

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 27 November 2003

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I move:

That this house recognises the Public Works Committee's important role in ensuring parliamentary accountability of executive government in the development and delivery of major capital works proposals and therefore opposes any move to:

- (a) increase the current \$4 million project value criterion that necessitates mandatory referral to the committee; or
- (b) remove or limit the discretionary power of the committee to require the referral of certain public works to the committee.

This motion is very straightforward. All it does is ask the parliament to leave the powers the committee currently has with the committee. I have heard all sorts of discussions on this matter about delays and so on. As you would know, sir, the Public Works Committee does not delay the process: it usually works within the process and does not cause delay.

I cannot speak for the committee per se, but I know that members of that committee have made various public comments, so I will generalise. I believe the government's decision to attempt to amend the act to increase the referral threshold can be traced back originally to the Fahey Report. I believe the Public Works Committee is highly critical of that report, because it was an executive government task force reviewing legitimate activities of the parliament, which, as you would know, sir, is a quite separate activity.

The task force research relied on incorrect hearsay, and the committee was not contacted for comment. It assumed that cost is the only measurement of a project's importance. On that basis, the North Terrace redevelopment would not have been a matter of interest to the parliament. The task force recommendation was to achieve improved efficiency in the capital works process. However, it ignored entirely the areas within government policy control which cause major delays, and the fact that the aim of parliamentary oversight is accountability, not efficiency.

As we know, the recommendations of the Economic Development Committee endorsed the Fahey recommendations without examining the basis upon which they were formed, and I discussed this with the minister a few moments ago. Again, the Public Works Committee was not approached for comment in relation to the alleged 'problems' the recommendations were designed to fix. So, in a day and time of accountable government, I cannot understand how the EDB report comes out with a recommendation to lift the accountability from \$4 million to \$10 million to avoid that extra scrutiny. I was very curious and bemused as to why the EDB would make the recommendation and, secondly, as to why the government would adopt it. We are all very strong on open and accountable government and then we see an action like this.

The proposed increase in the threshold would eliminate almost 60 per cent of the proposed projects included in the government's 2003-04 capital works budget that would otherwise have been referred to the Public Works Committee. Of the remainder, it is not known how many would be eliminated by an amendment that increased the referral threshold to \$10 million of state government funds.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: That is right. They would be presented in, say, two projects to avoid that. Capital works are also provided through private and public partnerships (PPPs) in partnership with the federal and state governments, with private venture capital input and support from charitable organisations such as the McDermott-McGuinness Foundation.

The committee has no way of knowing to what extent the remaining 40 per cent of the capital projects would be excluded from parliamentary scrutiny because of the funding method chosen. The committee has just learnt of a Crown opinion that DAIS charges should be excluded from the cost of a project when deciding whether it needs to be referred to the committee. That is a strange move indeed. It is not known, at this stage, whether that opinion extends to other components of the project cost, but it means that the referral threshold now applies only to projects with a cost in excess of \$4 million. Therefore, the new threshold would be in excess of \$10 million, thereby excluding more projects from scrutiny.

The amendment is contrary to the spirit of the act. When the Public Works Committee was re-formed back in 1994, the minister's second reading explanation stated that the lack of parliamentary scrutiny of significant government projects was 'a major deficiency in the parliamentary committee structure'. The Labor Party supported the bill. The committee is aware of a further suggestion before the government that would exclude certain categories of projects (such as schools) from scrutiny. So, the plot thickens. It makes you wonder whether we should continue to have a public works committee. Again, this would diminish the number of projects automatically referred to the Public Works Committee.

An increase in the referral threshold to reflect increases in the CPI would only change it to about \$5 million from the \$4 million and not the proposed \$10 million. Even if the government decided to leave the self-referral in this act, but then left the \$10 million there, the powers of the committee would be substantially diminished because the government—particularly the executive government—could say, 'Well, we don't need to take any notice of you; the project will continue,' and the Public Works Committee might as well not investigate because the project will go ahead anyway. The government could say, 'Well, this project is under \$10 million. We do not care what you have to say about this because, by the rules, it is a project under \$10 million.' So, even though we could give ourselves a self-referral, it would not matter in the least, because it would just happen.

There is another matter which has come to hand very recently. I think it would be very inappropriate for this parliament to have less scrutiny on projects than, say, the cabinet. If this were to pass and the \$10 million threshold came in, I do not believe the cabinet would adopt that; it would probably still leave the ceiling at \$4 million or \$5 million. In other words, the cabinet would have much more scrutiny of itself than would the parliament. I do not believe that is correct or advisable.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The minister might know more than I do. I would certainly like to get the minister's interjection on the record, if it was there.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr VENNING: As I have said, the rules of the parliament should at least match those of, say, cabinet in relation to scrutiny.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: There is no guarantee of that at all, and it would be wrong if it was the other way around. I do not want to speak for too long, because the positions are quite clear. The two party rooms have met on this matter. I believe that the Labor Party has had its discussion and made a decision and I know that we have. I would have liked to vote today but, for the sake of the discussion we had a few moments ago, I am happy that it waits until next week.

Since joining the Public Works Committee, I have to say that I really have enjoyed the work. I can see that this is an arm of government that not only works but is essential. Some silly things occur and someone has to be responsible and accountable. As you know, sir, as the previous chair, this committee is an essential arm of parliament. This is not the time to muffle it, to restrict it or to downgrade its importance. This is the time to back it and leave in place the criteria of, first, referring any project in excess of \$4 million and, secondly, the power of the committee to self-refer.

I believe that the committee is operating extremely well. There has been very little delay. Projects come to the committee, they are discussed at the very next meeting and it is passed at the following meeting. There has not been any more than one week from receiving the submission, holding the hearing, preparing the findings and presenting the report to parliament. There is no delay and there is no backlog, so I congratulate the committee. The government has a majority, the committee works extremely well and we get on pretty well as a team. Having had experience on another committee, I am very pleased to be a member of this committee and I pay tribute to the chair, the member for Colton, and to the member for Norwood, the member for West Torrens and the member for Unley.

Mr Hanna: The member for Mitchell?

Mr VENNING: No, the member for Mitchell hasn't had a guernsey yet on the Public Works Committee. However, when the member for Colton is elevated to the ministry very shortly, I am sure that the member for Mitchell will appreciate filling that vacancy. So, that is on the record. This is a very serious motion and I urge the support of members for this. I know that a lot of government members have sympathy for this motion. All it seeks is the status quo. We are putting it on the record so parliament can tell the government that we want it left the way it is, because we know that bills will be introduced, possibly next year, to try to implement these changes. We are going to say, 'No way, leave it the way it is.'

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development): I am happy to put on the record the reason that I oppose this motion. It is quite simple. I am on public record as supporting 70 of the 71 recommendations that came to cabinet as part of 'A Framework for Economic Development in South Australia'. This recommendation is quite clear. However, it is obvious that the first speaker does not understand it because, in speaking to the motion, it is clear that he does not understand the total content of recommendation 21.

The far more important issue is that I would like the opposition to put on the record where it stands on all 71 recommendations. I am looking for that and the community is looking for it. I know that John Bastian, Maurice Crotti, Carolyn Hewson, Scott Hicks, Fiona Roche and David Simmons would all like to know. Importantly, the business community needs to know. One of the undertakings that was made in a bipartisan way at the end of the summit

was that, in 12 months, everyone would report on what progress they had made. If we have an incremental attacking of the recommendations over that 12-month period, we will not be acting in the spirit of the bipartisan pledge.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable minister will need to keep the focus of his remarks relevant to the motion before the house, not to the deliberations of the economic summit and its recommendations in any other respect than the particular instance where it apparently touches upon the matter before the house at present, as moved by the member for Schubert.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: My apologies, Mr Speaker. Obviously I have not linked as well as I should have this recommendation to the broad sweep, because I do not see this as a stand-alone recommendation. I see this as part of the package, and that is the important thing. A theme runs through the whole report, and I believe that this is consistent with the other elements. So, to try to erode some bits of it erodes the fundamental platform. To that end, I need to express a view about the 71 recommendations as much as recommendation 21. I look forward to hearing why this one does not fit as part of this debate and, therefore, what other areas of the platform there is an intention to erode.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I was interested to hear what the minister had to say. On the surface, this motion appears to have considerable merit, because at face value it appears that the government is trying to decrease accountability. One hopes that is not the case, but one always needs to be vigilant with executive government because, after a while, it tends to take the position that mummy knows best and mummy knows all.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: It could be daddy, but mummy or daddy. I am not convinced that the current arrangements are grossly deficient and I do not want to see this measure killed off in a hurry. I would like to see some negotiation behind the scenes with the government so that the objectives of the member for Schubert and others, including me, namely, full accountability and efficiency in terms of the expenditure of taxpayers' money, are met. At this stage, I indicate that I have considerable sympathy for the member for Schubert's motion. I heard what the minister said, but I think there is room to make some progress to reach a common meeting point.

I will not support any measure that diminishes the accountability of executive government for capital projects. I know that people are keen to have development accelerated, but the democratic process is always slower, more time consuming and more costly than authoritarian regimes. If you want things done in a hurry you get the guy with the little moustache; he was very quick. So was Idi, and Saddam was probably even quicker. If you want a democratic process, if you want accountability—as with the legal system—it grinds slowly. At times it might annoy us, especially business people, but we live in a democracy and part of that democratic process of accountability is that things are looked at properly and the people are informed and know what is happening to their money—governments do not have any money of their own; it belongs to the taxpayer.

I would argue that to have a parliamentary committee such as the Public Works Committee examining projects might take a bit longer, even though that has not been demonstrated. In the long run it helps reduce the likelihood of mistakes, given that we are dealing with projects running into the millions of dollars. I have considerable sympathy for this

motion, and I trust that in the very near future the government will deal with the issues raised by the member for Schubert in a way that does not diminish accountability in regard to the spending of taxpayers' money.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise to support this motion. I am pleased to hear that the member for Fisher is also concerned about the reduction in accountability that the government is moving toward if it has its way and increases the level of scrutiny of public works by the Public Works Committee from \$4 million to \$10 million. I have been in this parliament for nearly 10 years, and I do not believe that there have been very many projects—I can remember a couple—that have been held up inordinately because of scrutiny by the Public Works Committee, regardless of their size. This government was elected on a platform of openness and accountability, and this move to increase the size of projects to be scrutinised by the Public Works Committee from \$4 million to \$10 million defies what the government said when it was elected to government.

Surely the parliament has the right to scrutinise a \$4 million project (which is a substantial size) to ensure that proper procedure has been followed, that there is a public tendering process, and that the public is satisfied with the project. That is what we are here to do; that is the process that we are here to carry out. I commend the member for Schubert for bringing this motion because when the government moved to raise the project value from \$4 million to \$10 million, I thought, without any doubt at all, that it was a step backward in accountability and openness. It flies very strongly in the face of what this government promised the people of South Australia when it went to the election in 2002. The minister for trade—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Well, I would question that. I think the minister for trade has completely missed the point when he argues for one recommendation out of 71 or 72, because I remember that, in his first four years in this parliament, he was very strong on accountability and openness of the parliament. It would now seem that the tide has turned and that, in fact, he is quite happy for the public not to have access to projects valued at less than \$10 million. I will keep my comments brief. I strongly support the member for Schubert's motion. I think this is a grossly backward step by the government to close off the ability for scrutiny of public works and that it flies in the face of their promise prior to the last election.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I rise to support the member for Schubert's motion.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Really!

Mr WILLIAMS: The Attorney seems to be surprised. This is an important motion, one which I think every member of this house should earnestly consider supporting. Unfortunately, many of us (when we come to this place) forget what we are here for. We have been given the trust of the people of South Australia to represent them and their interests. By and large, most of us have handed the obligation that we have to the people of South Australia to the executive arm of government. We sit here or in our electorate offices doing very good work for our electors, but many of us fail to understand what is going on behind the closed doors of the cabinet room with regard to the decision-making process of executive government and therefore fail to be accountable to the people who put us here.

I think the committees of the house perform one of the most important functions that we can carry out on behalf of the people of South Australia. As previous speakers have said, this government would like the community to think that it is honest, open and accountable, but the reality is that this government is very long on rhetoric and very short on action. It is extremely long on rhetoric, but it never puts into action any of that rhetoric.

I will refer in a moment to what the minister said about the framework for economic development and recommendation 21, in particular. What the minister failed to tell the house is that that is exactly what it is: a framework for economic development. The minister knows full well that he and the government have done nothing to progress that framework to develop the strategic plan that we were promised. The minister knows this. What is the point of having 70-odd recommendations if they sit on a shelf in his office gathering dust? Because that is all that has happened to these recommendations over the past 12 months. Every member of this place, and the community, knows that.

So, I think it is a bit rich for the minister to come in here and talk about how wonderful the framework for economic development is, how important it is for South Australia and how sacrosanct those recommendations should be, because the minister knows that he has done nothing toward developing the strategic plan, which is the meat on the bones of that particular document. There is no meat on the bones; it is a dust-gathering document.

Regarding recommendation 21, I can understand any government being concerned about red tape and whether a parliamentary committee such as the Public Works Committee is holding up projects or frustrating developers, whether in the public or private sector. The reality is that that has not been the case. I had the good fortune to serve with you, sir, on the Public Works Committee in the 49th parliament and, as you well know, that committee was very busy.

Mr Caica: It still is.

Mr WILLIAMS: The member opposite says that it still is. The committee might be very busy, but it is busy doing nothing at the moment because the government is not bringing projects forward. The honourable member, who was not here in the last parliament, might be interested to note that the Public Works Committee considered a new project on virtually a weekly basis and that it sometimes took two or three projects on board every week.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And the member for Hammond did a marvellous job.

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes he did, as did the other members of the committee. They worked hard and diligently to ensure that the committee did not hold up projects. If there was any hold-up in the process to bring a project to fruition, it was not at the hands of the Public Works Committee. Over that four-year period, the members of the Public Works Committee went out of their way to ensure that they did not frustrate any agency or contractor involved in public works in South Australia. I am proud that I was a member of that committee and I am very proud that we were able to achieve that goal.

You will recall, sir, that, of its own volition, that committee, because of its very busy workload, said that it would treat minor projects of a lower cost differently and try to streamline them even more. We took it upon ourselves (after receiving and perusing the relevant paperwork) almost to give automatic approval to projects valued at up to \$6 million if we thought that we did not need to bring in the agency

involved or the proponents of the project to give evidence. So, we decided to undertake that process.

According to my memory, even though we made that decision to streamline the process we never in fact did so, because we were able to keep up. Even though we were considering numerous projects on a weekly basis, we were able to keep up, and we did not frustrate agencies and proponents of projects. So, for the minister or any other member of the government to argue that the Public Works Committee is a source of frustration is a nonsense. It certainly was not in the 49th parliament, and it certainly could not be in the 50th parliament, because it literally has not had any projects presented to it other than those which were started by the previous government. My understanding is that virtually no new projects initiated by this government have been brought before the Public Works Committee.

Mr Meier: It's unbelievable.

Mr WILLIAMS: As the member for Goyder says, it is unbelievable, and it is a disgrace. What has happened to capital works? Under previous Labor governments the capital infrastructure of this state fell into disrepair, but I will not go into that because that is a completely different debate.

It is my understanding, as the member for Schubert pointed out, that the government has every intention of bringing a bill to the house to do what the member for Schubert suspects, and that is to curb the powers and the process of accountability that the Public Works Committee carries out on behalf of all of us. I think it will be disgraceful if the government brings that sort of measure before this house to try to curtail one of the committees whose essential role is to protect all of us from executive government.

Mr Caica: It struggled under your government.

Mr WILLIAMS: For the member for Colton's benefit, I was just about to say that there were a number of projects that came before the Public Works Committee when you and I served on it, sir, in regard to which the Public Works Committee I think did the executive government a great favour by pointing out some of the failures that it was heading towards and some things which it had obviously overlooked. These were things which were of great import and, indeed, came to be of great import. So, the Public Works Committee protects all of us in our roles as representatives of the public of South Australia from the executive arm of government. If members of the government honestly believe that they do not need to be protected from what happens behind closed cabinet doors, they are kidding themselves. I assure them that there are plenty of things happening that they need to be protected from, and over the next few years those things will come to light and they will be severely embarrassed. I commend the member for Schubert for bringing this matter to the attention of the house in this form so that, hopefully, we can cut off at the pass, so to speak, this outrageous move by the government to muzzle the Public Works Committee and be anything but open and accountable.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The SPEAKER: I put the question. Those of that opinion say 'aye', and to the contrary 'no'. I believe the noes have it.

Honourable members: Divide!

The SPEAKER: A division is required. The honourable members who called 'divide' should recognise that they will have to vote with the ayes. Ring the bells.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The motion to adjourn was lost on the voices.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes.

The SPEAKER: No other speaker rose and the motion was then put. I called in favour of the motion's passing, because it was my judgment that the voices in favour were greater than the voices against.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: On the adjournment, or the substantive motion?

The SPEAKER: The substantive motion has passed. I called in favour of passing the motion. I called that the noes have it, that is, that the motion would fail. Honourable members on my right called 'divide' (which means they want to test the numbers) and, by calling 'divide', they must vote in favour of the motion.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Sir, my understanding is that you put the adjournment motion.

The SPEAKER: I did.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Your call was that the motion to adjourn was lost, which was accepted by both sides of the house, and then you put the substantive motion.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and said that the motion was lost.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, you called that the member for Schubert's motion was carried—

The SPEAKER: Sorry, that is correct.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—and that the ayes had prevailed.

The SPEAKER: I said the noes prevailed and left it to the member for Schubert, if he was unhappy with the loss of the motion—or any other member of the house—to call a division.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Then the member for Schubert called 'divide.'

The SPEAKER: No, my recollection is that the member for Torrens, the member for Giles and you called 'divide'. I will resolve the matter in the following fashion. The motion is in the possession of the house. I put the motion. Those in favour say 'aye', and those against say 'no'. I believe the ayes have it.

An honourable member: Divide!

The SPEAKER: A division is required. Ring the bells.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (21)

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Brindal, M. K. | Brown, D. C. |
| Buckby, M. R. | Chapman, V. A. |
| Evans, I. F. | Goldsworthy, R. M. |
| Gunn, G. M. | Hall, J. L. |
| Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J. | Hanna, K. |
| Kotz, D. C. | Matthew, W. A. |
| Maywald, K. A. | McFetridge, D. |
| Meier, E. J. | Penfold, E. M. |
| Redmond, I. M. | Scalzi, G. |
| Such, R. B. | Venning, I. H. (teller) |
| Williams, M. R. | |

NOES (20)

| | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| Atkinson, M. J. | Bedford, F. E. |
| Breuer, L. R. | Caica, P. |
| Ciccarello, V. | Conlon, P. F. |
| Geraghty, R. K. (teller) | Hill, J. D. |
| Key, S. W. | Koutsantonis, T. |
| Lomax-Smith, J. D. | McEwen, R. J. |
| O'Brien, M. F. | Rankine, J. M. |
| Rann, M. D. | Snelling, J. J. |
| Stevens, L. | Thompson, M. G. |
| Weatherill, J. W. | Wright, M. J. |

PAIR(S)

Kerin, R. G. Foley, K. O.
 Brokenshire, R. L. White, P. L.

Majority of 1 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The SPEAKER: Whilst I am on my feet, so that members will understand my own position on the matter, in spite of the fact that it has passed, had it been a hung vote my support would have been for the ayes, not just because of my former involvement in the Public Works Committee during the last parliament but more especially because of the substance of the compact for good government to which both the member for Schubert and the member for Light referred in the course of their remarks. I may have overlooked noticing that other members who contributed may have mentioned that point as well.

It is especially important in this context to recognise that there is no necessity for the Public Works Committee to extend the time that it may take to examine a matter beyond a few seconds, should it resolve to pass approval and recommend a public work without formal examination of it. However, in my judgment there are too many public servants whose job specifics ought to require them to demonstrate competence in discount cash flow technology and the ability to make appropriate assessments of economic projects for which they are grossly incompetent and totally ignorant. It is about time their job specifications were rewritten in a way that requires them to be able to make such judgments.

Any member of the general public attempting to run a business which has a budget of even a fraction of the size of some government departments would fail miserably within weeks had they not access to or understanding of such skills as I have just referred to. The Public Service is about 50 years behind the private sector. It is about time that it caught up. That is where the problem is. Governments need to address that as a matter of urgency. Moreover, the Public Works Committee needs to retain the measure of rigour that has been introduced to the approach that is taken in assessing whether or not a public work is in the public interest and determining whether or not the dollars, once applied to one public work, are being applied to a public work that exceeds all other public works to which they might be applied by the extent to which it generates benefits that are demonstrable on the bottom line financially.

Just because members, or even people in the wider community, wish to say that it is a good idea does not make it so. Just because such people as there may be in the parliament, the Public Service or the public at large want something to be so does not make it so. Anyone who believes that to be true, namely that if people say it is a good thing, are really people who ought to belong to the Flat Earth Society. That is about as ancient as the concept is. My final remark is this: \$4 million or \$10 million is not of itself an objective line to be drawn in the sand, but there has to be one. To my mind, too many attempts have been made in the past to break public works up into components that are less than the total amount required at the threshold requiring their scrutiny by the Public Works Committee of the parliament and, by that deceit and that device, government agencies and/or ministers aiding and abetting them have attempted to avoid the scrutiny of the Public Works Committee for the benefit of the public's knowledge about how their taxes are being applied.

To that extent, then, the Economic Development Board, rather than seeking to avoid the inefficiencies of wasted money that occur through the incompetence of the people in the Public Service who do not understand the concept and have to hire expensive assistance from other sources and take inordinate amounts of time to prepare the case to be submitted, is no reason for that case to not be submitted. Such savings can be made within the Public Service by requiring those people who have responsibility for such recommendations to be competent to make the decision about them in the first instance.

PHILIP SATCHELL: RETIREMENT

Ms BREUER (Giles): I move:

That this house congratulates and thanks Mr Philip Satchell for his 43 years of outstanding service to the South Australian public and wishes him well in his retirement from the ABC.

Some years ago I was driving on one of my frequent long trips north and, as usual, was tuned into the ABC, and I heard a discussion on whether cornflour is actually corn or wheat flour. The discussion continued for some time, and many listeners phoned in with various points to make and information to give. The dulcet tones of the program's host managed to keep the discussion going on for almost an hour. As I listened to what must have been one of the most boring topics of all time, I realised that Mr Philip Satchell had this incredible ability to hold your attention, turn trivia into entertainment and make you listen. It was at that time that I realised the magic of Philip Satchell. His pompous, pedantic, toffy voice was wonderful, and I loved it, along with thousands of other listeners in South Australia.

Philip Satchell, the doyen of Adelaide radio for more than 40 years, announced his retirement and ended his full-time involvement with the ABC on Thursday 18 September 2003. On announcing on air his intention to retire, Phillip said that a recent bout of sickness—from which he had made a full recovery—had given him time to contemplate his future. He said that some years ago he had set himself a goal of working into the turn-of-the-century, into 2000-01, but when the evening program became available he decided to give it a go for one year as a challenge. He had previously been involved in both morning and afternoon programs at various times, and we all remember those programs. His one year drifted into two, and he decided it was the right time to give himself time, some freedom and flexibility, a time for his dreams outside a full-time working life.

Phillip had spent his working life at the ABC. The early years were spent in Sydney and Port Moresby before he moved to Adelaide. Career accolades that he received included the award of a Churchill Fellowship, a Member of the Order of Australia for services to radio, the Archbishop of Adelaide's Media Citation for outstanding contribution to broadcasting, and last year the inaugural South Australian Law Society's Colquhoun Award for best feature story on radio or TV. Phillip said on air that he had had a most fortunate life, at work and home, and paid tribute to the support of his first wife Anne and their three sons. Phillip remarked that his recent marriage to Cecily was another wonderful turning point, which made the prospect of the freedom of a new lifestyle very attractive.

Despite his shyness and nervousness at the beginning of his radio career, Phillip said that he had always known he wanted, and was going, to be a broadcaster, and he spent a lifetime doing so. He believed that if radio was going to work

for you as a career it had to be an obsession, especially if you were going to make the grade and last the distance—and it certainly was for Philip. Philip came to Adelaide with a sense of mission to make ABC local radio relevant to South Australians and not just a fill-in between programs from Sydney. He said that, when he arrived from Sydney, Adelaide was a very quiet town, but he believed it came alive during the 1970s, and he came to love this sunburnt state immensely.

In his final program, Phillip also acknowledged the invaluable work of his team of producers and station managers over the past 43 years, and said that he could not have done so many wonderful hours of broadcasting without the considerable assistance of his colleagues. Above all, he would miss the contact and the relationships that had been built up between him and so many of his listeners, many of whom he had never met. I think this is an important point about Philip—his relationship with his listeners. He was the one who often made you squirm, but you could not resist him. One of the most moving presentations that I heard from him was his broadcast from Whyalla of the memorial service for the victims of the Whyalla Airlines crash. At a very difficult time for us, we appreciated him for his sensitivity to the emotions of our city at that time. Philip is an expert at handling these situations and is remembered for this on many other occasions.

During his last broadcast he received messages from many other journalists who obviously respected him and, in many cases, appreciated his assistance to them when starting out and over the years. One was from Nicole Haak from 5AAA. I was recently interviewed by her, and I was impressed by her method of interviewing and her appreciation of the issue. This was Phillip's style, and I believe that many of our current journalists could also learn from him. He was never aggressive, never rude, never confrontationalist, but listened, questioned intelligently, and got far more out of you than the wham-bam, shock-jock insulting approach that many seem to believe is necessary. We will miss him for this. Only Andrew Denton on the ABC in his recent program showed an ability to match Philip in drawing out his guests and getting to their real feelings.

I listened to Phillip's last program, again travelling between Adelaide and Whyalla, for I spent many hours travelling with Philip on these trips. He kept me company many nights and days. It was very much like the lady who rang up and said that she went to bed with Philip every night. There are many South Australians who did the same or who, like me, travelled with him. I smiled at the comments from one of his final guests that the medical profession in South Australia breathed a collective sigh of relief that he would finally have to start paying for his medical advice and not pick it up on his program. Philip's obsession with his bodily functions is well-known, and has always been a highlight of his programs. In fact, my son—also of fan of Phillip—and I, on a number of occasions, rang each other to say, 'Philip is on about his prostate again.' However, he certainly taught South Australians and, in particular, male South Australians, that it is acceptable to talk about these things and be aware of our health.

I was interested to hear the range of people who paid tribute to Philip on his retirement, including my predecessor, the Hon. Frank Blevins, who said that he was a very powerful political force in South Australia, and when Philip disagreed with something, the government looked at it again, and he kept them on their toes. My warmest congratulations go to Philip Satchell on his retirement and my best wishes for the

future, and I am sure that I am joined by all members from this parliament in thanking Philip for his outstanding contribution to radio in this state.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise in support of this motion by the member for Giles and confirm the words that she has spoken. I go back to when I first came home to the family farm and, of course, had the transistor radio stuffed down the front of a greatcoat or inside my shirt, and listened to Philip Satchell. Let me get it right: in those days when you were going north-south with a transistor radio it worked perfectly well, but when you were going east-west it did not work quite so well. But I can assure you that Philip Satchell has cultivated, sown and harvested many thousands of acres with me over that period of time—in 20 years of farming at Wasleys—and he was always a pleasure to listen to. As the member for Giles has said, his ability to draw out of those people he interviewed, sometimes what they did not expect to let out, was extremely good.

I also remember very strongly the pregnant pauses that often came along with Philip, when you were sitting listening to the radio and there was nothing there and you were thinking, 'Well, Philip; are you going to say something? What's happening?' Then eventually he would come in with some wry comment or a bit of humour or the next probing question. I know that the member for Giles is exactly right in saying that his attitude to those people he had on his program was one of respect. It was not one of, 'Let's see if we can break them down and bash them around the ears.' It was a matter of, 'We have some listeners here who are going to be interested in what this person has to say—let's see if we can get the maximum amount of information out of them so that it is interesting to the listeners, rather than trying to browbeat these people into submission or making them look a fool.' I think that was part of the popularity of Philip Satchell's radio program, and I am quite sure one of the reasons why he stayed with the ABC and survived in radio for some 43 years.

I trust that Philip has a very long and a very enjoyable retirement. He can retire being quite assured that he has entertained many, many millions of people across the state over that period of 43 years and also provided the public with a level of information that they would not otherwise have achieved had it not been for the way that Philip interviewed those people who were on his program. So, I say, 'Congratulations on an excellent job.' We will all miss Philip on radio, and on behalf of the Liberal Party, I wish him all the best in retirement.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise very briefly to support this motion, because it would be remiss of me as a country person not to rise in my place and pay tribute to Philip Satchell. Those who live in the country, particularly those who drive their cars or their tractors—as the member for Light just said—for hours and hours, we sit there and listen. It certainly whiles the time away because it is very interesting and, as the member for Light just said, often it is not what Philip said but what he did not say that was more to the point, and certainly the pregnant silence was used very effectively. I listened to the final show and I felt it was riveting.

When the people who came on the program over many years, and paid the glowing tributes, it gave one goosebumps. Philip only has to open his mouth; the voice is so familiar to us all, over many years in radio. We might not always agree with some of the strong lines and passionate positions that Philip took but, generally, I think we would all say that he

was pretty fair. I do not know what his politics are; I do not think anybody would try and guess. I would probably class him as a swinger; it does not matter. As a commentator, entertainer, and a South Australian, I think he has done a very good job. I do question why he retired right now. I thought he might have gone into semi-retirement and done one or two days a week, but I am sure that we have not heard the last of Philip Satchel, because I think he has a lot more to give.

I think a person like that should never retire; just stand back from the front desk and operate from the back one. I thank this gentleman, on behalf of all South Australians, particularly country South Australians and all those who are home-bound and cannot get out, for the hours he has given them, not only as entertainment but stimulating their thoughts and giving them a good insight into politics from the position he comes from, as a lay person. I think it has been fantastic, and I certainly wish him a long and eventful retirement. I hope it is not the last we have heard of Philip Satchel on the airways here in South Australia. I certainly support the motion.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I have known Philip Satchel, as have most people in this chamber, probably at least since they were elected, as somebody with whom you get to work with on occasions. Certainly, in the 14 years I have been in this place I think Philip occupied nearly every slot that was on the ABC dial. He has had morning programs, I think he has had afternoon programs, he has had late morning programs, and he ended up in the evening program. He became in his own career almost a legend, and people always talk about Philip Satchel, especially journalists, because he was a journalist of a particular mark and calibre.

There are some people who would say, very unkindly, that Philip's famous pauses were in fact his brain catching up with his tongue, because he did not know what to say next. I always found that those pauses were a lethal trap, especially for politicians, because when you are on air and somebody asks you a question, and then there is a dead silence, the person who is supposed to be responding to a question or is supposed to be talking, starts to panic and thinks, 'I am supposed to say something,' and often then rushes in and says something that they had no intention of saying just to fill the gap.

I think that Philip was an absolute master of getting people to say more than they ever intended to say, simply by shutting up and leaving the airwaves silent. I often found, not that I have ever been known to be reticent, or accused of being reticent—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Hartley kindly calls me a very shy person, but I think that just shows that the member for Hartley is a very poor judge of character, in some respects, with deference to the member for Hartley. The point with Philip Satchel was that he was a craftsman in his field. He was a great wordsmith, and he was a person who, as I was saying, in the many interviews that he conducted with me, made you feel so comfortable that you just started talking like you would to a friend or a family member, and you did find yourself, not betraying your own confidences, but saying things more frankly and more openly and more honestly than you are perhaps inclined to in a much more formalised situation of question/answer, like you get with some of the political journalists around this place.

I think that ability of Philip's was a very great ability and one that I think endeared him to generations of listeners on

the ABC radio. It is perhaps something that in our more modern world, our more contemporary world, is a lesson that does not pass from communication. Communication is not always about who did what and who said what. It is often about human beings and the reactions between human beings, and I sometimes think that this place could be better understood, if people sought to understand that it is an institution, and it does have its rules, and it is important that all those rules are kept and treasured and obeyed. But it is also an institution based on the interaction of human beings, for all their foibles, with all their strengths, and with all their weaknesses

If you look at this place, it is an excellent microcosm of South Australia. There are highly educated people in here. There are less educated people here. There are people who chat so loudly on the phone that you can hardly hear yourself speak. There are people who are sincere. There are people who are less sincere. There are teachers. There are policemen. There are people like yourself, sir, who come from many different experiences in life; horticulturalists, as you were, amongst other things. I see the member for Norwood here; she was a librarian. The member for Giles was a teacher, a lecturer at TAFE. And I do not know what some of the other members did, but that is good. We are a multiplicity of people.

Philip could dwell on those things and he could enhance those things, and it is a pity that in some way we are not capable of having them enhanced so that the public of South Australia could understand not only the institution this is, but the humanity of this institution.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Perhaps he could. I think the Speaker is looking for some people to operate a new system which he contemplates some time in the future, and perhaps Mr Satchel might be an applicant. I do not know. I do not know whether the new system will come with commentary, sir, or not. That is to be determined; but probably will not.

However, I would say about Philip Satchel, as other people have said, if he ever asked me on air for an interview, I would always make sure I had no reproductive problems, no urinary problems or no digestive problems, because Philip could home in on anything below your waist quicker than any other subject. He seemed fascinated with the nether regions of the body. I was privileged to speak at his roast and there was a story told by one of the journalists who said that Keith Conlon told him he was having a discussion with Philip and they were talking about putting something to air and Philip said, 'I would find that a bit embarrassing,' and Keith Conlon turned around and said, 'No. You don't find anything embarrassing, Philip,' to which Philip laughed, and he thought about it and he described a situation which was rather crude, so I will not put it on the record, and he said to Keith, 'No, if I saw two men doing [such and such], I might find this embarrassing,' and Keith Conlon said, 'No you wouldn't, you'd ask them what it was like and proceed to conduct the whole interview on it,' and Philip laughed and said, 'Yes, you're probably right.'

