorism equipment. What you are seeing is—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Leader of the Opposition interjects, 'PPP'. How do you think you pay for a PPP?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not pay anything. The Treasurer and Minister for Police will address the chair.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition says, 'They're PPPs.' Of course, they are PPPs. Where do recurrent payments to service the PPPs come from?

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Newland!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am delighted the member for Newland is not the Treasurer or shadow treasurer. She says that seven extra is not an increase. Well, it is an increase because 'seven extra' means there is extra. Let us not worry about it because the irrelevance of the member for Newland is known by all on this side and many on the other side.

This government is tough on crime and it is bringing into this house some of the toughest laws to deal with many of the criminal elements in our community. This government is committed to resourcing our police force. The Premier is giving a speech tomorrow to the Police Association. The government's views about policing are well known. The government's views about police resources will be the subject of the Premier's discussion and the Premier's speech to the Police Association tomorrow. I say to members opposite: you are the mob that slashed the force; we are the government that is increasing resourcing to policing, and we will continue to do so to make South Australia a safer community.

CRIME PREVENTION

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What measures is this government taking to ensure that our children are educated about the consequences of crime? At a recent gathering in my electorate, members of the community expressed their concern that too many young people do not understand the impact of crime, including graffiti and vandalism, on its victims and the community in general.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Next year, in our state's public schools children aged 11 and 12 will be taught the consequences of crime under a new prevention program to be introduced into the upper primary level curriculum. It is a program that formulates part of this government's clear vision for safer communities. I want our children to grow up with the strong understanding that criminal behaviour is unacceptable, and that the messages need to be clear that criminal behaviour can ruin the lives of many people, including their own. I also want our children to have the knowledge and values necessary to lead positive and constructive lives, and to resist the temptation to drift into patterns of criminal behaviour.

While some schools have gone some way to address aspects of what we want our children to learn, this program is a new direct and structured approach to ensure that our children understand community values, the importance of respecting others, as well as themselves, and the consequences of decisions to partake in criminal activity. The new program is a longer term strategy that complements the immediate work this government is doing to improve safety and security in our schools: work such as the extra \$4 million, commitment to improve the physical security of our schools, introducing new regulations to evict and ban troublemakers from schools, and the establishment of the school care centre

and initiatives. As well, we are putting increased focus on attendance.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: In response to the member for Unley—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order and so are responses to them. The member for Unley full well knows that. He now joins the member for Newland and the member for Schubert as being on notice.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The importance of having our children attend school regularly is highlighted when we consider that children who are truant from school are subjected to all sorts of undesirable influences. The program is being developed in South Australia for delivery to years 6 and 7 students. It will include a series of modules based on issues around assault, harassment, bullying, stealing, malicious damage including shoplifting and graffiti, and crime prevention strategies. Police officers will work in partnership with classroom teachers on the program as part of the police's ongoing work with local schools. The government proudly acknowledges the fine working relationship between my department and the South Australia Police, which provides us with a very good service in helping in our schools and in the education of our children. An information booklet will also be produced for parents so that they can reinforce these messages about community safety at home, as well.

POLICE NUMBERS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Minister for Police. What additional resources will the government provide to recruit extra police officers between now and the end of 2003 in order to address the shortage of police, particularly in rural and regional South Australia? The South Australia Police annual report revealed that police recruitment in 2003 has plummeted from 80 extra staff over and above attrition in 2001 and 156 in 2002 to only seven in 2003 as a result of Labor's first budget. When this was pointed out to the minister, he said it was misleading, deceptive and wrong to use the figures contained in the SAPOL annual report to illustrate the fact that recruitment had plummeted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): Let me make the point that this government is committed to recruiting against attrition. That is government policy, that is what the police commissioner's policy settings are, and the police commissioner is recruiting against attrition. Of course, in any recruitment process, there are lags; a training process is involved; and there are fluctuations. However, we are doing something that the Liberal Party never did in government until its dying days: we are maintaining police numbers. As I said, the Premier will be speaking at the Police Association conference tomorrow. I suggest members opposite wait until then.

STATE BUDGET

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is to the Treasurer. What progress has the government made in meeting its fiscal target?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Members opposite laugh because the easy, lazy thing to do in opposition is simply say, 'Spend, spend, spend. Let's spend money here;

let's spend money there.' The member for Unley, in one of the most bizarre and silly announcements a week or two ago, suggested that we spend \$100 million of SA Water's profits so that we can fix leaky pipes. The deputy leader consistently says, 'Spend, spend, spend.' The lazy thing to do in opposition is simply say, 'Spend.' That is lazy and it is easy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Morphett, for the second time!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The hard work in opposition is to determine how you are going to pay for it. I say this to the media in this state, because this point must be made and will be made by this government: every time members opposite say they want to spend something, they have to tell us what services they are going to cut, what taxes they are going to raise or whether they are going to run budget deficits.

Mr WILLIAMS: I rise on a point of order. The Treasurer is debating something that was not the subject of the question. The point of order is relevance.

The SPEAKER: It is an interesting question in that it is fairly broad in its ambit. Fiscal targets relate to the amount of money that the government proposes be made available. Whatever measures it proposes to enable that to happen the minister may detail. I trust that he will stick to that rather than belt up the opposition.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. That is never my intention. My reason for saying that is a backdrop or a setting for what Access Economics has said, because we get a lot of criticism from members opposite that we are not spending enough money. We are criticised for not spending money here and not spending money there. However, Access Economics has issued a report that highlights the quality of this government's budget management. The report makes it clear that, with respect to financial management, we are the superior political party in this state. We have a government that is resisting the opposition's calls to spend and is making sure that our superior economic and financial credentials are there for all to see. Let us see what Access Economics has said, and it is not noted as being favourable towards Labor governments.

As you would be aware, Mr Speaker, the government has set a target to have zero net borrowings on average across its parliamentary term. Access Economics' most recent state and territory budget monitors notes that South Australia has made good progress towards meeting its target. These are some of the things that Access Economics has said about this government's financial management:

Barring unforeseen economic or policy developments, strong surpluses now seem assured in the forward years. Not only is the government likely to go close to achieving its target of zero net borrowing in the budget sector over the medium-term, the state's balance sheet, as well as its annual budgetary performance, looks set to better those of some of the AAA rated states.

It continues:

South Australia has consistently surprised Access Economics with its strength of late—

and note 'of late'. It says that, sure, it remains sceptical about our long-term future and that the jury is still out, but then it states that its clients should take note that business is now betting its investment dollars on a revival of South Australia's fortunes. It states:

Business is now betting that South Australia is coming of age, and that its economy is finally shaking off the ravages of the 1980s and the first half of the 1990s.

It goes on to state:

South Australia's economy has consistently surprised Access Economics. . . barring unforeseen economic or policy developments—

such as constant calls by members opposite to spend—

the state's finances from a bottom line/balance sheet perspective therefore look set to improve beyond those now evident for the AAA rated states of New South Wales and Western Australia.

That is how good our balance sheet is being reported by Access Economics. However, can I say that that is the hard stuff of government. That is the hard choice of good government. That is about quality government. The lazy, easy thing to do is to say, 'Spend, spend, spend.' I reissue my challenge to the media and to the opposition: whenever a Liberal says that they want to spend, what tax will they increase? What service will they cut, or are they going to blow the budget and send us into deficit?

Mr BRINDAL: I rise under standing order 116. I ask that a matter of fact be corrected before the house. The deputy leader claimed that, last week, I called for the expenditure of \$100 million; I did no such thing. The figures comes from the minister, not me.

The SPEAKER: Under standing order 116, the member invites me to contemplate a proposition not entirely relevant to that, but rather something I would have thought that he could have made by way of a personal explanation to correct the record. I accept the remark he has made in that context, without wanting to waste further time on it.

CRIME

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Police. In the context of an open letter to the people of South Australia, as published in the *Sunday Mail* at the weekend, how does the minister justify his comments to the house last week that the government is 'tough on crime'? In its open letter to the community, the Police Association states the government has—

. . . failed to provide urgently needed extra officers to patrol our streets and investigate crime.

The association asks the question:

How effectively can a police force under constant severe strain serve its community?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I don't think this is the first time the police association during a run-up to an enterprise bargaining agreement has raised issues of police numbers. I suspect the member for Bright would be sitting there thinking, 'Crikey, I can remember the hard time I copped when I was minister for police.'

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: Not like this.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Not like this, no, it was much worse: they had bumper stickers, and they used to come into our electorate offices and leave them on the counter. The member for Bright well knows what happens in these situations. But come on, let's get real: we're tough on crime because we are.

STATE LIBRARY

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is directed to the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts. What is the operating grant for the State Library of South Australia, and has this level of funding increased or decreased under this government?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): I acknowledge the member for Norwood's

ongoing interest (as a former librarian herself) in things to do with libraries. At the opening of the library last week, which was attended by a number of members of this place (including the Premier, who made an excellent speech), we heard Rupert Murdoch, the proprietor of News Limited, make certain remarks in relation to library funding. I was pleased to be there because I have always wanted to meet Rupert Murdoch, an outstanding Australian who has contributed a lot to the world.