He was and is a very great South Australian. I think the following is one of the greatest tributes I can pay to Philip, and some members in this house would have had this experience and some will not. Philip has a number of children. One of them is Tim Satchel, who for a while was a political reporter with *The Advertiser* and worked in this place. I think that sometimes a person does what they do in their life and that is a mark of their life, but also a measure

of their life is often the calibre of their offspring. Philip was not only himself a great character, producer, journalist, broadcaster and a thoroughly decent human being, but in Philip's children whom I know he has a remarkable legacy. Tim is a remarkable young man—I think he is working for Rupert Murdoch in London at present—and to quote a very dated expression: a chip of the old block, and in the son you see the father. The father was a great attribute to South Australia and I hope, along with every other member of the chamber, that he has a long and happy retirement and that he uses it productively, because he has still got much to offer this state.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I would also like to add my congratulations and admiration to Philip Satchel for his contribution in South Australia. I was interviewed by Philip a number of times, and the first time was fairly daunting. It was at the time when the former mayor of Norwood, Jack Richards (against whom I had contested the position back in the early 1990s), had died. Philip was speaking about Jack and saying very kind things about him. Just before I came on, Philip said, 'Well, now we will speak to the Mayor of Kensington-Norwood, Vini Ciccarello. If there was one person who could get up Jack Richard's nose it was Vini.' So, it was very difficult to go into the interview at the time. Philip did put me at ease and we were able to talk about Jack in a loving and friendly way; because, whilst I had become an opponent of Jack's, we had been great friends, and I was flattered that I was asked to do the eulogy at Jack's funeral.

I agree with some of the things mentioned by the member for Unley about Philip's ability and style and those pregnant pauses. On two occasions I had lengthy interviews of about an hour with Philip. I am actually quite a shy person, which most people find difficult to believe, and also very private. It was amazing that Philip was able to draw out of me things about which I had never spoken to most of my friends and family, and particularly about my father's death, which had happened back in 1976 when I was living overseas. I had always found it very difficult to come to terms with that event. In fact, we had to go into a musical pause. I was not able to continue the interview because I was quite upset. My family and friends were quite amazed that I had been quite so open and frank when I was speaking with Philip, but I think that is a testimony to his ability. He had a regular program on which he interviewed many people from many walks of life in South Australia. He was able to make us aware of just what wonderful individuals we have in South Australia by his gentle conversations with them. The member for Unley mentioned those pregnant pauses. You just felt the silence there.

He asked a question and you just felt obliged to fill those silences, and you filled those silences sometimes with your innermost thoughts and feelings. He will be sadly missed. He had a very particular style. With those remarks, I wish him well for the future. There was an indication at Philip's roast that, at some stage, he might be considering a political future. If he did decide to do that he would certainly bring a wealth of knowledge to the position. So, Philip, well done. You are much loved by South Australians.

The SPEAKER: May I say, also, that I, too, personally, as the member for Hammond, support the proposition. I shall write to Mr Philip Satchell, and do that as the chair, on behalf of the house to pass on those remarks. I would describe Mr Satchell as unvulgar, erudite, eloquent, compassionate,

incisive, considerate, determined and a thorough gentleman—indeed, a gentleman in any company anywhere with whom it is a pleasure to share company, not only because of what he is and the way he goes about doing whatever he does but also because of the way that then affects others in that immediate conversation or company. He attracts people to conversational groups as though it were second nature, and I am sure we are the better for the service he has provided to society in the work he has undertaken so modestly. I am equally sure that he is the kind of person whom I believe ought to be attracted to serve a term in the Legislative Council as one of the tribal elders, if I can use that term, of our South Australian society, reviewing (in the model which I proposed for reform of the parliament) then the functions of government, legislation and so on as and when that were necessary in a way which did not require him to do more or less than put the position as he would see it, and other people of his ilk.

Indeed, it is sad that such people are not attracted to public life to the extent that they might otherwise be in consequence, I guess, of their unwillingness to subject themselves to the sort of abuse to which we are subjected from time to time, whether delivered to us by our colleagues or by anyone else commenting upon us and the work that we do here. Altogether, I thank him for the support which he has given to a better understanding of parliament and its processes, the development of public policy and the awareness there needs to be of what makes society a civilised place in which to live oneself and in which to raise children. He is altogether a thoroughly competent and delightful South Australian.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Motion carried.

OUTBACK AREAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRUST

Ms BREUER (Giles): I move:

That this house congratulates the Outback Areas Community Development Trust on its 25th anniversary and thanks it for its outstanding service to the outback communities in South Australia.

In the early 1970s the commonwealth government introduced an amended income tax assessment notice that showed the proportion of tax revenue that went to the federal government, the state governments and the local government. The obvious lack of reference to them drew a sharp reaction from the people of unincorporated Outback areas of South Australia. Several communities made direct approaches to the then South Australian premier, Mr Don Dunstan, and their local members of parliament. But an initial proposal to form local government in each remote area was rigorously opposed and subsequently abandoned, and we have had many incidents since.

In a 1977 election policy speech, Mr Dunstan indicated that, as a means by which tax rebates could be returned also to the people of the outback, he would, if elected, establish a trust to operate in the outback and distribute funds by the Local Government Grants Commission. The trust was to qualify as a local government authority for this purpose. The Labor government, of course, won the election, and on 20 May 1978 the Outback Areas Community Development Trust was proclaimed. In May this year the Outback Areas Community Development Trust completed 25 years of operation since its proclamation. The trust has come a long way since its first year of operation in 1978-79 when it made financial contributions to projects at 10 remote communities,

including the then Coober Pedy Progress and Miners' Association Incorporated. Funds made available in that first year amounted to \$93 500. Last year it approved 91 community funding applications for a total subsidy funding contribution of \$323 000. The incorporated progress associations and community bodies that the trust assists are widely dispersed within the nearly 85 per cent of the state that is in out-of-council areas.

These, of course, are areas that do not have a local council; they are isolated communities that stand alone and, of course, there are many of these in my electorate. The trust now recognises 36 remote communities for funding assistance purposes. During the 25 intervening years since its inception, some of the original and early communities, such as Cook, Mount Gunson, Iron Baron and Hesso have closed down. Coober Pedy now has its own local government area. But many others have begun a productive association with the trust, with the most recent decision being the 2001 recognition of the expanding opal mining community at Seven Waterholes on Lambina Station.

In contrast to the past, these communities today find themselves required to be accountable to a much greater degree in the provision of effective local organisation and in taking advantage of any opportunities presented. The trust now sees its greatest challenge as the need to support continuing improvements in the quality of life, capacity and effectiveness of Outback communities, without detracting from its unique character and its communities. I am pleased to see the member for Stuart has walked in, because I know the Outback Areas Trust is dear to his heart.

In taking up this challenge, the trust is completing a strategic plan for the next five years, which it intends to launch in conjunction with a 25 year celebration event at Blinman. This year, the trust has also completed the development of its own web site, which can now be accessed on www.oacdt.sa.gov.au. It is only a few years ago that the trust kept in touch with its communities by letter and by terrestrial telephone, but now almost everyone in the Outback has access to a fax machine, a few have satellite telephones, and well over half of the remote communities focused around some sort of settlement are on the internet.

The development of the web site was one of the regional approaches the trust took during 2002-03 to broaden the range of activities in which it is involved and to strengthen its approach to the management of these activities. Other broader regional approaches included its strong support for the establishment of the fledgling youth advisory committees at Penong, Leigh Creek and Andamooka and its coordination of the UHF CBRS repeater tower maintenance and erection in the Outback.

The trust has also tried to work collaboratively within its region in the establishment and joint funding of regional tourism and heritage initiatives. The trust has approved subsidy payments for community projects totalling \$6.2 million over the 25 years of its operation. It has made a very significant financial contribution to the maintenance of 18 public toilets in its area of responsibility (if you have been in Outback South Australia, you would know how important those toilets are when you are travelling in the Outback); two septic tank effluent disposal (STED) systems at Oodnadatta and Marla; and a waste water treatment plant at Blinman. Until the responsibility was transferred to the Office of Energy Policy in July 1997, the trust funded and operated 10 electricity undertakings, which were local off-grid power generation.

Funding priorities have fluctuated with development imperatives and technology changes. For instance, significant funds have been made available for aerodrome establishment maintenance, particularly following the decision of the commonwealth government to transfer regional and remote aerodrome responsibility to local communities.

The following examples illustrate both the priorities that have driven remote communities over the last 25 years and the diversity of projects that the trust and its communities have dealt with. In relation to aerodromes, there have been new, reconstructed and refurbished airstrips at Glendambo, Oodnadatta, Marree, Marla, William Creek and Mannahill; water supplies at Copley, Andamooka, Mintabie and Glendambo; and outdoor facilities at Marree, Oodnadatta, Penong, Leigh Creek, Blinman and Woomera. Of course, these are projects that city people take for granted. However, for Outback people they are actually a luxury and it is much appreciated that the trust has been involved with them.

In more recent years, assistance with projects to upgrade existing communications technology and adopt new approaches has increasingly occupied the trust's time. These projects have related to radio and TV re-broadcast facilities, computer awareness and public access to the internet and the establishment and maintenance of ultra high frequency two-way radio repeaters in the Outback.

The diversity of the trust is shown by the fact that the trust never loses site of its client base: the remote communities of Outback Australia. The trust continues to enjoy a high level of recognition and regard from Outback communities, a reputation which was noted in a 1999 report to the Minister for Local Government by a revenue panel appointed to consider the trust's performance and future. The report stated:

... importantly, in their relationships with Outback towns and groups, the Trust and its staff have demonstrated that it is possible to 'bridge' remote distances and create responsive service mechanisms.

I cannot emphasise enough the importance of the trust to Outback communities. These communities are very isolated and for many years have had to stand alone. The trust has changed that. In my electorate, for example, Andamooka has had many issues. In the last few weeks, I have been working with the chair of the Progress Association, and the number of times she has mentioned the trust and its officers is amazing. Similarly, the little community of Pimba, unbelievably, is still not on mains power, despite being on the main highway to Darwin and alongside the transmission lines to Roxby Downs. For years, it battled alone to change this. Thankfully, I am able to say that we are now getting much closer, and this has been very much with the assistance of the trust.

I am aware, everywhere I go in the Outback, of the respect for the trust and the fact that they are so well known personally. Many members in this place have probably not even heard of the Outback Areas Trust, but my colleague the member for Stuart and I are very aware of the role it plays in our communities and in our electorates.

I want to pay particular tribute to Mr Bill McIntosh, who has been a driving force for many years as the Chairman of the trust and also the General Manager, Dean Gollan. There are also other dedicated staff and the dedicated board members who have been members of the board for many years. The staff include Mr Leith Yelland, Mr Mark Sutton and Ms Melanie Armistead. It is only a very small team, but they cover a huge area and do an incredible job. I urge this parliament to support my motion of congratulations today.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I strongly support the motion moved by the member for Giles, because it recognises the valuable contribution made by the Outback Areas Community Development Trust to the north and west of South Australia, and puts on the record the outstanding service given by the members of the trust over 25 years, as well as the people who have worked for the trust. They have all made a contribution, and they have not sought publicity. It has been a very cohesive organisation and it has not been involved in public controversy. The trust has provided services which would not otherwise have been provided to the people in the Outback, and they have done it by working very closely with local progress associations. They have been aware of the needs and aspirations of the local committee.

The member for Giles rightly put on record the contribution made by the current chairperson. I want to recognise the contribution made by Mr Connelly, who was the first chairperson, and those who followed him—Mr Keneally and Lois O'Donoghue—who were all involved in making a valuable contribution to the organisation.

I well recall the debate that took place in this parliament. Some people had some doubts, and some people thought that it was going to be the first step towards paying rates. However, that has not been the case, and it will not be the case. The ability to attract federal and state funding to invest in various projects to improve the lifestyles of the people in that part of the state has been a great achievement. Those of us who have had the pleasure of assisting and working beside the board and the staff know of the great efforts that have been put into it. I sincerely hope that the organisation continues to prosper. I think it is terribly important that the people on the board are locally based and that they should not be appointed other than on their ability to make a contribution. To my knowledge, the people on the board have been able to make that contribution because they have had the support of their own communities. Further, the people who have worked for the board have had an understanding of the Outback; they work there, and they are ensuring that the facilities that are needed are being fixed.

The member mentioned the toilets and the UHF radio (which has been an outstanding success) and there are many other examples. If you go into these small communities, you will see the work the trust has been involved in. A few weeks ago, I was pleased to attend the 25 year celebrations at Blinman with the minister. Blinman is a very pleasant spot, and I have always enjoyed going there. They have always been kind to me.

Ms Breuer: Lovely pub.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, great pub, great community and a very pleasant spot. We had a most convivial evening.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Much fun was had by all—in an orderly fashion. It recognised the contribution the trust has made to the northern parts of the state, and that was a very good thing. I sincerely hope that the trust is able to continue to provide these services and to work with local communities because, whether it is the registration of dogs or other things, it plays a very important role.

One of the things that have been so good about the trust is that it has been aware of the needs and aspirations of the local community. Trust members have not set out to impose their own ideas or their own views, which do not relate to those communities, and therefore they have been free from the interference of insensitive and uncooperative bureaucracy, which has been the hallmark of other organisations that are

not as highly regarded in the north as the Outback Areas Trust. I do not mind if I have upset a few people by saying that, but that is why the trust has worked so well, because it has worked with the communities. It has not endeavoured to impose its will on the communities.

I commend the member for bringing the motion to the house. I look forward to the work of the trust in my electorate in the north of South Australia and I am very pleased to continue to give the board and the employees of the trust my wholehearted support. I have a very strong view that it is not my role to interfere or to tell the trust what to do, or to make public comments about it, but if it comes to me for help I am always pleased to assist. It is a bit like councils. It is unwise for members of parliament to get involved and tell a council how to run its business. Those who do so usually end up with the wrong end of the stick, and the same goes for the trust. It has never been my role to interfere but I am very happy to continue to support the excellent work that it has done. I know that the community supports it and I add my congratulations.

Mrs HALL (Morialta): Like my colleague the member for Stuart I wholeheartedly support not only the words in the motion on the *Notice Paper* but also the sentiments that those words so ably express. I support very much the work of the trust and the service provided to the South Australian community by this trust. It is interesting to reflect on some of the achievements of its 25 years in operation, and some have been outlined by the member for Giles. However, its general service to the Outback community is incredibly important, and I doubt that many South Australians, particularly those based in the metropolitan area, would have a lot of understanding of its importance to our state and the extraordinary contribution it makes to South Australia as an identity and to the perspective of South Australia in a general sense.

We could all talk about the economic development that is generated from Outback and isolated communities, and I guess that all of us know a little about the history and the traditions of the Outback. Many of us probably know a lot more about the characters of the Outback because the Year of the Outback in 2002 gave people in the rest of this state, and nationally and internationally, some perspective of what the community in South Australia north of Gepps Cross is all about. There has been a huge contribution to a general lifestyle and understanding of South Australia generally, and in many ways I would like more recognition of how the Outback Areas Community Development Trust is involved.

I have made a few notes of some of the things I know about personally. I believe that members of the trust deserve enormous congratulations for their involvement because, as the member for Stuart said, they have an enormous capacity to work at a local level and in partnership with so many other groups. I refer to their involvement, particularly in the Year of the Outback, when they worked most enthusiastically to ensure that some of the long-term benefits of that year flowed through, not just to the visitors to the outback during those 12 months but also to their local community afterwards. At the time, in my role as tourism minister, I was very pleased to consider and support a number of the infrastructure projects that gained support because of the Year of the Outback, and a contribution to the many local communities has remained in place.

I have always had the view that tourism in Outback areas has to be worked in with the local communities because tourists, say, from Germany may come to this country and

this state, spend six weeks here and then return to their country, but it is the people of the Outback communities who have to live with some of the services that were provided during that year. We heard the member for Giles talk about the toilets. We heard her talk about the airstrips and the water supplies, and one of the issues that I want to raise is the importance of the roads. We understand the importance of the airstrips but the roads in the Outback areas of this state are crucial, not only to the people's economic wellbeing but to the way they can travel around, communicate and make contact with other communities.

One of the great concerns, as members of this house have heard over the last few months, is the condition of the roads in the Outback and their lack of resourcing. Over the weekend I was involved in several discussions with people from Outback areas who are absolutely terrified about the washaways that will happen if we have heavy rainfall during the next season. I am told that many of the main roads are in an appalling condition, and a number of people are concerned at what will happen if there are car accidents and emergency services need to be delivered. There will be difficulties when trying to assist if tragedies happen.

A number of individuals, being good local citizens, off their own bat and at their own expense have taken first-aid courses because they are so concerned about the tragedies waiting to happen because of the condition of so many of the roads in Outback areas. I have a view that the role and the achievements of the trust thus far are extraordinarily commendable, but trust members would acknowledge that there is still so much more to do. Sadly, they will become prominent when accidents happen and emergency situations develop. So I hope that the member for Giles has some success within her government to ensure that, for Outback areas, particularly given the condition of the roads, there is some extra resourcing and some extra funding.

Like my colleagues, I pay tribute to the fantastic role that Bill McIntosh has played as Chairman of the Outback Areas Community Trust, particularly his capacity to generate huge support from large numbers of volunteers who work very closely with the people who are involved with him. The importance of creating partnerships with this trust and obtaining funds from both state and federal resources remains a crucial issue. On a personal level, I congratulate the trust members for the work done thus far and say thank you for the contribution that has been made not only to their local communities but also to the rest of this state. I wish trust members good luck in their future endeavours.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: Again, I wish to make a couple of remarks. It occurred to me in the early 1960s when I first ventured to places north of Hawker as a shearer that there ought to be a means by which it were possible to properly and responsibly look after that part of South Australia rather than relying upon the charity or magnanimity of some of the pastoral interests of the people who live there to keep it accessible to all of us. An increasing volume of traffic from the early 1960s meant that by the time the government of the day introduced legislation to establish the Outback Areas Trust, something of that nature was well and truly overdue.

I have personally enjoyed having access to the Outback, and I acknowledge the role that has been played by the trust in enabling that to happen. So it is, as other members have mentioned, that other people from within the Australian community (most of them from suburbia, because that is

where most of them live) and tourists who come here from other parts of the world are now able to have much safer access to what we call the Outback. Without the community development aspects of the bill which established it, these things could not have happened.

I lament the fact that funds have been taken away from the development and maintenance of appropriate roads out there beyond suburbia and the provincial towns. I am a miner, and other people in mining exploration share my concern. It costs an enormous amount more now in tyres just to get around because the roads are in a hell of a mess, and it is far less safe. I have noticed that the number of rollovers are increasing, and the folk who are involved in the industry (especially in exploration) testify to that in an anecdotal context.

We cannot ignore what the Hon. Don Dunstan saw as a very real need when he introduced the bill on 7 March 1978 to establish the Outback Community Development Trust. Those areas need an equitable and fair access to the public purse to ensure that all of us can have access safely and that we can derive the benefits that will continue to accrue to the state well above the amount of expense incurred by properly retaining access to those areas by the tourism industry that is growing apace as the world's economies are better managed and people are more prosperous in a far greater number of countries.

It is one of the last frontiers on earth and, in consequence of what this trust has done and what services are provided by the Royal Flying Doctor Service and other such institutions, we have an enormously valuable asset which people elsewhere want to come and look at. They are getting the message now, though—if you look at the internet at some of the remarks that are made—that it is not safe because there are not sufficient funds being applied to it. It is for that reason that I have taken this length of time to draw attention to it. Miners need it, pastoralists need it, and we need it for twin reasons: Australians need to be able to get around in their country safely; and, if we do not fix it, it will be at a great cost and loss to us in terms of tourism dollars.

THE INTERDOMINION

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): I move:

That this house—

(a) condemns the government for—

- (i) withdrawing funding support for the 2005 Adelaide Interdominion Championships, identified by the International Trotting Association as one of the world's seven greatest races;
 - (ii) its failure to assess the overall economic, tourism and business benefits this event brings to this state;
 - (iii) its failure to assess the future impact on harness racing in South Australia if this event is not held;
 - (iv) its failure to negotiate a government funding guarantee which would enable Harness Racing SA to extend timelines in seeking further sponsorship funding in lieu of the loss of financial support from this government; and
- (b) notes the failure of the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing to support one of South Australia's most prestigious and beneficial sporting events, and urges the government to reinstate funding support for this event.

The Interdominion Championships had been rostered for Adelaide in 2005. However, because of the failure of this government to recognise the benefits major sporting carnivals and this particular carnival bring to South Australia, that

opportunity has now been lost. Harness Racing SA has been calling on government support throughout 2003 as they struggled to raise the necessary finances to guarantee that the Interdominion would be held in South Australia in 2005. This government (and, in particular, the minister for racing) has, on numerous occasions, stated that it would not support this carnival and that, in effect, it would not support the sporting public of South Australia. They now have their wish: the Interdominion has gone not just to another state but to another country. I can only suggest that this government must be the laughing stock of the entire racing world.

Harness Racing SA has been forced to negotiate a trade-off carnival with Auckland to enable an extra two years to raise the necessary finances to hold this iconic event. The Interdominion championship series is Australasia's premier race meeting, a fact alluded to by the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing on more than one occasion and, in fact, it has been included as one of the world's seven greatest race events by the International Trotting Association. The Interdominion series has been ranked as one of seven of the most elite international events, including: the Prix d'Amerique, a trotting event in Paris, France; the Gran Premio Lotteria, a trotting event in Naples, Italy; the Elitlopp, a trotting event in Stockholm, Sweden; the North American Cup, a pacing event in Ontario, Canada; the Hambletonian, a trotting meeting in New Jersey in the United States; and the Little Brown Jug, a pacing event in Ohio in the United States.

The mere fact that the Interdominion is held in such esteemed company is reason enough for the state government to have put our state's sporting reputation and the future of world-class events before their current dollars and cents mentality and back this event with the support it deserves. However, minister Wright has already stated in the budget estimates of 25 June that Harness Racing SA can be left in no doubt that there is no commitment of a financial nature from the government to support the Interdominion in Adelaide. The minister also placed in doubt the overall funding assistance of \$650 000 annual distribution to the three racing codes: thoroughbred racing, harness racing and greyhounds.

The Interdominion championship series is recognised as a major event for harness racing, the equivalent of a Melbourne Cup, and an event held only once every seven years in this state. Private sponsorship and government funding have enabled the event to be hosted by South Australia in previous years but without government assistance for the Interdominion we have seen another high-profile sporting event lost to this state. How could the Rann government with its promises to attract high-profile sporting events to this state really expect any sporting organisation to invest time, effort and money, not to mention the reputation of the involved sport, to hold a major event in this state when it knows that the government is liable to pull the rug from under their feet when the political winds change direction?

South Australia has a reputation second to none for the organisation and successful presentation of major events. This reputation has been severely damaged by the loss of the world-class Interdominion in 2005 immediately after the potential loss of the world-class Adelaide International Horse Trials in 2004. More importantly, if this government does not have the backbone to stand up for events which directly affect the livelihood and recreational pursuits of its own citizens, why would any business company want to invest in this state in the future? I give full credit to Harness Racing SA for negotiating this exchange, but this government has still damaged the chances for South Australia again to host this

world-famed event. After all, if confidence within the industry in the ability of South Australia again to step up to the plate and host a top-class event is shattered by the inaction of this government, it will be a hard proposition to sell the financial liability to potential sponsors the next time this state is called on to host the Interdominion.

The government could well have underwritten a financial guarantee under conditions of its choice, but to categorically walk away without any negotiation looking to support this event is indicative of arrogance of unbelievable proportions. The ultimate arrogance of this government is well and truly shown by the minister for racing who advised that he would be available to present the Interdominion Championship Cup (when the championships were still rostered for 2005)—his one and only contribution.

Harness Racing SA provides annual funding for the national pool of funding over a seven year period, funding which returns to the state hosting the Interdominion. Had Harness Racing SA not been able to negotiate the exchange with Auckland, it would have lost its committed \$450 000, not to mention the economic benefits which flow from this iconic event. The government's callous inaction could still result in harness racing being decimated as a racing code with the major impetus created by an Interdominion series being removed from its racing calendar.

It is high time the government looked seriously at supporting the sporting events of this state in whose best interests they are elected to act. After all, it would not be the first time that this government would be forced to realise that it had got it wrong. The debacle over the Adelaide International Horse Trials and the months of uncertainty and anxiety caused to the entire equestrian industry in this state because of government fears to acknowledge and rectify a clear mistake are testimony to that fact. On Tuesday 27 June 2000, the current minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing said:

The Interdominion is the premier harness event which is held once in a cycle around Australasia: it is held in all the states of Australia and also New Zealand. This is the biggest carnival in harness in Australasia.

The same day, the minister was upset that the Harness Racing Victoria chairman said that the Interdominion should be restricted to Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane and Christchurch. The harness racing chairman said:

We have the right formula, but we are not able to exhibit it while others will drag the Interdominion back to the dark old days.

On that day, the minister was rightly upset that Adelaide may lose the right to host such an important and prestigious event. I say to the minister: what has changed since then? Why in 2000 did he admit the importance of this event and yet he is more than willing to do nothing and jeopardise the ability of South Australia to host the Interdominion in 2005 (now 2007, thanks to this government) and possibly in future cycles? The Interdominion has a long and very important history in Australian sporting events. For harness racing the ultimate prize is unquestionably the Interdominion Pacing and Trotting Championships, the most important harness event in the southern hemisphere—in fact, the only southern event included as one of the world's seven greatest racing events.

The Interdominion brings together the best horses, trainers and drivers from across Australia and New Zealand, and recently horses from the northern hemisphere have joined the competition. The event attracts extensive national and international television, radio and print media coverage, and hundreds of thousands of people across Australia and New

Zealand would have their eyes firmly fixed on Globe Derby Park over the 14 days that this iconic event was meant to be held in February and March 2005. That South Australia has lost the 2005 Interdominion because of government inaction is one of the most shameful chapters in our state's great sporting history. There can be no doubt that an Interdominion carnival would provide substantial and ongoing tourism and business benefits for the state government, the tourism and hospital industry, the harness racing industry and many other businesses.

Many Australian and New Zealand travel agents organise tours of varying sizes to each Interdominion carnival, and these tours will be a major source of visitors to Adelaide. Of course, many people will make their own private arrangements, including owners, trainers and drivers associated with the participating horses. The official travel agent for the Interdominion Harness Racing Council, Harness Racing Travelworld in Melbourne, has estimated that the number of persons who would have been expected for the Adelaide Interdominion in 2005 was at least 6 500. At the last South Australian Interdominion in 1997, horses and riders came from all over Australia, and similar if not greater representation was expected for the 2005 series.

Each participating horse has trainers, drivers, stable hands and owners, together with partners and friends, who will make the trip to follow their pride and joy in the event that they all dream of winning. All these people will spend on accommodation, fuel, souvenirs, entertainment, meals, tours and hire cars. In fact, the official travel agent has estimated that South Australia will benefit from almost 1 000 rooms or apartments being rented during the carnival. Members should remember that the carnival is spread over 14 days, so the bed nights in South Australia generated by the carnival are potentially 14 000. Total attendance for the four nights of the carnival in 1997 was 32 945, and it has been estimated that total visitor expenditure during the 2005 Interdominion would have been of the order of \$5.5 million.

If we compare these figures with the Adelaide International Horse Trials, which the government finally reprieved for now, we will see that it is ludicrous that the government has not stepped in to ensure that South Australia will run the Interdominion in 2007, as now planned. The economic impact statement prepared in January 2003 by the research group Destination Development, of the SA Tourism Commission, on the 2002 Adelaide International Horse Trials, stated:

Net economic impact to South Australia was in the order of \$1 million, being the equivalent of 15 effective full-time jobs.

If this is the case, and the estimated benefit to the state through the horse trials and from the 2005 Interdominion carnival is estimated to be \$5.5 million, this means that the Interdominion carnival is the equivalent of some 82 effective full-time jobs for South Australia. On Wednesday 18 June 2003 the Minister for Tourism announced that the state government had finally decided to support the very important Adelaide International Horse Trials. In her press release the minister stated:

Faced with the prospect of cancelling the event, I have secured additional funds from Treasury in a compromise that will see this year's trials staged. . . '

From the comparisons I have just noted, the 2005 Interdominion Cup Carnival would have been every bit as important or even more important to the state of South Australia; and this government, faced with the prospect of cancelling this event, needs to get its priorities in order and

save the Interdominion for the benefit of the state, to which it has a responsibility. With the allocation of sufficient resources, planning and effective management, the 2005 Interdominion Pacing and Trotting Carnival would have been remembered as the greatest racing carnival ever run in South Australia. History has shown, as the minister well knows, that Adelaide conducts the best Interdominion carnivals in Australasia.

The successful achievement of this ambition would have reflected on the state of South Australia and further enhanced its reputation as a state that can deliver the goods when it comes to conducting major events. The 2007 Interdominion can only be a success to this degree in South Australia with the financial and political support of government and its related agencies. And we can only hope that, by 2007, we will actually have a government willing to support sporting occasions and events in this state. Should the Interdominion not be held in South Australia, I have grave fears for the future of harness racing in this state, as the loss of such an elite event to South Australia would most assuredly have a devastating impact from which harness racing may not recover.

A guarantee of financial assistance from the South Australian government would not only ensure that South Australia will host the Interdominion in the future; it would also most strongly identify to potential sponsors that the Interdominion is a worthwhile investment, rather than the negative perception that is now being created by the government's turning its back and walking away from this world class racing event. I urge all members to support this motion to safeguard the future of both this event and harness racing in South Australia.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): We have been treated to a nice dose of 'Kotzonomics' here: the idea that anyone who wants money should get it; spend, spend, spend, and what we do not like from the opposition is the idea that we are only interested in dollars and cents. What a turnaround! They are complaining that we want to balance the budget. They are complaining that we look at our expenditure carefully and make choices. They are complaining that we might actually worry about where the money is being spent. I am not going to apologise, because it is other people's money and, rather than just agreeing to every project that comes before us, we have to assess each project on its merits and make decisions.

The honourable member may well not remember what it was like to be a minister, but decision making is difficult and you have to decide how best to spend other people's money. In fact, I have yet to hear from the opposition benches of any option to spend money that they have not supported. I have yet to hear of any idea that they would not fund, and I would just like to ask where the money would come from. Certainly, the view about tourism from the opposition benches has been very clearly enunciated by the opposition spokesperson for tourism, who complained that as Minister for Tourism I released a draft tourism plan and did not hold a party! The would-be government for parties on the opposition bench will always support any plan to spend money.

In fact, we know how big and glorious their parties are: it was their main achievement. The advice of the 'Kotzonomics' process is that we should support this event because we did so in 1997. Whilst I am a great supporter of history, spending other people's money should not always depend on what we did in the past. If we look at that expendi-

ture in the past, in 1997 I have no evidence that the government of the day gave carte blanche agreement to fund every single project in the future. What we are to hear is that, once one festival or project is funded, it is guaranteed funding into the next century, into the next millennium, because you can never change funding strategies.

It would seem to me that if you went back into history—and I know that the member opposite has no idea of how to fund special events—the member would find out that the special event funding in 1997 was a sponsorship without any commitment to ongoing future funding, as far as I can tell in looking at the files. In fact, whilst her ‘on the back of an envelope’ calculations about economic benefit based on the horse trials—which she claims have been lost in the year 2004, another fact that she has got wrong—came up with some conclusion that we would be filling hotel rooms, it might be of interest for her to know that the proposed date for the Interdominion in 2005 seems, as far as I can see, to coincide with certain other events that would have filled the hotel rooms in any case.

This period would have coincided with the Film Festival, Womadelaide, the 2005 Australia and New Zealand Police and Emergency Services Games, the Clipsal 500, and the BMX championships. Now, there is a limit to how many people can sleep in a bed and how many times you can charge them, but far be it from me to criticise the economic calculations that the member has made on the back of her envelope.

But let us just remember, these are the people who do not believe in dollars and cents, who do not want to critically look at any options, and who do not want to make choices. I think it is about time that we started making choices about all the events that are funded, and make critical decisions based on facts instead of spurious comments and assumptions that are inaccurate and not factually correct.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Mr Speaker, only fools and dead people do not change their mind. You do not get elected to this place if you are a fool and, although the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has been accused of being late on many occasions, he is far from dead and I would never say that he is a fool. So, there is hope. When it comes to spending, if you have a good economy such as the Liberal government left this Labor government—with an \$85 million surplus—and you keep that economy going, you will have money to spend on all sorts of events. That is not just on health, education and law and order—which are priorities—but on everything that is going on in this wonderful state. Certainly, the Interdominion horse trials are—as the member for Newland said—one of seven great events in the world. A number of times in this house I have stood and pleaded with the government to change its mind on the international horse trials. The Adelaide International Horse Trials, the only four-star event in the southern hemisphere, was going to get the flick, was going to go up to a track at Oakbank which was not going to give it its four-star status, and the competitors were going to have their Olympic selection in jeopardy.

What we have with the Interdominion is not just an event for the elite. The trots and the greyhounds have always been the bastion of the punters and the workers. In fact, when I was in practice, many of my clients were not rich people but they enjoyed training their greyhounds and they enjoyed training their trotters, and they got a lot of pleasure out of it. Look at the RIDIC report on the equestrian industry in Australia and you will see that it is an \$8 billion industry—it

is not just a mickey mouse industry. This is a serious part of the Australian economy, and it should be noted as a serious part of the South Australian economy. The Interdominion is a world-class harness event for trotters and pacers. For those who do not know the difference: both trotting and pacing are two-time gaits; one is on the diagonal and one is on the parallel, but they are both very classy events to watch. The Interdominion is THE number one event. The Victorian government have backed the Interdominion, and we see that the Queensland government backed the new cricket institute and so it has gone up there; the South Australian government did not back that.

This government really does need to recognise that we have handed them an economy in good shape. They have had a windfall in income from stamp duty—I would hate to think how many millions it is from that fantastic development at the Bay but it is certainly in the hundreds of thousands, if not millions. They do have the money. This AAA rating that the Treasurer goes on about; it is nothing to with that. It is about squirreling the money away for the 2005 budget so that he can then spend, spend, spend and pretend how good he has been. In the meantime, we see the South Australian economy being beaten around the head, and see world-class sporting events such as international horse trials—and in this case the Interdominion—being given the bum’s rush.

Let me just give you a bit of history on the Interdominion, to put you into the full picture of what is going on. The Australian Interdominion Championship is one of a series of seven great harness races in the world. The last time it was held in South Australia was back in 1997, and it was supposed to be here in 2005 but, as we have heard from the member for Newland, it will not be here. The Interdominion started back in 4 March 1896 at Moonee Valley racecourse, when a £100, three-heat series called the ‘Inter-Colonial Free For All’ was staged. It brought together the New Zealand champion trotter Calista, the freak Victorian trotter Fritz, Australia’s finest pacer Mystery, the illustrious trotter Osterley and the leading New South Wales trotter St. Louis. Fritz won—and I tell you there are a few horses I have backed that I think the only race they would ever win is inside a greyhound as a bit of dog fritz.