As a small boy, I remember hearing his name being bandied around my grandparents' dining room table, because my grandfather worked for *The Daily Mirror* in Sydney and was sacked by Mr Murdoch as he approached the age of 70. So, there were some views about Rupert Murdoch being bandied around my grandparents' table. Mind you, my grandfather was approaching retirement, but he liked doing what he was doing. He was a photo engraver, but I suppose that kind of work was becoming a bit redundant.

Mr Murdoch referred to cutbacks in funding to the library over the last 10 years, so I thought it would be appropriate to have a look through the record at what has happened over that period of time. The first year I could find was 1995-96, when the library operating grant was actually available as a specific figure, and that figure was \$9.699 million. Over the course of the Liberal government, the figure ebbed and flowed: it was \$10.1 million in the following year; then \$10.4 million; \$10.7 million; \$11.5 million; in 2000-01, it was \$10.8 million; and in 2001-02 it dropped to \$9.694 million. In its first budget, the Labor government increased it again to \$10.326 million, and in our second budget we increased that amount by a further half a million to \$10.84 million. So, over the last 10 years funding has increased, and particularly so under the current government.

In addition, the number of full-time equivalent staff was referred to by Mr Murdoch. In 1995-96, the figure was 163. That declined to 122 under the former government in 2000-01, and I am pleased to see that it has increased again to 141-odd under the current government. So, additional resources have been put into the library by this government, and over the last 10 years resources have increased. That does not take into account about \$44 million worth of capital funding which was put into the library and which can be attributed to decisions made by the former government.

POLICE NUMBERS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Does the Minister for Police believe that the open letter to the community from the South Australian Police Association, as published in *The Sunday Mail* at the weekend, is another example of a trade union indulging in 'nothing more than a grab for more union members'? The Police Association's open letter in *The Sunday Mail* lays it down in no uncertain terms when it states:

There are presently not enough police on the streets in South Australia.

Last week, when the Public Service Association stated that there were not enough social workers in FAYS to investigate more than 1 000 cases of reported child abuse last year, the minister in his role as Treasurer said that this was nothing more than a union push for more members.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): It would be fair to say that I have a good relationship with the Police Association; some would say, a better relationship with the Police Association than I have with the public sector

association. I will leave that for others to make that judgement. As I said to the house earlier, on the numbers that I have from briefings, there is something in the order of 300 to 350 more police as at 30 June this year than back in 1997. The opposition can get up and ask these questions, but here again this highlights how lazy this opposition is. 'Spend, spend, spend,' as I have already said, but to get their questions they have to go to the *Sunday Mail*. Normally it is 5AA, or it might be Matt Abraham and David Bevan, but this time they are going to the *Sunday Mail*. Thank goodness we have media in this state that can do a job that the opposition cannot. There is not an original thought in the minds of members opposite. They cannot come up with an original attack point on the government. I reiterate that we have a good working relationship with the Police Association. We do not always agree, and we often disagree, but that is the nature of a good, mature, robust relationship. To repeat again for the benefit of all: we are committed to more resourcing in policing, as we have done since coming to office.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They say we have not. We are building police stations that the members opposite would never build; and we are not even building them in Labor electorates. The Deputy Leader says that we will have a new police station in Victor Harbor. The member for Light is not complaining, or is he complaining about the new police station in his electorate? Is the member for Flinders complaining about a new police station in Port Lincoln, or is the member for Davenport—I think it is his electorate, the Mount Barker Police Station.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: You're only about 20 kilometres out.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Heysen's electorate; I apologise.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, geography was never a strong point of mine at school; and you should have seen what my maths results were like! But I can say this: that we are building the infrastructure to house our officers, to give our police a decent working environment. Over the term of the last government, the condition of the Mount Barker Police Station was appalling. But we are fixing it. We cannot clean up all of the mess of eight years of Liberal government overnight; it is work in progress. With Labor, when it comes to policing, it is work in progress, and more progress than ever occurred under the former Liberal government. Could I just say that members opposite have to stop being a lazy opposition, getting their questions out of the *Sunday Mail*.

The SPEAKER: Order!

There being a disturbance in the Strangers' Gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the member for Colton, can I point out to the house that the question could have been rewritten, or rephrased, in a way which would have made it a question in order. I did not intervene at the time; but members need to know that the chair will not allow questions that are out of order. It is highly disorderly to ask for an opinion or to ask what the minister believes about an opinion that has been expressed in an explicit newspaper advertisement or article. The opposition knows the consequences, as does the Deputy Premier, of asking questions of that nature.

WATER CONSERVATION

Mr CAICA (Colton): My question is to the Minister for Administrative Services. How is the government addressing

the need for community education regarding the ongoing water conservation measures?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Administrative Services): I thank the member for his question. Yesterday, together with minister Hill, I announced a range of permanent conservation measures aimed at reducing our reliance on our river systems generally and the River Murray in particular. Those permanent water conservation measures were in part directed at raising the community's awareness about this whole question of the need for water conservation. We have moved away from the restrictions that were aimed at getting a particular target of water savings because of the reduced flow down the Murray. We are now moving into the phase of actually preventing waste, and of trying to value that water resource.

Those water conservation measures will be advised to households through a mail-out that will be sent to every household in the state within the next few weeks. This information will fully explain the new water conservation measures. You would have seen today that the local press also carried advertisements about those matters. There will also be measures that will allow us to communicate with people from non-English speaking backgrounds in order to ensure that they also are fully aware.

We have been extremely gratified to see that, even with the relatively limited exposure that the current restrictions—which have been in place from July this year—have had, there is something like a 97 per cent awareness in the community of those restrictions and, indeed, a 95 per cent support for them. That is a massive community acceptance of, and response to, what has been an approach to the them to engage in a different set of behaviours around the way in which they use water. We are extremely pleased about that. We believe that the community education campaign and the material that we supply to them will not only document the particular measures that people are required to comply with, but will also give people information about additional steps that they can take to become water-wise, and there will be a diagram in the material put out that will give tips for ways in which people can save water around the home.

POLICE, OPERATION AVATAR

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): My question is to the Minister for Police. Will the minister now allocate to the SA police force's Operation Avatar some of the additional \$450 million of increased tax revenue as shown in the Rann government's budget papers—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not refer to the government by the name of the Premier.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Yes, sir—as shown in the current government's budget papers for this year, where \$450 million of additional taxation revenue will be raised from the South Australian community? Last week, the minister said that the current government was:

... taking on bikie gangs in this state. We are taking on the bikies; we are prepared to knock down their fortresses.

Over the weekend a brawl between rival bikie gangs left two nightclub workers seriously injured. Furniture was wrecked and windows were smashed in what police have described as a well-planned and orchestrated attack. I am advised that a male worker received a broken jaw, a fractured cheekbone and eye socket, as well as a possible broken nose. A female worker also suffered a broken jaw.

The most recent police department annual report refers to the SAPOL motor cycle gang program, Operation Avatar, and it illustrates the success of this program, which was implemented under the former government. I am advised by police that with additional resource funding Operation Avatar could achieve a great deal more in terms of breaking the back of the bikie problem.

The SPEAKER: That is the last time any such explanation will be permitted by the chair.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): There are a couple of points I want to make on this. First, there is not much flexibility from the lazy opposition, getting questions—

The SPEAKER: The minister will not seek to inflame passions from those people sitting opposite.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir—by referring to a paid Police Association advertisement. What next week? Am I going to get questions about lounge chairs out of a LeCornu advertisement or something? I am going to flick through and see what else they can find for me, because that is about the quality of their questions. But on this one, I say this: the budget management of members opposite is what got us into the hole that we were in when we came to office, because the \$450 million surplus to which the member refers is a one-off surplus driven, to a large extent, by the surging property boom and a rise in employment.

I will give members opposite a quick briefing on budget management, because clearly they knew nothing in office and have learnt nothing in opposition. If you want to allocate new recurrent resources, you have to pay every year. If you want to allocate money out of your \$450 million surplus in one year, when you are back to zero in the next year, do you go into deficit, because you do not that have \$450 million surplus year on year? The member for Mawson is obviously so interested in his question that he cannot be bothered listening. This is a very lazy opposition! They are not even listening to my answer. You do not have a year on year surplus of that magnitude. I cannot recall that the police commissioner has not asked me for extra resources for Operation Avatar.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Morphet, for the second time!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is my recollection, and I will correct the record if I am wrong. I have no recollection of the police commissioner asking me for more resources for Operation Avatar. If the police commissioner felt that he was in a squeeze and he needed more resources, I would have thought he would come to me on that matter. We have a well resourced police force. We have a larger police force than we had in 1997 in the middle of the Liberal government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is the truth, as best I can work from my advice.

Mr Brokenshire: There are more police because of the Liberal budgets, and you know it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They have not got over the fact that they are no longer in government. I will say this about the incident on the weekend—and we must be careful what we say, because it is an operational matter, and it is not my role to make significant comment on operational matters, and indeed it may well be before the courts—what happened on Saturday night was terribly unfortunate. As I said to the media last night, one can only assume that that was a blatant attempt by bikie gangs in this state to thumb their noses at parliament. It was clearly a sign that the bikies of this state

believe that they are above the law. Even at a point of great debate about this government's commitment to tougher laws and a crackdown on bikies, they allegedly undertook violence last weekend, in nothing more than a provocation of this house. This government will not be intimidated by bikie gangs in this state. We will bring in the toughest laws that we can to make our streets safer. I look forward to bipartisan opposition support for the package of that legislation as quickly as possible through this house.

HEALTH REBATES

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. What is the latest advice from Mutual Community and Healthscope in relation to the dispute over the level of rebates paid for services in private hospitals operated by Healthscope?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): The dispute between Bupa Health Insurance—or Mutual Community as it is known in South Australia—and Healthscope relates to the level of rebate for services provided at some 25 private hospitals operated by Healthscope in several states and the Northern Territory. Private health insurance is supported by a federal rebate costing taxpayers \$2.5 billion a year, and I wrote to the former federal Minister for Health and Ageing on 26 September 2003 and again to the Hon. Tony Abbott, the new federal Minister for Health and Ageing, on Wednesday 8 October 2003 on this issue. I have been in contact with Mutual Community and Healthscope since this dispute commenced, and I have been pressing both parties to resolve this issue for the sake of their members and patients.

I am pleased that I have been informed today that discussions between Mutual Community and Healthscope have recommenced with regard to the ACHA hospitals (Ashford, Flinders Private and Memorial) and all Healthscope owned hospitals. The parties will work on an arrangement regarding rates and benefits that will give Mutual Community members a realistic option to be treated at ACHA and Healthscope acute hospitals with either affordable gaps or no gaps.

In the interim, the following arrangements will apply for Mutual Community members at ACHA and Healthscope acute hospitals. The removal of up-front payments effective from today and previous no gap contract arrangements will apply effective from today as an interim arrangement only. The parties say that they will now focus on completing discussions and establishing a long-term arrangement as quickly as possible. Both parties have also agreed to make no further public statement on this matter until such time as a new arrangement has been finalised.

POLICE NUMBERS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is again to the Minister for Police. When the latest group of police cadets graduates in December, will this lead to additional extra feet on the ground for SAPOL or will it merely replace those officers who are retiring? The Police Association President, Mr Peter Alexander, has said that in the life of this government there has been no recruitment beyond attrition.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I will get a considered answer on that, but I will say this. The government's policy is clear: we recruit against attrition. I am looking at some numbers which I have been provided by

SAPOL. Between July and December 2002, 86 police officers separated the service and 102 graduates graduated. That is a difference of plus 16—

Mr Brokenshire: From the Liberal budget.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You are not in government, member for Mawson. Can I just say, Mr Speaker, although I know that this may not be to your liking: they are a lazy opposition because the 2002-03 budget was a Labor budget—

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, you ruled that such a remark was inflammatory and he has made it three times since. Either he should respect your authority as chair, or the house should do something about it.

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I do hold the Speaker in very high regard, and I apologise if my frustration with the opposition comes through in that way. The member for Unley is forever on his feet, being a bit of a sook, but if that is the case we will have to live with that. Between January and June 2003, 52 police officers separated and 82 graduated. That is positive 30. That is just a few statistics I have in front of me.

Mr Brokenshire: What about the six months?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not have those figures in front of me but I will get them. I do hope that members opposite are not being critical of the police commissioner, because if the shadow police minister now wishes to be critical of the management of the police force by the commissioner, implicit in his question—

Mr BROKENSHERE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The minister has said that I am critical of the executive of SAPOL. The point of order is that the question and criticism is directed to the minister. I did not talk about the commissioner.

The SPEAKER: This is question time. It is a matter not of criticising anyone but of seeking information. There is no point of order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What I say is that, implicit in questioning the recruitment of SAPOL, it is my understanding—and I am happy if others want another—that it is implied criticism of the way in which the department is managed. The policy of this government is that we recruit against attrition.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the minister simply provide the factual information in response to the explicit inquiry. It is not necessary for him to impute motives to the honourable member asking the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have given some statistics. I do not have every single last figure at my fingertips. I am happy to get that information, but I reiterate that under the Liberals in 1997 there were 350 fewer police than there are today. That is their legacy. We are proud of our record.

SEA RESCUE SQUADRON

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is to Minister for Emergency Services. What are the details of the Sea Rescue Squadron's new craft which the minister launched so well yesterday in my electorate?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services): I was very pleased yesterday formally to name the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron's new craft *The Robert B. Spicer*, after a deceased member of the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron. Mr Spicer, whose family was there, provided enormous service to the community as

a volunteer in a range of areas. *The Robert B. Spicer* is a 7.4 metre Gallant, built locally by Clayton Marine with a 200-horsepower Volvo diesel motor. The trailer was built by Premier Trailers, also a South Australian company well known in the boating industry. The vessel is fitted with state-of-the-art marine electronics, including radar, GPS/plotter, sounder and a range of radio communications, including VHF and UHF command channels.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I can tell the member for West Torrens that there are no fishing rods or crab nets on board! Out of the overall cost of the vessel of \$142 000, the SA government was pleased to provide \$132 000 from the community emergency services fund. The rest was supplied by fundraising efforts of the Sea Rescue Squadron. I can assure the house that this government gave the money. The member for Mawson can be assured that it was not his budget, although he may want to claim this as well. Last year, the Sea Rescue Squadron attended 138 incidents, assisted 286 people to shore from disabled craft and put in almost 2 000 operational hours. The increasing demands on the squadron are demonstrated by rescue boats operating from Adelaide Shores and O'Sullivan Beach and the spread of country flotillas at Edithburgh. This new vessel will allow the transfer of a vessel to Edithburgh and the Copper Coast, and there are plans for Sunset Cove. As a keen fisherman myself, I assure the house there is a great sense of security and assurance knowing that the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron is there. I put on record my gratitude to those volunteers. This is a case of the government supporting those who support the South Australian community.

SCHOOLS, LAW AND ORDER STUDIES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): My question is to the Minister for Police. Given the government's announcement today that it will introduce law and order studies into primary schools, will the minister advise the house whether anyone in his department has assisted in the development of the curriculum, and whether the development process included consultation with educational and law enforcement bodies and those experienced in similar models overseas or interstate?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The question is about a curriculum matter, so I am happy to provide more information to the house. The Commissioner of Police, an assistant commissioner and others were consulted on this curriculum to be introduced next year to years 6 and 7 in our upper primary schools, along with the crime prevention unit and the Department of Human Services. There will be further consultation as the curriculum is developed further. Term 4 will be used to refine the program. Also, there will be parent input on the content of the program. In fact, I was talking to the President of SAASPC this morning and she indicated her group's delight with the program. Quite a lot of consultation will be undertaken this term in preparation for its introduction in the 2004 school year.

WATER RESTRICTIONS

Mrs MAYWALD (Chaffey): Can the Minister for the River Murray please advise the house when he will make public the framework parameters he is using to make decisions regarding the level of water restrictions that are applied to irrigators in South Australia? I note that, today, the

minister has announced that water restrictions have been reduced by a further 10 per cent, which is welcome news. However, since the imposition of water restrictions in South Australia in July this year, the irrigation community has been calling on the minister to provide information regarding the framework that he will use to determine the level at which water restrictions will be set. In July, the minister imposed a 35 per cent cut in allocation based on the likelihood that South Australia would receive less than its minimum entitlement of 1 850 gegalitres. At the time, there was the 70 per cent probability that South Australia would receive 1 700 gegalitres and the active water storage within the basin was at 21 per cent. We have since seen irrigation restrictions—

The SPEAKER: Order! The information is interesting but not relevant for any person to understand the thrust of the question. It is the kind of thing that should be included in debate on the subject rather than in explanation as to the meaning of the question. The chair reminds the house that explanations are not for the purpose of setting out a case that justifies asking the question. They are for the explicit purpose of ensuring that the question is understood. I also remind honourable members that the word 'please' is to beg. No honourable member in this place needs to beg any minister for anything, least of all an answer.

Mrs MAYWALD: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understand that it is not necessary within standing orders to use the word 'please'. However, I spend most of my time outside this house insisting that my daughter use the word 'please' when asking a question, and I wonder whether or not it is against standing orders to use the word 'please'.