I digress. Later, the Interdominion progressed to being widely known around the world as a classy harness event. The inaugural Australian event of the modern era was held in 1935, when harness racing delegates from all states and New Zealand met and formed the Australasian Trotting Conference, which then announced the Interdominion series. The horses that have competed in the Interdominion, both at Wayville and now at Globe Derby, are world renowned horses. The blood lines they have come from and their descendants are known right throughout the harness industry all over the world, not just in Australia, not just in South Australia. It is a world class event that we have put in jeopardy here.

The track at Wayville was a very small track for the Interdominion, yet times that were set there were absolutely fantastic, showing the ability of the horses, and the punters could get right up next to the rails and could really feel part of the event. The glamour of the Interdominion continued to grow over the years, and going out to Globe Derby was certainly a very positive move for harness racing in South Australia. There is some talk of wanting to bring it back closer to town, but I guarantee that the track out at Globe Derby is one of the best in Australia.

The biggest boil-over in Interdominion history came at Globe Derby in 1976, when at the then new Globe Derby Park, the unfancy Carclew, a descendant of the immortal Globe Derby—the horse that the Globe Derby Park is named after—defeated the horse known as Pure Steel to take the Interdominion crown. This is a bit of history on Globe Derby Park, or on the horse known as Globe Derby. Globe Derby was an amazing Australian trotter. This horse was foaled down in 1910 and was so good that he could give his rivals 135 yards or about 130 metres start and still beat them. Globe Derby's prowess was completed when he was retired to stud and established one of the longest and most successful breeding lines in the world of standard-breds. Let us look at the history of South Australians in the Interdominion, right back to 1958, when in Adelaide Free For All won the Interdominion. That great reinsman, Bill Shinn, was behind that horse and that horse Free For All was known throughout the world as having won a classy event; one of the seven great events in the world, the Interdominion.

Anybody who has had anything to do with harness racing over the years will not forget the great Cardigan Bay in 1963. The New Zealand horse Cardigan Bay came and blitzed the rest of the field. He was a very powerful horse. The last South Australian to win was in 1982, when Rhett's Law, with Mr C.G. Warwick as the reinsman, won then. In 1984, Gammalite won two years in a row. When I was working for Bloodstock Air Services, I actually had the pleasure of flying Gammalite to the Interdominion from Melbourne. He was a mongrel of a horse; he would kick you at the drop of a hat but, hell, he could pace. In his racing career Gammalite had 94 wins and won \$1.384 million, as well as winning the Interdominion twice.

The Interdominion race is a world class event. Let us hope that the government does not just write off this event as another casualty of the AAA rating. It cannot be that; it is a world class event. Let us hope that the government sees some sense in where it is going with sport in South Australia. Let us not forget the equine industry; let us not forget the punters out there—the blue collar workers, the people whom the government claims to represent. Let us get out there and give them the opportunity to see a world-class event in their own backyard, out in the northern suburbs, where the Premier is from. The Premier should be supporting this motion. Why is he not in here supporting this motion? This government needs to re-examine this issue. It should bring back the Interdominion to South Australia as soon as possible.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): The opposition has no shame whatsoever. This parliament has been presented with the greatest lot of drivel from people who know nothing about racing. Let me go back a step and remind all members in this parliament of what the former government did with respect to racing. The former government, the now opposition, sold the TAB and, as a consequence, not only made a loss for taxpayers but also provided an income stream to each of the three codes: thoroughbred racing; harness racing (about which we are talking today); and, of course, the greyhound industry. In a moment I will remind members of those details, because it is a salutary lesson, and every member should be reminded of it.

The member for Morphett speaks about leaving the economy in good shape. Well, what about the loss of taxpayer dollars with the sale of the TAB? But, of course, what the former government's twin policy was all about in regard to the racing industry was the corporatisation of the racing

industry. What was the corporatisation of the racing industry all about? Well, it was all about providing the codes with the responsibility for their financial management. We now have the opposition coming into this place talking the greatest lot of drivel you have ever heard after not only selling the TAB at a loss for taxpayers but also, of course, after corporatising the three racing codes.

Of course, the whole ethos of the corporatisation of the racing industry was for those corporatised entities to be able to run their own business. We know full well that the opposition knows nothing about running a business, because we know what it has done to WorkCover. We now have the absolute nonsense—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I will go there, all right, I will go there, don't worry about it. We had the absolute nonsense—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Waite will have his chance.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The former government corporatised the racing industry. It wanted the corporate entities to run their own business, and now members opposite walk in here saying that the taxpayers should pay for the Interdominion. What a load of nonsense! It is absolute nonsense; it is nothing but absolute voodoo economics. What members opposite are going against is the legislation that the former government passed. The codes know this. The thoroughbred code knows it, the harness code knows it and the greyhound code knows it. That is why, of course, the CEO of Harness Racing SA previously advised me that he was confident of securing sufficient financial support for the event in 2005.

As previous speakers have highlighted, there has now been a change in the format and we have been rescheduled to 2007. But whether it is 2005 or 2007, it is the responsibility of Harness Racing SA to be able to run harness racing. It is also its responsibility to organise its finances. As I said, in previous meetings the CEO has advised me that Harness Racing SA was confident about securing sufficient financial support for the event in 2005. It is disappointing that Harness Racing SA was not able to do that, but that is not the debate here today. The debate is whether taxpayers should be paying for this event. The debate is whether taxpayers should be paying for this event post-corporatisation and post the sale of the TAB.

You cannot have it both ways, and that is what this incompetent opposition wants. All the time it wants to come in here and spend, spend, spend. What the sale of the TAB did was to set up income streams as a result of the sale of the TAB and, as a result, there have been benefits to the codes. There has been no benefit to the taxpayer, because this former dopey government actually made a loss at the point of sale for the taxpayers of South Australia. This is incompetence at its best. It corporatised the racing industry and it sold the TAB at a loss, and then it comes in here wanting the taxpayers to pay for a corporatised entity, which has the responsibility to run its own event.

This motion is nothing but nonsense. It does not alter the fact that this is one of the great events. That is not in question—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Of course, it is. It is very important, but the honourable member misses the point. Harness Racing SA, under the corporatised model introduced

by the honourable member's government, has the responsibility for running the event. That was what corporatisation was all about. It was about putting in place—and go and ask your former minister—the corporatised entities to run their own business. That is what corporatisation is all about. This is no longer a statutory body. It is a corporatised entity. If the member for Newland does not understand that, she should go and speak to the former minister for racing in the former government—her government.

The honourable member should go back to the debates. She should see what the former minister said about it. The whole basis of establishing corporatised entities was to give them the independence, the responsibility and the authority to be able to run their business; and now the member for Newland wants taxpayers to do the complete opposite of the ethos of the bill introduced in this parliament by the former government, which is now law. It is absolute arrant nonsense, and she should recognise that. This motion should be seen for what it is. If we are serious about this, we should be making sure that Harness Racing SA and the Globe Derby Racing Club get together to get behind this event rather than warring between each other.

We should make sure that Harness Racing SA is provided with the correct infrastructure to try to bring about this premier event.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is not in question. We want it in South Australia, but it is no longer the responsibility of the taxpayer to fund an event of this nature. That is the opposite of corporatisation, and that is why the Racing Industry Advisory Council has taken on this debate at that particular forum. That is why we have organised with the other codes to work with Harness Racing SA to help it provide the infrastructure, expertise and advice as to where it goes in the corporate market to seek the financial support to run an event of this importance.

That is why this event is important to South Australia. We all know that it is a premier event. We all know how great trotting is. We all know the importance of Globe Derby. We all know the importance of the northern suburbs. That says nothing. The member for Newland again demonstrates that the opposition has learnt nothing from government.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite will come to order.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Just like it let WorkCover run out of control from 1995, it now wants taxpayers to fund an event and an organisation which has been corporatised and which now has the responsibility of running its own business, of organising its finances, of having the independence that it wanted, that it supported, that it called for and that was provided by the former government. You cannot have it both ways. You have it one way or the other. This is another example of an irresponsible opposition, which knows nothing about racing, financing or what the industry wants.

If you ask Harness Racing SA and people from the thoroughbred and greyhound codes, they will support corporatisation. They want to be able to run their authorities. They now have that responsibility and the power to do so, and good luck to them. Where we can provide assistance, we will. However, we will not simply use taxpayers' dollars to fund events that are now the responsibility of the corporate entity of the authority that was established by the former government. The authority has that right and responsibility; let us see the authority get on and do it.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): We have just heard an explanation as to why this government has lost its way in regard to tourism; events development; and racing, sport and recreation. We have had Labor's goose and gander: the Minister for Racing and the Minister for Tourism. The goose and gander of the Labor government come in here and tell us how it has all gone wrong and why they cannot support Interdominion racing. They have both revealed to the house that they have no understanding of the need to develop events as a basis for tourism and economic growth within the state. We have had the Minister for Racing astound us with the compelling logic that, because racing has been corporatised, government no longer needs to get involved. The Minister for Racing's logic is wonderful! His logic is that the Australian Rugby Union was responsible for running the World Cup, so why on earth would a federal or state government get involved in promoting and supporting the World Cup? Let the Australian Rugby Union do it; they are corporatised.

The Minister for Racing's logic is that the Confederation of Australian Motor Sport and AVESCO operate the Clipsal 500. They are corporatised, so why would the government want to get involved? Why would we want to put money into the Clipsal 500? There is nothing in it for South Australia. But, of course, we do, don't we? For an amount of \$1.5 million (in fact, it is more now), we create multi-millions of dollars worth of economic turnover. The Minister for Racing's logic is that the AFL runs Australian Rules Footy, so why would the state or federal governments want to put money into Australian Rules Football development and to develop those events as tourism events and to generate economic activity?

The Minister for Racing's economic logic is so astounding that it is easy to see why we are facing a \$1 billion blow-out in WorkCover. We are talking about a government that crewed the HMAS State Bank, led by a Premier who was the chief engineer; the captain has been banished. And then there was the cabin boy Treasurer, the member for Hart; he was the cabin boy at the time, running around. Now we have a new little crew of shipmates over there on the HMAS State Bank, trying to lecture the parliament on how to generate economic activity within this state, led by the goose and gander of Labor government, the Minister for Tourism and the Minister for Racing. What a load of nonsense! If this government understood for one minute how important racing is to economic activity, employment and tourism in this state, they would realise why they need to support such events. You leverage off these events and you make them into something. Let me explain what the gander has done for tourism—

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I think it is highly inappropriate for the member for Waite to refer to members on this side, or any member in this house, as an animal or other duck.

Mr Goldsworthy: Goose.

Mrs GERAGHTY: There might be some geese on your side, but I certainly would not want to name them.

The SPEAKER: I draw honourable members' attention to a couple of aspects. There are occasions upon which I tend to feel sorry for the animals with which comparisons are drawn and, on other occasions, I wonder at the truth of the statement that 'it takes one to find one'. Altogether, if the remark made in the context of the speech is not too disparaging as to be insulting, in the past the house has allowed that to stand. Parliaments of the Westminster model are replete with examples of parody. When it becomes insulting, it is unparliamentary, and there is a fine line between the two.

Honourable members who engage in it need to remember that it is a double edged sword and, altogether, we are probably better off without needing to rely on such metaphors, similes, or both, in the course of our remarks. However, it has not been considered unparliamentary in the past, and the ultimate test of whether or not an offence is caused is determined by whether the member in question takes the point rather than someone on their behalf. With those remarks in response to the member for Torrens, though, I find there is no point of order. The member for Waite.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker. I simply make the point that we have just heard the Minister for Racing and the Minister for Tourism give the opposition a blast, in a very colourful way. If Labor Party members wants to come in here and dish it out, they can expect some back. And if they want to use coy little names and labels, which the frontbench on the other side is apt to do, they are going to cop it back. However, let me move on to explain how brilliant the Minister for Tourism has been in her duties. Last week during the debate on the Auditor-General's Report, she had to admit that she had reduced spending by \$9 million (or 17 per cent) in the past year and that revenue from event entry was down \$1.9 million. So, that is \$11 million in reduced investment going into tourism in the last year alone. Then she came out with the stunning remark that the best way for the government to deal with the SARS outbreak and the Iraq war was to cut marketing. What a brilliant idea! You hit difficulties, so what you do is cut down your marketing. Anyone with a business brain would say, 'Maybe I need to lift my marketing and look at other markets that are not affected by SARS or the Iraq war to try to get the numbers up.' But there was no such brilliance from this government.

Then we had to acknowledge last week that international tourist arrivals in South Australia had fallen in the past year by 10 per cent, interstate arrivals were falling by 5 per cent and there was an overall reduction of almost 3 per cent. It is in the annual report. Not only that, but Labor is spending \$9.5 million (or 36 per cent) of its marketing budget on administration and salaries. A smart government would take the Interdominion—

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I have been listening very carefully, but I fail to understand what the member's comments have to do with the motion before this house.

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite strikes me as talking about the Interdominion of 2005 and the activities of harness racing.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. They do not like it. The point I am making is that, if you take the Interdominion and spend some money on sponsorship, you can attract media coverage; you can attract visitors to the event; and you can make it into an economic generator. Let me tell you what our brilliant Minister for Tourism has done. We had the International Horse Trials (an event closely related to the Interdominion) and, to save \$100 000, she threw away \$3.5 million worth of national and international media coverage that had previously accompanied the event. So, we save \$100 000 and we lose \$3.5 million! Well, it is the same with the Interdominion: we pull out the sponsorship money. If you do not get the media coverage and you do not generate the activity, you do not get the visitors. It is commonsense. I asked the Minister for Tourism whether she has thought of one new idea or event since coming to office to replace the

many events we ran, such as the Year the Outback and Encounter 2002.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The World Cup Rugby. Do you know what I heard back? Stunning silence: there has not been one new event.

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

HOSPITALS, NOARLUNGA

A petition signed by 403 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to provide intensive care facilities at Noarlunga Hospital, was presented by Mr Brokenshire.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

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 10, 127, 161 and 164 to 167.

SAME SEX LEGISLATION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Last year the government proposed to review all South Australian laws to remove unjustified discrimination against homosexuals by the end of its term. A preliminary examination of legislation showed that at least 54 acts may require amendment. In February this year, a discussion paper was released prompting more than 2 200 submissions. The responses were equally split between support and opposition.

Mr Brindal: Absolutely equally?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Roughly. Today I can announce that these matters will be decided by the parliament in the new calendar year. The government has canvassed legal recognition of same sex couples in the same way that de facto couples have legal rights and duties.

Mr Venning: No way.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: 'No way' says the member for Schubert.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: And the member for Stuart too; it's on record.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: And the member for Stuart. I expect to introduce a bill into the parliament in February that will remove unjustified legislative discrimination against same sex couples. It will remove discrimination from all relevant legislation but will not include the Adoption Act 1988 and the Reproductive Technology Act 1988.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: So you can get married but you won't be able to adopt?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: South Australian law attaches a range of rights, benefits and responsibilities to people in opposite sex couple relationships. By contrast, the law does not recognise relationships between partners of the same sex. Same sex relationships do not give rise to legal regulation, rights or duties in this state. Most states and territories have given legal recognition to same sex couples. However, marriage is beyond the scope of state law—for the

benefit of the member for Waite—and neither marriage nor anything like it will be dealt with by this proposed bill.

The success or otherwise of this bill will be decided by the parliament. The bill covering most of the changes includes: extending de facto rights about property matters to same-sex couples; dealing with inheritance concerns over the death of a partner; covering grief payments, funeral expenses or loss of dependency damages if a partner is killed in an accident or murdered; allowing for legal objection to cremation if it is not originally specified by the deceased; and input in decisions about organ transplantation—I am reading all the things that the member for Stuart and the member for Schubert would deny to same-sex couples—providing for guardianship decisions and medical consent not open to same-sex partners previously; extending parental leave to same-sex couples; taking into account same-sex relationships when analysing conflict-of-interest; and recognising same-sex partners' spouses so they are not compelled to give evidence in court against each other if it would harm their relationship.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Bragg says: 'The marriage you have when you're not having a marriage.' The government has also agreed to carry out legislative recognition of non-gender specific domestic relationships in all current and future South Australian legislation. I am not labouring; I am pausing to give the homophobes a chance to express their opinion and get it on the record. Parliamentary counsel have been asked—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I thank the member for Elder, who says that I don't need a make-over. Parliamentary counsel have been asked to draft a bill reflecting these changes, and I expect it to be finalised for introduction in February—when the member for Bragg can vote against it—thus fulfilling the Premier's election commitment to remove unjustified legislative discrimination against homosexual people.

SOUTHERN CROSS REPLICA AIRCRAFT

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

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Earlier this month, I announced that ownership of the Southern Cross Replica Aircraft would be transferred to the Historical Aircraft Restoration Society (HARS). That decision was made following a comprehensive selection process that began with a public call for organisations to apply for ownership of the aircraft. Of the four organisations that applied, the Southern Cross Replica Association (SCRA) and HARS were found to be conforming bids. These bids were evaluated against the conditions required by the government.

The first condition was a demonstrated ability to repair the aircraft. Both SCRA and HARS demonstrated that they are able to repair the aircraft. The second condition was that the aircraft is to be owned and operated from South Australia. Both organisations met the ownership condition, with SCRA being a South Australian based incorporated association and HARS proposing to register an incorporated association in South Australia. Both organisations also met the operational condition with SCRA to base and operate the aircraft at Parafield Airport and HARS to base and operate the aircraft at Murray Bridge. The third condition required the aircraft to be flown in South Australian skies. Both organisations met

this condition. The fourth and final condition required each organisation to demonstrate financial viability and sustainability.

HARS demonstrated itself to be a well-run organisation with significant financial, operational and technical expertise and clear lines of accountability. HARS has a strong record of success in its business operations and significant success at raising corporate sponsorship and donations. I am advised that the SCRA was not able to demonstrate that it has in place the processes and governance arrangements to ensure that it can manage financially all aspects of the operation of the aircraft. HARS was recommended to me as the best bid. The organisation already owns and operates 21 historic aircraft with a large membership that includes 70 licensed engineers.

Obviously, the SCRA is disappointed that it is unsuccessful; it has had a long association with the aircraft. It has managed it in the past, including when the plane crash-landed at Parafield on 25 May 2002. Paying passengers were aboard when the plane crash-landed. Luckily, all crew and passengers escaped serious injury. At the time, the plane was operated in breach of CASA licence conditions and there should not have been any paying passengers on board. The experimental licence issued to the SCRA by the Civil Aviation Safety Authority did not allow the operator to take paying passengers. CASA warned the SCRA that it had failed to demonstrate an appropriate level of understanding and appreciation of the nature and importance of its responsibilities as operator of the replica aircraft. The SCRA was told that further contraventions of its CASA licence could result in administrative action and/or criminal prosecution.

It is obviously very important that the plane is managed by a credible organisation that can ensure ongoing safety. It is also important that the organisation that manages the plane is viable and committed to a sound business plan. Arts SA asked the SCRA to present the government with a business plan for the future operations of the aircraft. The business plan that the association finally presented in January 2003 was flawed because it was based on the aircraft's being able to take paying passengers, even though its licence does not allow that to happen. Without this income stream, there was no viable financial plan. In summary, SCRA breached its CASA licence, and its business plan for the aircraft was flawed. Arts SA was also concerned that, after the accident, the association was rendered largely dysfunctional by internal instability. The government was not going to simply give an aircraft to an organisation with a question mark over its management record and financial viability. Instead, the SCRA had to apply for the aircraft in a process that was open, fair and transparent.

What the government wants is very clear. The Southern Cross replica aircraft should be fixed and flying in South Australian skies, and the aircraft should be owned and operated locally by an organisation that is capable of managing it into the future. That organisation is HARS, Australia's largest historic aircraft society. HARS already has members in South Australia and it will establish an incorporated association in this state.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): I indicate that questions for the Minister for Social Justice and the Minister for Health will be taken by the Deputy Premier, Caring Kev.

The SPEAKER: So that all members are clear, the presence of the Minister for Social Justice is not a virtual presence—it is a real presence—but she has a vice-regal duty to attend at Government House later during the course of question time and, after her departure, the Leader of Business for the Government has pointed out to whom questions otherwise directed to her will be directed.

MAGNESIUM INTERNATIONAL

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): I voice the opposition's concern at the Treasurer's handling the social justice portfolio even for the duration of question time! My question is to the Premier. Why has he not responded to a letter from Magnesium International received on 10 October (nearly seven weeks ago) that is vital not only to the development of the magnesium industry in South Australia but also to the building of a power station that could have been operational by the summer of 2004-05?

Magnesium International has been seeking urgent negotiation with the Premier to help pave the way for a new power station in Port Pirie as part of the SAMAG magnesium project. As local member I am in constant touch with the company. I was advised today that, despite regular contact with the Premier's office since writing to him on 10 October and flagging the possibility of a new power station, Magnesium International has received no reply. I was advised today that the company had:

... followed up regularly to see whether our request for an in-principle decision by the government was being considered favourable so we could put the two companies in touch with the relevant government officers as soon as possible. We had clearly indicated to the government that the two prospective companies were intending to make their decisions about location in Victoria or South Australia in a short period, i.e. six to eight weeks.

I have been informed that the matter was dealt with by the department over a month ago but has been stalled in the Premier's office. One of the power companies has now decided to go to Victoria, and Magnesium International has announced this week that it may now also be looking to move to another state.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development): The letter has now been answered. In answering the letter it was important to establish that we were not prepared to support a power station other than as part of the broad infrastructure support for the smelter, and it required some work in terms of how they could be bulked up together. Obviously, the last thing we would want is to end up with a power station without the smelter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: An interjector said that we dropped the ball. The important thing is that we are the only ones who have held the ball high in the air the whole time. You, like me, Mr Speaker, are still keen to see this go ahead and, like me, you know that the ball we held high in the air had \$25 million written on it. Further, you and I both know that, as part of the update of the business plan, the marketing plan and the technical plan for that project, we not only reaffirmed our commitment but extended it by one year. Like me, you know that I first had the discussion with the federal member in relation to matching this support last December. After a number of discussions I was given an indication that I would get an answer by the end of May. I then took the opportunity, after receiving the update, to go and present it personally in Canberra to the minister's staff.

The minister was on sick leave at the time. I was told that the minister would be back at work within two weeks and would quickly work towards giving us an answer. It is embarrassing not only for me but also for the local member and Leader of the Opposition that this state still has not been given the courtesy of a response from the federal government. If we want to point fingers, we have to point fingers at where the total flaw in this process is. I know that the Leader of the Opposition as local member is embarrassed. We should all be embarrassed for the federal government, which has failed now for more than 12 months even to give us the courtesy of an answer.

SCHOOLS, BEHAVIOURAL PROBLEMS INITIATIVE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. How is the government helping students with speech or behaviour problems to reach their full potential?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I am pleased to announce to the house a new service that will be put in place by the state government in time for the 2004 school year. Children with behavioural problems are the focus of this new state government initiative, aimed at detecting learning difficulties amongst our young school and preschool children earlier in the process, thereby lessening disruptions in the classroom. There is often a link between communication impairment and behavioural issues. Intervening early in a child's life gives us a greater chance of alleviating those issues that come from poor communication skills. I am pleased to announce that five speech and behaviour assistants will be appointed before Christmas to a new Learning Links team.

They will work with professional speech pathologists and early childhood psychologists, who will also be part of this new mobile service to schools around the state. This new Learning Links team will work with individual children who have significant language and behavioural difficulties. They will also help parents to put in place supportive programs for their child at home. This will be a specialised service and will complement other measures that the state government has introduced.

One such measure, of course, that I announced quite recently was the introduction of a special education hotline; a hotline that makes information about special needs education in state schools and preschools more accessible for parents. These are just some of the measures that the government is putting in place in time for the 2004 school year to deliver a better service to our young students.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Was the Minister for Energy aware of the proposal put forward to government which may have seen a power plant built at Port Pirie, possibly generating electricity as early as next summer? If so, what action has he taken specific to that proposal?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): I was aware, and the matter is firmly in the hands of the Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development. I can say, though, that for years and years I have been aware of proposals about a power station up there—that was not a power station, then was a power station, and then wasn't, and

then was a power station again. Perhaps this power station should be called Lasseter's Reef, because it has the same mythological existence. So, yes, I was aware; but the matter is firmly in the hands of the Minister for Industry and Trade.

FREIGHT INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr SNELLING (Playford): My question is to the Minister for Transport. How is the government improving freight infrastructure in order to encourage South Australia's economic development?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for Playford for his question and for his ongoing hard work in this area. The Department of Transport and Urban Planning is actively pursuing several initiatives in north-western Adelaide to support South Australia's economic development.

Providing effective freight access to Outer Harbor from the north is a particular priority for the government. Outer Harbor is South Australia's major port facility handling imports and exports to and from locations all over the state. Indeed, Outer Harbor is one of the five major Australian container ports. Maintaining effective land transport access is crucial to supporting the state's goals for increased exports. In particular, the land transport corridor from Outer Harbor south along the Le Fevre Peninsula to Inner Harbor, to the east through Gillman and then to the north and north-east is critical to connect the harbours with the national freight network. Overpasses at both South Road, which is already recognised as one of Adelaide's most important road corridors, and Hanson Road will provide significant benefits over the traffic signals previously proposed for where these roads intersect with the major east-west route. Completion of the overpasses will dramatically improve access to the Le Fevre Peninsula in terms of both safety and efficiency.

As indicated in the draft transport plan, proposed improvements to the Marion Road/Holbrooks Road/Hanson Road corridor will further enhance north-south movements in Adelaide. They will provide key links to Adelaide Airport and other freight links for the business community. The overpass at Hanson Road will support these proposed initiatives and, importantly, will also provide a high level of access to the proposed eco-industrial precinct at Gillman, which will be crucial to South Australia's pursuit of a zero waste policy. Together, these initiatives will provide a substantial boost to freight and export efficiency and, in turn, to the state economy.

SEAGAS PIPELINE

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Can he advise the house of any further update that he has in relation to the completion of the Seagas pipeline to bring gas to South Australia from Victoria?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): The last I had heard was that it was going to be operational in January, but it is not a project that we directly run, although we did a great deal to bring it about, as everybody knows. We did a great deal to bring about the forming of two pipelines into one, so we do take a keen interest in it. That is a matter I will bring back to the house.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I have a supplementary question. Will the minister for Energy explain to the house

why the annual report of BHP Billiton, the company responsible for the Minerva gas field that will put the gas into the Seagas pipeline, has advised its shareholders that the completion date for the gas field is now under review; why, on 24 November 2003, BHP Billiton advised company representatives that the completion of the Minerva gas field has now been delayed until well into 2004; and why pipeline operators are concerned that there may be no gas flowing down the pipe until August 2004?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It was not actually me who did that to BHP. I just want to make sure the member for Bright knows that I have not been slipping over to Victoria and wrecking BHP. I know that he likes to blame me for a lot of things, but I am not putting my hand up for that one. It is the sort of thing the previous government could have done. They can wreck from a great distance both in space and time, but it is not something I am capable of. I am aware that the operators of Seagas have had concerns with that, as I understand it. I am not an expert on mines, either here or in Victoria, but I do understand Minerva is not the only gas field in Victoria. I know we have got a Victorian person in the gallery and they could probably confirm that it is not the only gas field in Victoria. I understand it has had some effect on the pricing of gas for people operating the pipeline. I am quite happy to go and get that information and bring it back to the house, but I will do it with this comment.

If delays are caused to the flow of gas by events outside this state—even if there are any delays—South Australia, with the Seagas pipeline, for the first time, will double the capacity of gas flowing into South Australia. It will have basin-to-basin competition. It will have competition in gas for the first time in its history, and it will have reliability of supply far beyond anything that has occurred before. While I would find it regrettable if events beyond our control in other states were to cause delays, I can still say that, as a result of this government's good work, we are in a much superior position to any in our history.

CARERS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Social Justice. How is the government supporting carers in their communities?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): There is more to government than balancing budgets. It is important that we are not always fixated on the balancing of budgets and the financial outcome. Carers are an integral part of how we care for people with disabilities in our community, and play an important role in other areas such as aged care. It is humbling to hear stories of sacrifice and great love when the Minister for Social Justice speaks to carers and their advocates.

The Hon. Dean Brown: Who wrote your speech?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have a feeling I have been set up here. I think I have fallen for this one hook, line and sinker. Therefore, I was pleased to hear that the Minister for Social Justice recently opened the Carer Support Centre at Victor Harbor, in the Deputy Opposition Leader's electorate, which I am advised is the new home for the South Coast Carer's Respite Program.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No. The centre caters for communities at Victor Harbor, Goolwa and Yankalilla. These

communities comprise one of the fastest growing retirement areas in this state, with carer numbers increasing all the time.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Perhaps when the member for Finnis retires he will have a facility to look after him in his old age.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

The Hon. Dean Brown: How much support did the state government provide?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Plenty, I am sure. I do not know. The centre has around 144 registered carers. The new centre will offer extra respite to carers who take on demanding responsibilities. I can advise that the centre has received \$200 000 in home and community care funding to date; and, as Treasurer, I was pleased to assist in providing that money. I did so with good grace—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, in fairness, the Minister for Social Justice certainly ensured that that money flowed through to the community sector. That funding has allowed the full-time employment of a centre coordinator and the acquisition of a building for a drop-in facility, which provides information, education, peer support and a meeting space for carers. At the opening of the centre, I am advised that the carers associated with the centre shared their important stories with the large number of community members who came along to show their support for this facility. The Minister for Social Justice was delighted, I am advised, to see that the community had embraced the Carers Support Centre. As I said, it is pleasing to see that one can balance good financial outcomes with a compassionate, caring and comforting government. This government is always prepared to care for its community. We will go on doing that, because we are a caring government that balances budgets.

MENTAL HEALTH WORKERS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): What action is the Premier taking to overcome the absence of mental health workers in the prison system and the fact that, due to this absence, public safety is being compromised? The report of the Correctional Services Advisory Council tabled yesterday (26 November) contained the following statement:

There are no dedicated mental health workers in any of the prisons or community correctional centres, notwithstanding the department is managing an increasing number of offenders with mental health issues.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): On behalf of my colleague the minister responsible for corrections, I will get a report for the honourable member.

TOURISM

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is to the Minister for Tourism.

Members interjecting:

Ms BREUER: A good minister.

Members interjecting:

Ms BREUER: The Minister for Tourism is an excellent minister. How will the tourism white paper, recently released by the federal government, impact on South Australia's state tourism plan 2003-08 and the activities of the South Australian Tourism Commission?

Members interjecting:

Ms Breuer: Listen carefully.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for Giles who, together with the member for Norwood, is keenly interested in this issue. The white paper, which has formed the basis for the new funding round from the federal government, is an important step forward. It has resulted from 18 months of extensive consultation throughout the country, and has recently allowed the federal cabinet to give substantial sums of money to the tourism industry over the next few years. The minister, Joe Hockey, should be commended for his activities because—certainly, more than his state Liberal colleagues—he has really put tourism on the map to the extent that it is now recognised as a major employment sector.

Tourism is an area that has a major impact on export dollars. It is an area that has a major impact as an employer and it has the opportunity to impact on the environment and sustainability across the regions. The white paper, particularly, is complimentary and endorses the way in which the State Tourism Plan operates. In many regards it endorses and shadows some of the activities that can be picked out of the South Australian Tourism Commission's plan for the next five years. There is a series of initiatives within the plan, underpinned by structural reform and aimed at positioning Australia as a world leader in the provision of tourism, goods and services and as a destination that meets and exceeds expectations in terms of the quality and value it provides, whilst also recognising the need for tourism to shift away from volume and move more to yield, so that each tourist yields more financial benefit rather than having high turnover.

This is particularly important, as it will reduce the pressure on infrastructure and, in addition, it will protect special places and environmental values. It also allows diversification and product development, which has always been one of the strengths in South Australia. It particularly emphasises the need to market to international visitors and the opportunity to—

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The minister is repeating the content of a ministerial statement given some time ago about the state tourism plan, which is on the record, and she is going through it step by step. A ministerial statement has already been given on the subject and the house is well aware of the content. I ask you, sir, whether it is repetitious. We should get on with questions.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member brings me the evidence, I will deal with it. The minister.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The point I make—and the member for Waite is not aware of this, perhaps because he has not read it—is that the white paper does clearly delineate the opportunities to market special places internationally and spread tourism around the regions by cataloguing clearly what each region has that is specific. Of course, the most obvious area is the Outback opportunities that we offer in South Australia. In particular, there will be a focus on the new tourism agenda for wine and food tourism, which is one of our key strengths. We will benefit and have opportunities to pull tourists away from the Gold Coast, the Reef and the Sydney Opera House, by coming to niche opportunities within our state.

It is very clear that South Australia has niches which are quite different from the rest of Australia. There is an element of fairness in this tourism package, which South Australia

should commend and support. For the first time, the Australian Tourism Commission will be marketing particular activities that will favour South Australia. So, instead of the previous push for Reef, Rock and Opera House, there will be a clear incentive for the Australian Tourism Commission to market special features that are niches for South Australia. That means that South Australia will be a winner—Kangaroo Island will be a winner, the Outback will be a winner, and wine and food tourism will be a winner—and it is sad that the efforts of the federal minister, which should be applauded, are not reflected by the member for Waite. Clearly, he likes to knock and drag down and criticise.

I think we should commend the federal minister, because his actions have been productive and will support South Australia, particularly in dealing with nature-based tourism. We have just released a policy which finally meshes with the federal policy by allowing us to focus on our opportunities for difference, niche, authenticity and originality. That is the joy of the white paper, because it builds on South Australia's strengths and is not based entirely on the east coast. I commend the federal government for its activities.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): What steps will the Minister for Emergency Services take to overcome problems that have been created as a result of the government's decision to introduce new communication technology, which has been described by South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service officers as substandard? I have been advised by concerned firefighters that the entire communications centre at the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service headquarters, which has been roundly criticised by fire officers and which has, at times, been unable to handle emergency calls, shut down last night and that the only way to turn out fire appliances in metropolitan Adelaide was by using the telephone.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services): Sometimes when I get a question from the member for Mawson, I need to pinch myself to make sure that I am not dreaming. When we came to government, we inherited, among other horrible errors—

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I rise on a point of order. I refer to standing order 98 and the issue of relevance. I am asking what the minister will do to fix his bungle.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure the member for Mawson will be interested to discover the failings of the government radio network that the minister is about to reveal.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: My point of order referred to the specifics of the question, which dealt with the communications centre, not the GRN.