The SPEAKER: It is, explicitly, and has been for 300 years.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for the River Murray): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am pleased to answer this question from the member for Chaffey and I thank her for her ongoing interest in this matter, which is obviously of great importance to her community and to the whole of South Australia. As the member said in her explanation, in the middle of this year, the government was put in a position where it had to say to irrigators, 'We cannot deliver to you the full amount of your water allocation. We will have to put a restriction framework in place.' At the beginning of the season we said that we could authorise only 65 per cent of their allocation. As the season proceeded, we said that we would keep monitoring the conditions to see whether or not we could raise that level. Today I have been able to announce a further 10 per cent to bring to 85 per cent the proportion of allocations that irrigators can use this year, so that will benefit many irrigators in South Australia.

The member has asked really about what process we will use to determine what the allocation will be. That is a complex matter, which I will attempt to explain. It involves bringing together a whole range of factors that need to be brought into consideration. Those factors are looked at by a high level task force that has been set up by the government. That task force consists of the chief executives (CEs) of the department of the environment, the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation, the planning department, Treasury, primary industries, and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That's fine; I am happy to keep going. Those CEs consider all the issues and make recommendations, which go to cabinet, and then sign off on them.

That task force takes into account the amount of storage that is in the dams, the amount of rain that we have had in the season, the amount of rain that it is anticipated we will have, the history of rainfall in South Australia and the rest of the catchment, the amount of irrigation that has already occurred, what the weather is likely to be, and how many hot days there are likely to be; and then, using the most prudent and cautious approach, we can work out what the volume should be.

In particular, I can inform the house of three principles that are used to guide decision-making on River Murray allocations; the first of those is predicted water availability to South Australia. This is the Murray Darling Basin Commission's predictions for available water. South Australia has adopted the 90 per cent in-flow conditions when making decisions with respect to allocations. Under this risk profile, South Australia will receive 1 686 gegalitres during this year.

The second principle is predicted water requirements for river maintenance and losses. The predicted water requirements for river maintenance and losses is premised on circumstances expressed in 2002-03 when, for the first time, we were able to complete a generic water balance. Losses last year were in the order of 1 200 to 1 250 gegalitres. This level of loss has been adopted as the predicted water requirements for river maintenance and losses in the 2003-04 year.

The third principle that has been relied upon is the predicted implications of various allocation levels on water quality and water levels in the river below Lock 1 and the Lower Lakes. The impacts of drought on the River Murray in South Australia were first felt, and for a longer period, below Lock 1, as the member for Finnis will no doubt tell you, and particularly in the Lower Lakes. From experience gained during last summer, levels falling below .35 metres AHD cause disruption to irrigation access and cause salinities to rise significantly. Without restrictions, levels could fall well below this level and salinities would be even greater than last irrigation season.

I understand that this is complex and difficult to comprehend in such a statement. I have arranged for officers from my department to conduct a briefing in the parliament (I think on Thursday of this week) for any members who would like to go through those principles and ask questions. We hope to be able to provide as much information as we can about the processes we use—that is, the departmental officers use—to set what the percentage of the allocations would be.

I finish by saying that we will keep monitoring the allocations as the season progresses. There may well be an opportunity to increase the percentage of the allocation available to irrigators further, but there is a maximum percentage. We cannot go beyond 95 per cent of the entitlements, because we have already forgone some of the water through the earlier part of this season. So, there is a potential to go up to 95 per cent. I do not overstate it, because I do not want irrigators to go overboard; however, there is that potential.

SMOKING BANS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Treasurer. Since the introduction of the pokies super tax last year, has the Treasurer given any assurances or undertakings to any member of the Australian Hotels Association regarding the timing of implementation of smoking bans in licensed premises, including gaming rooms?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I have had a number of discussions with the Hotels Association about many matters, and one of the matters of discussion was the very point that the member raises. I assume that many members have said many things, because I am aware of commitments given by people such as the Leader of the Opposition and others. However, this is a—

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I rise on a point of order. If I heard correctly, the Deputy Premier just accused me of giving undertakings that I know nothing about.

The SPEAKER: The chair heard the Deputy Premier. Whilst the leader may have come to that conclusion, I did not, although proceeding in that direction, I thought. However, the Treasurer may wish to respond to the explicit question of the member for Mitchell.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, I was not saying anything other than the fact that the Hotels Association, along with many, is talking with many members of parliament. I have said that I have been advised of certain undertakings given by other members of parliament. However, I am working through a process—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I did, the Leader of the Opposition, absolutely; that is what the AHA has told me. But that is fine; I do not have an issue with that. I am not actually accusing the leader of anything. I am making the point that I will continue to consult with the AHA, as I will with many other interest groups.

COUNTRY THEATRES

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts. Has the minister breached the requirements or intent of the Development Act 1993 and, in particular, sections 33 and 71, by failing to fund adequately the upgrading of safety and disability access to buildings he controls? Has he read the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's circular that requires him to comply? The opposition has a copy of a Department of the Premier and Cabinet directive which specifically requires the minister to 'address safety and access issues in buildings'. The document describes such risks as 'those that may arise from fire, structural failure or unhealthy conditions, while access risks are those that could lead to a complaint under commonwealth disability discrimination legislation'. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet directive further spells out to the minister that 'agencies are also required to develop plans to improve physical access to buildings and facilities, with time lines, under the Promoting Independence: Disability Action Plans for SA policy'. The house has previously been told that the minister has received—

The SPEAKER: Order! That goes way beyond what is necessary to explain what the question means. It is debate.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): I am not entirely sure what the member for Waite is alluding to. He asks a most general question referring to a whole range of circulars and parts of legislation by title.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The minister seeks a further explanation. I have one sentence in which I can provide that. The minister seems to be floundering with his answer, so I ask you to allow me to state the additional part of the explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Waite knows that what the minister seeks to do is respond in a way which

is more general than the initial question. It is about time that both the government and the opposition recognised that standing orders say explicit things about what can and cannot be done during question time and amend the sessional orders to try to enable a more balanced approach to debate, and not do it hypocritically under the provisions as they stand at present in the standing orders. I will allow the member for Waite to state the additional sentence which he sincerely believes will enable the minister to come to a clearer understanding of what he implied but did not explicitly include in the inquiry he made in putting the question.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker. The house has previously been told that the minister has received advice on safety and disability access work as part of the \$7.2 million worth of work needed at the four country theatres but that the minister has only provided \$500 000, a fraction of the \$7.2 million that is needed.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is exactly the point I make to the honourable member. The last phrase was a gratuitous rhetorical statement and it added nothing to the explanation other than that it was part of debate. Hence, the minister's good temper may in prospect—regardless of the fact that it is this minister; any minister's good temper—be abraded by the house allowing such a proposition to be put in explanation of a question to the extent that the minister then feels justified in responding in kind. And so the debate takes off; interjections begin and abuses are exchanged; the house is in uproar; and the people who come here to observe their parliament see us as members representing them behaving like ill-supervised schoolchildren. Hence my point (in the occupancy of the chair) in attempting to get across to members what the chair believes the standing orders intended to avoid. If it is necessary, as I believe it is properly justified, to debate such matters, then let us find a form, through the sessional orders, to test that approach. The minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I will try not to be upbraided, or 'downbraided', or any other kind of 'braided'—abraded! The member asked the question really about the country theatres. He has asked this question several times. That is no doubt why he asked it in this peculiar form that he asked it today. The reality is that the government has put a considerable resource into fixing the problems that exist in those four theatres: I think from memory it was around half a million dollars over this current budget. I am advised that that will address urgent Occupational Health and Safety issues that are of concern in those theatres. The member has asked me that question again. I will refer it for a more detailed answer if he would like me to do that. If he has a particular issue he should come directly to the question, rather than go through the nonsense that he went through in that question.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Adelaide Festival Centre—Report 2002-03

Adelaide Festival Corporation—Report 2002-03

South Australian Film Corporation—Report 2002-03

State Opera of South Australia—Report 2002-03.

CHILD PROTECTION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: On Saturday, the Premier announced the government would commit an additional \$2.1 million per annum to employ and train additional workers in the Family and Youth Services. This funding will be ongoing and will provide a permanent increase to our capacity to provide child protection services and assist children who are under the guardianship of the minister.

The Layton Report disclosed a child protection system that had been neglected for many years and was in need of a major overhaul. In the state budget this year the government committed an extra \$58.6 million over the next four years to target specific child protection measures. An additional \$1.5 million was subsequently allocated to create additional positions in Family and Youth Services. We know from the Layton Child Protection Review that it is important that tier 2 cases, where a child is at high risk of abuse, are adequately investigated.

We also know that action is required to ensure that young people under the custody or guardianship of the minister receive an annual report and that they have proper case plans and proper medical and psychological assessments. These are the areas that require long-term systematic improvements. Those systematic improvements will be developed as part of the major workload analysis that Family and Youth Services is conducting, with the assistance of consultants and treasury officials.