The SPEAKER: The honourable minister.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is either silliness or crazy brave asking a question about communications when the honourable member was the minister in the previous government that gave us the GRN, that gave us the money-eating monster that is the GRN. Some CFS areas, fortunately very few, are still making complaints about it to this day, despite the \$300 million-odd that we put in to make it work. I caution the shadow minister about relying on some of the information he has been fed in the last few weeks and I remind him—

Mr Brokenshire: Firefighters.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, firefighters. I remind him that some of the information might be coming from disgruntled parties to a recent union election. We are looking at some

of the information he provided on counselling and it is not coming up as he suggested, and I will bring that back to the house.

The first point is that the only change that has been made by this government to the proposals of the previous government in terms of the communications centre was not to change the parameters but to separate out the Ambulance Service and send it back to another communications centre where I understand the same technology is working very well. If the honourable member thinks we have problems at the moment, I point out that, if we tried to jam them all in there while we were doing this transition to new equipment, it would have been a disaster. The repeated advice I have from the chief officer of the fire service is that there are some transitional difficulties in making the space for what is very big, very new, communications centre with a lot more capacity, a lot more redundancy. I rely on the advice, I accept it and trust it, and my advice is that absolutely no operations of the Metropolitan Fire Service have in any way been affected by the current communications centre. If there is anything wrong with what I say, I will certainly bring it back.

All we have done in communications is put in tens of millions of dollars to fix the holes in the previous government's \$250 million disaster that they called the GRN. We have done that despite a great deal of pain and we have improved enormously the performance of the dreadful GRN that they left with us. We have done a number of things that the previous government failed to do, like putting emergency services representatives on the steering committee for the GRN for the first time. They would not have them on there because they complained too much. They did not want them on the steering committee because they might tell the truth about some of the system's shortcomings. We were prepared to face up to it and put those people on the steering committee. We are prepared to face up to the issues and problems and fund them and fix them. Our record in communications for emergency services, as opposed to that of the previous government, is absolutely chalk and cheese.

I ask people to cast their minds back to what happened with the disaster that was the GRN. I remember the document they released, 'Media handling in case the entire GRN goes down'. That was the previous government's method of dealing with it. What to do—immediately draw the wagons into a circle and don't tell the journalists anything! That was the way they handled it. We have handled it by putting in the money, putting in the resources, fixing the communications and looking after our emergency services workers. Anywhere, anytime the former minister wants to debate this I will be there, but I do not think it will be happy for him.

YOUTH, DRINKING

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Consumer Affairs. How has the government promoted responsible drinking amongst young people during Schoolies Week?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): Following the end of the year 12 exams, many young people converged on Victor Harbor to celebrate Schoolies Week, which concluded yesterday morning. Although Schoolies Week has finished, it is important for young people to continue to drink responsibly whilst celebrating the end of their school years during the summer months. Statistics show that one in 10 young people aged 14 to 19 put their health at risk through excessive alcohol consumption at least weekly.

Excessive consumption can also put young people at risk of unwarranted sexual activity; participation in dangerous activities such as driving or swimming whilst intoxicated; or exposure to, and use of, violence.

The Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner (together with industry partners) has developed and distributed a wallet card for young people. The card provides information on the potentially adverse effects of alcohol consumption, myths and facts about alcohol, tips for safer consumption of alcohol, and the law about alcohol and young people. It also supports the decision of young people not to consume alcohol. Although it is important for young people to enjoy their end-of-year celebrations, it is also important that they do so safely. The card also provides information about calling emergency services and basic first-aid if someone passes out while drinking or becomes unable to speak. A wallet card is available from the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, and other information about young people and partying is available on the web site: www.olgc.sa.gov.au.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Well, the member for Schubert may need some information about partying. I suggest that he access the web site. I am sure that those rumours that he was there at Schoolies Week are untrue.

Mr Brokenshire: I went there.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Mawson says that he went there.

Mr Brokenshire: I spoke to 300 Christian volunteers who were looking after the young people.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Well, that's his story and he's sticking to it. I am pleased to say that both government and non-government schools have placed orders for the wallet card and that more than 16 000 wallet cards have been distributed. The cards are available at some clubs and licensed venues. The Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner was an active participant in Schoolies Week in providing a party safe environment for participants.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: In what way?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: As part of that approach, the dry area that has been covering Victor Harbor from midnight on Friday 21 November will continue until midnight on Sunday 30 November to curb liquor-related misconduct and to minimise broken glass in streets and parks.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Premier mentioned to me that it is seven years today since the Hon. J.W. Olsen rolled the member for Finnis, the then premier. I will always remember the silence in private members' time on that day.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The then premier had won only 37 seats at the general election and guess what, three years later—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am pleased that so far this summer the vast majority of young people have been celebrating the end of their school days in a way that the member for Finnis did not celebrate the end of his premiership, and in a way that has not left them vulnerable to the medical or social consequences of excessive alcohol consumption.

HERITAGE BUILDING, MINISTER'S REPLY

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation advise the house why he told the house on 11 November that he was unaware of any cabinet decision to give in-principle approval for the sale of any heritage-listed buildings when a departmental minute dated well prior to the minister giving that answer to the house states, 'cabinet approved in principle of the sale of the heritage building'?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I am not aware of the detail of the question the honourable member has asked, but I will have a look at it. If I made a mistake, I will apologise.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN BIODIVERSITY

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What steps will the government take to preserve and enhance South Australia's biodiversity, and will this include a commitment to the planting of indigenous flora?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I pay tribute to the member for Norwood for her long commitment to this issue. I understand that she was on the committee that resolved to plant ironbarks on the median strip on The Parade in 1988, so she has good credentials in relation to this. The state government is in the process of releasing a new policy that guarantees that indigenous plant species will make up the majority of state government plantings. This policy, which will cover all agencies, will ensure that generally local plants will be used on government projects and properties such as roads, landscaping for buildings, and habitat restoration work. Of course, there will be some exceptions, particularly in the case of heritage-designed areas.

For too long we have just planted whatever is convenient, and we have had a whole range of trees in place that are not really appropriate to their circumstances. Under this policy, priority will be given to planting grasses, shrubs and trees that have been grown from seed collected in the area where the works are happening. There is a great opportunity here for small business and local community groups to develop seed and seedling businesses based on local plants. Favouring indigenous plants has a variety of benefits, because the local species are more likely to survive in the prevailing soil type and climatic conditions—and probably use less water.

Indigenous plants are vital for biodiversity because they can be used as food for local species of birds and insects. Using indigenous plants will become an important part of the state government's Nature Links program, and the One Million Trees program also fits in to this.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: A brilliant program.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: A brilliant program, as the Premier said, which is making a big change. Only recently I was very pleased to announce a forest in the Onkaparinga Park named after David Suzuki, who was there to work with Conservation Corps young people who were using the One Million Tree program to plant out part of that park. The policy is available from my department on its web site, and I encourage all members to have a look at that site.

NATIONAL COMPETITION POLICY: FINANCIAL PENALTIES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Will the Treasurer confirm that the government has been advised that South Australia is facing financial penalties for not meeting the requirements of the National Competition Policy, and can he also advise the level of those penalties?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I think I should quote from Graeme Samuel today on radio. He said:

I am really delighted to be able to say that both South Australian Premier Rann and South Australian Treasurer Kevin Foley, when they saw that the appointment was to proceed, were very quick to turn around and say 'The only responsible thing to do is support the appointment.'

He goes on to say:

They're I think more principled. I had a discussion with Kevin Foley on the matter. He behaved in a very, very principled fashion and he said it was totally inappropriate for someone to adopt the important role under some temporary appointment. I admire him and Premier Rann for the approach they took.

This is not directly on the matter raised, but I will certainly get a report for the honourable member.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. The question was about the level of penalty the state government has been advised of in relation to national competition policy, and I ask that you direct the minister to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: The minister is not here.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: I said I would get a report.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order. You have previously and consistently ruled in this house that there is a collective cabinet responsibility; just because the opposition asks a question of an absent minister, does that mean that no minister in the cabinet left is responsible to answer the question?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I think I made it perfectly clear to every member of this house that I would be most assiduous in ensuring that the Treasurer gave a report on this important matter. However, I thought it was important that, in the process of advising you of that report, I should enlighten you as to the tributes paid by Graeme Samuel to both the Treasurer and myself.

The SPEAKER: Can I tell the honourable Premier that I am impressed that he should think that I need to be enlightened on the remarks made by the competition commission's chairman, or whoever else it was that he was quoting. The question that was asked was not, in any sense, related to his views of the good conduct of the Premier or the Treasurer but, rather, to the penalties which may be incurred by the state. Given the inexplicable absence of the Treasurer from the chamber, it is understandable that no answer can be given to that question, and it is regrettable that the Treasurer cannot be with us. The member for Unley, whilst taking a point of order, does not take a point of order upon which it is possible for me to uphold his view. The chair simply makes the observation that ministers ought to be in the chamber if they are in the building during question time, at least.

SWIMMING POOLS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning. How is the state acting to reduce the risk of young children drowning in backyard swimming pools?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): The government is presently

considering a report of the Swimming Pool Safety Working Party which makes a number of recommendations about this important matter. It remains the case, sadly, that drowning is the largest cause of accidental death to children under five. It is also the case that there are a considerable number of children who suffer death through drowning, but there is an equally large number who suffer impairment because of the drowning incident.

There are three important issues concerning children and water. The first and most important issue is adult supervision. In the lead-up to summer it is a timely reminder to those who are responsible for children around water to take that care, because this is the single most important contributor to things going wrong. The second issue, of course, is the sorts of measures that we take around swimming pools. We have a mishmash of regulations, which have been pointed out. The previous government presided, unfortunately, over a regime of swimming pool safety measures that distinguished between swimming pools built before and after 1993, when there is no sensible safety difference between them. There has now also been a proliferation of other inflatable pools that have filter systems that are, for all intents and purposes, as dangerous as other swimming pools, yet they are unregulated. Above-ground swimming pools are unregulated and, as I said previously, there is an anomaly between pre and post 1993 swimming pools.

So, the working party recommends that we do something about that. It also recommends that we consolidate all of those measures into one act, the Development Act, and it actually draws attention to the fact that there may be something like 40 000 swimming pools out there that are not subject to these safety regulations. It has been estimated that about one quarter of those—so, about 10 000—have taken the measures themselves to provide relevant fencing and other safety features concerning the use of suction equipment in swimming pools and, indeed, have complied with the relevant requirements. However, there could be as many as 30 000 pools out there that represent a danger to the community.

The other important measure that the working party discusses is the danger that is represented by unguarded creeks and other waterways that exist around the metropolitan area. There are some sensible measures there about engaging with local government and the mutual liability scheme to talk about measures that can be introduced about the design of those artificial waterways. Obviously, measures that address the way in which those waterways slope and the sort of material that is used near the water can all make a serious contribution to the safety of those waterways. I know the member for Wright has been involved in making some important representations to her local council about the safety of a particular waterway which was very unsafe, and this has led to a design change in that wetland. So, there are important measures that can be taken to make these particular features safer.

I conclude on the point that children can, of course, get into trouble even in a bucket of water. So, while all of these measures are important, there is no substitute for supervision. I remind people that we are dealing with the safety of our children, and remind them, as we lead up to summer, to take special care for their safety.

HERITAGE AGREEMENTS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation explain to the house why the

government has reduced council rate rebates paid to owners of land under heritage agreements by over 50 per cent? A property in my electorate has been under a heritage agreement since 1980. Recently the owner was advised that the government's reimbursement for council rates on the property had been reduced from 45 per cent, which it has been since 1980, to 18.18 per cent. He received no prior warning of this reduction and by explanation the letter advised that the increase was due, 'to the updating of heritage agreement payments.'

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I am not aware of the details to which the honourable member is referring, but I would be happy to take the matter up. If the member could give me the details I will certainly have it inquired into.

DOG AND CAT MANAGEMENT BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is for the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Why has the minister not tabled the Dog and Cat Management Board Annual Report prior to the house being scheduled to debate the Dog and Cat Management Bill? The board has statutory obligations to provide the minister, councils and the Local Government Association with copies of the annual report before 30 September. The minister must table the report within six days of receiving it. As yet, the minister has not tabled the report.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for that question. I have every intention of tabling that report as soon as it is available for me to table. I asked a question just recently about the matter that the member raised and I was advised that the report was with the Auditor-General. I am awaiting its arrival in my office from that—

Ms Chapman: Have you seen the draft?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yes, I have seen the draft. I am awaiting the report to come into my office before I can table it. As soon as I can, I will. A draft was emailed into my office after this issue was raised with me on a radio program on 5CK. I sought advice as to whether or not the report had been sent to my office. I was told that it had come in in a draft form, but we were waiting advice from the Auditor-General. When I receive it I will certainly table it.

SA WATER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning as the minister responsible for SA Water. Will the minister confirm whether water restrictions cum conservation measures apply to SA Water users on Kangaroo Island? In September, SA Water employees—and I happened to be there at the time—told a full meeting of the Kangaroo Island Council that such restrictions did not apply on Kangaroo Island. When resident Mr John Gunn of Kingscote, Kangaroo Island telephoned the SA Water hotline about this issue, he was told by a smart young employee that the restrictions did apply, because the island's water came from the River Murray. When Mr Gunn told her that no such pipeline ran under the sea, she replied that such a pipeline from the River Murray was on the drawing board to be constructed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister for creation and geography, as well as urban development and planning.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I understand that the telephone line between the Adelaide metropolitan area and Kangaroo Island can, from time to time, not be as clear as it might. I think that when the relevant operator heard the letters 'KI' she might have heard Clare. There are no such plans, of course, to build a pipeline from the River Murray to Kangaroo Island. I must say that some very interesting ideas have emerged through Waterproofing Adelaide, for example, towing icebergs. I have not heard this one, but it is certainly not one that is on the drawing board.

I would offer this, though, as a possible explanation for some of the confusion: while the water restrictions did apply to SA Water users who, in fact, were taking supplies that drew on the River Murray and hence did not include Kangaroo Island, the water conservation measures in fact apply to all SA Water customers, which does include Kangaroo Island. That may be the explanation for the confusion.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, perhaps that is the case but, in any event, it is a timely reminder to explain that there is a difference between the water conservation measures and the water restrictions. The water conservation measures apply generally to SA Water customers, whereas the water restrictions apply only to those customers drawing from the River Murray.

OMBUDSMAN, ANNUAL REPORT

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is to the Minister for Administrative Services. What issues have been raised by the South Australian Ombudsman in his 2002-03 annual report regarding the government's openness and accountability agenda?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, sir. That report was tabled yesterday and is available to all members.

The SPEAKER: I am distracted for the moment; excuse me. The question is out of order. The member for Morphett.

LAND TAX

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Will the Treasurer inform this house of the total additional revenue expected to be received in land tax in 2003-04 for properties that have previously been exempt from land tax? I have been informed that for the year 2003-04 Revenue SA will be sending out an additional 28 000 accounts for land tax. These accounts primarily relate to properties which were previously valued below the tax-free threshold. Revenue SA is currently sending out around 98 000 land tax accounts, with 28 000 new accounts. This indicates a 20 per cent increase in the number of land tax bills. How much additional revenue will these accounts provide to the state government?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Again, a predictable question from the honourable member opposite. There is no doubt that the state has experienced a significant housing boom. It has happened nationally. Good government means being prudent. To be a compassionate and caring government, you have to care for the finances of the state. That means you do not succumb to the temptation to spend the downfall of a boom until such time as you have assessed the downturn. If anyone had noticed recently—

Dr McFETRIDGE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I asked the Treasurer how much extra revenue, not about policy or anything else.

The SPEAKER: I was curious about the same thing.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. The point is an important preamble to the answer, which is that we have seen a significant slowdown or reduction in clearance rates for auctions in the eastern seaboard and here in South Australia. We are already seeing, with the 0.25 per cent interest rate rise delivered by the Howard Liberal government, a reduction in housing activity. So, Blind Freddy could see—

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The point of order is: debating the question, relevance, and not answering the subject of the question—all three, and anything else I can think of.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is giving us a background. The honourable the Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am simply making the point that we have a boom, we have a reduction; therefore, a prudent government would not spend that windfall.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, and it relates to the honourable member not addressing the subject of the question, which was a very specific question about how much revenue would be received from the extra 28 000. It is a straightforward question. How much?

The SPEAKER: I am sure the foreground is coming.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The opposition has asked for a figure for the 2003-04 financial year. Hello? We are in the beginning of the 2003-04 financial year.

Mr Brokenshire: Nearly in the middle.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, nearly in the middle; you have those figures at the end of the financial year. However, I can say that land tax receipts will be revised and updated, and will be presented in the mid-year budget review, which will be released in January or February of next year.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that ministers are required to give accurate answers. I ask you to rule on the fact that the Treasurer told us that the Howard government delivered a 0.25 per cent increase in interest rates. In fact, the Reserve Bank is an independent statutory body and it fixes interest rates. I therefore contend that the Treasurer has erred in his answer, and I ask you to rule on it.

The SPEAKER: It is an interesting point, but not one within my capacity. All honourable members, and those currently observing the proceedings, who may read the record in *Hansard* will judge for themselves as to the extent of the veracity of the information provided by the Treasurer, or any other minister, and equally, likewise, when explanations are given.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As a personal explanation, I am prepared to acknowledge the point that the Reserve Bank of Australia is an independent authority that reacts to the policy settings and the environment created by the Howard Liberal government, which has been a 0.25 per cent increase.

EDUCATION, CEO

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services provide an explanation as to why it has taken more than 12 months to finalise a performance agreement (which, according to my last advice, was still in draft form), as required under the Premier's Ministerial Code of Conduct, for the education department's chief executive,

Mr Steve Marshall, who took up his appointment on 14 October 2002 and is the third highest paid CEO in the state?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): This is an extraordinary question and, as per usual, the member for Bragg has it wrong. The member for Bragg has not bothered to check her facts and, yet again, she has it wrong. In fact, if this is the best the member for Bragg can throw up at the government, I am very flattered indeed. It means that South Australian public education and education generally across this state must be doing pretty well. In fact, it should be, given the priority that this government has placed upon it. The only part of her question that she did get right was the appointment date of the chief executive—14 October 2002. Her claim that a performance agreement is not in place is absolutely wrong. In fact, a performance agreement was put in place for the 2003 school year.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: That is absolutely wrong, and I expect the honourable member to get her facts right before she comes into this house. She is absolutely wrong. In fact, she might take the opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: If she would just stop and listen I will explain her mistake. I am alerted to her mistake because the member for Waite issued a press release on his web site recently in which the member for Bragg commented. The comment from—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: In a press release from the opposition, the member for Bragg commented that the opposition had lodged a freedom of information request about chief executive performance agreements. The request was for the 2003-04 financial year. The response that the 2004 performance agreement had not been finalised was correct, but the member should have immediately asked whether a previous agreement was in place, and there is. An agreement was put in place for the 2003 school year. The chief executive—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: It should not surprise the member for Bragg. The first fact is that the chief executive arrived in October 2002. Secondly, the education portfolio works on school years and most of the new initiatives, planning, etc., are aligned with the calendar year—the school year—so why should it surprise the member for Bragg that there was an agreement for the 2002-03 school year?

I return to the other claims in the press release that somehow I had breached the ministerial code of conduct. First, the code of conduct refers to assessment of the chief executive, and I advise the house that there have been continuous assessment discussions between me and the chief executive. There was also a formal assessment discussion on the performance agreement that is in place, but the 2003-04 performance agreement, which relates clearly to the following year, has not been finalised. Why is that so hard for the member for Bragg to understand? Yet again she has her facts wrong and yet again it has not even occurred to her to check the obvious.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

ROAD SAFETY RESEARCH

Mrs HALL (Morialta): Today I rise to express my concern about the lack of sufficient research material on road safety in our state and the government's tardiness, in my view, in ensuring that this parliament is properly educated to make informed decisions about saving lives on our roads. Last week AAMI insurance released its annual young drivers index which details, as we know, findings based on analysis of car accident insurance claims that have been lodged with their policyholders and a survey of drivers of all ages across Australia.

The key findings of the young drivers index were very interesting but, I would contest, very concerning, and highlighted the problems that we have with our young people on the roads. They also underpinned the all too regular news stories and pictures, many of which are horrifying, that we see too often, almost weekly, and we hear about young drivers, often in their twenties, who have lost their lives on the road. The investigation found that 14 per cent of young drivers in the 18 to 24 age bracket have experienced a road crash in the last 12 months compared with 8 per cent of older drivers. A staggering and I think horrifying 94 per cent of young drivers have been the victim of road rage or anti-social driving behaviour.

The report goes on to discuss what it calls the seven deadly sins of young drivers and it outlines drug driving, speeding, impatience, drink driving, risk taking, breaking the law and bad habits. I find particularly disturbing in this mix the fact that a fifth of young drivers have been driving under the influence of recreational drugs, a fifth believe it is acceptable to drink and drive as long as they feel capable, while almost a quarter of young drivers say they exceed the speed limit all the time or most of the time. These figures only reinforce the concern that I am sure we all have for the safety of young people on our roads, indeed, for all people and all drivers.

However, there is one aspect that I am increasingly concerned about, and that is what seems to be the reliance on investigations of private insurance companies to provide us with statistics needed to put in place appropriate government policies and strategies to address these road safety issues. As we know, road safety in this state covers so many issues, and some anecdotal evidence suggests that an increasing proportion of crashes are occurring with drivers hitting stationary objects such as trees and Stobie poles. I am particularly concerned that a large number of accidents involve driving on the wrong side of the road.

I imagine that most of us have heard stories of road crashes on the wrong side of the road. It is suggested that some of these accidents are caused by international drivers who are unfamiliar with our road systems and our rules, have some difficulty with our signage, and are certainly unfamiliar with many of the hazards of driving in some of our country areas. Perhaps it is something to do with the ease with which an international driver's licence can be obtained or perhaps it is just a general lack of information. However, when one tries to obtain specific figures on road crashes on the wrong side of the road, it is extremely difficult.

I have spent some months now attempting to collate material from the South Australia Police, the Motor Accident

Commission, the RAA, Transport SA and the University of Adelaide's Centre for Automotive Safety Research. Whilst some material is available, it is very limited in the area of road crashes on the wrong side of the road. Some anecdotal evidence from hospitals suggests that these crash victims are coming in more frequently and they are concerned that there does not appear to be a concentrated effort or a concentrated research project on this issue. I hope that, in the future, the minister looks at what can be done specifically to request such research. It is an important issue.

PNEUMOCOCCAL DISEASE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): Last Thursday, I moved a motion in the house calling on the federal government to act urgently to make pneumococcal vaccine free to all Australian children in line with other the recommendations of the National Health and Medical Research Council. In September, for the first time ever, the federal government announced that it would not follow a recommendation of the National Health and Medical Research Council concerning the vaccine. I wrote to the federal minister some time ago about this issue, and I know that the Minister for Health has also written to him. I certainly have not received a response to my correspondence. How many more children must die or suffer a disability such as deafness or brain-damage before something is done? In South Australia last year there were 405 notified cases of pneumococcal disease and 26 deaths. Without the government subsidy, the three-dose series of the vaccine will cost a parent about \$600. How many families can afford that? Now that my motion has been carried with bipartisan support—and I thank members of the opposition for their support for this very important issue—there is real pressure on the federal government to change its mind.

I mentioned last week the support of the AMA for the vaccine and some of the issues raised by the Chair of the AMA's Child and Youth Health Committee, Dr Michael Rice. Only this week, another statement has been issued by the AMA, and this is of real concern. The AMA has now announced that it is withdrawing support for the Department of Health and Ageing's booklet, *Understanding Childhood Immunisation*, in protest at the government's failure to fully fund the Australian Standard Vaccination Schedule. In his statement, Dr Rice says:

Australia now has two immunisation schedules: one which is recommended, on the best scientific evidence, by the NHMRC, but not fully funded by government; and another which the Australian government is prepared to fund.

Rates of full ASVS immunisation in Australia have risen substantially since payment of the child care benefit and the maternity immunisation allowance became dependent on compliance with the ASVS immunisation schedule. It now seems that parents are being told that they will be eligible for these benefits even if their children are not fully immunised according to that schedule.

The federal government agreed to fund the vaccine for children in high-risk groups but not all children. Dr Rice makes the concerning point that children most notably at risk are those who attend child-care centres. This is a significant omission of a vaccine from the funded schedule. This dreadful disease can be passed through droplets, so a child can pick it up through a cough, a kiss, or a sneeze. As I pointed out the other day, this disease is four times more prevalent than meningococcal disease, the vaccine for which is funded. I understand that there were 388 cases of meningo-

coccal disease in Australia and 25 deaths compared with 400 deaths each year in Australia from pneumococcal disease.

The current schedule clearly discriminates against lower income families. Some of our babies will be vaccinated because their parents can afford it, but some will not. As the member for Morphett so aptly said last week, this is very much a social justice issue. The federal government needs to start listening to the experts in this field. I venture to say that there is no better Christmas present than the federal government could deliver for all children than the security of being free of pneumococcal disease.

SPEED ZONES

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise today to make some remarks about the 50 km/h and 60 km/h speed zones on main arterial roads. I and other members of the Liberal Party have been receiving a significant amount of feedback from the community which indicates that there is a fair degree of confusion about why certain roads are 50 km/h zones when they are arterial roads. When this policy was brought in with the government's safety package last year, it was stated that the 50 km/h zone would be for residential roads and that main arterial roads would be maintained at 60. The government's policy is just not standing up. I will cite a few examples. Two days ago, Councillor Anne Moran of the Adelaide City Council indicated that the council was going to make a submission to the South Australian government regarding the speed limit of 50 km/h on the stretch of road which is the extension of Pulteney Street between South Terrace and Greenhill Road through the parklands, as the council believed that it should be returned to 60 km/h. The comment from the minister in the newspaper was that it would remain at 50. The substance of what he said was that there was no sense in the council's making a submission, because that is what would happen.

How does the minister justify the speed limit on Montefiore Road being 60 km/h when that road runs through parklands in a similar situation as the road from South Terrace to Greenhill Road? It just does not stand up. Peacock Road (the extension of King William Street), which goes from South Terrace to Greenhill Road and continues on King William Road, is zoned 50. There are no residences on that road, so there are no cars entering from residences or places of business, but that road is zoned 50 when Montefiore Road is zoned 60. I can understand why councillor Anne Moran is frustrated about this, because it is inexplicable.

However, it does not stop there. Port Pirie is also having problems, because the community has asked for the main arterial roads to be returned to 60 km/h. Taxi drivers in Port Pirie say that the 50 zone on arterial roads is costing them money. The council made an application to Transport SA, and it came back with an extremely bureaucratic reply, which states:

The application has been assessed against the Australian standard AS1742.4 speed controls and with regard to the 50 km default limit, the application has been declined. As a result all the roads contained in council's application are considered suited to the default speed limit and increasing the speed limit to 60 has not been approved. The roads are suited to the 50 km default limit because residential development is dominant and the major function of the road is to access properties. Also the speed measured on these roads is compatible with the 50 km default limit. It is acknowledged that there are some sections of road with roadside developments that may suit a higher speed limit. However, these are relatively short and

would create frequent speed limit changes, which is inappropriate because it has the potential to confuse drivers.

John Vucic, the CEO of the Port Pirie Regional Council, was on radio talking about this, and he said:

... pure basic logic should be applied here. ... not standards applicable to Australian national issues. ... we're talking Port Pirie here. ... not talking Canberra. ... or Melbourne or Sydney. ... we really need to know how the community really feels about this issue before we take it in there with a sledgehammer. ...

I have other examples. The member for Schubert has raised with me the main arterial road which goes through Truro, which has been reduced to 50, and, when you come into Lyndoch (my local town) on the Barossa Way it is 60, but when you go out on Gilbert Street it is 50.

Time expired.

NOARLUNGA TOWARDS A SAFE COMMUNITY

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Earlier this week, it was my pleasure to congratulate Noarlunga Towards a Safe Community on its re-designation as a World Health Organisation Safe City. I mentioned at the time that this is the first community outside Scandinavia to be re-designated in this way and I started to give the house an appreciation of the many, varied and excellent programs that Noarlunga Towards a Safe Community is undertaking. I continue to recognise that work, both because it deserves to be recognised and, secondly, because the activities that they have undertaken are useful in many communities. Noarlunga demonstrates how a community-based health service can work with a broad range of organisations in a community to increase safety for all. One of the projects that I have found particularly valuable is the Safe Dreaming Trail to School project. This has been undertaken in a number of schools in my electorate—including the Flaxmill primary and Morphett Vale East schools. I think that recently there was a celebration at one of the schools in Seaford in the electorate of the member for Kurna which undertook the same sort of activities.

There are many layers to this project, which benefits both the young people participating and the community in different ways. The young people learn about a safe and pleasant neighbourhood. Having learnt about this, they go out around their school with cameras and notebooks to identify hazards and also unpleasant obstructions in the neighbourhood. In this way, they learn very early about the unpleasantness of graffiti and the damage that it does to our community and, given the level of concern about and the abhorrence for graffiti in my community, it is important that children in about grades five and six are learning about the damage it does and how it brings about an unpleasant aspect.

Having documented what might be some of the hazards in the community, the children research who is responsible for fixing them. They then contact these organisations and advise them of the different hazards that they have identified. Later, there is a meeting where representatives of these organisations—the council, Telstra, ETSA or SA Water—come and report on the activities that they have undertaken as a result of the children's correspondence. These various agencies explain to the children how their issue was addressed. In this way, children learn that it is their responsibility to take account of their environment and that, when they raise concerns with government agencies, things do happen. Given the cynicism that exists in our community, I think it is very important that young people see that their views, information and knowledge are valued in our community.

So, we have already seen many levels of this project, but there is another level. They work with an Aboriginal artist and, in this way, learn about how Aboriginal art tells the story of a trail. The children learn some of the basics of Aboriginal art and develop their own story of the trail that they have followed. It was quite wonderful at the launch of the Morphett Vale East project to see the children's art work along the wall. In addition to that, the Aboriginal artist involved (in most cases, Shialee Brodie, in our community) creates a work of art that remains the property of the school, so that inside the reception area there is a magnificent piece of Aboriginal art that all the school community can be proud of, and the young people can explain to their parents and other visitors to the school what it means. So they are learning again at another level about the history and culture of our indigenous community and gaining an appreciation of art and its role in a community. This is, indeed, an excellent program.

ADOPTION BY SAME SEX PARTNERS

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Yesterday, in answer to a question by me to the Premier, the Attorney said:

... the member for Hartley will not be disappointed [with the announcement]. I know the member for Hartley has a long, particular and abiding interest in same sex relationships.

I commend the minister for his answers to my questions on adoption and on IVF, and I am sure that members on both sides of the house would be pleased that those two sections (very importantly, for the community) have been exempted. My questions have been answered by the minister on those particular issues. However, I listened to the ministerial statement today with interest and—

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: He is obsessed.

Mr SCALZI: The member says I am obsessed. Part of the job of a parliamentarian, I understand, is that we have to be obsessed in the interests of the public.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It was a very disappointing announcement for you today, Joe.

Mr SCALZI: I have just commended the minister. The minister was outside the chamber when I said that I was not disappointed. However, after listening to and reading the ministerial statement today, I noted that these matters will be decided by this parliament in the new calendar year. I just wonder what 'to be decided by this parliament' means. Does it mean that it will be a government bill, does it mean that we will have a conscience vote as we call it on this side of the house, or does it mean a free vote as it is often called on the other side? I look forward in the new calendar year to finding out exactly what is meant by 'decided by this parliament'. I hope that the Premier will take a more active role in implementing the things that he listened to during the previous election campaign. Also, will it be a free vote or a conscience vote on certain issues or will it be a vote on the package? I look forward to that. As I have said, the Premier really has been forced to come to a position, but I commend all the family groups and churches that have written to the Premier, the Attorney and, indeed, to many members on these important issues. They have been listened to.

I also note in the ministerial statement that there is recognition of same sex partners as spouses so that they are not compelled to give evidence in court against each other. An earlier paragraph states that most states and territories have given legal recognition to same sex couples; however, marriage is beyond the scope of the state law and neither

marriage, nor anything like it, will be dealt with by the proposed bill. I am really keen to see how all that is going to be sorted out.

I also refer to the last point regarding specific domestic relationships in all current and future South Australian legislation. I note that with much interest because, as members would be aware, I have an interest in domestic co-dependent relationships.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Do you have an interest?

Mr SCALZI: Members would be aware that I have proposed a bill that would be based on caring relationships instead of on sexuality.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Do you think about anything else?

Mr SCALZI: Indeed, I do think about other things, because I say it should not be based on sexuality. What concerns me is that we are all going down the path of assessing an individual's worth based on their sexuality. I do not believe that should be the case. There is more to an individual than their sexual behaviour. That is why I have always said that a person who has cared for another, whether they be related or not, whether they be of the same sex or the opposite sex, should be considered in any legislation, and I welcome those aspects of the announcement today.

Time expired.

NATIONAL COMPETITION POLICY

Mr RAU (Enfield): I am going to find it very difficult to top the last contribution. I realise that it stirred the members of the chamber considerably, and I have to say that my effort will be less provocative, although I will do my best. I would like to speak today about a matter that was raised by the member for Davenport in a question which, unfortunately, has not yet been answered and which is about national competition policy. Of course, national competition policy is the policy administered by the federal government, in particular by the federal Treasurer, and is a policy by which the federal Treasurer penalises states for doing anything other than they are directed by the federal government. This is what national competition policy means.

A shorthand way of describing it might be: 'Do as you're told or I [Peter Costello] will take money off you.' I am actually surprised that the member for Davenport has the cheek to raise a question like this in this chamber in circumstances where he will obviously be embarrassed by the answer. I have been thinking quite a bit about national competition policy because, I suppose, to the extent that I have an obsession, like the member for Hartley, this is mine. It strikes me that national competition policy represents a triumph of ideology over commonsense. It is a strange thing I have noted since being in this parliament that we describe things as commonsense when commonsense appears to be an extremely scarce commodity, especially when talking about national competition policy.

I have tried to analyse all this and reduce it to a fairly simple proposition, and I think I have more or less got it. This is the simple proposition. This is what national competition policy stands for. The game is very simple. It is all about building in the opportunity to maximise shareholder profits and executive salaries, at the same time, at the expense of community service obligations and national or state sovereignty. I would like to repeat that, because I spent a bit of time working on it. The game is a simple one of building in opportunity to maximise shareholder profits and executive

salaries at the expense of community service obligations and national or state sovereignty. Let us look at some of the classic examples of this.

National competition policy applied to the electricity market—what a shemuzzle! National competition policy, national electricity policy, ETSA sale—catastrophe in the marketplace. Why? Because all the players in that game are building in their shareholder margin for profit: the retailer, the generator, the distributor are all building in their profit for their shareholders. They are not interested in what the public pays for electricity: they are interested in what the bottom line is for their company. Look what demutualisation did for those lucky people who were policy holders for AMP. George Trumble did pretty well out of it, but those people who saw their shares open up at about \$16 or so are now getting \$5.40 for them, courtesy of the same blind ideology that applies triumph of ideology over commonsense.

This whole issue of national competition policy is an abdication of responsibility by governments, state and federal. It is weak, it is gutless, and it is morally reprehensible. The sooner we in this parliament wake up to this and our colleagues in the federal parliament wake up to it and start dealing with the community in a honest, direct way, the better. I believe that what we require now is a complete pause on this policy of national competition policy. No more penalisation of the states. The whole thing needs to be reviewed and the balance needs to be completely shifted—not so that we have to prove that we have something that is worthwhile, even if they do not like it, but they have to prove that what we are doing is wrong. That is the point.

I am glad to see the member for Stuart here, because he knows that what I am talking about is absolutely right. He knows that this policy applied to grain farmers is going to ruin the barley industry, because they are trying to destroy the single desk. He knows that it is all these eggheads in Canberra working this out. He knows that it is the federal Treasurer who is going to penalise this government. He knows that and so do a lot of his colleagues back there. I think the deputy leader knows it, too. They all know it. I implore them: ring up Mr Costello. You have more influence over him than we have. Get him to face reality. Tell him the emperor is not wearing any clothes. National competition policy is a great big crock.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT (DISSOLUTION OF PASSENGER TRANSPORT BOARD) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (VEHICLE IMMOBILISATION DEVICES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

PROBLEM GAMBLING FAMILY PROTECTION ORDERS BILL

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to allow orders to be made for the protection of family members from serious harm resulting from problem gambling; to make a related amendment to the Domestic Violence Act 1994; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

On 24 September 2003, a Ministerial Statement was made informing this House of the development of an early intervention order scheme that would empower families to restrict further harm being caused by problem gamblers.

The Problem Gambling Family Protection Order Scheme was developed by the Independent Gambling Authority and is similar to the model for domestic violence orders in this State.

Specifically, the scheme provides for application to the Authority to seek a problem gambling order against a family member who has caused financial harm through excessive gambling. Orders can include provision to bar persons from gambling venues, to seek counselling and to make specific financial arrangements. Orders would be issued in an environment which would encourage counselling and mediation in the first instance. There would be no penal sanction for breach of an order but orders could be registered in the Magistrates Court and ultimately enforced as an order of that Court. The Chief Magistrate has indicated that “diversionary management” would be practised in these cases.

Following the Ministerial Statement of 24 September, the proposed scheme was released to stakeholders for public consultation. Industry, community and government bodies provided input to the process of further consideration and refinement of the proposal, including issues to be considered in its practical implementation.

It is important to note that this proposal is only one measure in the range of actions being taken with respect to problem gambling. This measure focuses on the individual taking responsibility for his or her actions and on the families being provided with a tool to assist to intervene where the problem gambler is causing financial harm. It will, almost certainly, not be appropriate for all families to use this approach as the appropriateness of the approach will depend on their particular circumstances.

A range of other measures focussing on the nature of the gambling product and the gambling environment is being developed to be implemented through compulsory codes of practice. The industry and welfare sectors have been working together to assist the Independent Gambling Authority to formulate these codes. In addition, following the release of the inquiry report by the Authority into the management of gaming machine numbers in South Australia, the Parliament will separately get the opportunity to consider issues with respect to gaming machine numbers in this State.

This Bill seeks the establishment of a new Act to give effect to problem gambling family protection orders. It also makes amendments to the *Domestic Violence Act 1994* to enable the Magistrates Court to issue problem gambling family protection orders as part of domestic violence restraining orders where appropriate.

This Bill establishes an innovative approach to dealing with problem gambling. The Government is not aware of any other gambling orders of this type.

The Government thanks the Independent Gambling Authority for their work in development of this scheme and those that contributed in the consultation process. Honourable Members are asked to support the introduction of the scheme as an additional tool to assist families who suffer from the negative effects of problem gambling.

I commend the Bill to Members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause contains definitions of words and phrases used in this measure.

4—Grounds for making problem gambling family protection order

The Authority may make a problem gambling family protection order on a complaint against a respondent if there is a reasonable apprehension that the respondent may cause serious harm to family members because of problem gambling and the Authority is satisfied that the making of the order is appropriate in the circumstances.

5—Terms of problem gambling family protection order

A problem gambling family protection order may apply for the benefit of all of the respondent's family members or specified family members. Among matters that may be the subject of a problem gambling family protection order are the following:

- participation in a program of counselling, rehabilitation or special education or any combination of these;
- barring participation in gambling activities;
- barring attendance at premises where gambling activities may be undertaken;
- requiring the closing of gambling accounts;
- barring the taking possession of personal property (including money) reasonably needed by a family member;
- requiring the respondent to make arrangements for specified family members to be paid or have access to—
 - (i) money owing or accruing to the respondent from a third person; or
 - (ii) money of the respondent in the hands of a third person (including money in an ADI account).

6—Attachment order

A problem gambling family protection order may include an order (an *attachment order*)—

- (a) that money owing or accruing to the respondent from a third person; or
- (b) that money of the respondent in the hands of a third person (including money in an ADI account),

be paid to satisfy a debt owed by the respondent, or be otherwise applied in a specified manner, for the benefit of all of the respondent's family members or specified family members (the *beneficiaries*).

7—Complaints

A written complaint may be made to the Authority, on which the Authority may exercise any powers vested in the Authority for the purposes of proceedings before the Authority (see sections 13—15 of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*). A complaint may be made by—

- (a) a family member of the respondent affected by the respondent's problem gambling behaviour;
- (b) a departmental officer;
- (c) the Public Advocate;
- (d) a person who satisfies the Authority that he or she has a proper interest.

8—Complaints or applications by or on behalf of child

If a child is at least 14 years of age, the child may, with the permission of the Authority, make the complaint in person. The complaint may be made on behalf of the child by a family member or other person referred to in clause 7

9—Making problem gambling family protection order in respondent's absence

A problem gambling family protection order may be made in the absence of the respondent.

10—Variation or revocation of problem gambling family protection order by Authority

The Authority may vary or revoke a problem gambling family protection order on application if all parties have had a reasonable opportunity to be heard.

11—Conduct of proceedings

Proceedings under this measure are proceedings for the purposes of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995* with the Authority being constituted of the presiding member (or his or her deputy) and at least one other member of the Authority. Any question of law that arises in such proceedings must be decided by the presiding member (or his or her deputy) (a legal practitioner of at least 10 years standing—see section 5 of the *Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995*). The conduct of such proceedings may not be delegated.

12—Service

An order, or variation of an order, is not binding on a person specified in the order until personally served on the person.

13—Notification of making, variation or revocation of problem gambling family protection orders by Authority

If a problem gambling family protection order is made, varied or revoked by the Authority, the Secretary must provide a copy of the

order to the complainant, the Chief Executive of the Department and the proprietor or licensee of any premises specified in the order.

14—Enforcement of problem gambling family protection orders
A problem gambling family protection order made by the Authority may be registered in the Court and enforced as an order of the Court.

15—Removal of respondent barred from certain premises

The powers under the *Casino Act 1997* or the *Gaming Machines Act 1992* relating to requiring a person to leave, or removing a person from, a place from which the person has been barred under either of those Acts, extend to a person barred from such a place by an order under this Act, as if the order were an order under the relevant Act.

16—Court may review decision of Authority

The Magistrates Court may review a decision of the Authority in proceedings under this Act on application by the complainant, the respondent or a member of the respondent's family affected by the decision.

On a review, the Court may—

- (a) affirm the decision of the Authority;
- (b) rescind the decision and substitute a decision that the Court considers appropriate;
- (c) make any ancillary or consequential order that the Court considers appropriate.

17—Priority of problem gambling family protection order proceedings

The Authority and the Court must, as far as practicable, deal with proceedings for or relating to problem gambling family protection orders as a matter of priority.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

A new section 10A is to be inserted into the *Domestic Violence Act 1994* that provides that when the Court makes a domestic violence restraining order, it may, if satisfied that it is appropriate to do so in the circumstances, make any order of the kind that the Independent Gambling Authority is empowered to make on a complaint under the *Problem Gambling Family Protection Orders Act 2003*. If that occurs, the order will be taken for all purposes to form part of the domestic violence restraining order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

VICTIMS OF CRIME (CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION REGULATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 November. Page 944.)

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Smug in victory, vituperative in defeat. We have one of the most political attorneys-general the state of South Australia has ever been graced with. The Attorney deploys his combative approach in respect of his legislation in the same way that he runs factional battles within the Labor Party. I need to state that because, as we go through the contribution of the Attorney in relation to this bill, it becomes clear that the Attorney sometimes brings in matters of personal argument that are unhelpful in the overall resolution of these matters for debate.

The proposal before the house essentially concerns two matters: one is in relation to lawyers' fees for victims of crime compensation applications; and the more important aspect, in many ways, is the availability of adequate medical reports for victims at the stage when they negotiate—generally through lawyers—with the Crown. The vast majority of claims are negotiated successfully; that is to say, very few cases go to trial.

The new proposal for lawyers' fees will accentuate that if anything, because there is a built-in incentive for finalising matters before trial. The lawyers whom I know practising within the area are unlikely to ever change their advice to their clients on the basis that they will receive very little reward for proceeding to trial. This simply perpetuates the pro bono element of their work in relation to these types of

claims. In his second reading speech the Attorney made a number of statements which, I feel, need to be challenged. However, I must applaud the government for making the move to increase remuneration for lawyers' work in respect of these types of cases, and, indeed, if it was the Attorney-General who championed that particular cause in cabinet, then credit is due to him for that. I will return to the issue of the offer to increase lawyers' fees in a moment, and the way that it ties in with the other reform proposals.

The problem that bureaucrats within the Attorney's department sought to address was that a substantial proportion of costs was expended on medical reports for victims who were putting their claims to the Crown. Naturally, some claims would be supported by general medical practitioners and there would be plenty of claims supported by medical specialists: some of them orthopaedic surgeons, for example; some of them psychiatrists, and so on. It is a fact that many victims will go to a hospital as their first port of call after being bashed or in some other way being a victim of a crime. Sometimes people will be away from their usual general medical practitioner and may see some other GP in case of an emergency. When the government put forward regulations to deal with this issue by confining the obtaining of medical reports, as of right and with certainty of reimbursement by the Crown, to reports from treating general medical practitioners, those regulations were examined by the Legislative Review Committee and were the subject of a recommendation for disallowance. Those regulations were disallowed once again when the Attorney put them forward again.

I concede that this bill is a compromise. It is certainly better than the arrangements which were put forward in the regulations earlier this year, but it is still not without problems. One of the assertions made by the Attorney was that assessment of compensation is not usually difficult, and consequently it was suggested that it was better economy to use specialist reports only where there was some good reason why a general practitioner's report would not do. The problem is that that is such a generalisation. There are many claims where there is considerable argument about the compensation payable. It is very common for there to be a considerable amount of discussion and correspondence back and forth between the Crown and the lawyer representing the victim before an agreed settlement figure is arrived at, and there is already built into those settlement figures the risks, the unpleasantness etc., of going to trial for the victim. So, even if there is a settlement offer from the Crown which might be \$1 000 or \$2 000 short of what the lawyer recommends or what, in justice, ought to be paid to the person, often it is worth taking that discount for the sheer sake of avoiding delay and avoiding the unpleasantness of facing a court and facing the offender.

The point is that compensation reckoning is often difficult or, if not difficult, is at least the subject of argument. If it is the subject of argument, it is incumbent upon a lawyer representing a victim to get the best evidence possible to be able to, on the one hand, advise the client properly and, on the other hand, have the best evidence possible to present to the Crown in order to get every cent to which the person is truly entitled—no more, no less. The Attorney's way of putting this was to say, 'the examining specialist is chosen by the lawyer for forensic advantage'. In the context, it is as if there is something unsavoury about that, when that is exactly what the lawyers' job is. The lawyer is there to gather evidence and to present it as persuasively as possible to maximise the settlement offer from the Crown and, if that is not adequate,

then to proceed to trial with as much evidence as can be gathered and presented.

So, it is disturbing to see the heavy emphasis on economy when there are other more fundamental issues which the victims of crime legislation itself seeks to address, namely, the welfare of the victims. It is true, as the Attorney said, that many victims report distress at recalling or reliving the criminal assault upon them, and it is tiresome—if not traumatic—to have to repeat their experiences to police, to lawyers, to doctors, and so on. I make the point that in many cases where claims are currently put to the Crown there is certainly the need to have reported the matter to the police and to have instructed a lawyer but, beyond that, a number of victims with traumatic psychological injury do not actually seek treatment for that until referred to a psychiatrist by their lawyer. That is not to say that it is a fabricated injury or that it is not worthy of compensation.

It is simply that many people, where they have been bashed or traumatised by an offender, do not think of addressing the psychological or psychiatric issues specifically until prompted to do so, either by a lawyer or a health professional. In some cases, when they see a psychiatrist for medico-legal purposes, it is the first time that a witness will have properly unburdened themselves of the trauma of the crime which led to their injury.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): Order!

Mr HANNA: The Attorney submitted that some members of the legal profession took exception to these restrictions on the obtaining of medical reports and the reimbursement for such. The Attorney states that their objection seems to have been that general practitioners are not qualified to write a report for this purpose. That entirely misses the point, and I say that it is unfair to members of the legal profession who objected to the regulations earlier this year. General medical practitioners are well-qualified to deal with some problems, but in many cases, to gather the best evidence for a claim for psychological injury, a psychiatrist or a psychologist will be the best-qualified to write a report for that purpose. It is incumbent upon the lawyer to get the best evidence available, as I have previously stated.

There is nothing forceful in the Attorney's submission that general practitioners are legally entitled to treat such injuries. It simply adds nothing, because the obligation on the lawyer is to get the best evidence possible, and for the client to seek the best medical treatment possible, rather than chat to the GP about what might be a serious post-traumatic stress disorder, for example.

The Attorney says that there are two or three practitioners who disagree with the system that was put forward in the regulations earlier this year. The figures that have been put to me are that those few lawyers probably perform the majority of criminal injury claim work in South Australia.

It is not fair, and it is not right for the Attorney to dismiss the arguments by saying that it is a matter for only two or three practitioners. I found the Attorney's treatment of the Legislative Review Committee very objectionable as well. The contention that a general practitioner is unqualified to write a satisfactory report about an injured person was alleged by the Attorney: 'to have seemed persuasive to the Legislative Review Committee of the parliament, because it moved the disallowance of these regulations, apparently mainly for that reason.'

There were clearly more persuasive grounds for the disallowance of those regulations and I outlined them in this

place when I moved the disallowance of those regulations. The concern of the Legislative Review Committee was primarily the interests and the rights of victims, victims who had every right to expect that reasonably obtained medical reports, to get the best evidence of whatever injury it was that they suffered, would be reimbursed by the crown.

I refer to a letter from the Victim Support Service, which is dated 26 November 2003 and which was provided to the Attorney-General's department. I presume the Attorney will have the letter, and have the opportunity to comment upon it today. The letter sums the position up very well and, because the agency is there primarily to represent the interests of victims, their voice must be heard in this debate. I quote from the letter:

It is our submission that these regulations—
and in passing I add that this also refers to the bill—

represent a dilution of crime victims' ever-reducing capacity to gain compensation for the harm done to them. Indeed, we argue that crime victims may well be re-victimised by some aspects of this bill. It is clearly the case that legal practitioners who act in the interests of crime victims will be restrained in presenting their client's case by the directions of representatives of the crown.

I interpolate at this point that although there are some people at the crown who have been managing these cases for many years, there are elements, in my respectful submission, that are quite unsympathetic to the interests of victims in the way these claims are dealt with.

I wish I had time to read the whole letter from the Victim's Support Service. I would like the Attorney's assurance that their funding base will not be eroded as a result of this submission which might cause him some trouble.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That is just completely stupid. We have increased it in real terms in two budgets.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HANNA: As they state in the letter:

With crime compensation lawyers' hands tied, the crown can have a free reign to offer paltry sums of compensation without risk of challenge in court.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney will have his opportunity.

Mr HANNA: The letter goes on to state:

The most serious challenge to crime victims gaining adequate compensation (within the confines of a very low compensation regime) has been the substantial restrictions placed on victims in the three month negotiation period being able to document their injury or loss by properly qualified specialists. Further, the regulations also state that the compensation fund will not normally pay for the cost of reports from allied health practitioners (i.e., people without a medical or dental qualification).

That is a significant point, too, because many people who do suffer psychological injury go off to see a psychologist, or people with back injuries might see a chiropractor, or somebody who could provide a very helpful report, but is, nonetheless, not recognised for reimbursement purposes by the crown.

It is no good to say that the bill prevents lawyers being sued for negligence by not obtaining the best evidence they can. The very fact that the suggestion is made in the legislation suggests that there is something seriously wrong with the practice which is being encouraged. It is being encouraged purely as a money-saving measure. I will not say any more about the Attorney. I have said more than enough.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You could actually provide some substantiation.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HANNA: The problem is that the bill does not work in the interests of victims. It makes it more difficult for victims to properly establish their claims.

Time expired.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate on the bill, and for their assistance towards its speedy passage. I believe that the legal profession is anxious, and justifiably so, to see the bill pass in this session, if possible. The member for Mitchell has pointed out to me, and I acknowledge, that the Legislative Review Committee of the parliament had concerns about the former regulations, regulations which were ultimately disallowed, and was concerned not only about the qualifications of general practitioners to write medical reports.

The committee's concerns, I accept, included other matters, such as the scope of the discretion given to the Crown, a matter that has been dealt with by including in the bill a list of factors that the Crown must consider; and the concern that there was no express provision in the regulations for the case where the victim had been treated only at a hospital, a matter that has been rectified by an express reference to hospital records or reports. These concerns were reasonable, and I appreciate the committee's having identified them. The ultimate result will be all the better for the committee's scrutiny.

In fact, I think that even the member for Mitchell, in his current bad temper, would acknowledge that I was the only minister to appear before the Legislative Review Committee to answer questions. I do not recall another minister accepting the committee's invitation during the term of the current government, and I do not recall any attorney-general accepting its offer during the eight years of the previous government, but the member for Mitchell gives me no credit for that. The member for Heysen spoke about the rule that the cost of a specialist report will not be covered unless the Crown agrees.

It is important that members grasp that this rule applies only in the three-month period contemplated by section 7(3) of the act. That section requires that, three months before application to the court, the victim is to serve on the Crown particulars of the claim. The intention is that there be an opportunity for the Crown to consider the claim and negotiate with the victim toward a settlement. The rule restricting payment of the cost of specialist reports applies only to that period. After that, if application is made to the court, the rule is that the victim may recover reasonable disbursements as allowed by the court.

If members are under the impression that this bill seeks to impose a general rule that specialist reports will not be paid for from the fund where the case cannot settle and that an application to the court is required, that is a mistake; and the member for Heysen was labouring under that mistake. There is no attempt to restrict the victim, when proving the case to the court, to reports of a general practitioner. That misunderstanding seems to have dogged this measure throughout but, I hope, I have now put it to rest. The member for Heysen also asked why the reference to hospital records is limited to 20 pages. The answer is that, in general, a report in the form of a letter from the hospital registrar is of much more use to the parties than a copy of the hospital record. The record will, of course, consist largely of material such as observations, temperature and drug charts, test results and like documents that lawyers cannot interpret. It will be far more useful for the

purpose of the compensation claim if the victim requests a letter from the hospital registrar summarising the injury, treatment and condition on discharge. If, however, the victim wants to rely on the hospital record, the cost will be covered up to 20 pages. The Law Society told the government that most hospital records in these cases are no longer than that, so the intention is to cover the cost of most of them.

If, however, the report is longer, one has to question the value of paying for the photocopying of a voluminous record—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—when a summary report that is of more use could be obtained more cheaply. In some instances—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—the fund has been billed hundreds of dollars for the photocopying of hospital records that prove to be useless in resolving the claim. The member for Heysen's accusation of bias against the Acting Deputy Speaker is not well grounded, because the Acting Deputy Speaker, as the *Hansard* will show, pulled me up continually during my contribution—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—Acting Deputy Speaker—to the member for Mitchell's contribution. I suggest that she refer to the *Hansard*.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: You just did. You just accused him of pulling you up.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Perhaps the minister will return to the debate.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: There will, of course, be cases where it is relevant to obtain the hospital record even though it is longer than 20 pages. In those cases the victim should seek the Crown's agreement to pay; but if that is refused the victim can apply to the court. The honourable member also asked for confirmation about the application of the bill. As the honourable member said, the increased scale of costs, for which I am personally responsible, and the associated rules about disbursements, apply only to claims which arise under the old act and which were first notified to the Crown—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—yes—on or after 19 December 2002. Also, they will not apply retrospectively to claims in which costs have already been determined. And if the member for Heysen thinks that her party, when it was in government, would have done anything different, she is merely fooling herself. The bill is thus of limited application, as the honourable member says. I foreshadow some minor amendments of a technical nature that do not change the operation of the bill. I apologise to members for the lateness of the amendment, but these matters were brought to my attention only yesterday and today.

In his opening the member for Mitchell said that we had the most smug and vituperative Attorney-General the state has seen: that I was smug in victory and vituperative in defeat; yet, in the 20 minutes available to him, he could not cite a single example of that. Indeed, compared with some of my ministerial colleagues, I think that I have been positively generous towards the member for Mitchell. He is one of the select group of people I always consult about judicial appointments. Indeed, I let him off the hook when he changed

his party affiliation. His reference to my being a factional player is odd coming from a member who, throughout his time in the parliamentary Labor Party, was at all times a paid up member of the largest faction in the Australian Labor Party.

The member for Heysen makes reference to the Magistrates Court scale. I remind the honourable member that the jurisdiction for criminal injuries and victims of crime claims is the District Court, and applications of the kind she raises are usually made to a master. However, I believe that the honourable member's concern has been dealt with already in the bill and that the suggested amendment is unnecessary. There is only one government which would have given lawyers practising in the victims of crime compensation field the kind of increase in their rates they have received, and that is a Labor government. Had Mr Kerin's ministry been re-elected on 9 February last year, no such increase would have been possible.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mrs REDMOND: Before we start the debate on this clause, I have a point of clarification. In the structure of this act (and we have come across this problem before), the whole of the substantive provisions of this bill are contained within a single clause, that is, clause 3. I do not have a million questions per clause, but I do seek more than three questions for clause 3, given there are numerous amendments imposed into the regulations by the single operative clause of this bill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Snelling): We will break the clause down into sections.

Mrs REDMOND: It seems to me that the two amendments proposed by the Attorney-General are unlikely to be contentious—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Three.

Mrs REDMOND: I do not have the third one. I will check the other amendment, but it seems to me that we might knock those out of the way, because they are very simple and straightforward.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We will deal with these amendments and then we will go through the clause section by section.

Mrs REDMOND: I again seek clarification. I understood the Attorney's adviser indicated that there are three amendments, and I have only 56(1) and 56(2).

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No; there are two sets.

Mrs REDMOND: Two sets; thank you.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I move:

Page 7—

Line 14—After 'report' insert:

, unless

Line 15—Delete 'unless'

Both amendments are matters of drafting and do not change the effect of the bill. These amendments would move the word 'unless' from line 15 to line 14. This is necessary, because it governs both subparagraphs of this provision. That is, in the case of any other report, the cost of the report will not be payable unless either there has been no acceptable settlement offer within the period referred to in subparagraph (i) or the Crown has agreed, as referred to in subparagraph (ii). The amendment is moved on the advice of parliamentary counsel.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I move:

Page 7, after line 39—

Insert:

Schedule 2—Negligence and reliance on certain reports

It has been pointed out that the schedule in which this provision appears is headed 'Prescribed scale of costs' and deals with the topic of legal costs and disbursements. However, clause 5 is not about that topic but deals with immunity for legal practitioners who rely on certain reports.

Accordingly, as a matter of drafting, clause 5 does not belong in schedule 1 but requires its own schedule. The amendment therefore creates a new schedule, resulting in numbering the existing schedule as schedule 1 and the incorporation of a new schedule 2, which contains clause 5 only.

Amendment carried.

Mrs REDMOND: I seek a couple of further clarifications in relation to some of the matters raised under this modification of the regulations. In particular, the definition of 'hospital report' clearly indicates not just the report one normally thinks of in terms of medico-legal reports being specific documents prepared and written as medico-legal reports but the whole of the victim's hospital record. It may also be a copy of the victim's summary of discharge, but it clearly contemplates that it is a copy of the medical record.

I raise again my concern that on the next page (page 3), in proposed subregulation 5(p)(i), it refers to '(up to 20 pages)' and there is another reference to it on page 6 in another section about the hospital report being up to 20 pages. Whilst I appreciate the Attorney's comments in his final summation of the second reading debate, that it may well be a specially prepared report, firstly, I seek his comment on whether he thinks that would be more expensive than going to a specialist and simply asking for a report rather going via the hospitals, especially since, in my experience, hospitals normally charge a search fee to even tell you who the specialist was let alone to try to get through a report through that circuitous route.

More importantly, in relation to the issue of the 20 pages, it seems to me that, if a hospital record is 23 or 24 pages, or some such amount, it does not make sense to me to say that we are going to limit to 20 pages instead of ensuring that the hospital report is incorporated. It does not make any sense in terms of running any medico-legal matter that you would limit the recovery of the whole of the hospital record if it was decided that the best place to get information upon which to decide the claim was the hospital record.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The cost of getting reports from a hospital registrar varies from \$50 to \$200 and sometimes it is gratis. It is not as expensive as getting a medico-legal report from a medical specialist who will charge from \$700 to \$800. On the question of photocopying the hospital records, there was one case where an insistence on photocopying those records necessitated a payout of close to \$800.

Mrs REDMOND: I would accept the cost of getting medico-legal reports as being \$700 to \$800 in the situation where someone is sent for a specialist report to a medico-legal practitioner who has not necessarily seen the patient before and therefore has to spend some considerable time taking the patient's history. I am talking about the situation where the report being sought is from the specialist who treated the person for their injury and, given that they already have the history and do not need to spend such time, my experience is that it would not be very different from the cost of going through a hospital and, given the circuitous route,

could even be less. I understand the definition of limited claim as a claim for grief suffered in consequence of homicide or funeral expenses where the victim dies in consequence of an offence. My question relates in part to the definition on that page and partly to the note that appears to the schedule of costs on page 5, which states that a solicitor is not entitled to a fee in respect of a limited claim for compensation where the identity of the offender is unknown and the Crown Solicitor agrees to settle the claim.

That leads me to a peculiar sort of situation in practice because, presumably, someone who has a family member killed in a homicide can go along to a solicitor and say, 'I think that I am entitled to some compensation.' The solicitor says, 'Well, yes, if the person has been killed,' but at that stage they may or may not know whether the offender can ever be known. If it turns out that the offender is known, the solicitor can get paid for the work, but if it is known at the time that they will never find the offender or they will never have any charge against the person or persons unknown, what are you anticipating the practitioner will do? Are you anticipating that a practitioner in that circumstance will say to the client, 'Well, yes, you may have a claim but you are going to have to proceed on it yourself, because I can't be paid anything. I am not allowed to charge you for doing any work for you because that is what the act has always provided. I can only get paid from the fund, and it is now structured so that I can't get paid in that circumstance. So you are just on your own. You have to do it yourself.' Is that how you are helping victims under this legislation?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It is true, as the member for Heysen says, that the bill provides no lawyer's fee in a homicide case if the claim is limited to reimbursement of funeral expenses or to a claim for the lump sum fixed payment for grief, that is, solatium, or for both of them. Interestingly, I appealed to the previous government to increase the amount of solatium and the Liberal attorneys-general always refused, but I know that the member for Heysen is not tainted by their original sin. I am sure that she would increase the amount of solatium tomorrow by a large amount; isn't that right?

Mrs Redmond: Are you asking me?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am asking you.

Mrs REDMOND: On a point of order, I understood that questions have to be asked through you, Mr Acting Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I understood the question to be rhetorical.

Mrs REDMOND: With respect, which is the term we lawyers always use affectionately when we want to say the opposite, that does not address the issue that I raised.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am going to answer it. I was just inviting the member for Heysen to add—

Ms Bedford: Inviting or inciting?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—inciting the member for Heysen to add to the Liberal opposition's already billion dollar shopping list of promises. The reason that we do not give a lawyer's fee is because it should not be difficult to make such a claim without the assistance of a lawyer. The victim need give only basic information and does not require reports. If the offender is unknown, there is no-one to serve, no second defendant to serve. The particulars are basic and the amounts to be claimed are fixed and therefore well known. However, I thank the member for Heysen for drawing my attention to it and, owing to her question, I think that we would be happy to draft a pro forma to help members of the

public claim without the need to go to a lawyer, but I know that the member for Heysen, because of her vocation, is always keen to make work for lawyers.

Mrs REDMOND: I thank the Attorney for that suggestion; I think that will be worthwhile. Could I also suggest that he supply copies of the pro forma letter to those practitioners who regularly practise in this jurisdiction, because it seems to me that, otherwise, there is a distinct difficulty for a practitioner with the best will in the world who is confronted by someone who thinks they have a claim having to say, 'Sorry, you have to do it yourself.' At least if there is a pro forma letter, they can send them away, because people who are distressed by the death of a loved one and who may not necessarily be as well educated as some other members of the community may have difficulty with these things. So, I thank the Attorney for that.

My question on this clause of the schedule relates to the definition of a 'series of offences'. I have no difficulty with the definition, but I am puzzled as to why the definition of 'related claim' has been divided into two paragraphs, because I think it would have been simpler if it simply said: 'If in proceedings under the act the same legal practitioner represents more than one victim of an offence or a series of offences claiming compensation', because I cannot see any difference between the two. I just wonder whether there is any reason for that style of drafting, because it seems to provide no difference in reality.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: As the member for Heysen knows, I always speak highly of her when people ask me about the opposition. She has been true to form again in a close textual analysis of the bill in what I think may be her first time in leading for the opposition.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I tend to be more generous than the member for Florey towards my political opponents.

Ms Bedford: I doubt it.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: On this occasion, despite the comments of the member for Florey, I congratulate the member for Heysen on picking up what might be a superior drafting style. I understand that parliamentary counsel would prefer to do it in this way and that this is their in-house style. As the minister, I think I am bound to respect that, although if the member for Heysen wants to move an amendment I will consider it on its merits.

Mrs REDMOND: In relation to Regulation 6—Applicable scale of costs, is the Attorney prepared to consider what I put to him in the second reading debate last night concerning a limited number of cases which are not covered by the new act but which were notified prior to 19 December 2002 but not settled until that period between 19 December 2002 and the commencement of the new act? Is he prepared to consider paying according to the new scale those claims which are settled but which fall within that period?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The first point is that there is no budget for the largesse which the member for Heysen proposes, because the increased victims levy applies only from 1 January. Secondly, I think it would penalise those practitioners who process their claims swiftly and reward those who delay.

Schedule—Prescribed scale of costs.

Mrs REDMOND: I have already commented on what I think of the fees, but in relation to the counsel fee of \$750, it provides that it is to include 'all work preparatory to an application to the court for compensation (including, advice on evidence and any other legal advice on the application,

conferences and proofing witnesses) and for the first 5 hours of the hearing of the application.' Does the Attorney accept that there would not be a member of the independent bar in Adelaide prepared to undertake that amount of work for that fee?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My intuition is that this is not the kind of work that members of the bar would do: it is the kind of work that solicitor advocates would do. As the member for Heysen impressed upon us in another debate, we have a fused profession in South Australia—

Mrs Redmond: I didn't say anything in that debate.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Well, the opposition's position was that we have a fused profession, and the member for Heysen's roommate was rubbing it into me, I think unnecessarily, that we have a fused profession and that I was somehow detracting from this fused profession by altering the law to authorise the Chief Justice's longstanding undertaking sought from candidates for silk that they practise only at the bar. The member for Heysen's question as to whether members of the independent bar would take this work runs contrary to the point made earlier this week by her roommate, the member for Bragg. My initial feeling is that this is not work for members of the bar: it is work for solicitors who, owing to a fused profession, can appear in court acting for people who are their clients in their double capacity as a solicitor. However, I am reliably informed that members of the bar appeared in court to do this work when, under the Liberal government, the fee was only \$500.

Mrs REDMOND: My other question on this section relates to item 3, fee for an appeal. The fee in that case is \$500. Will the Attorney explain why it would not be appropriate, given that an appeal would be instituted only in cases where someone felt it was necessary for them to get justice to appeal against a finding and, if they were found to be vexatious or to have instituted an unwarranted appeal, would have to bear the costs? Why would it not be appropriate simply to allow the costs of an appeal to run with the event and allow the award of appeal costs in the normal way?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The fee for an appeal has been fixed for a long time. We inherit this fee from the member for Heysen's own party and no-one from the Law Society asked for it to be changed. Why that fee is fixed at that level is something that the member for Heysen could usefully ask her party room colleagues.

Mrs REDMOND: I have only one more question on the whole of the bill, and that relates to the provision at the bottom of page 7 and over to page 8 that says that a legal practitioner who relies on the victim's hospital records or a GP's report is not going to be found negligent. It seems to me that, in putting in this provision, the government is recognising that a practitioner may well otherwise be negligent. In other words, the practitioner is not doing his job properly because of the provisions of the legislation relating to payment for medical reports and, in spite of that, we will now by statute protect the practitioner from a claim in negligence. Will the Attorney confirm for me whether my reading of that provision is correct?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: We inserted this provision out of an abundance of caution.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes. In fact, the Acting Chairman could probably render it for us in the Latin language if he cared to. However, members of the legal profession working in this area asked for this provision and

we are happy to comply with their wishes. I am certainly not embarrassed to do so.

Schedule passed; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

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

That this bill be now read a third time.