Funding of \$2.1 million will provide immediate and sustainable outcomes for children whilst long-term planning takes place. The money will fund approximately 35 full-time equivalent positions in a full year and will strengthen the FAYS capacity to:

- investigate high-risk cases within time frames that meet the needs of the child; and
- provide the necessary care to children who are under the custody or guardianship of the minister.

The priority use for this funding will be to ensure that children and young people under the guardianship of the minister are allocated a social worker and that they will receive timely assessments and have established case plans.

On coming to government, we moved urgently to identify this issue of child protection as a priority and have had it thoroughly investigated by Robyn Layton. We have made substantial budgetary commitments for long-term reforms. We have acted to put in additional resources to FAYS to ensure that some of our most vulnerable young people receive the attention they need. The government has no intention of ignoring the issues of child protection. We intend to reform the child protection system and ensure that there are long-term improvements for children and young people.

WATER CONSERVATION

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Administrative Services): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: From 26 October this year permanent water conservation measures will be in place in South Australia. These will replace the water restrictions which have been in place since July this year. These measures

mark a shift from short-term responses to the drought to a policy of conserving our valuable water resources on an ongoing basis. These are simple, commonsense measures which target waste. We have simplified these measures after considering community feedback on the water restrictions. As is currently the case, there will be a permit system to ensure that people in unusual circumstances are not unfairly disadvantaged. The permits that have already been issued under the current restrictions will remain valid until 25 November to allow SA Water time to contact the existing permit holders and automatically issue a new permit if one is still required.

The new water conservation measures are as follows:

- private gardens, recreational areas, sports grounds and nurseries can only be watered by hand using a hand-held hose, bucket or watering can or by using a drip feed irrigation system, or by using a sprinkler system after 5 p.m. and before 10 a.m. or, during daylight saving, after 6 p.m. and before 10 a.m.;
- hosing down of paved areas will not be permitted unless doing so protects public health, ensures the safety of people using the area, protects the health and welfare of animals using the area, or deals with a fire, accident or other emergency;
- cleaning vehicles must be done using a bucket or watering can filled directly from a tap or by using a high-pressure low-volume water cleaner, or by using a hose fitted with a trigger nozzle;
- commercial car washes or an automatic washing system that recycles water are also acceptable options;
- boat motors—and I am sure that the member for Colton would be interested in this—may be flushed or rinsed after use; and
- at construction sites, water is not to be used to control dust or other pollutants from building works unless a hand-held hose with a trigger nozzle is used, or water is applied directly from a motor vehicle designed specifically to carry and deposit water.

Anyone in breach of these measures will be issued with a warning notice, and continued non-compliance will result in a \$315 expiation notice. Serious and ongoing breaches could result in court action and fines of up to \$5 000 for individuals or \$10 000 for corporations.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

HEALTH EXPENDITURE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Last week the Auditor-General's Report was tabled in this parliament. The Auditor-General's report allows us to look at exactly what the facts are, as opposed to the fiction or the media spin that might be put on by the government in terms of their areas of expenditure. So, we should look at exactly what the facts are when it comes to the Department of Human Services and particularly in terms of health expenditure. I want to touch now on the recurrent expenditure for the Department of Human Services, which is overwhelmingly in the health area, because most of that expenditure goes on our hospitals and other health areas.

The Auditor-General's Report shows that, compared to the previous year, the increase in funding was 0.78 per cent—that is, a less one per cent increase. Of course, this is funding over the entire year, taking into account salary increases and other

increases imposed by inflation. It shows that we have an increase in expenditure of less than 1 per cent when we have inflation officially running at 5 per cent during the same period here in South Australia, and we have had wage increases of 5 per cent or more, particularly for nurses and doctors during that period. That means that we have had an effective cut of 5 per cent in services across the health and other family and community welfare areas. It is a clear explanation as to why there is an increase in waiting times for elective surgery in this state, why we have had longer waits in emergency departments for people who have been admitted to hospital, why we have had longer waits in emergency departments to actually get into a hospital, and why we have had increased pressure on the doctors and nurses within our hospitals.

It is interesting to use the Auditor-General's figures in relation to the increase in funding from the federal government. In the same 12-month period—that is, 2002–03—we see that, while the state government increased its expenditure by less than 1 per cent, the federal government expenditure in South Australia on the same areas has increased by 6.4 per cent, more than eight times more in percentage terms than that of the state government. In fact, if we look at the very specific line of the Australian Health Care Agreement, which is the major portion of the federal funding, we see that expenditure in this area increased by \$41 million, which is a 7.3 per cent increase in funding.

Incidentally, I highlight how small the increase in funding was of the state government. In a total budget of \$1 454 million, it increased expenditure by a mere \$11.3 million, whereas the federal government, in a total expenditure of the \$978 million, increased spending by \$59 million. Of course, that is substantially more in dollar terms and much more—eight times more—in terms of a percentage increase. If you look at even the increase in the Australian Health Care Agreement allocation, you see that the increase in funding there has been \$41 million, which is much more than the total increase in funding of the state government of \$11.3 million, which, of course, had to cover not only health but Family and Community Services, disabilities and ageing.

So, it is ironic and very embarrassing for the state government that, whilst it has been criticising the federal government for so-called cuts in funding, the federal government has increased expenditure by a massive amount, while the state government has increased expenditure by less than 1 per cent. I also draw comparison with what the Liberal government spent in its last full year budget—\$146 million or a 11.3 per cent increase.

Time expired.

SIEV-X

Ms BREUER (Giles): Yesterday, I attended a very moving service at the Whyalla foreshore in memory of 353 people who died at sea two years ago. Many people attended. There were prayers from the Muslim, Buddhist and Christian communities. Everyone there was touched, and many had tears for those lost souls. Two years ago a 19.5 by 4 metre wooden fishing boat—a very dilapidated, overloaded fishing boat—sailed from the Sumatran port of Lampung. This passenger load on the boat was initially 420 people. Later, 23 people disembarked at an island, leaving 397 people on board. At about 3.10 on Friday 19 October 2001, the boat sank. Its location was about 60 nautical miles south of

Indonesia on its way to Christmas Island, and it was within Australia's border protection surveillance zone. Of those people who survived—initially there were about 120 in the water—the final rescue, after 20 hours, saw only 44 survivors. Of those dead—the 353 people who died—there were 146 children, 142 women and 65 men. Yesterday at our service, we had six minutes silence. We had 353 seconds of silence for those poor dead, lost souls.

This was the sinking of the *SIEV-X* boat that sank two years ago on 19 October (*SIEV* is government jargon for suspected illegal entry vessel, and *X* is for an unknown vessel). How much Australian authorities knew about that incident is certainly a matter of controversy. At the time, the media, by and large, failed to ask the key question: how could an overloaded boat leave Indonesia and sink unnoticed during the most intense land, sea and air surveillance operation ever undertaken by the Australian Navy? Soon after, the Prime Minister John Howard declared that it had sunk in Indonesian waters and, while it was a terrible tragedy, it was not Australia's concern.

In the last week, much has been said about Bali. There have been many memorials and many services in relation to Bali, and we have seen many comments and many photos, with the Prime Minister included. Of course, we need to pay tribute to those poor souls who died in the Bali explosion. But in the last week, I have not seen one mention by the Prime Minister of the 353 people who lost their lives on the *SIEV-X*.

A senate committee began an investigation into the incident after questions were raised by the former ambassador to Cambodia, Tony Kevin. Thirteen days of hearings and 1 500 pages of testimony began to unravel withheld information from senior government and navy personnel. The federal government had something to hide. The senate inquiry was originally set up to investigate the government's misuse of Navy photos, upon which it based its claims that children had been thrown from an asylum seekers' boat on 8 October. The committee's terms of reference were widened by government committee members, who were confident that, if it could not prove the children were thrown overboard on 8 October, it could prove that such incidents had occurred on other occasions. This allowed Kevin to present his concerns about the sinking of the *SIEV-X*. Kevin pieced together the available information and hypothesised that the Australian authorities knew about the boat but decided to look the other way.

Many questions have yet to be satisfactorily answered about the sinking of *SIEV-X*. Is there a relationship between the sinking of this and the Australia's people smuggling disruption program that was operating in Indonesia at the time the vessel foundered? This question was raised by Senator John Faulkner in the Senate. Other questions include: why is it that the Royal Australian Air Force surveillance map of the day when the *SIEV-X* survivors were rescued by passing fishing boats does not show a rescue boat within 27 nautical miles of the rescue coordinates, when it appears that the RAAF Orion flew directly over the survivors as they were being plucked from the water? Why is Australia still cruelly punishing the *SIEV-X* survivors and their families living in Australia? When will the Australian government respond to the Senate motion moved by John Faulkner calling for a comprehensive independent judicial inquiry into the people smuggling disruption program in Indonesia and the circumstances of the sinking of the *SIEV-X*?

The government has systematically tried to ensure that these people are not personalised but that they be left as numbers, as figures. However, they were ordinary people.