I thank the member for Heysen. She asks me to thank her profusely and I do so, because of her splendid work for the opposition in ensuring a proper debate on this bill. It is a pity that, as readers of *Hansard* will see, the member for Mitchell did not share her labour and did not bear the heat and burden of the day.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

EDUCATION, CEO

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Ms CHAPMAN: Today in question time the Minister for Education and Children's Services, in a response to a question that I put to her, stated, *inter alia*:

The only part of her question that she did get right was the appointment date of the chief executive, 14 October 2002. Her claim that a performance agreement is not in place is absolutely wrong. In fact, a performance agreement was put in place for the 2003 school year.

Further, she stated:

In a press release from the opposition, the member for Bragg commented that the opposition had lodged a freedom of information request about chief executive performance agreements. The request was for the 2003-04 financial year. The response that the 2004 performance agreement had not been finalised was correct but the member should have immediately asked whether a previous agreement was in place, and there has been. An agreement was put in place for the 2003 school year.

Further, the minister stated:

... and I advise the house there have been continuous assessment discussions between me and the chief executive. There was also a formal assessment discussion on the performance agreement that is in place, but the 2003-04 performance agreement, which relates clearly to the following year, has not been finalised.

On 13 October 2003, the Hon. Angus Redford MLC forwarded a letter addressed to the minister in which he enclosed a request for access form pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act 1991, and he details in the letter what was sought in the request for access. The details of the request are:

Under respect of each department or agency under your portfolio, I request access to documents that detail the establishment with senior and departmental agency managers of a mutual understanding of their respective roles and relationships. These should include agreements on priorities, directions, targets and expected levels of performance and evaluation of performance, as required on page 15 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

At no time in that document, and I will table a copy of the document—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): I am not entirely sure where you are going. Are you responding to the ministerial statement made by the Deputy Premier yesterday about the Hon. Angus Redford?

Ms CHAPMAN: No: the Minister for Education and Children's Services today. I am happy to table a copy of that letter and request, nowhere in which is disclosed a date or limited period. I do not wish to comment any further, but I simply say that is not referred to. In a response to that request under freedom of information and a request for access to that information, a letter dated 12 November 2003 was forwarded to the Hon. A. Redford MLC from Mr Don Mackie, Manager, Legislation and Legal Services, of the Department of Education and Children's Services. This letter is in response to that request. I will not read all of the letter: I will read the first two paragraphs. The balance of the letter, which I am happy to table, also simply repeats what I call the usual notice and advice as to the opportunity to appeal. The letter states:

Dear Mr Redford,

Re FOI application, reference AR/FOI/191/03.

Thank you for your freedom of information application, received on 14 October 2003, in which you requested a copy of documents that detail the establishment with senior and departmental agency managers of a mutual understanding of their respective roles and relationships.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! A personal explanation has to be limited to saying where and how you were misrepresented. You are not allowed to unpack all the issues: that would be more suitable for a grievance.

Ms CHAPMAN: I may do that, sir. Can I just clarify the two issues. I am simply responding to identify the two issues: the statements made by the minister in respect of the fact that the FOI had sought a certain specific date and I have simply detailed what is in the letter and the FOI application; and the second aspect is in relation to what agreements had been provided and undertaken by the government. I am simply reading the response in these two paragraphs, and that will identify our position on it—the accurate position—and then it will be a matter for other applications, as you quite rightly point out, at a subsequent time.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I will grant you a little longer, but you are limited to five minutes which you have already gone over.

Ms CHAPMAN: I thank you for that, sir. I will just complete the paragraph, and, as I say, I am happy to table the letter:

... including agreements on priorities, directions, targets and expected levels of performance and evaluation of performance, as required on page 15 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

The facts of my investigation are as follows. I have located a document relevant to your application, namely the 2003-2004 Chief Executive Performance Agreement. I have examined the document and have found that it is a draft still under development. I have been advised that the minister has not yet seen the draft document.

As I indicated, sir, I now table those documents and make them available.

HERITAGE BUILDING, MINISTER'S REPLY

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

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Today in question time the member for Davenport asked me a question which built on a question he asked on 11 November. The *Hansard* draft for today says, and I quote:

Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation advise the house why he told the house on 11 November that he was unaware of any cabinet decision to give in-principle approval for the sale of any heritage-listed buildings, when a departmental minute dated well

prior to the minister giving that answer to the house states, 'cabinet approved in-principle of the sale of the heritage building'.

I read that because the question, of course, was suitably vague and applied the usual standards of ethics that the member for Davenport is well known for. He refers to a departmental minute; he does not say which department and to whom that minute was sent. He says it was dated well prior to the minister giving the answer; he does not state when the date was—it could have, in fact, been during his term of office; and nor does he refer to the heritage-listed building which he is presumably alleging that cabinet approved the in-principle sale of.

So, of course, when I attempted to find information to get an answer to the question it proved somewhat difficult. Nonetheless, my officers—very good officers indeed—who have spent the last hour or so wasting their time trying to find the document that he refers to, have come across a particular document which may be the one that he has referred to. It was provided to him, or at least to someone in the opposition, I understand, through an FOI application to the Minister for Agriculture's office. The document in question is a minute from Executive Director, PIRSA Corporate, a Mark O'Shea, dated 6 November 2002, and it relates to a property called Struan House, which is a heritage-listed property. As part of the background, the document states:

Rumours about the sale of Struan House have been circulating for some time. These rumours reached a peak approximately three months ago when a potential purchaser expressed interest in the property and cabinet approved, in principle, of the sale of the heritage building.

Those would appear to be the words that the member for Davenport, in his tricky question today, was referring to. Well, I have checked with the cabinet office, my own office, and the minister who was responsible for the potential sale of Struan House—the honourable Minister for Administrative Services—and I am assured by all of them that this matter did not go to cabinet. In fact, the minute signed by Mr O'Shea was incorrect. So, the member was relying on a document which was wrong. In relation to Struan House, there has been no decision by cabinet. I refer to a newspaper article dated 5 September 2002 which appeared in *The Naracoorte Herald*—that wonderful newspaper from the South-East—and which states:

Following an offer from a private enterprise for the landmark—this is referring to Struan House—

about 15 km south of Naracoorte, the Minister for Administrative Services, Mr Jay Weatherill, has asked his department to assess the value of the building to the government and the most appropriate course of action.

It also says:

Mr Weatherill's spokesman Mr Flaherty said the government had already been considering the future of Struan House and other government-owned buildings when the offer to buy the SE landmark was made.

So, cabinet did not make a decision, in principle or otherwise, in relation to that particular matter.

However, to be absolutely abundantly open with the house, cabinet did make a decision in relation to the divestment of another heritage property, and I refer to Beechwood in the Adelaide Hills. I have said a number of times in this house, and recently in answer to a question from the member for Morphett on 23 June, that the government was considering what to do with that particular set of gardens. That particular set of gardens does have a glasshouse which is heritage listed. In the sense that the government has made a

decision in relation to that, it has agreed that I can proceed with the divestment of that property. There might be a shed on it as well, although I do not think that is heritage listed. Of course, the overall property is part of a heritage agreement. I have discussed the matter with the member for Heysen and I have kept her informed of where we are proceeding in relation to that matter.

However, in relation to the substantial matter, that is, the minute on which the member for Davenport relied for his question, I was not wrong when I said that cabinet had not made a decision in relation to that property to which he was referring. I table that minute so the house has a copy of it.

DOG AND CAT MANAGEMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 October. Page 368.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I would like to make a brief contribution. This is an important bill. One would have to acknowledge that, whenever you are talking about dogs—and I guess in the near future cats—one needs to tread carefully—and I am not talking about the footpath—because most people do not understand world peace or the possibility thereof, but they certainly understand when governments and bureaucracies get involved with their pets and, in particular, dogs and cats. I guess horse lovers feel strongly as well; they often feel as though they are left out of the loop altogether. I welcome this measure and I am pleased that the government has modified it from the original proposal. I also acknowledge that the former minister for the environment did have a reference before the Social Development Committee in relation to some aspects now being picked up in this bill.

The process has been moving along, but it has moved along very slowly. I commend the government and the minister for bringing this measure before the house and, as I said, in particular, for modifying it and taking into account some of the issues raised by people in the wider community who are keen on, own and have an interest in dogs. As have most members, I have been contacted by dog owners, particularly after the first draft was released. A couple of the main concerns were the lack of firm direction in relation to areas where dogs could run free. That matter has been picked up in this bill, and that is good. Some owners were concerned about the necessity to restrain their dog in a car. I would have to say that I was a little puzzled by that because, if you understand a little about physics—and I do understand only a little about physics—you know that, if you stop a car suddenly, an unrestrained dog will continue to travel at the speed of the car; and it is not good for the dog and it is certainly not good for anyone else in the car.

In a society which is becoming increasingly urbanised and controlled, because we have less open space and so on, I guess there is a sensitivity about restraining pets. Some people see their motor car as part of one area where the dog can be a little bit of a free agent. I think it is unwise for people to see unrestrained dogs in a car as a plus. This is a question for the member for Morphett, but I understand that the practice of having dogs with their head out of the window of a car is not actually good for the animal; not good for their eyes. The reality is that people will keep doing those things, because they like doing them.

This bill contains a lot of good features and key elements, including the effective control of dogs. Dogs give a lot of

pleasure to people and it is not usually the fault of the dog if something goes wrong. It is usually the fault of the owner. We see people who are irresponsible owners—a minority, fortunately—and we see it also in the way some people, once again a minority, who dump dogs in cartons at waste depots and all those sorts of examples of hideous behaviour. For most people, their behaviour is responsible, and it is usually the innocent dog that cops it at the end of the day, because of poor training or poor management by the owner.

Effective management and effective control are dealt with by this bill, and that is good. Under the same sort of category and related to it are the tough penalties for allowing dogs to wander at large, particularly dogs which may be in the category of a prescribed breed. I have seen one of these dogs in action, and I refer to the American pit bulls. They are a nice looking dog until they get angry, and then the fangs come out and you start saying your prayers, because they are bred basically to kill and attack. If you are going to have that sort of dog, and I do not believe it is really necessary to have them, they should be under tight control. Certainly, if they wander, the owner should be dealt with.

With respect to the reporting of dog attacks, I cannot recall exact figures but I have heard them given in this house before. I think it was the former minister for health, Dr Michael Armitage, who gave some figures once about the number of dog attacks reported to the Women's and Children's Hospital in any one year, and it was quite high and they were quite serious.

The bill requires accreditation of pet shops and compliance with a code of practice, and I think that is to be commended. I notice that people over the age of 16 will be able to own a dog; currently, you have to be at least 18. That might be according to the strict letter of the law, but I do not think that is the practice in terms of asking a young person, 'Whose dog is it?' I am sure if they are 10 they will say it is their dog. I just point out, as a slight digression, that we have all these different rules about what you can do at various ages and it is a bit of a mine field. I think that is a sensible adjustment.

In relation to registration fees, as I understand it the current practice does not generate sufficient fees for councils to have an effective dog management policy. I am sure other members do not want to see this as an opportunity for councils to unfairly or unnecessarily rip money out of the pockets of dog owners. I think it is fair to say that, if you have a dog, you should make a reasonable and sufficient contribution so that the council can carry out its tasks in terms of the management of dogs and that, in fairness, non-dog owners are not required to subsidise dog owners.

It would be good if the irresponsible and the less responsible were made to pay a greater amount, and I believe that would be the case under this bill in terms of penalties. I notice that dogs that help with various disabilities get greater recognition in this bill. I am always impressed with the absolute skill of not only guide dogs, whether it be for people who have a lack of sight or poor hearing, but also other types of dogs that assist people with various disabilities. In passing, I commend those associations and the Lions that still support the training of hearing dogs.

'Dogs in shops and restaurants' is an unfortunate heading, I guess, because it might suggest to some people that they are there for a culinary purpose. I do not have a problem with dogs in outdoor eating areas, and a sensible modification was recently announced by the Minister for Health, as a result of a lot of the good work done by the member for Morphett. I

think in all those situations a bit of commonsense should apply. Clearly, if people are eating outside and they do not like dogs next to them, then, in order to avoid that situation, common courtesy would suggest you ask those people whether they mind your dog near them. In France they have dogs inside restaurants—not on the plate but under the table. I have been in some restaurants in Paris and seen the odd scuffle between dogs. Now, I do not think that is a good idea, but the bill does deal with some of the aspects relating to dogs being in shops and restaurants.

The bill also deals with menacing and dangerous dogs. Irrespective of the size of a dog, it is still a dog inside but just in a different package. They can be threatening and scary, particularly to young children, and they can scare young people not only physically but also mentally. It is important those sorts of dogs be properly dealt with. Why people want to encourage and train dogs to be menacing and dangerous, I do not know. There seems to be a certain group of people in the community who love to have a dog which I think they see as an extension of their own ego and which they hope will scare the daylight out of other people. I think those particular characters suffer from a deficiency in their own personality.

There are special provisions for patrol and guard dogs—and that is appropriate. I am pleased to see that greyhounds that have been through the decommissioning process will be able to get around without a muzzle. That has already happened in Victoria. People in my community have said to me that they have a greyhound which was a racing dog but which is now retired and which has been through the training program, learnt how to watch television and other decadent activities, and which should be able to get around the community without a muzzle. I think that is a positive step forward. I am rather fond of greyhounds but I am more likely to—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: No, I do not bet on anything much, except X-Lotto—and that is a donation to the hospitals. I am more likely to go for a whippet rather than a greyhound, but it is something that has concerned some of my constituents: they have greyhounds but they have to have a muzzle on them, even though the greyhound after it has been through the training program is about as harmless as the most benign creature on earth. Overall, I support this bill. I think it is a step forward. It is never easy to introduce measures such as this. The next round, when we get onto cats—presumably in the new year—will be interesting because, for some reason better known to others, women seem to have a closer affinity to cats than men. Someone might be able to explain that to me during their contribution—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: But it takes, I guess, a brave government, a brave minister and brave MPs to resolve what in some ways is a much more serious issue environmentally than the issue arising from dog management, that is, cat management. Once again, responsible owners do the right thing, but too many out there are irresponsible and throw kittens into the bush and all those sorts of stupid things.

I welcome this bill. I commend it to the house, and I trust that, by the time it has been through the committee process, we will have something that allows good, responsible dog owners to enjoy their dogs, where the dogs can have some freedom in appropriate places and where that enjoyment can continue in an appropriate and civilised way.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.26 p.m. the house adjourned until Monday 1 December at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 24 November 2003

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ROSE FESTIVAL

3. Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:

1. Has an economic benefit analysis of future funding to the Adelaide International Rose Festival been undertaken and if so, when did this occur and what are the findings?

2. Has an economic impact statement of the Festival been commissioned by Australian Major Events and if so, what are the findings?

3. What action is the South Australian Tourism Commission pursuing to secure future Festivals?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The 2000 Adelaide International Rose Festival and the 2002 Adelaide Rose Festival were managed by the South Australian Tourism Commission's Australian Major Events (AME) division.

After receiving the economic impact assessment of the 2002 event, AME conducted an analysis of the event in February 2003.

The event created an economic benefit for the State of \$1.17 million, excluding media exposure, representing a return on Government investment of less than 2:1.

The analysis showed that it would seem highly unlikely that the event could be continued in its current form, given the relatively low attendance numbers and the return on Government investment.

An economic impact assessment has been undertaken of the 2002 Adelaide Rose Festival, commissioned by Australian Major Events. The key findings are as follows:

- 31,500 people attended the event, comprising 23,400 adults and 8,100 children under 15.
- Two-thirds of adults attending were aged 50 years or more. Almost two-thirds of adults attending were female.
- Visitors who came to Adelaide specifically for the event included 680 from interstate and 354 from elsewhere in the State.
- The total bed-nights generated in South Australia by event-specific visitors was 4,620.
- Total event-specific visitor spending was \$499,500.

A range of options is currently being considered including the possibility of providing support to industry-related conferences and/or industry sectors or associations, to support activities that would form part of the State's conference and/or events program.

TOURISM

4. Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:

1. How much funding has been allocated to the Tourism Emergency Plan and why hasn't it been released to Tourism operators?

2. What tourism policy changes will be made in conjunction with, or in response to this plan?

3. Will health and emergency services charges associated with this plan be passed onto the Tourism operators and if so, what are the details?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:

1. The National Tourism Response Plan establishes a framework to ensure that national tourism crisis are managed in a whole-of-government way to minimise the negative economic impacts. The cost of drafting the Plan was minimal and shared between the States and the Commonwealth. The Plan did not provide a funding mechanism although the co-ordinated policy response ensured that international marketing campaigns were postponed until they would be most effective in the marketplace. The Australian Tourist Commission was given an additional \$10 million in funding from the Federal Government as part of their recovery campaign 'Australia - You are Welcome'. South Australia will be promoted as appropriate within international markets in which the State is active. Additionally \$100,000 in See Australia funding allocated to South Australia has enabled the South Australian Tourism Commission to extend current and future domestic co-operative marketing activity with wholesale partners to promote travel to and within the State. Tourism operators are participating in these campaigns. They have been an integral part of the National Tourism Response Plan receiving regular market intelligence updates via email and fax.

2. There are no policy changes, however, the Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources is currently coordinating the evaluation of the National Tourism Crisis Response Plan in consultation with government and industry stakeholders. The evaluation seeks to assess whether the Plan covers all elements necessary for an effective response to a tourism sector crisis; how effective the processes in the plan were in providing a framework to coordinate responses; and what impact and outcomes the plan achieved relative to what might otherwise have occurred.

3. There are no health and emergency services charges associated with National Tourism Response Plan.

FEDERAL FUNDING

5. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** For all departments and agencies reporting to the Minister:

1. Since March 2002, are there any instances where Federal Government funding has not been, or will not be provided due to the State Government not co-funding joint State-Federal programs and if so, what are the details, including foregone Federal funding?

2. Were all required budget savings targets for 2002-03 met and if not, what specific savings programs were not implemented?

3. What was the cost and the details of each consultancy undertaken in 2002-03?

4. What are the classifications and TEC of all current surplus employees?

5. What are the details of any program under-spend in 2001-02 not approved by Cabinet for carryover in 2002-03?

6. What is the estimated level of under-spend for 2002-03 approved by Cabinet for carryover in 2003-04?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:

Adelaide Convention Centre

1. The Adelaide Convention Centre (ACC) does not receive any funding from the Federal Government.

2. Savings for 2002-03 were met.

3. The cost of consultancies for 2002-03 was \$14,000 for an Energy Audit that was undertaken by Bestec Pty Ltd.

4. The ACC has no current surplus employees.

5. The ACC had no under-spend carry-over from 2001-02 that was not approved by Cabinet.

6. The under-spend for 2002-03 which has been carried over to 2003-04 amounted to \$667,000 which related to outstanding defect works yet to be completed on the ACC Extension Project.

Adelaide Entertainment Centre

1. Not applicable.

2. All budget savings targets for 2002-03 were achieved.

3. Consultancy details as follows:

| Name of Consultant | \$ Value | Explanation |
|-----------------------------|----------|---|
| McGregor Tan | \$20,000 | Market Research on patrons' perception of their experiences at AEC events & functions |
| Ogden IFC | \$20,000 | Strategic Business Review and benchmarking of the AEC's business activities |
| Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu | \$10,600 | Review of profitability of Food & Beverage operations, and comparison to peers |
| Swanbury Penglase | \$13,355 | Building inspection / maintenance advisory services |
| Gutteridge Hasken and Davey | \$10,804 | Building Services Management, and review of mechanical and electrical maintenance plans |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|---|
| David Dawson Architects | \$3,500 | Advice on maintenance of culturally significant fabric of heritage buildings on the AEC site. |
| Edward Rushton P/L | \$2,500 | Assistance with identifying and valuing building plant & equipment, as part of development of a strategic asset management plan |
| E-utility P/L | \$8,460 | Advice on energy efficiency and cost reduction strategies |
| Breakthrough Consulting P/L | \$2,425 | Advice on strategic management of human resources |
| William Mercer | \$400 | Advice on employee remuneration. |
| Hardy Milazzo | \$4,012 | Advice on site development and improvement. |
| Rider Hunt | \$1,060 | Structural engineering advice |
| Total | \$97,116 | |

4. There are no surplus employees.
5. Not applicable.
6. Not applicable.

South Australian Tourism Commission

1. No instances.
2. The South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) met all required savings targets for 2002-03.
3. The SATC employed two consultants in 2002-03 as shown below:

| Project | Consultant | Amount \$ (GST exclusive) |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------------------|
| Risk Management Planning | MQM | 34,000 |
| Produce Manual | M Davies | 3,000 |
| Total | | 37,000 |

The SATC has 3 surplus employees, whose classification and TEC details are shown below:

| Classification | TEC \$ |
|----------------|---------|
| ASO-05 | 60,314 |
| ASO-05 | 60,314 |
| ASO-01 | 31,476 |
| | 152,104 |

5. Nil response
6. Cabinet has approved the SATC to carryover \$3 million of underspend from the 2002-03 financial year. This is made up of \$2.5 million of infrastructure funding, as shown below:

| Project | Carryover \$'000 |
|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Head of Bight | 400 |
| Penneshaw & Cape Jervis Ports | 100 |
| General Infrastructure Fund | 600 |
| Outback Infrastructure Fund | 1,200 |
| Minor Infrastructure Fund | 140 |
| Coorong Wilderness Lodge | 60 |
| Total | 2,500 |

The remaining \$500,000 relates to an international carryover approved by Cabinet in response to the downturn of international activities due to the SARS virus and world wide terrorism attacks. The SATC held back on a number of international activities during 2002-03, with the intention of providing an injection of funds to boost international activities in 2003-04.

INTERNATIONAL FLIGHTS

6. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Has the Minister held meetings with Singapore Airlines, Malaysia Airlines, Virgin, Qantas, Air New Zealand and Emirates Airlines to increase direct international flights to Adelaide and if so, what are the details and concerns these airlines have in increasing services?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Both the Minister and others from the South Australian Tourism Commission have met with these airlines. The details of these discussions are 'commercial in confidence'.

However, Singapore Airlines, and Malaysian Airlines have both recently increased their international services.

TOURISM, PROMOTION

10. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** How will this State's tourism be promoted in Asia, Japan, United Kingdom and America, respectively, in 2003-04?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) works closely with the Australian Tourist Commission (ATC) in overseas markets.

The SATC acts as a conduit between the local industry, the ATC and the world's travel trade. The aim is to ensure South Australia is depicted as a compelling part of the Australian journey. This is achieved through activities such as Trade marketing, Consumer marketing, marketing support and familiarisations.

TOURISM, TOKYO OFFICE

11. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What changes have been made at the Tokyo office and will this affect the delivery of Japanese tourists into this State?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The South Australian Government office closure was announced publicly in October 2002. The South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) shared this resource with the South Australian Government and Education Adelaide.

As a result of the closure of the Japan Office, the SATC's Japanese marketing operations are managed from Adelaide by the Market Development Manager, Eastern Hemisphere, who has more than 10 years experience in the Japanese travel industry, both in Australia and Japan.

This change is not anticipated to have an effect on the delivery of Japanese tourists into this State, and the International Visitor Survey indicates that visitors from this market to South Australia are at similar levels to the previous year. The Japanese travelling market, not surprisingly, was affected by world events earlier this year. Japanese visitor numbers to the whole of Australia have been affected by international events and reduced airline capacity, which consequently also has an impact on visitation to South Australia.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE

13. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** How many permanent, casual and contract staff, respectively, are employed at the Adelaide Convention Centre?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: As at 14 October 2003:

121 permanent full time, 23 permanent part time, 407 casual

The ACC has no temporary/contract staff employed through external employment agencies.

KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

15. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What are the details of any discussion with the Minister for Transport regarding a new ferry service to Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The Ministers have met to discuss various tourism and transport issues, one of which was the Kangaroo Island ferry service.

TASTING AUSTRALIA

19. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What is the budget for 'Tasting Australia' in 2003-04, how will it be spent and what are the comparative details of the previous event?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: With regard to the comparative details of the previous event, the following information provides details of the total budgets for the 2001 event and the 2003 event.

| | 2001 event | 2003 event |
|--|------------|------------|
| Government | 1,600,000 | 1,475,000 |
| Corporate Sponsorship | 545,000 | 670,000 |
| Total | 2,145,000 | 2,145,000 |
| Government Contribution for 2003 Tasting Australia | | |

(\$450K in 2002-03 and \$1,025K in 2003-04) Government contribution has decreased 8 per cent from the 2001 event.

Corporate Sponsorship

Included sponsorships and revenue from exhibitors at the Feast for the Senses. Sponsorship for Tasting Australia 2003 has increased by 23 per cent over the 2001 event.

Expenditure for the 2003 Event (over two financial years)

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---|
| Overheads: | \$131,996 | |
| Salaries: | \$432,808 | |
| Contractors: | \$564,000 | |
| Marketing/operations: | \$1,016,196 | (infrastructure, fees, permits, television signage, catering, guest travel etc) |
| Total | \$2,145,000 | |

Expenditure for the 2001 Event (over two financial years)

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---|
| Overheads: | \$125,131 | |
| Salaries: | \$416,254 | |
| Contractors: | \$590,048 | |
| Marketing/operations: | \$1,013,567 | (infrastructure, fees, permits, television signage, catering, guest travel etc) |
| Total | \$2,145,000 | |

Comparison

The event has continued to grow through increased corporate sponsorship. In addition, Tasting Australia has attracted many more ancillary events that have become part of Tasting Australia but do not require full time Tasting Australia management. In 2003, there were over 40 separate public events, an increase of some 20 events over 2001.

A large increase in national pre-publicity was also enjoyed for 2003. Australian Gourmet Traveller Magazine distributed free of charge 120,000 Tasting Australia programmes and Fairfax ran an 8-page supplement in both the *Sydney Morning Herald* and *Melbourne Age* on 2 September 2003 at no cost to Tasting Australia.

Tasting Australia hosted for the first time, the Starlight Foundation Gala Dinner to help with the funding of the Starlight Express unit for seriously ill children to go into the Adelaide Women's and Children's Hospital. The celebrity chefs who cooked the dinner, the produce and the majority of the staffing for the evening was given free of charge.

TOURISM

28. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What input has the Department had into the Draft Transport Plan to ensure that tourist roads are maintained?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) participated in a reference group that discussed issues relating to the proposed SA Transport Plan.

Following the publication of the Draft Transport Plan, the SATC has continued to participate in the reference group, which is currently refining the Draft Transport Plan.

ROSE FESTIVAL

29. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** When will the 2004 Adelaide Rose Festival occur, how much has been allocated to this event and what were the results from 2003 festival?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: A range of options is currently being considered including the possibility of providing support to industry-related conferences and/or industry sectors or associations, to support activities that would form part of the State's conference and/or events program.

Should these activities take place, the event would be held during the month of October 2004.

The Adelaide Rose Festival is a biennial event and has not been held in 2003.

LIMESTONE COAST

32. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** How much funding has been allocated in 2003-04 to each festival event in the following regions—Limestone Coast, Fleurieu Peninsula, Eyre Peninsula, Adelaide Hills, Adelaide and Barossa Valley and what were the individual allocations during 2002/03?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:

**Limestone Coast
2002-03 Allocations**

Ten events in the Limestone Coast region were approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2002-03 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$46,000.

| | |
|---|---------|
| Coonawarra Cabernet Celebrations | \$5,000 |
| Frances Folk Festival | \$8,000 |
| Generations in Jazz | \$3,000 |
| Kingston Lions Surf Fishing Competition | \$2,500 |
| Moot Yang Gunya Festival | \$5,500 |
| Mount Gambier Festival of Country Music | \$3,000 |
| Penola Festival | \$7,500 |
| Port MacDonnell Bayside Festival | \$2,000 |
| Robe Village Fair | \$5,000 |
| Taste the Limestone Coast | \$4,500 |

2003-04 Allocations

To date, eleven events in the Limestone Coast region have been approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2003-04 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$76,500

| | |
|--|----------|
| 10th National Historical Machinery Assoc Rally | \$5,000 |
| Beachport Festival By The Sea | \$4,000 |
| Coonawarra Cabernet Celebrations | \$16,000 |
| Discover Robe | \$10,000 |
| Frances Folk Gathering | \$8,000 |
| Great Southern Muster | \$5,000 |
| Moot Yang Gunya Festival | \$5,500 |
| Padthaway Harvest Festival | \$4,000 |
| Palaentology Week | \$10,000 |
| Port MacDonnell Bayside Festival | \$4,000 |
| Taste the Limestone Coast | \$5,000 |

**Fleurieu Peninsula
2002-03 Allocations**

Three events in the Fleurieu Peninsula region were approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2002-03 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$17,500

| | |
|---|----------|
| Glenbarr Highland Gathering | \$2,000 |
| Strathalbyn Collectors, Hobbies and Antiques Fair | \$3,000 |
| SA Wooden Boat Festival | \$12,500 |

2003-04 Allocations

To date, six Fleurieu Peninsula events have been approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2003/04 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$55,950. One event is still under consideration for possible funding support from the 2003-04 Program.

| | |
|---|----------|
| 150th Anniversary of the Goolwa—Port Elliot Railway | \$26,950 |
| Australasian Regional Food Wine Tourism Workshop | \$10,000 |
| Glenbarr Highland Gathering | \$1,500 |
| Mt Compass & Strathalbyn Working Sheepdog Trial | \$2,500 |
| SA Wooden Boat Festival | \$10,000 |
| Victor Harbour Heritage Festival | \$5,000 |

**Eyre Peninsula
2002-03 Allocations**

Six events in the Eyre Peninsula region were approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2002-03 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$33,770.

| | |
|---|----------|
| Beyond and Back Gawler Ranges Outback Challenge | \$7,000 |
| Cummins IGA Kalamazoo | \$6,520 |
| Mediterraneo | \$10,000 |
| Quins Blue Water Classic | \$3,000 |
| Sculptures on the Cliff | \$2,250 |
| Ultimate Busking Challenge | \$5,000 |

2003-04 Allocations

To date, six Eyre Peninsula events have been approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2003-04 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$43,000.

| | |
|---|----------|
| Beyond and Back Gawler Ranges Outback Challenge | \$7,000 |
| Cummins & Yeelanna Centenary | \$8,000 |
| Eyre Peninsula X Games | \$5,000 |
| Tunarama | \$5,000 |
| Whyalla Fishy Fringe Festival | \$3,000 |
| Whyalla—Australian Angling Series | \$15,000 |

**Adelaide Hills
2002-03 Allocations**

Three events in the Adelaide Hills region were approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2002-03 Regional Events and Festivals Program with total funding of \$40,000. However, one of the events was later cancelled and therefore the funds allocated were not provided.

| | |
|---|----------|
| Bay to Birdwood Run (see also Adelaide) | \$30,000 |
| Heysen Festival | \$5,000 |
| Festival in the Forest (cancelled) | \$5,000 |
| 2003-04 Allocations | |

To date, four events in the Adelaide Hills region have been approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2003-04 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$93,000.

| | |
|---|----------|
| Bay to Birdwood Classic (See also Adelaide) | \$35,000 |
| Classic Adelaide Rally (See also Adelaide) | \$50,000 |
| Mount Barker Festival | \$5,000 |
| Meadows Country Fair | \$3,000 |
| Adelaide | |
| 2002-03 Allocations | |

Eight events in the Adelaide region were approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2002-03 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$149,000 allocated. However, one event was later cancelled and therefore the funds allocated were not provided.

| | |
|---|----------|
| Adelaide Bay Sheffield Carnival | \$5,000 |
| Bay to Birdwood Run (See also Adelaide Hills) | \$30,000 |
| Carnevale | \$4,000 |
| Feast Festival | \$50,000 |
| Festival of Ideas | \$35,000 |
| French Festival | \$10,000 |
| National Historic Motor Cycle Championships | \$10,000 |
| Dozynki Polish Festival (Cancelled) | \$5,000 |
| 2003-04 Allocations | |

To date, nine Adelaide events have been approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2003/04 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$237,000.

| | |
|---|----------|
| Bay to Birdwood Classic (see also Adelaide Hills) | \$35,000 |
| Carnevale | \$4,000 |
| Classic Adelaide Rally (See also Adelaide Hills) | \$50,000 |
| Coopers Pale Ale Rally | \$40,000 |
| Dozynki Polish Festival | \$5,000 |
| Feast Festival | \$80,000 |
| Glendi | \$4,000 |
| High Beam Festival | \$15,000 |
| Hills on Hutt | \$4,000 |
| Barossa Valley | |
| 2002-03 Allocations | |

Three events in the Barossa Valley region were approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2002-03 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$125,000.

| | |
|--------------------------|----------|
| Barossa Jazz Weekend | \$10,000 |
| Barossa Under the Stars | \$45,000 |
| Barossa Vintage Festival | \$70,000 |
| 2003-04 Allocations | |

To date, three Barossa Valley events have been approved for funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's 2003-04 Regional Events and Festivals Program, with total funding of \$60,000

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|
| Barossa Slow | \$20,000 |
| Barossa Under The Stars | \$30,000 |
| Gawler Gourmet and Heritage Festival | \$10,000 |

FEDERAL-STATE PROGRAMS

65. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** For all Departments and Agencies reporting to the Minister:

1. Since March 2002, are there any instances where Federal Government funding has not been, or will not be provided due to the State Government not co-funding joint State-Federal programs and if so, what are the details, including foregone Federal funding?

2. Were all required budget savings targets for 2002-03 met and if not, what specific savings programs were not implemented?

3. What was the cost and the details of each consultancy undertaken in 2002-03?

4. What are the classifications and TEC of all current surplus employees?

5. What are the details of any program under-spend in 2001-02 not approved by Cabinet for carryover in 2002-03?

6. What is the estimated level of under-spend for 2002-03 approved by Cabinet for carryover in 2003-04?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Please refer to Estimates Committee A and B Replies to Questions as provided to Parliament.

PREMIER'S SCIENCE AND RESEARCH COUNCIL

66. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What is the structure, role, membership and funding available to the Premier's Science and Research Council, how many times have they met and what outcomes have been achieved?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The Premier's Science and Research Council was established in June 2002 to bring together key figures from industry, education and research organisations to work with Government to improve the performance of science and research and development in South Australia. In addition, the Council has a role to advise Government on its resource allocation across the science, technology and innovation area and to propose new initiatives that should be implemented collaboratively by Government, the research community and industry.

Policy, executive and administrative support for the Council is provided by the Science, Technology and Innovation Directorate of the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology under the Minister for Science and Information Economy.