They were mothers and fathers and there were many babies. A survivor's account says:

We heard so much about Australia, that Australians are not racist, that they are humanitarian, so we wanted to come, because we suffered from racism in Iran, children up to 15 years of age could not read or write because they were not permitted into schools. I have relatives in Australia, they used to tell me that Australians are great, tolerant people, Australians are not racist and they have freedom, for this reason, we wanted to come to Australia in particular, we were deprived of freedom in our own countries.

These people lost their lives trying to come to Australia, for that freedom which we are still denying these people, even the survivors from that dreadful event.

POLICE NUMBERS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It was an unprecedented event on the weekend when the Police Association put a full page advertisement in *The Sunday Mail*, the second in only a few months. The Police Association is a very professional association. Not only does it have the responsibility and care for those members it represents but, broader than that, the Police Association of Australia, ably led by the President, Mr Peter Alexander, actually has a genuine interest in law and order and community safety. For 18 months now I have been in this house saying to this government that it has to get fair dinkum when it comes to delivering extra police officers in South Australia. We have heard the rhetoric through and through.

The facts are not as indicated in the rhetoric from the minister last week, when he said that Labor was tough and Liberals were soft on crime. We all know that that is not true, and you only have to look at the records of previous Liberal governments to see that. I would say that we have a Labor government which is tough on police. Why is it tough on police? Because all it does is deliver rhetoric. It is not listening to what the Police Association is saying and it is not listening to what the opposition has been saying on behalf of the South Australian community. We need more police, because, for a start, crime prevention programs were cut. By whom did the government expect that to be picked up? They expected that to be picked up by the police.

In relation to the unfortunate circumstances around sexual abuse in South Australia, more resourcing is required by police. But what happens? There is no additional resourcing. What is the only thing police can do? Pull the officers from general patrols, that is, pull them off the beat where they are needed to respond to the South Australian community, and this therefore has a negative impact on police resources.

I am very pleased and happy to show the police minister at any time he wants information that I noted when I was police minister. At the end of the term of the Liberal government, there was a real increase of approximately 7 per cent in police numbers. That was on the back of a lot of other initiatives that we took, such as taking police away from transporting prisoners to courthouses and operating speed cameras. We freed up police and increased civilian numbers. When we had done that and fixed the State Bank mess—and this Treasurer forgets to say that this state was on its knees when Labor left office last time—we then grew the police; and for three successive budgets out of the four in which I was involved as police minister we had consecutive growth budgets one after the other. We grew the police numbers; the facts are there.

It is disappointing that in this house, in the media and in the public arena the police minister has decided to try to tell

what strictly is a furphy when he says that there are more police in South Australia now under a Labor government than there were under the previous Liberal government. The fact is that we have those additional police as a result of their being funded and going through the academy when the Liberal government delivered those record budgets. The other fact is that, at this stage, this Labor government has no forward estimates funding for additional police. The number of police will increase because this government cannot continue to manage the pressure that the opposition, the Police Association and the South Australian community are putting on it.

If we keep that pressure up, sooner rather than later we will see some additional police resources. However, in the meantime, we have a government which I believe has badly neglected the most important needs of the South Australian police department, that is, numbers on the beat. They can talk about building police stations and information technology, but we did all that as well. They are things that the community expects you to do when you are in government and, what is more, we paid for the police stations that we built. They were not privatised as this Labor government is proposing. What we really need and what the Police Association is calling for—and I have tabled a petition with 4 000 signatures in this respect—is extra police.

We do not want more rhetoric, or smoke and mirrors by the police minister: we want delivery of extra police. Why? Because they are needed and because this government now has the budget to deliver extra police numbers because of our good economic management—and we fixed Labor's mess. It also has received \$450 million extra in tax revenue this year from the hip pocket of South Australian families. That is a massive increase in taxation revenue, yet this government is not delivering one extra police officer—although it can find \$1.8 million more for an extra minister. It is a shame that the government is not listening.

GOLDEN GROVE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): Today I ask the Tea Tree Gully council to establish a residents action group to work through issues in relation to water management in the Tea Tree Gully council. The amenity of the Golden Grove development is very important to the residents, but they also know—as indeed we all know—that we must be much more water smart. I am suggesting to the council that the residents are willing and able to assist progress the issues in relation to water management. At their last council meeting, the council addressed a number of issues in relation to the use of water and passed a motion, in part, relating to the maintenance of parks and gardens in our area. They have also identified some targets for a reduction of water use. Indeed, they relate to passive reserves such as roadside verges and median strips with a target of a 30 per cent reduction; a 20 per cent reduction on medium level profile passive reserves such as neighbourhood parks; high level profile passive reserves such as Civic Park; a 10 per cent target for roadside areas, verges and median strips on arterial roads; and, for active reserves such as high level sporting ovals, a 10 per cent reduction.

The council will also work through and determine the classifications of each of those facilities. I think a residents group would be able to work with the council both to identify the priority areas and to determine the best possible way to reduce water consumption while, at the same time, ensuring that the essential character and amenity of Golden Grove is

maintained. In 2001, there was a great deal of controversy in the Golden Grove area when the parks and gardens deteriorated quite substantially. It was an area of some public concern. Much of the media covered issues relating to residents expressing their concern and frustration. We saw trees, shrubs and even hearty old rose bushes dying simply because the taps were turned off. The council will not try that trick again: residents simply will not cop that.

However, that is in the past, and it is time to put that antagonism to rest and to work with the community. The way to go is by setting up a consultation group, a community group. Residents were willing to work with the council in the past and I am sure they still are. Consultation is not making a decision and then convincing everyone you are right: it is about talking with and listening to residents before the decision is made. In that way, you have them on board and willing to accept the decisions that are made. If they are actively involved in the choices, they will accept them. It is vital, I believe, that local residents be given this opportunity to decide on the priorities for their area. Each of us knows that we do have to make changes in the way in which we use our household water. All I am suggesting is that residents deserve to have a say on what those changes are and how they will be handled.

This is something that is essential to our community. I have offered to provide any assistance the council may need in facilitating and assisting a local residents group. As I said, my office is available and we are more than willing to be involved. I have discussed this matter both orally and in writing with the council to let them know of our willingness to assist in developing a proposal to identify areas in which water can be saved but which will not cause concern to residents or a deterioration in the very lovely amenity in Golden Grove. I must say that no-one has a greater interest or investment in that area than the residents of Golden Grove.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I rise today to put before the house what I consider to be a most serious matter which arises from the Auditor-General's report and which also was highlighted in an article by Mr Greg Kelton of *The Advertiser*. I refer to page 76, paragraph 7.4.3.1 of the Auditor-General's Report, which states:

Many of the services or activities conducted by public sector agencies are by force of legislation. These priorities are established by parliament and it is necessary for agencies to fully understand and fulfil their legislative responsibilities. There will be, in my opinion, little discretion available for agencies in some matters, and as a consequence there may be limited opportunities for cost savings.

The auditor then goes on to point out that this budget, which this parliament has voted through, is basically predicated on a number of assumptions, some of which indicate the necessity for cost savings. As I understand the Auditor-General, in his report he is putting a caveat on the ability of this government's budget to realise the targets that this parliament approved its realising. I think that is a very serious matter. Sir, I know you would be particularly interested in the section, which is headed, 'Parliament and the Statutes'. At page 8, the report states:

Whatever parliament mandates by statute is the policy of the state and any administrative practice and/or policy that is not in accordance with the statutory requirements is unlawful. This is recognised as one of the fundamental principles of the common law.

The Auditor-General cites *Wilkinson v Osborne* 1915. Indeed, sir, I have heard you talk many times about this. He

goes on to say that it is the job of public sector agencies to maintain a continuous review of operational policies and administrative practices to ensure that the tendency of the operation of such policies and practices do not directly or indirectly defeat a statutory requirement. At page 9 he goes on to say:

The legality and regularity of all administrative practices/policies of government must be based on lawful authority. This is simply one aspect of the rule of law in its application to executive government.

Again, he cites Chief Justice Murray Gleeson in the High Court of Australia in the Boyer Lectures 'The Rule of Law and the Constitution' at page 5. I raise these matters because it is not yet the will of this house that the Auditor-General appear before it, but we are scheduled to examine ministers on aspects of his report. There can be no more worrying aspect of his report than the allegation that some of the budget may not hold up because there are legal requirements which may not be met within the amounts of money on which this government has voted. I ask this house to consider, whether or not as a statutory officer, the first thing we should do is examine carefully the Auditor-General before this place.

I do not think it is good enough to make broad sweeping statements of this nature without this house being informed of the specifics. If the budget is not well framed or if the amount of money appropriated by this parliament to do the job which the executive government says needs to be done, according to the money applied to it, or if it in any way breaches the law, it is an absolute requirement of every member of this place to check that statement to try to ascertain as clearly as possible whether this is an efficacious budget, whether this budget will hold up, or whether this parliament by the executive government may have been sold a pup. I do not impugn improper motive to the executive government; neither do I impugn improper motive to the Auditor-General. But I say that the Auditor-General is at clear variance with the Treasurer of South Australia, and this house has a perfect right to ask the Auditor-General to come before it to explain quite specifically his comments.