The Council is Co-Chaired by the Premier and Professor Tim Flannery, internationally renowned scientist and Director, South Australian Museum. Membership includes representatives from the State's key research institutions, such as the CSIRO and DSTO, the pro-vice chancellors of research from the three universities, key industry leaders and the Ministers for Science and Information Economy, Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, and Health.

Funding has been made available to support the administrative aspects of the Council, such as research expenses and membership fees.

The Council has met six times since its inception, with the first meeting being held in August 2002.

A number of key outcomes have been achieved by the Council to date. The Council identified a number of strategic initiatives required for a more competitive science and research community in South Australia, which were supported in the 2003-04 Budget. These initiatives include:

- A Premier's Research and Innovation Fund to support new science and research infrastructure projects and ensure a more strategic approach to science infrastructure funding
- Improved high performance computing capabilities in South Australia which will give industry access to one of the fastest 40 supercomputers in the world
- A high performance communications link to the national broadband research network providing vital infrastructure needed for continued industry development
- Support for innovation and science awareness activities, such as the Tall Poppies Program and regional events held during National Science Week
- Initiatives to improve the delivery of science and mathematics education in South Australian schools, including:
 - the Premier's Science and Mathematics Teaching Awards for 36 teachers to undertake industry placements, and
 - Australian Science and Mathematics School Scholarships to provide 20 students from disadvantaged backgrounds and from regional areas to attend the Australian Science and Maths School.
- A Premier's Science Award to recognise excellence in scientific research.

The Council is building on these initiatives by developing a 10 Year Vision for Science, Research and Innovation to set a long-term strategic framework for SA. The 10 Year Vision will build on the State's intellectual capabilities, which is characterised by knowledge being generated out of the defence/electronic/IT activity centered at Technology Park Mawson Lakes, the molecular plant breeding capabilities at the Waite research precinct and expanded Thebarton Bioscience precinct.

TRANSPORT SA

79. Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:

1. Where was the technology for the recently announced new registration system developed and will any of the application hardware and software to monitor the system be built or designed in South Australia and if so, by whom?

2. Will Transport SA supply the necessary application software and hardware to SAPOL and if so, under what arrangement?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

1. The development of a Transport Regulatory & User Management Processing System (TRUMPS), which will electronically integrate and Internet-enable the delivery of registration and licensing services provided by Transport SA, will use the Western Australian system (TRELIS) as a foundation.

Where it is necessary to modify or develop additional functionality on the new system to meet legislative requirements or Transport SA business needs, it is expected that this work would be carried out by the private sector. Some participation by local companies could be anticipated.

2. As you may be aware, SAPOL maintains a duplicate copy of the Register of motor vehicles and driver licences. The development of TRUMPS will provide approved external agencies, such as SAPOL, with the ability to access current data 24 hours a day 7 days a week.

80. Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: What is the future of the Kingswood Transport SA office?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No formal review of the viability of any specific Transport SA Customer Service Centre is underway, other than that which would be normally expected in managing the performance of these centres.

ACCESS CABS

102. The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: How much have Access Cab drivers been paid from the on-time bonus scheme and what plans are there to further improve Access Cab response times?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: For the period 1 December 2002 to 20 August 2003, the total value of on-time bonus payments to Access Cab drivers was \$374,245. Access Cabs is now known as Adelaide Access Taxis (AAT).

The introduction of the on-time bonus scheme has contributed to an improvement in waiting times. For instance, since March 2003, the number of jobs picked up within 13 minutes has increased from 73 percent to 81 percent, and the number of jobs picked up within 30 minutes has increased from 91 percent to 95 percent.

AAT plans to make a number of changes that should further improve response times to customers, including giving drivers more notice of bookings, increased pre-allocation of jobs to vehicles, and identifying opportunities where there is a potential for ride share for multiple wheelchair users.

TRANSPORT, INTEGRATED PASSENGER SERVICES

103. The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: What are the details and costs of the proposed integrated passenger services for the Lower North, South Coast, Riverland, Upper South East, Gawler and Flinders Ranges regions, respectively?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

Gawler

The Gawler Integrated Passenger Transport Study is being conducted in partnership with the Gawler, Light and Barossa Councils, Gawler Chamber of Commerce and Gawler Health Service. The study area incorporates the Gawler Council district, plus the adjoining communities of Hewett and Kalbeeba. Steps are being taken to enable tenders to be called for a service. As the service is subject to a tender process, it would not be appropriate to specify an indicative cost at this stage. Once this service is in place, studies that focus on movement of students within Gawler and better connections to the TransAdelaide train service will be conducted.

For the remaining regions it is too early to determine accurate costings at this stage as the needs are different in each region and the cost of providing services differs widely between regions.

Lower North

The Lower North Integrated Passenger Transport study is being conducted in partnership with the Clare and Gilbert Valley, Wakefield and Goyder Councils, Department of Education and Children's Services, Department of Human Services and the Mid North Regional Development Board. The study area incorporates the

three council districts, plus the southern part of the Regional Council of Port Pine i.e. Redhill, Snowtown etc.

South Coast

The South Coast Integrated Passenger Transport Study is being conducted in partnership with the Victor Harbor and Alexandrina Councils. The study area incorporates the coastal strip between Goolwa and Encounter Bay.

Riverland

The Riverland Integrated Passenger Transport Study is being conducted in partnership with the Loxton/Waikerie, Renmark/Paringa and Berri/Barmora Councils, Department of Education and Children's Services, Department of Human Services and regional Aboriginal representatives. The study area incorporates the three council districts.

Upper South East

The Upper South East Integrated Passenger Transport Study is being conducted in partnership with the Tatiara Council. The study area incorporates the Tatiara Council district, plus near border communities, such as Wolseley.

Flinders Ranges

The Flinders Ranges Integrated Passenger Transport Study will be conducted in partnership with the Office of the Upper Spencer Gulf Cities, Flinders Ranges and Outback, Flinders Ranges Council, Outback Areas Community Development Trust, ATSIIC, North and Far West Regional Health Service, Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, and the Flinders Ranges Office of Tourism SA. The study area will cover the area between Marree and Quorn, including Blinman and Arkaroola.

BUSES

104. The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: What action has been taken to address concerns by bus drivers over the storage and control of prams on buses?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am advised that bus drivers raised this issue several years ago. Extensive research and consultation was conducted at the time. As a result the following procedure was put in place:

"A child is permitted to remain in a pram/stroller provided that the pram/stroller is located in the wheelchair area of the bus. The brakes on the pram/stroller are to be applied and the child is to face the rear of the bus. Adequate supervision is to be provided at all times by a responsible person accompanying the child. If the wheelchair space is occupied already, the child must be removed from the pram/stroller, which is then to be folded and stowed in a safe place.

I am advised that there are risks for a child in the event of an accident whether they are in the pram or held by an adult passenger. For this reason, the procedure gives carers discretion in choosing to hold the child or leave it in the pram.

As some time has passed since the procedure was put in place, I have asked the Passenger Transport Board (PTB) to write to the bus contractors seeking feedback regarding the matter. Subject to support from the contractors, the PTB will arrange for the procedure to be made a formal condition of travel on public transport buses. This will involve publication in the SA Government Gazette.

It also is important to note that bus travel is one of the safest modes of road transport, with the lowest overall number of fatalities and hospitalisations per 100 million passenger kilometres travelled (Australian Bus Safety Report (ATSB), November 2001).

PASSENGER TRANSPORT BOARD, TVSPs

105. The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: How many TVSPs will be offered to Passenger Transport Board staff, which positions are being targeted and what impact will this have on service delivery?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Five Targeted Voluntary Separation Packages (TVSPs) were offered to Passenger Transport Board staff. Four TVSPs were accepted.

Members of staff from across the organisation were advised that TVSPs were available. Positions that were considered to involve skills and functions that could be easily transferred and that were held by people who might be attracted to a TVSP were targeted.

Of the four TVSPs that were accepted, one was in the Regional Services area, two in the Accreditation and Standards area and one in the Contracts area.

The acceptance of TVSPs will have minimal impact on service delivery.

TRANSADELAIDE**106. The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**

1. How are TransAdelaide track supervisors trained to assess and control risk, and how are TransAdelaide drivers advised of the location of trackside workers?

2. When were train radio communications last reviewed and do all TransAdelaide trains have fully operational radio communications equipment and if not, are trains permitted to proceed and what happens if the equipment fails during transit?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

1. The TransAdelaide Track Superintendent is the person responsible for TransAdelaide's daily track maintenance and construction activities. The Track Superintendent has received accredited training in risk assessment and control techniques through TransAdelaide's Frontline Management Program.

TransAdelaide drivers are advised of the location of trackside workers by a notice issued on a daily basis called the "Daily Train Notice", which details the location of work and any speed restrictions in place associated with the work or other reasons. Where unplanned work has to occur, the driver may receive advice on a "special train notice" or verbally from the Operations Controller if already in transit. In addition to this, the driver receives warning of approach of a worksite via various trackside signs erected on approach to the site. These signs are erected in accordance with safe working regulations and are positioned in such a way that the driver has ample warning to adjust train speed if necessary.

2. TransAdelaide trains have been using the South Australian Government Radio Network (SAG RN) since late 2002. The Passenger Transport Board and TransAdelaide are now currently evaluating its use for trains. TransAdelaide's operations control centre radio equipment has been upgraded recently, which included making it compatible with the SAGRN. TransAdelaide maintenance personnel have been using twenty portable radios for the last two months, to determine if there are any coverage issues. It is anticipated that TransAdelaide radio communications will be fully transferred to the SAGRN over the next six months.

All TransAdelaide trains have operational radio communications equipment, installed in 1993/94, which drivers must test before a train enters service for the day. Should a train have faulty radio equipment and a train cannot be excluded from service, then a handheld unit is made available. If equipment fails during transit there are trackside telephones which staff can access, which provide communication directly with the Operations Controller. The operations controller has the ability to stop a train at certain signals should they wish to contact the driver.

TRANSPORT SA**107. The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**

1. What are the details of Transport SA staffing levels for 2002, 2003 and 2002-03, respectively?

2. How many registration and licensing transactions occurred in 2002-03, how many staff processed these transactions and are staff reductions in this area proposed for 2003-04?

3. How many staff will be made redundant in the Planning Section and in what areas are they employed?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

1. December 2002 actual staff Transport SA 1567; June 30 (2002-03) actual staff Transport SA 1543

2. I am informed that the total number of vehicle registration and driver licensing transactions, that is amendments to the Driver Licensing and Vehicle Registration System (DRIVERS) database, processed in the 2002-03 fiscal year was in excess of 26 million. Of this number, over 3.8 million resulted in the collection of revenue, these are commonly referred to as 'cash transactions' and are a primary measure of performance. A variety of different service delivery channels were used to perform these transactions. These were Transport SA Customer Service Centres, Service SA Customer Service Centres, Transport SA Call Centre, Australia Post outlets, the Internet payment facility and the Automated Phone Payment (or IVR) Service. Transport SA managed Customer Service Centres processed over 2.5 million cash transactions and the Transport SA Call Centre processed over 240 000 cash transactions during this period. Due to the number of service providers involved, I am unable to provide a definitive answer as to how many staff processed these transactions in total. However, the average staffing level for all Transport SA Customer Service Centres for the 2002-03 year was 209.5 FTEs and the Transport SA Call Centre was 35.5 FTEs. Staff at these centres also provide information services to the general

community. It is anticipated that more transactions will be performed using the Internet and IVR overtime. As this change in work volume occurs, staffing levels will be reviewed and changes made.

3. The interpretation of Planning Section is taken as being the Transport Planning Agency of the Department of Transport and Urban Planning. The Transport Planning Agency has had one redundancy—being in the Vehicle Policy area. There has also been the equivalent of 5 FTEs reduced as part of the support services review for the Transport Planning Agency.

108. The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:

1. Which areas and services in Transport SA will be affected by the \$22M funding cut in 2002-03?

2. How will the \$13M increase in the 2002-03 expenditure line—Other Expenses be spent?

3. What are the details of the revenue line—Sale of Goods [\$55.7M] in 2002-03 and why has this increased from the previous year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: In responding to the Honourable Member's question the financial year that the response relates to is for the 2003-04 year as this corresponds to the figures in his questions.

1. Various areas and services in the Transport Services and Transport Planning agencies will be affected by the \$22m funding cut in 2002-03, and are outlined in the 2003/04 Budget Statement—Budget Paper 3, page 227, Table 2.17. A summary of these savings initiatives are:

| | |
|--|------|
| Major Plant | 4.82 |
| Function reform and Corporate Services | 3.73 |
| Sustainable transport and environment programs | 1.95 |
| City West Connector | 1.30 |
| Safety Audit | 1.20 |
| State Minor works | 1.20 |
| Information Technology | 1.04 |
| Bus Priority Lanes | 0.90 |
| West Lakes Revetment | 0.78 |
| Operating savings — TRUMPS | 0.75 |
| Bus maintenance efficiencies | 0.55 |
| Jetty Works | 0.55 |
| Light Vehicle Fleet | 0.51 |
| Training and Development | 0.50 |
| EDS Costs | 0.45 |
| Pavement marking | 0.40 |
| Registration and Licensing | 0.25 |
| Marine | 0.23 |
| Adelaide Better Roads | 0.21 |
| Workers Compensation | 0.20 |
| Maintenance administration and supervision | 0.10 |

2. The majority of the \$13 million increase in the expenditure line — Other Expenses represents a distribution of the payment of \$14.9m made to SAPOL from the Community Road Safety Fund as advised by Department of Treasury and Finance. This payment is funded from revenue collected through anti-speeding devices and is managed by the Department of Transport and Urban Planning.

3. Details of the revenue line Sale of Goods and Services for 2003-04 are as follows:

| | |
|---|------|
| Bus and Bus Depot Leases | 36.7 |
| Port River Expressway Stage2 and 3 Contribution | 9.4 |
| Reimbursement Works | 6.5 |
| Sundry Fees and Charges | 2.6 |
| Mawson Lakes Contribution | 0.5 |
| | 55.7 |

The reasons for the increase are listed below:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Port River Expressway Stage 2 and 3 Contribution | 9.4 |
| Bus and Bus Depot Leases | 0.5 |
| Mawson Lakes Contribution | 0.5 |

ROAD TRAIN ROUTES**109. The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**

1. What plans are there to extend existing road train routes?

2. Will a road train route from Ardrossan North to Port Wakefield be established and if so, when will this occur?

3. Are the current Ardrossan to Kadina and Kadina to Crystal Brook road intersections capable of carrying road train traffic?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

1. Extensions to existing road train routes will be subject to policy direction that is still being finalised under South Australia's Draft Transport Plan. There have been many submissions received in response to the draft Transport Plan, which has included maps of freight routes in both regional South Australia and the Adelaide metropolitan area. I am advised that industry was generally appreciative of seeing these routes defined for the first time in this way.

The draft plan also makes quite clear this Government's intention to move freight from the road network to rail and sea where possible, to relieve road congestion and make our roads safer.

In support of the draft Transport Plan is a second tier of strategies, including a Freight Strategy. The finalisation of the draft Transport Plan, together with the more-detailed strategies underpinning it will deliver sound policy bases for consideration of future road train route extensions.

2. With reference to the previous question, this issue is possibly one of the many submissions received in response to the draft Transport Plan relating to road freight route extensions and will be considered along with the other proposals submitted.

3. I have been advised that the route from Ardrossan to Kadina may involve two specific routes, either via Maitland and Moonta or Arthurton and Agery. Similarly, the route between Kadina and Crystal Brook could be either via Bute and Snowtown or Port Broughton and Merriton.

In accordance with route assessment records and regional road condition records, these roads (including major intersections and junctions) are currently not constructed to safely accommodate large road train combination vehicles.

KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

111. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** What decision has been made regarding any additional ferry service to Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: An Expression of Interest process for new and improved ferry services was commenced by the Department of Transport and Urban Planning (DTUP) in February 2002 with the call for submissions closing in late April 2002. Following detailed technical analysis of the submissions made, the process was concluded in September 2002 with the announcement that the proposal for a fast passenger ferry between Kingscote and Wirrina had been accepted.

Proposals submitted for additional or upgraded services between Cape Jervis and Penneshaw were not accepted, either because of safety issues or because the bids included conditions unacceptable to the Government.

Since that time the successful proponent, Kangaroo Island Ferries Pty Ltd (kIF) submitted and has had accepted an amendment to their original proposal which now mean they are proposing to operate a car and passenger vessel. They currently are engaged in the process of negotiating licences and relevant leases with DTUP, as well as finalising infrastructure requirements and securing a suitable vessel.

Discussion also has been ongoing in relation to the issue of competing ferry services operating between Cape Jervis and Penneshaw. The Government currently is considering this issue, and in doing so it will balance the issues and the associated risks to set a policy position which it believes will ensure Kangaroo Island has reliable, safe ferry services appropriate to the needs of residents, businesses and tourists.

RAIL TRANSPORT FACILITATION FUND

115. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** What is the current value of the Rail Transport Facilitation Fund and will funding be allocated to upgrade the Eyre Peninsula Rail Network and if not, why not?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The balance of the Rail Transport Facilitation Fund on 19 September 2003 was \$6,884,402.28.

These funds are set aside for the South East rail project and consequently are not available to be used to subsidise the commercial operation of the grain rail network on Eyre Peninsula.

RECREATIONAL JETTIES

116. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** How many recreational jetties are yet to be transferred to councils and what additional funding has been allocated to councils for maintaining previously transferred facilities?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Eight recreational jetties are yet to be transferred to Councils and no additional funding has been allocated to Councils for jetties that have already been transferred.

In 1996 the former Government allocated \$1 2.8M for the repair and upgrade of jetties to be divested to local government. Thirty nine jetties were divested under this program.

Two more jetties were upgraded for divestment in the 2002-03 financial year. This brought the total of divested jetties to forty one.

Under the arrangement with each Council, jetties were brought to an acceptable recreational standard before their transfer and ongoing responsibility for their maintenance was accepted by the Councils.

SPEED LIMITS

117. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** What was the individual cost of implementing the 100 km/h speed limit on each major northern country road, how was it spent and were local councils reimbursed for any costs incurred?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The cost of implementing the 100 km/h speed limit on major northern country roads was approximately \$650.00 for each section of road where signs were changed, which consisted of replacing existing 110 km/h signs with 100 km/h signs and a supplementary Speed Limit Changed sign.

Transport SA installed the signs and incurred all costs as the changes occurred on roads under its care, control and management.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

118. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What are the Government's achievements in discouraging domestic violence?

The Hon. S.W. KEY:

The government is committed to policies that will reduce the incidence of domestic violence and which will stop the cycle of violence continuing across generations. Families, and individuals within families, must be able to feel safe, and have access to a safe haven when domestic violence is present.

The government funds services across a range of portfolios. These include crisis services, accommodation, community and women's health, acute care services, welfare (financial support, child protection services) and criminal justice responses.

For example, the Northern and Central Violence Intervention Programs involve the human services and criminal justice systems (SA Police Department (SAPOL), Department for Correctional Services and Magistrates Court) and work collaboratively to respond to families currently experiencing domestic violence. In addition they work in partnership with other services such as Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, Family and Youth Services and SAPOL to prevent domestic violence through projects such as "*Domestic Violence—through children's eyes*", an educational tool launched in June 2003 which uses children and young people's voices to educate others, including adults and workers.

Other examples of services provided include:

- A domestic violence group for men at the Noarlunga Health Village run by staff from a range of agencies including the Department of Human Services, the Department for Correctional Services and non government organisations;
- A domestic violence group for men at Inner Southern Community Health Service;
- "Extreme Choices"—an early intervention violence prevention and life skills program for young men at Marion Youth Centre; and
- Young Aboriginal Men's Stopping Violence Program run by Northern Metropolitan Community Health Service through their Aboriginal Health Team.

The Department of Human Services has convened a coordinating committee for domestic violence, Indigenous family violence, sexual assault and child abuse. This committee has commenced work on the development of an integrated policy direction for domestic violence, Indigenous family violence and sexual assault. This policy direction will be complementary to the implementation of the recommendations of the Child Protection Review.

The government also supports the Domestic and Indigenous Family Violence Action Groups Annual Conference. These groups are local, community based groups that are actively involved in providing information about domestic violence and working with services and government departments to end domestic violence.

The Rekindling Family Relationships—Framework for Action is the statewide strategy responding to Indigenous family violence. Local communities are central to the development of responses. In June 2002 the first regional forum with key stakeholders and

community members was held at Ceduna. The forum resulted in the development of a local community action plan responding to family violence.

The Child Protection Review paid particular attention to domestic violence and its impact on the children and young people of this state. A number of recommendations of the report, if implemented, would enable the achievement of increased safety for children and young people.

At the Commonwealth, State, Territories and New Zealand Ministers' Conference on the Status of Women held on 29 August 2003 the Ministers agreed to report to Heads of Government on the outcomes and achievements of the Partnership Against Domestic

Violence. This initiative provides best practice information in preventing and responding to domestic violence.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

121. Dr McFETRIDGE:

1. What are the Government sponsored travel details of each Metropolitan Fire Service officer since 2000?

2. When will the salaries of District Officers and Fire Commanders be reviewed to bring their remuneration in line with interstate counterparts?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

| Name 2000 | Department | From | To | Cost | Date of Travel | Reason for Travel |
|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| W Dunn | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 254.10 | July | Retained BA Course |
| S Staunton | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 257.40 | July | Retained BA Course |
| T Hammat | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 257.40 | July | Retained BA Course |
| D Kemp | Training | Adelaide | Olympic Dam (return) | 210.10 | July | Hot Fire Pad Training |
| G Benham | Training | Adelaide | Olympic Dam (return) | 420.20 | July | Hot Fire Pad Training |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 402.60 | August | NECWG |
| M Bentley | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 607.20 | August | AFAC Health Fitness |
| S Staunton | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 253.00 | August | Retained Recruitment Course |
| T Hammat | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 253.00 | August | Retained Recruitment Course |
| M Bentley | Executive | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 1103.44 | August | View CAD Systems with Mr Pickering |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 631.01 | October | NECWG |
| M Bentley | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 631.01 | October | AFAC Development Board |
| W Haynes | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 260.59 | October | Training Course (Retained) |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Auckland (return) | 834.20 | November | NECWG |
| B Walker | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Hobart (return) | 425.42 | November | FCI Seminar |
| G Hyde | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 168.41 | November | Retained Hot Fire Training |
| S Staunton | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 168.41 | November | Retained Hot Fire Training |
| T Hammat | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 168.41 | November | Retained Hot Fire Training |
| G Hyde | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 72.82 | November | Retained Hot Fire Training |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 457.19 | November | Fire Safety |
| D Schmerl | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Wellington (return) | 844.40 | November | Capex GP Pumps |
| T Dew | Country Operations | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 208.10 | November | Country Operations |
| B Keen | Training | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 437.19 | November | Training |
| J Wise | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 179.63 | December | Retained BA Course |
| W Dunn | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 155.92 | December | Retained BA Course |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 882.29 | December | Fire Safety |
| G Benham | Training | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 437.19 | December | Training |
| A Gill | Training | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 437.19 | December | Training |
| T Dew | Country Operations | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 220.70 | December | Country Operations |
| D Kemp | Training | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 480.59 | December | AFAC Conference |
| Name 2001 | Department | From | To | Cost | Date of Travel | Reason for Travel |
| R Thompson | Human Resources | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 212.97 | January | Human Resources |
| P Heinrich | | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 212.97 | January | Human Resources |
| G Sulley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 514.25 | February | Fire Safety |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------|----------|-----------------------------|
| P Chapman | Country Operations | Whyalla | Whyalla (return) | 220.13 | February | Retained Recruitment Course |
| D McNamee | Country Operations | Port Augusta | Adelaide (return) | 311.57 | February | Retained Recruitment Course |
| L Brown | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Wellington (return) | 837.60 | February | Appliances |
| W Glowers | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Wellington (return) | 837.60 | February | Appliances |
| D Schmerl | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Wellington (return) | 837.60 | February | Appliances |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 451.43 | February | NECWG |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 480.59 | February | GRN Conference |
| R Melin | Country Operations | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 216.19 | February | Country Operations |
| R Castignani | Country Operations | Mount Gambier | Adelaide (return) | 274.67 | February | Retained Recruitment Course |
| M Bentley | Executive | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 269.28 | March | Country Competitions |
| R Sedunary | Country Operations | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 269.28 | March | Country Competitions |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 451.43 | March | Fire Safety |
| G Matters | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 451.43 | March | Fire Safety |
| B Keen | Training | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 451.43 | March | Training |
| M Bentley | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 627.00 | March | AFAC Meeting |
| G Dougherty | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 559.14 | March | Fire Safety |
| D Kemp | Training | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 328.17 | March | Training |
| D Launder | Human Resources | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 451.43 | March | Human Resources |
| M Bentley | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 451.43 | March | AFAC—OH&S Management |
| M Smith | Operations Metropolitan | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 407.65 | March | AFAC Course |
| G Benham | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 441.33 | March | Training |
| M Bentley | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 257.33 | March | AFAC |
| P Gottsche | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 195.41 | April | Planning and Logistics |
| D Launder | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 441.33 | April | Training |
| G Vass | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 441.33 | April | Training |
| M Bentley | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 518.54 | April | AFAC General Meeting |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Canberra (return) | 430.10 | April | NECWG |
| M Bishop | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 254.12 | April | Retained Recruitment Course |
| P Abbott | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 254.12 | April | Retained Recruitment Course |
| M Welk | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 221.14 | April | Retained Recruitment Course |
| S Cowan | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 221.14 | April | Retained Recruitment Course |
| A Bishop | Country Operations | Wyalla | Adelaide (return) | 221.14 | April | Retained Recruitment Course |
| M Bishop | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 181.17 | May | Retained Recruitment Course |
| P Abbott | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 181.17 | May | Retained Recruitment Course |
| M Welk | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 181.17 | May | Retained Recruitment Course |
| S Cowan | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 181.17 | May | Retained Recruitment Course |
| A Bishop | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 231.18 | May | Retained Recruitment Course |
| W Dunn | Country Operations | Adelaide | Whyalla | 115.59 | May | Retained Recruitment Course |
| B Bishop | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 397.76 | May | NECWG |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 397.76 | May | NECWG |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 456.28 | May | ESAC |
| S French | Human Resources | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 597.74 | May | OHS&W Audit Team Training |
| R Thompson | Human Resources | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 667.48 | May | OHS&W Audit Team Training |
| M Bentley | Executive | Adelaide | Indianapolis (return) | 6799.72 | June | WPFGB Bid |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| G Dougherty | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 456.28 | June | AFAC Working Group |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 185.13 | June | AFAC Meeting |
| P Jones | Training | Canberra | Adelaide (return) | 458.15 | July | Training |
| W Kidd | Training | Sydney | Adelaide (return) | 334.73 | July | Training |
| T Templer | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Hobart (return) | 646.85 | July | Fire Safety |
| V Schar | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Hobart (return) | 646.85 | July | Fire Safety |
| G Sulley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 535.48 | July | Fire Safety |
| B Nunn | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 716.98 | July | Training |
| W Baeker | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 716.98 | July | Training |
| P Jones | Training | Canberra | Adelaide (return) | 341.27 | August | Training |
| W Kidd | Training | Sydney | Adelaide (return) | 237.27 | August | Training |
| D Horsell | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 199.15 | August | Fire Safety |
| M Morgan | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 212.22 | August | OH&S |
| A Eckert | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 212.22 | August | OH&S |
| R Thompson | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 212.22 | August | OH&S |
| M Smith | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 212.22 | August | OH&S |
| D Launder | Training | Adelaide | Darwin (return) | 1099.00 | August | Training |
| D Wise | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 269.28 | August | Country Operations |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 359.04 | August | NECWG |
| L Batley | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 491.48 | August | Training |
| J Gray | Country Operations | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 265.31 | September | Country Competitions |
| T Dew | Country Operations | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 265.31 | September | Country Competitions |
| P Gottsche | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 255.55 | September | Fire Alarm Failure |
| J Wise | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 277.20 | October | Retained Recruitment Course |
| M Welk | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 277.20 | October | Retained Recruitment Course |
| W Dunn | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 336.70 | October | Retained Recruitment Course |
| B Keen | Training | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 935.74 | October | Training |
| W Dwyer | Public Relations | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 464.74 | November | ANZ Sports Games |
| N Mangelsdorf | | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 464.74 | November | ANZ Sports Games |
| R Sedunary | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 582.18 | November | Metropolitan Operations |
| T Drohan | Country Operations | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 582.18 | November | Country Operations |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 582.51 | November | Fire Safety |
| M Smith | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 582.40 | December | Planning and Logistics |
| D Cranwell | | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 581.96 | December | |
| M Welk | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 216.70 | December | Retained Recruitment Course |
| D Kemp | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 648.07 | December | Training |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 648.07 | December | NECWG |
| B Bishop | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 720.67 | December | Planning and Logistics |
| Name 2002 | Department | From | To | Cost | Date of Travel | Reason for Travel |
| T Drohan | Country Operations | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 451.60 | January | Country OH&S |
| C Stott | Human Resources | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 451.60 | January | Country OH&S |
| J Arthur | OH&S | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 451.60 | January | Country OH&S |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| G Dougherty | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 611.88 | February | Fire Safety |
| B Bishop | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 188.47 | February | Planning and Logistics |
| R Carrison | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 135.84 | February | Retained Recruitment Course |
| T Drohan | Country Operations | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 319.33 | February | Country Competitions |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 319.33 | February | Country Competitions |
| R Crockford | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 549.09 | February | CBR |
| J VanDongen | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | NSW (return) | 678.10 | February | NSW Bushfires |
| A Brice | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | NSW (return) | 678.10 | February | NSW Bushfires |
| R Gray | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | NSW (return) | 678.10 | February | NSW Bushfires |
| A Wilckens | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | NSW (return) | 678.10 | February | NSW Bushfires |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | NSW (return) | 678.34 | February | NSW Bushfires |
| C Stott | Metropolitan Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 165.82 | February | Country Operations Reliever |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | NSW (return) | 709.36 | February | Conference |
| G Rawson | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 651.36 | March | Planning and Logistics |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 480.18 | March | AFAC Conference |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 480.18 | March | Fire Safety |
| G Sulley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 458.33 | March | Fire Safety |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Berlin (return) | 2100.09 | March | ISO Conference |
| J Wise | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 362.98 | March | Retained Recruitment Course |
| R Davies | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 362.98 | March | Retained Recruitment Course |
| T McIntosh | Training | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 906.50 | March | Training |
| T Drohan | Country Operations | Adelaide | Perth (return) | 557.99 | March | Executive |
| T Drohan | Country Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 596.89 | March | Country Operations |
| G Benham | Country Operations | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 686.18 | March | Country Operations |
| D Launder | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 686.18 | March | Training |
| B Keen | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 658.48 | March | AFAC Conference |
| K Murphy | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Canberra (return) | 519.99 | March | Fire Safety |
| T McIntosh | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 378.40 | April | Training |
| D Kemp | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 378.40 | April | Training |
| R Carrison | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 253.88 | April | Retained Recruitment Course |
| K Litchfield | Country Operations | Wyalla | Adelaide (return) | 223.41 | April | Retained Recruitment Course |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 619.96 | April | AFAC Conference |
| D Kemp | Training | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 952.01 | April | AFAC Meeting |
| G Howard | Training | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 952.01 | April | AFAC Meeting |
| K Searle | Training | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 357.88 | April | Country Operations Reliever |
| J Davies | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 242.20 | April | Retained Recruitment Course |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 625.82 | April | AFAC Conference |
| G Dougherty | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Canberra (return) | 801.62 | April | Fire Safety |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Berlin (return) | 2100.00 | April/May | ISO Conference |
| K Murphy | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 457.89 | May | Conference |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Port Augusta (return) | 323.69 | May | Country Competitions |
| T Drohan | Country Operations | Adelaide | Port Augusta (return) | 323.69 | May | Country Competitions |
| W Dunn | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 324.12 | May | Retained Recruitment Course |
| D Cockroft | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 324.12 | May | Retained Recruitment Course |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------|----------|------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------------------------|
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 691.75 | May | NECWG |
| G Williams | Planning and Logistics | Brisbane | Adelaide | 309.56 | May | Appliance Purchases |
| R Harland | Planning and Logistics | Brisbane | Adelaide | 309.56 | May | Appliance Purchases |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 656.04 | May | Conference |
| T Drohan | Country Operations | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 324.12 | May | Country Competitions |
| C Stott | Country Operations | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 437.58 | May | Country Operations Reliever |
| R Crockford | Country Operations | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 341.65 | June | Country Operations Reliever |
| D Cockcroft | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 321.63 | June | Retained Recruitment Course |
| M Taylor | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 564.52 | June | NECWG |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 564.30 | June | Fire Safety |
| G Crossman | Training | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 623.70 | June | Conference |
| D Cockcroft | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 335.60 | June | Retained Recruitment Course |
| K Litchfield | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 335.60 | June | Retained Recruitment Course |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 570.31 | June | AFAC Conference |
| T Drohan | Country Operations | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 410.91 | June | Country Competitions |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 401.14 | June | Country Competitions |
| J Gray | Executive | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 401.14 | June | Country Competitions |
| G Williams | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 326.20 | June | Appliance Purchases |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 337.25 | July | Country Competitions |
| J Gray | Executive | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 346.47 | July | Country Competitions |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 478.60 | July | Standards Meeting |
| M Dawes | Country Operations | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 346.47 | July | Country Competitions |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Japan (return) | 4130.00 | July | Fire Chiefs Conference |
| R Thompson | Human Resources | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 376.00 | July | Incident at Whyalla |
| D Keenan | | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 376.00 | July | Incident at Whyalla |
| R Thompson | Human Resources | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 376.00 | July | Incident at Whyalla |
| S Pavlich | OH&S | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 376.00 | July | Incident at Whyalla |
| G Matters | Metropolitan Operation | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 1141.42 | July | Workshop |
| G Sulley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 439.00 | August | AFAC Meeting |
| D Cant | | Sydney | Adelaide (return) | 563.91 | August | DCO Interview |
| G Dougherty | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 655.33 | August | Fire Safety |
| D Goad | Metropolitan Operation | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 1141.42 | August | Workshop |
| D Schmerl | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Brisbane | 218.70 | August | Appliance Purchase |
| R Harland | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 218.70 | August | Appliance Purchase |
| L Batley | Metropolitan Operation | Adelaide | Hobart (return) | 617.46 | August | Course |
| A Brice | Metropolitan Operation | Adelaide | Hobart (return) | 617.46 | August | Course |
| H Kosiol | Metropolitan Operation | Adelaide | Hobart (return) | 617.46 | August | Course |
| L Williams | Metropolitan Operation | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 413.21 | September | Workshop |
| A Wilckens | Metropolitan Operation | Adelaide | Hobart (return) | 617.46 | September | Course |

| N Mangelsdorf | Metropolitan Operation | Adelaide | Hobart (return) | 617.46 | September | Course |
|---------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------------------|----------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| D Juniper | Metropolitan Operation | Adelaide | Hobart (return) | 617.46 | September | Course |
| K Murphy | Metropolitan Operation | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 346.11 | September | Conference |
| D Launder | Training | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 513.25 | September | AFAC Conference |
| D Schmerl | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Brisbane | 345.79 | September | AFAC Conference |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | London (return) | 4,180.18 | October | ISO SC15 Meeting |
| T McIntosh | Training | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 278.16 | October | Training |
| G Benham | Training | Adelaide | Roxby (return) | 456.01 | October | Training |
| G Vass | Training | Adelaide | Roxby (return) | 456.01 | October | Training |
| G Williams | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Brisbane | 309.00 | October | Appliance Purchase |
| G McLean | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Brisbane | 309.00 | October | Appliance Purchase |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 478.60 | October | AFAC Meeting |
| R Thompson | Human Resources | Adelaide | Whylla (return) | 177.16 | October | Incident at Whyalla |
| D Keenan | | Adelaide | Whylla (return) | 177.16 | October | Incident at Whyalla |
| W Jamieson | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 478.60 | October | Planning and Logistics |
| R Thompson | Human Resources | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 444.92 | October | Incident at Mount Gambier |
| S Pavlich | OH&S | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 444.92 | October | Incident at Mount Gambier |
| S French | OH&S | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 444.92 | October | Incident at Mount Gambier |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 351.61 | October | AFAC Meeting |
| K Searle | Country Operations | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 255.05 | October | Country Operations Reliever |
| J Wise | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 315.51 | November | Retained Recruitment Course |
| G Benham | Country Operations | Adelaide | Canberra (return) | 717.49 | November | CBR Conference |
| J Bascomb | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 320.51 | November | Retained Recruitment Course |
| S Cowan | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 240.01 | November | Medical Appointment |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 451.20 | November | AFAC Meeting |
| P Hall | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 658.63 | November | Community Safety Education |
| R Crockford | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 593.61 | November | CBR Meeting |
| W Trezise | OH&S | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 518.30 | November | OH&S Seminar |
| S Pavlich | OH&S | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 518.30 | November | OH&S Seminar |
| S French | OH&S | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 518.30 | November | OH&S Seminar |
| D Schmerl | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Wellington (return) | 2170.58 | November | Appliance Purchases |
| R Harland | OH&S | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 518.30 | November | OH&S Seminar |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 495.20 | December | AFAC Meeting |
| C Bohlin | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 263.09 | December | Retained Recruitment Course |
| R Cooke | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 263.09 | December | Retained Recruitment Course |
| T Steele | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 344.99 | December | Retained Recruitment Course |
| Name 2003 | Department | From | To | Cost | Date of Travel | Reason for Travel |
| R Marchant | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 326.13 | January | AFAC Meeting |
| A Wellman | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 222.23 | February | Graduate Certificate |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Hobart (return) | 743.03 | February | AFAC Meeting |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 605.53 | February | AFAC Meeting |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 271.13 | February | Standards Meeting |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 579.13 | March | Standards Meeting |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 464.23 | March | AFAC Meeting |
| V Schar | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 354.23 | March | AFAC Meeting |

| Name 2003 | Department | From | To | Cost | Date of Travel | Reason for Travel |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| M Heinze | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 579.13 | March | AFAC Program |
| C Fisher | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 239.83 | March | AFAC Meeting |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 222.23 | March | AFAC Meeting |
| T Norman | Business Manager | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 352.03 | March | AFAC Meeting |
| V Schar | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 315.58 | April | Delivery of Training |
| A Lambert | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 315.58 | April | Delivery of Training |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Winnipeg (return) | 844.15 | April | Standards Meeting |
| G Evans | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 329.99 | April | Retained Recruitment Course |
| G Evans | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 329.99 | May | Retained Recruitment Course |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Whyalla | 181.82 | May | ESLG Meeting |
| G Lupton | Executive | Whyalla | Adelaide | 154.05 | May | Country Competitions |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 546.59 | May | ISO Meeting |
| A Wellman | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 400.43 | May | Graduate Certificate |
| M Heinze | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Kingscote (return) | 256.70 | May | Regional Bushfire Forum |
| V Schar | Fire Safety | Port Lincoln | Adelaide | 381.82 | May | Delivery of Training |
| A Lambert | Fire Safety | Port Lincoln | Adelaide | 335.12 | May | Delivery of Training |
| G Senior | Human Resources | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 197.85 | June | Group Support Session |
| D Lubrook | | Adelaide | Whyalla (return) | 197.85 | June | Group Support Session |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Tonga (return) * | 1763.67 | June | Fire Service Assistance |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Tonga (return) * | 1745.95 | June | Fire Service Assistance |
| B Keen | Training | Adelaide | Tonga (return) * | 1920.74 | June | Fire Service Assistance |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 435.98 | June | Country Competitions |
| S French | Executive | Adelaide | Mount Gambier (return) | 429.98 | June | Country Competitions |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 246.95 | June | Standards Meeting |
| J Wise | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 241.13 | July | Retained Recruitment Course |
| K Price | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 222.08 | July | Retained Recruitment Course |
| K Evans | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 222.08 | July | Retained Recruitment Course |
| S Pavlich | OH&S | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 352.51 | July | MBF & Ballarat Conference |
| S French | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 352.51 | July | MBF & Ballarat Conference |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | UK-Barcelona (return) | 9097.00 | July | IFE Conference/WPFG |
| * To be subsidised by outside agency. | | | | | | |
| W Dwyer | Public Relations | Adelaide | Barcelona (return) | 2120.00 | July | WPFG |
| N Mangelsdorf | | Adelaide | Barcelona (return) | 2120.00 | July | WPFG |
| G Dougherty | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 266.71 | July | AFAC Meeting |
| A Wellman | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 338.83 | July | Graduate Certificate Course |
| T Norman | Business Manager | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 382.47 | August | AFAC Meeting |
| G Sulley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 317.57 | August | IAAI Conference & AFAC |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 358.01 | August | AFAC Conference |
| S Daviess | Training | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 590.65 | August | SABRE BA Course |
| S Dix | Training | Adelaide | Brisbane (return) | 590.65 | August | SABRE BA Course |
| K Price | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 224.18 | August | Retained Recruitment Course |
| K Evans | Country Operations | Port Lincoln | Adelaide (return) | 247.28 | August | Retained Recruitment Course |
| G Benham | Country Operations | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 317.57 | August | Summit on counter Terrorism |
| S French | Executive | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 271.48 | September | Country Competitions |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 271.48 | September | Country Competitions |
| M Smith | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 397.87 | September | Standards Meeting |
| D Launder | Training | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 369.01 | September | AFAC Committee Meeting |
| D Kemp | Training | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 369.01 | September | AFAC Education & Training |
| R Crockford | Country Operations | Mount Gambier | Adelaide (return) | 131.45 | September | Country Operations Reliever |
| D Schmerl | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 345.07 | September | AFAC Course |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------|-----------|------------------------------|
| W Jamieson | Planning and Logistics | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 538.81 | September | AFAC Meeting |
| C Fisher | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Port Lincoln (return) | 212.08 | September | Build. Fire Safety Committee |
| J Bradley | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Canberra (return) | 472.48 | September | AFAC Meetings |
| C Fisher | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Canberra (return) | 494.48 | September | AFAC Meetings |
| M Heinze | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Canberra (return) | 494.48 | September | AFAC Meetings |
| A Wellman | Fire Safety | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 188.13 | October | Certificate Course |
| A Eckert | Human Resources | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 248.01 | October | ACISA Conference |
| R Thompson | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 248.01 | October | ACISA Conference |
| G Senior | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 248.01 | October | ACISA Conference |
| C Bohlin | Country Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 248.01 | October | ACISA Conference |
| John Foody | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 248.01 | October | ACISA Conference |
| J Steiner | Metropolitan Operations | Adelaide | Melbourne (return) | 248.01 | October | ACISA Conference |
| G Lupton | Executive | Adelaide | Sydney (return) | 668.47 | October | AFAC Meeting |
| C Bohlin | Country Operations | Whyalla | Adelaide (return) | 193.49 | October | Peer Support Seminar |
| W Jamieson | Planning and Logistics | Coolangatta | Adelaide | 179.93 | November | QFS Communications Meeting |

2. The salaries of District Officers and Fire Commanders are currently under review.

CRIME, NUMBERS

127. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** How many reported car thefts, car break-ins, home break-ins and assaults occurred in the electorate of Morphett during each year 1995-96 to 2000-03?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Commissioner of Police has provided the following table depicting the numbers of crimes reported to police in the state electorate of Morphett from 1995-96 to 2002-03.

| Offence type | 1995-96 | 1996-97 | 1997-98 | 1998-99 | 1999-2000 | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|
| Serious Assault | 29 | 23 | 33 | 34 | 36 | 31 | 51 | 50 |
| Minor Assault | 156 | 133 | 209 | 176 | 166 | 165 | 235 | 206 |
| Serious Criminal Trespass (Residence) | 391 | 272 | 321 | 444 | 384 | 358 | 403 | 314 |
| Larceny/Illegal Use of Motor Vehicle | 303 | 158 | 217 | 312 | 375 | 353 | 301 | 262 |
| Larceny (Theft) from Motor Vehicle | 432 | 235 | 567 | 764 | 841 | 593 | 608 | 615 |

I am advised that statistics across the eight-year sequence are not consistently comparable due to the regular electoral re-distribution process. Additionally SAPOL crime data is structured primarily for reporting by police administrative units. Data for other administrative units such as Local Government Areas and Electorates are collated by aggregating Collection District data. The Collection District framework is revised each Census and electoral boundary changes and Census boundary changes will not always coincide. Morphett has also experienced an increase in population from 27,378 at the 1996 Census to 30,655 at the 2001 Census.

RECREATION AND SPORT, GRANTS

135. **The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Why are the community facilities grant carryovers for 2002-03 being paid over 2003-04 and 2004-05?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Applications for the 2002-03 Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Grants program were called for on 4 December 2002. The closing date for applications was 31 January 2003.

Successful organisations were notified of the allocation of the grant on 23 June 2003.

Upon receipt of this notification and the signing of a grant agreement, successful organisations have three months, or unless otherwise negotiated, to commence their project from the date of signing this agreement.

Grant payments to successful organisations under this funding program are made in instalments based upon the achievement of various project milestones. These payments are subsequently made

over a period of time based upon the successful applicant's capacity to complete their project.

As a result, projects funded from the 2002-03 round of the program will commence, and in most instances, complete their projects in the 2003-04 and 2004-05 financial years.

RECREATION AND SPORT, YOUTH

137. **The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Why was a Sydney based consultant engaged to prepare a youth sports strategy rather than the Participation Unit in the Office of Recreation and Sport?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The unstructured recreation needs of young people have been identified through a number of regional recreation and sport plans, as being a critical issue requiring a strategic approach from State and Local Government.

The Office for Recreation and Sport is working in partnership with Planning SA, the Office of Employment and Youth, Local Government and providers of services to youth to develop the South Australian Youth Recreation Strategy, not a Youth Sports Strategy.

The majority of funding for the project has been sourced from the Local Government Research and Development Scheme (\$57,500). The Office for Recreation and Sport has contributed \$10,000, Planning SA \$10,000 and the central sector councils \$8,000.

Only the \$57,500 from the Local Government Research and Development Scheme was used to engage the consultant to undertake the considerable research, consultation and development of appropriate strategies as required. The contract was between the

consultant and the Local Government Community Services Association (LGCSA). That is, the Office for Recreation and Sport did not fund this consultancy nor was party to the contract with the consultant.

The LGCSA procurement process resulted in the selection of *Suter and Associates Leisure and Tourism Planners* (who have bases in Adelaide and Sydney) and *Youth Innovations* (based in Adelaide). Both of which have significant presence, experience and history in Adelaide and South Australia.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SPORTS INSTITUTE

140. **The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Has a review on the future of public membership at the South Australia Sports Institute gymnasium been undertaken and if so, what are the details and if not, when will a decision be made?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The South Australian Sports Institute undertakes regular monitoring and review processes of its services and programs. In the case of the SASI gym the review processes have included an analysis by an external expert as well as an internal review of gym usage, service quality and effectiveness. The issue of public membership and access to the SASI gym was considered as part of these processes.

A recommendation to discontinue public access to the SASI gym has been under consideration for some time. It is proposed that the decision will be finalised following a consultation process with public members.

BUILDING MAINTENANCE SECTION

144. **The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Does the Building Maintenance Section receive direct appropriation and if not, what funding arrangements are in place?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. An annual appropriation of \$750 000 is provided to Building Maintenance for the government's Asbestos Removal Program.

Building Maintenance provides a comprehensive Facilities Management Service that is funded by client agencies on a fee for service basis.

NATIVE VEGETATION COUNCIL

147. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** On whose advice was the Chairman of the Native Vegetation Council appointed and what experience has the Chairman in agricultural or pastoral industries?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

1. Mr John Machum Roger was appointed by the Governor on 15 May 2003 to be the Presiding Member of the Native Vegetation Council on my advice as Minister for Environment and Conservation, in accordance with Section 8(1)(a) of the Native Vegetation Act 1991. I received a recommendation to appoint Mr Roger from Mr Rob Freeman, Chief Executive of the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation.

2. Mr Roger is a practicing member of 'Southern Vales Legal Solicitors' specialising in Environmental and Development Law. Mr Roger has been involved in community projects including the Landcare project 'Re-Greening the Range' (revegetation of the Sellicks Hill escarpment) and the Willunga Basin Water Users Group Joint Venture (use of waste water for irrigation purposes in the Willunga Basin). Mr Roger also has a diploma in Commercial Mediation.

The honourable member may also be advised that of the seven person Native Vegetation Council, four members and three deputy members are rural landholders.

TRANSPORT INSPECTORS

148. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** What training or experience do transport inspectors have in relation to assessing vehicle road-worthiness, what is the policy regarding cooperation with truck owners and how many inspectors have left the department due to stress or other pressure related conditions since 1999?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Road Transport Inspectors undergo formal training upon appointment and this is followed up and supported by intensive on-the-job training and experience. Training provided to Road Transport Inspectors is in accordance with the National Road Transport Commission's "Guidelines for Assessment of Defects".

Road Transport Inspectors are generally restricted to defects only, however, those Inspectors who possess are encouraged to conduct more detailed mechanical qualifications, background and experience. conducting checks for manifest formal mechanical qualifications checks in accordance with their

Road Transport Inspectors are required to conduct themselves in accordance with the requirements of the Public Sector Management Act and are encouraged to exercise discretion, at all times, when dealing with heavy vehicle drivers and owners.

I have been advised that one Road Transport Inspector has resigned from Transport SA since 1999 who, prior to his resignation, had submitted and later withdrew a stress related claim to WorkCover.

ROADS, BOOLEROO CENTRE TO JAMESTOWN

149. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Will the District Council of Mount Remarkable receive government funding for the completion of the sealing of the Booleroo Centre to Jamestown arterial road in 2003-04?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Sealing of the Booleroo Centre to Jamestown arterial road commenced in 1998 under the Unsealed Rural Arterial Roads Program. Sealing of 22 km of a total of 33 km of unsealed road has been completed to date (note that about 14 km of the road was sealed prior to the start of the program in 1998).

Funding of \$1.3 m has been made available in 2003-04, to continue work on a further 6 km of the unsealed sections within both the District Council of Mount Remarkable and the Northern Areas Council.

I have been advised that Transport SA currently is negotiating with both Councils in regard to construction of the sections that will be sealed within each Council area in 2003-04.

TRANSPORT INSPECTORS

150. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Does the department intend employing more transport inspectors and if so, at what cost and from which funds will these costs be met, and will they include former Air Force personnel?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Transport SA, at this time, has no intention to increase the number of operational Road Transport Inspectors located throughout the State.

Should any future employment of Road Transport Inspectors take place, Transport SA has a non-discriminatory recruitment policy, whereby all applicants would be considered on merit.

WEIGHBRIDGE, PORT AUGUSTA

151. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Are the existing traffic arrangements at the weigh bridge south of Port Augusta satisfactory and what are the risks to passing traffic?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The safety history of the Stirling North Weighbridge supports the current traffic arrangements and Inspector operating procedures at that site.

The Weighbridge is located within a two lane, double carriage-way, so opportunity currently exists for Inspectors to split traffic safely and, in doing so, provide a clear line of sight for both Inspectors and heavy vehicle drivers.

Although it is considered that both risks are controlled, Transport SA currently is investigating the feasibility of installing electronic "weighbridge open/closed" signs that are remotely operated from the Weighbridge on both approaches to the site. Furthermore, it is considering the feasibility of restricting vehicle speeds in the direct vicinity of the Weighbridge when the Weighbridge is in operation.

TRANSPORT SA

152. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** What new machinery will the department acquire in 2003-04 and 2004-05, and where will it be located?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I advise that a tender process is currently being run for the purchase of core plant (machinery) for 2003-04 and 2004-05 used by Transport SA in maintaining transport infrastructure. The plant to be acquired encompasses approximately 470 items and typically comprises:

- Earthmoving plant, including tractors, loaders, motor graders and dozers.
- Trucks of various capacities and configurations.
- Compaction equipment, self propelled and drawn.

- Trailers, caravans and trailer mounted equipment of varying sizes and capacities, including accommodation and amenities caravans used in remote areas.
- Miscellaneous plant including compressors, alternators, fuel and water tanks, material handling equipment, mowers, wood chippers, and specialised asphalt equipment.
- Attachments—a wide range of attachments fitted to earthmoving equipment and trucks.

Approximately 45% of the plant will be located in remote areas north and west of Port Augusta. The remainder of the plant will be located across other areas of the State similar to the existing locations of the current hired plant.

It is not possible to determine the actual numbers and location of new plant until after the tender process is completed, at this stage, anticipated to be early 2004.

The new machinery to be required by TransAdelaide in 2003-04 is as follows:

- One Tractor—Mile End Depot Compressed Air Facility—Gawler Stabling Yard

Requirements for 2004-05 are yet to be determined.

HOME SCHOOLING

153. **Mrs HALL:**

1. How many junior primary, senior primary and secondary students respectively were enrolled in Home Schooling in 2002-03?

2. What is the criteria and process for approving parents as tutors and is there a requirement to be networked with a registered school?

3. How many Home Schooling applications have been refused and what are the details?

4. How are assignments, examinations and basic curriculum monitored by the ~ implemented by the Department?

5. What was the cost of implementing the program in 2002-03?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) 2002 Annual Report provides the total number of students exempt from attending school for the purposes of home education in 2002. The total number of students that undertook home schooling in 2002 was 404. I am advised that the number of junior primary, senior primary and secondary students enrolled in home schooling regularly vary as reviews occur, therefore accurate figures for each category are not available.

Those who wish to apply to the department to exempt their child from school for the purposes of home education are required to provide information on:

- The name of the school within South Australia that the child is enrolled and attending.
- The proposed program of schoolwork and an outline of a typical day's schoolwork.
- The proposed work space.
- How the child's achievement will be assessed and monitored.
- The name of the person responsible for the provision of the educational program.

A home visit is then arranged to address, in detail, the information that has been supplied. A report that includes a recommendation regarding the approval/non approval for exemption from school attendance is then forwarded to the Director, Office of Learning and Service Delivery for consideration.

This exemption process aims to ensure that students educated at home, like students attending school, have access to quality education programs and opportunities for social development. An exemption from school for the purposes of home schooling is refused if any criteria within the exemption process are not met. An application may be refused for a variety of reasons.

Since 2000, 38 children from 20 families have been refused exemption from school for the purpose of Home Schooling.

Home educating families participate in an annual review process. They complete a review summary form about their education program and participate in a review meeting. Students also participate in the review meeting.

Home educating families are required to show evidence of student learning and progress in all areas of study, descriptions of social interactions and forward planning for the next year.

The cost to the department of implementing the Home Schooling program is the cost of a Home Schooling Project Officer position and associated costs such as phone and travel. DECS provides no financial support to families who educate their children at home.

SPEECH PATHOLOGY SERVICES

156. **Ms CHAPMAN:** How will speech pathological services to schools be affected by the removal of four speech pathology management positions in the Department?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: To clarify, there will be no loss of managerial jobs in the field. Instead of 4 speech pathology teams, there will be 17 multi-disciplinary teams. The current speech pathology managers will manage 4 of these teams. Therefore there is an opportunity to increase the number of managers who are speech pathologists as the additional management positions have been advertised and are open to speech pathologists.

The State Government has also increased the number of speech pathologists and psychologists working with students with communication and behavioural difficulties. This increase is aimed at improving speech pathology services to schools that need it most.

EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES

157. **Ms CHAPMAN:** How will the delivery of early childhood services be affected by the proposed restructure, including the removal of four District Children's Services coordinators?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: All children in State schools stand to benefit from additional and improved services to young students and children in their early formative years.

The new structures proposed for the Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) in 2004 will enhance outcomes for children from birth to eighteen years of age by improving support to children's services and schools.

This will be achieved by committing more resources to district offices. This involves the expansion of senior personnel in district offices from 69 to 102 positions. Balanced teams that are able to cover the full spectrum of learning outcomes from birth to eighteen will staff the new district offices. Improved support to early years sites will be a core priority for all district offices.

The proposed district structure increases resources available to each District Director from two to five positions. In this context, the work that is currently undertaken by District Coordinators will be reshaped and sharpened.

Curriculum support to Children's Services sites will be the responsibility of a new curriculum specialist focussing on the early years and primary years. Service improvement and development will be the responsibility of the Care, Preschool and School Improvement Coordinator.

Management arrangements and support for children with additional needs will be strengthened by two new senior positions that will focus on disability support and the well-being and inclusion of children. Access to support services for children with disabilities will be maintained.

District Directors will be accountable for the full range of children's services and schools in each of their districts. Their larger staff teams will be expected to include people with early years expertise and knowledge. There will be substantial scope for Children's Services District Coordinators to win new jobs in the new district structure.

The specific responsibilities for each of the new jobs within districts are being developed. The roles and functions that are essential to a vibrant and healthy children's services sector in every district will be designed into these new positions. Functions that are appropriate to other areas of the Department—such as preschool staffing—will transfer to state office. Other functions and services to sites will be maintained, including the support to children's services on action research and curriculum improvement initiatives.

The delivery of early childhood services to schools will also be improved through an extra six speech pathologists and psychologists working in districts plus a new state-wide Learning Links team of ten professionals and para-professionals.

In addition, seventy-seven primary schools will gain access to a school counsellor for the first time next year thanks to an \$8 million State Government initiative to address the well-being of our primary school children.

This will mean that more than 240 primary schools will have a primary counsellor resource from 2004, more than 100 extra schools than when this Government took office 17 months ago.

A more cohesive and connected early years system will deliver better outcomes for both children and the wider South Australian community in future years.

SCHOOLS, PUBLIC

158. **Ms CHAPMAN:** Has the review of future materials and services fees in public schools: being finalised and if so, who undertook the review, what are the recommendations and when will it be released?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Yes, the review of future materials and services fees in public schools has been finalised. This review was undertaken by the Department of Education and Children's Services.

The recommendations were produced in the form of a Cabinet Submission and are reflected in the Bill that I introduced to the House on 15 October 2003.

BIO INNOVATION SA

161. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**

1. What are the details of any sponsorship arrangement at the Biotech 2003 Conference funded by the Bio Innovation SA budget?

2. What are the Bio Innovation SA budget expenses for 2003-04?

3. Which funded Bio Innovation SA programs were discontinued in 2003-04 and which new programs have commenced?

4. What are the full details of the 8 applications under the Federal Government BIF Scheme facilitated by Bio Innovation SA?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:

1. AusBiotech 2003

The Government of South Australia, through Bio Innovation SA, was the Diamond Sponsor of the AusBiotech 2003 Conference which was held at the Adelaide Convention Centre from 16-19 August 2003

This sponsorship arrangement was paid out of the Bio Innovation SA budget at a cost of \$50,000 + GST

Bio Innovation SA provided in-kind support to the program, resulting in 29 South Australians presenting at the Conference.

2. The Bio Innovation SA budget expenses for 2003-04 are:

- Salaries and wages
- Office and equipment rental
- Grants to third parties
- Program delivery/marketing/contractors totalling \$4,705,000.

3. None of Bio Innovation SA programs were discontinued in 2003-04. Background work is currently underway for several new programs.

4. Funded Applications under the Biotechnology Innovation Fund (BIF)

AIB LABS INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

164. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What is the size and purpose of the AIB Labs Infrastructure Fund, what is the source of the funding and what are the full details of the technical positions established by the fund?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Bio Innovation SA allocated a total of \$800,000 to the program, comprising \$400,000 p.a. in 2002-03 and 2003-04. The funds will be utilized for short-term provision of advanced technical support (i.e. salaries) to operate and maintain equipment, in accordance with the merit and eligibility criteria of the AIB Labs Infrastructure Fund Guidelines.

The Adelaide Integrated Bioscience Laboratories (AIB Labs) is a new initiative between Bio Innovation SA, South Australia's three universities and key bioscience research institutes. The aim is to assist in improving the quantity and quality of research output for the State, thereby enhancing commercialisation opportunities.

AIB Labs Infrastructure Fund grants for 2002/3 were allocated to the following facilities:

- Flinders Advanced Analytical Laboratory
- Flinders Institute for Research, Science and Technology
- Flinders University
- Research Associate position
- IWRI Bio-Interface Technology
- Ian Wark Research Institute
- University of South Australia
- Technical officer position
- Adelaide Proteomics Facility
- Molecular Biosciences
- University of Adelaide
- Manager position
- Adelaide Microarray Facility
- Hanson Institute
- Technical officer position

Centre for Pharmaceutical Research
School of Pharmaceutical, Molecular and Biomedical Sciences
University of South Australia
Technical Officer position

DISTRIBUTED SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY CENTRE

165. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What was the Government's funding contribution to the Distributed Systems Technology Centre launched on 26 August 2003, how much was provided from other sources and what are the future plans for this centre?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:

1. South Australian Government: \$300,000 over three years.

2. Other sources: \$675,000 over three years.

3. Core and Supporting Partners' contributions will support the work of the Cooperative Research Centre, DSTC Pty Ltd over the next three years in research and development activities into the advanced use of Information Technology to build and transform Australian industries and improve organisational competitiveness and efficiency, particularly in the areas of Defence and Health.

FUNDING APPLICATIONS

166. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** How many applications for grant funding have been made to the Department and how many have been approved since March 2002?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Within the portfolio of Science and Information Economy 42 requests for grant funding have been received by the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology since March 2002.

Twenty five grants have been approved since March 2002 by the Department within the portfolio of Science and Information Economy, not including those applications that have been earmarked for referral to the Premier's Science and Research Fund for consideration.

IT COUNCIL REVIEW

167. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What is the status of the review of the IT Council of South Australia and what funding will the Government commit over the next 3 years to support the Council or its equivalent?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The review of the IT Council for South Australia was initiated by its Board and commenced in August 2003. The process of undertaking the review has involved extensive consultation with the Council's stakeholders including Government, ICT industry bodies, education institutions and local companies.

The IT Council Board is currently considering the review report and its recommendations.

A decision on the nature and extent of Government support (both financial and other) for future years will be dependent upon the outcome of the review.

SKA TELESCOPE PROJECT

169. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Which minister and agency is responsible for the progress of the \$1.4B SKA telescope project, what will be the respective state and federal government contributions in securing the project and will mining exploration pose a risk to the project?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: The Square Kilometre Array Radio Telescope [SKA] project comes within the portfolio of the Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development. The Department for Business, Manufacturing and Trade, State Infrastructure Division directs the project.

The project is located in this portfolio in recognition that the agency's considerable expertise in the key tasks of project management, infrastructure provision and business opportunity development plus the regional significance of the project. The business development opportunities that flow from the project will see considerable financial return to the State from our investment.

The South Australian Government has spent over \$100,000 over the past 3 years identifying a prime site for the core telescope development. \$175,000 has been committed in the 2003-04 financial year with a further \$100,000 proposed for the following year to continue that work. This does not include the staff resources from a range of Government Agencies [including DBMT, PIRSA, Transport and Urban Planning and Environment and Heritage] that

have assisted in the process. CSIRO has a budget of \$23.5m to undertake a range of SKA related projects including site selection and lens design. A significant part of this is being used to undertake radio frequency testing in WA, SA and NSW at the proposed core sites.

If South Australia is successful in securing the SKA for Australia, both CSIRO and DBMT will seek additional resources to establish the project. The quantum of this cannot be estimated until the site and design are decided and the level and nature of international commitment is confirmed. These decisions will be made over the next six years.

The existence of commercial mineral deposits in the proposed core site at Murnpeowie was a key part of the site selection process. While no commercial deposits have been identified in the research so far, it is important that this be confirmed. Work is currently being commissioned through PIRSA to complete that assessment. The proposed activities in current exploration licence application, if approved, will be completed before the site selection decision is made and poses no risk to the SKA. The exploration work will also provide confirmation status of commercial deposits in the area.

If South Australia is successful in securing the SKA, the core site and nearby outlier sites will need to be reserved from mineral exploration and mining for the life of the SKA. It is thus essential that a detailed understanding of the commercial mineral deposits exists so that informed decisions can be made.

SARS

170. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What tourism contingency plans are in place in the event of a SARS virus outbreak and what negotiations have occurred with the federal government on this issue?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Refer to QON 157 response tabled in the House of Assembly 17 July 2003.

BELAIR RAILWAY STATION

172. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** When will the restoration work commence on the Belair Railway Station, who will be undertaking the work and will a heritage report be made available?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: There currently is no time frame established for any rebuilding of the fire damaged structures at Belair station, nor which agency or company might undertake the work.

General reports describing the Belair station heritage significance are available from the State Heritage Register database, Department of Environment and Heritage.

CANE TOADS

174. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Have any incidents of cane toad infestation been reported in South Australia and does the government anticipate initial infestation along the River murray system?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

1. The Animal and Plant Control Commission investigates any reports of cane toads in South Australia. Cane toads have been recorded as occasional, inadvertent stowaways in consignments of fruit and plants from Queensland. None of these incidents have resulted in establishment of local feral populations.

2. Cane toads have established populations in the headwaters of the Darling River, approximately 800 kilometres upstream of South Australia. Computer modelling by CSIRO, based on long term climate averages, indicates that the cane toad is unlikely to establish populations in South Australia

Whilst there is no immediate threat to South Australia, the Government is very concerned about any potential long-term threat of cane toads spreading downstream. Unfortunately, scientific research has not delivered a solution to prevent the cane toad spreading. Even well resourced programs in the World Heritage Area of Kakadu National Park could not prevent their natural dispersal. The Animal and Plant Control Commission maintains close links with the current research and will seek to use any appropriate

methods available to control the pest should it ever spread to South Australia.

OBSTETRICIANS AND MIDWIVES, NUMBERS

181. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

1. How many full time obstetricians and midwives, respectively, are currently working in the South Australian public hospital system, how many work in the private system and what are the comparative figures for each of the past five years?

2. What is the expectant rate of attrition for obstetricians and midwives in South Australia over the next five years?

The Hon. L. STEVENS:

1. Midwives

The South Australian Midwifery Student Intake Requirements 2002-2004 Report (29 September 1999) has been used to provide a response to the question.

Headcount in relation to full time equivalent (FTE) positions has been used throughout the report to describe the midwifery workforce. This is consistent with other workforce data sources. It is not possible to provide reliable data with regards to the number of midwives who currently work full time in the public and private hospital system and provide comparative figures for the past five years, because the available survey data does not facilitate this. For this reason it is more meaningful to refer to the headcount of midwives in relation to number of fulltime equivalent (FTE) positions present in the public and private hospital system.

Nurses with midwifery qualifications work in a variety of clinical areas but for the purposes of answering this question only midwives working in midwifery were considered.

The public hospital system (metropolitan and country) has an approximate headcount of 1,324 midwives, which equates to 948.4 FTE.

The private hospital system has an approximate headcount of 271 midwives, which equates to 172.9 FTE.

Obstetricians

It is also not possible to provide details of the number of obstetricians in the workforce for each of the past five years.

The most recent comprehensive workforce review of obstetrics and gynaecology (Australian Medical Workforce Advisory Committee (AMWAC) Report on the Obstetric and Gynaecology Workforce, Supply and Requirements for 1997-2008 (August 1998)) is five years old and is due to be reviewed by AMWAC.

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare collects annual data collections at re-registration by the Medical Boards, but these have only been conducted over the past two years in South Australia.

According to AIHW survey data collected at re-registration by the Medical Boards, analysed in 2002, 66 doctors were specialists practicing in obstetrics and gynaecology (note: 74 per cent response rate. Data for 2003 has only just been collected and is yet to be analysed). Of these:

- 42 (64 per cent) worked more than 80 per cent of their time in private practice;
- 15 (23 per cent) worked more than 80 per cent of their time in public practice; and
- 9 worked about half public and half private.

As at 29 October 2003, there are 10.5 FTE obstetric and gynaecology positions in public metropolitan hospitals. Obstetric and gynaecology specialists consult on a fee for service basis in country hospitals. These 10.5 positions are supported by sessions and on-call arrangements from visiting medical officers to provide 24 hour cover 7 days a week.

2. Midwives

The projected annual net midwifery attrition rate for the period up to 2004 calculated on 1999 data was estimated to be between 5.16 to 8.6 per cent, which is less than the rate calculated on 1997 data (5.71 to 9.52 per cent) and 1994 data (6.9 to 11.5 per cent).

Obstetricians

In 2002, the average age of those who completed the AIHW survey was 50 years. Stated time to retirement indicates that 16 (25 per cent) will be retiring by 2007, 33 (50 per cent) by 2012 and 50 (75 per cent) by 2022.

The current training numbers are graduating 3 new specialists per year. Assuming that this level can be maintained, this will match (15 vs 16) the stated attrition rate until 2007. It will fall just short (30 vs 33) by 2012, but will correct (60 vs 50) by 2022.