Time expired.

NATIONAL COMPETITION COUNCIL

Mr RAU (Enfield): I rise today to impart to the chamber some very good news. The good news is that around Australia people are finally starting to wake up to the evil of the National Competition Council. This good news has come by virtue of an article that appeared in the weekend edition of the *Financial Review*. I commend this article to anyone who is interested in this subject—and all should be. It is on page 6 of the weekend edition. It appears that now no lesser figures than Premier Beattie of Queensland and Premier Carr of New South Wales have joined the increasing chorus of those for whom commonsense does appear to be something natural; and who have decided that the National Competition Council and its bizarre meanderings through the constitutional rights of the states has gone too far and it is time they pulled their heads in. The article states:

Queensland Premier Peter Beattie has launched a broadside against the National Competition Council and refused to bow to the regulator's demands on electricity pricing, and deregulation of the taxi and bottle shop industries. The stand against the NCC echoes New South Wales Premier Bob Carr's rejection of demands to remove regulations on everything from chicken farmers to medical professionals. The regulator's planned withdrawal of \$150 million in funding to Queensland was simply a tax on the state, Mr Beattie said.

How right he is! This sort of thing is happening in this state all the time. Whether it is chicken meat, the Barley Board, dried fruits or petroleum, the National Competition Council pokes its big nose into what is the constitutional province of the states. They start telling the states what to do, and they use blackmail in the form of a threat to withdraw money unless the states fall down on bended knee and doff their cap. Well, enough is enough. It is about time that all the states, not just New South Wales and Queensland—although I am very pleased to see their getting onto this fine crusade—said that enough is enough.

The important thing to remember is that this process of review by the National Competition Council basically observes a pattern whereby state legislation is scrutinised by some academic in Canberra. The academic subjects the state legislation to a test that goes something like this: your legislation is presumed to be evil unless you prove beyond reasonable doubt that it is not. Recently, I have been reading a book about Joseph Stalin, and I do not believe he had arrangements quite that severe operating in his country, even in the 1930s. We all seem to sit back here meekly copping it. No-one seems to mind it. Occasionally someone mutters here and there and occasionally there is a bit of guffaw here and there when one of these other silly proposals is put up through this place, but the time has come—or hopefully has come—where everyone can see that this thing has gone way too far.

Because of their fiscal positions, at least the premiers of New South Wales and Queensland are able to tell the commonwealth where to go. Unfortunately, we are in a far less powerful position than they are. But Geoff Gallop, Premier of Western Australia, who had the National Competition Council leaning on him and telling him what to do with shopping hours, told the National Competition Council what they could do with their recommendations. Good on him! He has been threatened with a \$41 million fine for having the temerity to say, 'I'm the Premier of Western Australia, not you. I will make decisions with my parliament about what goes on in Western Australia, not you.' And for that he will be fined \$41 million. This is outrageous. It is happening now and it will continue, I fear, because there are things, as I have said, such as the Barley Board—and God knows what we are going to be doing with chickens and dried fruit and petroleum, and goodness knows what else.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: Cemeteries.

Mr RAU: There is something else: cemeteries, for goodness sake. The important thing we need to remember is that, at the end of the day, as this article points out, the federal Treasurer Peter Costello makes the final decision. I say to Peter Costello: 'Mr Costello, it is about time you decided that commonsense would prevail over the orthodoxy that seems to be running your economic agenda. The states are crying out, "Enough is enough." Mr Costello, don't fall for this any more. Stand up and say that you will not do it again.'

ROSE TERRACE LODGE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation. Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Several weeks ago I raised in this house issues about supported residential facilities. During questions and debate at the time, I gave a list of facilities that were closing, about to close or had closed. The list, I might add, was supplied to me by the Supported Residential Facilities Association. One of those facilities was Rose Terrace Lodge. The proprietors of Rose Terrace Lodge have been in touch with me to ensure me they are not intending to close at this stage. They have no intention of closing. They are taking up with their own association the matter of how such inaccurate information was provided. But I have raised this matter in the house, and I therefore apologise for any incorrect information that was given. It was done inadvertently as it was information supplied to me by the association, and I wish Rose Terrace Lodge all the best for the future. We can assure its residents and their families that it has no intention of closing.

Mr MEIER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING (LOTTERY INSPECTORS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 October. Page 368.)

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): The opposition supports the bill for a few reasons, and I will put them on the public record. By way of background, I advise that Charities for SA is a representative association of a variety of charity and not-for-profit lottery fundraisers. It recently advised the government that, since the introduction of gaming machines, community fundraising sales of instant lottery tickets have fallen from 2.2 million to only 0.2 million per annum. As a result, it has requested, as I understand it, that the current legislation concerning instant break-open tickets, in particular, be revised in pursuit of a more profitable industry. The opposition supports this.

As all members travel around their electorates, they see the organisations that work so hard selling lottery tickets and bingo tickets, fundraising ventures that were quite successful for their organisations, whether they be retired persons' organisations or surf life saving clubs. The dilemma for surf life saving clubs as a result of the introduction of gaming machines is that they are now in a desperate financial situation. I trust that the government will listen to the calls of surf life saving clubs, the opposition and the community to look at some of the additional revenue that has been pulled in through gaming—it increased again this year—to assist organisations like surf life saving.

This legislation will not be of great benefit to the surf life saving movement. However, I acknowledge that it will be of significant benefit to many other organisations. They have been limited by restrictions on the maximum pool price of \$1 000, and I understand that the government has agreed to amend the regulations to remove the restrictive and cost prohibitive ticket approval processes and to raise the maximum prize pool to \$5 000. In a very bipartisan sense, we support the government on this and congratulate the government on listening to these organisations, which are all not-for-profit organisations. They are doing it hard, anyway, to try to make our community better. For them to experience such an impact simply is not satisfactory.

The broader concern, though, which is relevant to this bill, is that here is another example of small volunteer organisations that are the backbone of the social fabric of South Australia trying to do their level best, in a climate that sees a huge—and it is huge—\$450 million increase in taxation revenue, as spoken about in this parliament today. That is budgeted not on growth but on increases in taxes and charges, which I understood would not occur under the Labor government. Clearly it is occurring, and we have seen other examples of it, too.

For instance, in the small business sector, husband and wife electricians, who have everything in order for the Australian Taxation Office, instead of paying \$350 in costs to license that electrical business, have now been hit by this government and the fee has doubled to about \$900. That is just one example of the taxes and charges that have been increased, and a list of them that is probably longer than could be printed on one page of a tabloid was put through the *Gazette* at the end of June or early July.

It is one thing to support these South Australian charities, and I hope that they have some success in their instant lottery tickets from the point of view of fundraising and that they see some increases there. However, the government's priorities could differ from what they are today and, contrary to what the Treasurer warns about wanting to spend, spend, spend, there is some money there. It is interesting that he talks like that because, if I or my staff had time to look through *Hansard*, we would find members opposite advocating similar initiatives to what we are putting forward when they were in opposition. The difference then was that a massive amount of interest was funding the State Bank and the other debt problems that were passed on to us when we came into office.

It is a different scenario altogether now. Employment has been high for some time, and I hope that continues. A lot of infrastructure has already been put in place, although a lot more is required in a big state geographically such as South Australia. Debt levels have come down from 19 per cent of gross state product when we came into office, which was the highest debt level in South Australia's history, to about 5.6 per cent of gross state product being interest on debt. In real terms, it is the lowest debt. For the Treasurer to carry on in the way he does flies in the face of what is happening in the community and what is happening with the state budget, and that is where I argue there is a difference. We do not argue that the government should spend at all costs. We have never argued that: we have always been responsible. The Liberal Party in this state and nationally is a good economic manager, but there must be a balance.

It is not appropriate for a government to rip a heap of money out of the community, as we have seen in the first two budgets of this Labor government, at a time when the economy is growing and there is other growth naturally, such as with stamp duty. I read in the paper that \$100 million more has been collected in stamp duty this year than was budgeted. That is not a bad windfall on top of \$450 million of extra state taxes and charges this year.

We must not forget, of course, that the GST is now starting to have a better and positive impact on the states. I think that almost \$200 million of additional money is starting to flow through. So, off the top of my head, if you add all that up, probably something like \$700 million of additional revenue is coming to the government this year. Therefore, I appeal to the government to put some of that money into supporting these charitable organisations that are volunteers

looking after a large slice of South Australia's interests. If they were not doing so, where would we be in this state, because the government would be required to do so much more?

In supporting this bill as the shadow minister for gambling, having had the privilege of setting up this portfolio, whilst I see its benefits and initiatives I appeal to everybody in the community to be very careful about what they do in relation to gambling. I think most people can manage these lottery tickets quite well, and I have not seen much evidence of these sorts of tickets causing grief to families and communities, although I stand to be corrected if, indeed, anyone has any such evidence. When most people buy these tickets, I think that they have budgeted their few dollars for them, and if they get a win that is a bonus, over and above their helping the charities.

However, I appeal to the broader South Australian community to be careful about what they do in relation to gambling matters generally and to ensure that, if they are to have some recreational enjoyment from any gambling product (including this one, now that the threshold has been lifted to \$5 000), they do not get carried away and start to see money that they do not have as a surplus in their family budget starting to work against food and clothing and those sorts of essentials that the community needs in South Australia.

I note that a strong regulatory approach will continue by the government of the day to ensure probity and consumer protection in all forms of gambling, so I will not go into that at the committee stage. That is in order to guard the public against manufacturing abuses in instant lottery tickets, and I realise that it is necessary that regulators have adequate powers to investigate complaints. So, the inspector's side of this issue is also required.

Clearly, with any gambling product there need to be checks and balances to see that people who are licensed, or regulated to sell a product, are being assessed to ensure that, through inspection, they are working within the requirements of the legislative framework. I do not have any problem with that either, and I understand where the minister is coming from. It is not a very detailed bill, but it is an important one to assist these not-for-profit charities. Therefore, I advise that the opposition supports this bill.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Gambling): I thank the honourable member for his contribution and his support for the bill. I also join with him in noting that, while this measure seeks to relax certain elements of the regulation around certain lotteries, it could not be said to increase alarmingly the range of gambling opportunities available to people in a way that could tend to exacerbate problem gambling. With that wise caution that the honourable member placed upon the measure, I thank him for his contribution and commend the bill to the house.

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

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 October. Page 462.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): I rise to indicate the Liberal opposition's support for the passage of this bill, which was originally introduced by the Attorney-General on 28 May

2003 but was not progressed at the end of the last session. It was then reintroduced in the same form in another place. The first part of the bill makes minor amendments to 65 existing acts of the parliament. None of these amendments are controversial. They derive from decisions of parliamentary counsel rather than policy decisions of government. Most of the amendments relate to the headings in legislation, and some convert existing numbering to the standard and style now used in all new acts. The opposition commends this continual process of making our acts of parliament easier to read, as we have done previously in relation to the use of Latin when, as I recall, the Attorney-General was reluctant to see that art pass.

However, the second part of this bill repeals a number of acts, four of which relate to financial agreements that no longer have any practical relevance. They are the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Act 1945, the Commonwealth and State Housing Supplemental Agreement Act 1954, the Homes Acts 1941, and the Loans for Water Conservation Act 1948. The Native Industries Encouragement Act 1872 is repealed. This interesting measure was designed to facilitate the protection and encouragement of South Australian industry at a time when, as all students of Australian history know, there was a great debate between the protection state of Victoria and the free trade state of New South Wales.

The Hon. Robert Lawson, of another place, informs me that material that was gathered at fairly short notice does not indicate whether any—or, if so, what—financial support was granted under the Native Industries Encouragement Act 1872. However, it is worth noting that, with reference to the *Wakefield Companion to South Australian History*, published by Wakefield Press in 2001, in this state, until relatively recent times, the manufacturing industry played a minor part in our economy.

Under the heading 'Industrialisation', it is stated that by World War I manufacturing was still on a relatively small scale and contributed proportionately less to state employment than was the case in Victoria and New South Wales or, indeed, to the Australian average. It was largely restricted to a few industrial categories: the processing of rural products and the like. It was not until the late 1930s (largely coinciding with the premiership of Sir Thomas Playford) that rapid industrialisation transformed the state. Notwithstanding that interesting aside, it is clear that the Native Industries Encouragement Act has served its purpose and now ought to be repealed.

Finally, the act repeals the White Phosphorous Matches Prohibition Act 1915. The repeal of that act is entirely appropriate, as it is now a matter that is covered by other legislation, namely, the Trade Standards Act of 1979 and the Dangerous Substances Act of that same year. We indicate, therefore, our support for the second reading of this bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I move:

That the house do now adjourn.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today I wish to report briefly on my attendance at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference in Dhaka, Bangladesh. I know, Mr Speaker,

that you found this conference an enriching experience, as I certainly did. The conference was attended by 48 commonwealth countries and over 550 delegates. I was fortunate to attend not only as a delegate representing this parliament but also as a member of the executive (one of three representing Australia out of 35 members) because the Hon. Lorraine Braham, MLA, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly in the Northern Territory, was not able to attend. So, I joined Senator John Watson and Ms Kerrie Tucker, MLA from the Australian Capital Territory.

This conference was one of the most enriching that I have attended in my 10 years in this parliament, and I thank members for giving me this opportunity. I learnt a lot from being with members of parliament of the commonwealth and, from being a member of the executive and attending the workshops that were arranged, I believe I gained a perspective which will be of great benefit to me not only as a member but also as an individual in understanding the problems that face us globally.

I would like to thank the CPA organisers in Dhaka for their hospitality, especially the Speaker, Jamiruddin Sircar and other members of the parliament who made us feel most welcome. As I said, the hospitality of these people was wonderful. They were very helpful, and they went out of their way to make us feel welcome. I would also like to thank the students who were assigned to the members of parliament, and especially those who were assigned to the Australian delegates. They looked after us and provided us with valuable information and made us feel at home.

The opposition did not participate in the conference, and I think that was a drawback. Mr Speaker, I agree with your comments (as reported in *The New Nation*) about the opposition Awami League not attending. I agree with you that it was a pity, because it is important in any democracy that we have a government and an opposition, and the opposition has to be part of the game.

The security of the hotel and the efforts to which the police went to protect us were commendable. As I said, the students (specially Naveed Ahmed Choudhury, who looked after me and the other Australians) should be commended, because they are great ambassadors for their country. Bangladesh is a poor country, but it is rich in culture, history and tradition, and there is an abundance of warmth from its people. I know I have left many friends behind. Statistics show that it is a poor country, but it is developing, and since 1971 when it gained its independence from Pakistan it has made great progress.

This country is 88 per cent Muslim, but it is a multicultural and a multi-faith country. The stereotypes that people sometimes have about countries such as Bangladesh I believe are unfounded. There is no question that there is poverty (the GDP per person is low), and there is a lot that can happen before this country can be developed, but we saw things that gave us much hope. I was fortunate to attend a Hindu festival, which was attended by Muslim members of parliament, and we heard from members of parliament speeches about multiculturalism which gave us much hope.

When the conference finished, on two occasions, I visited the UCEP school for the underprivileged. I was most impressed by this school. I saw 45 students in a classroom, all eager to learn. The attendance rate was 97 per cent, so they must be doing something right. I was heartened to know that this school follows its students to the point where they gain employment; and, indeed, when they go overseas they keep in touch with them. This school is funded by overseas aid. I

found it a very enriching experience to see the eagerness of these students to learn. As I said to them, we in Australia also have problems. Our students might not have difficulties with getting basic nutrition and what they need to attend school, but some students, although rich, are poor in spirit.

How do we deal with disinclined students—those who do not want to attend school? There is a lesson to be learnt from this. We have to be flexible—as indeed they are—because when they started at that school, and they dealt with just literacy and numeracy, the attendance rate was not good and they did not have the cooperation of parents. However, with shifts of three hours, combined with the work they are doing and cooperation with parents, the attendance rate has grown to 97 per cent. Perhaps we will have to incorporate more meaningful courses for students, because we, too, have problems. Just because we are supposedly developed does not mean that we cannot learn from programs such as this.

As I said earlier, I agree that it was a pity that the opposition did not attend and play their part. Opposition leader, Sheikh Hasina of the Awami League, did not attend the conference. The opposition boycotted the conference, and I think that is a real pity. Democracy is no different from cricket, for which Bangladesh is famous. You must have a party in government that bats and an opposition that bowls but, if the opposition refuses to field or to bowl, you cannot

play cricket. That is how I explained it to my colleagues in Bangladesh, and they understood that the opposition is simply not playing cricket.

Members of parliament should travel. I have found this an enriching experience. We can learn from meeting other members of parliament. Doctors have to meet with doctors, lawyers have to meet with lawyers, teachers have to meet with teachers and politicians should meet with other politicians, not only within Australia, and not only in Europe, but throughout the world. We can all learn from each other. As a country with a small population, Australians will never be able to protect ourselves against terrorism unless we make bridges—human bridges—and link with the developing world.

I can tell the house that Australians have a good reputation overseas. They are well-respected. To maintain that respect, we must meet with them. We have got to be out there, and I certainly found myself overwhelmed by the hospitality I received. I have certainly learnt from this opportunity that you, as members of parliament, have given me to represent you.

Time expired.

Motion carried.

At 4.23 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 21 October at 2 p.m.