HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 19 February 2004

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

CONDOLENCE MOTIONS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I move:

That for the remainder of the session—
(a) Condolence motions relating to former members of the current parliament may be moved immediately after prayers; and
(b) other condolence motions shall be moved after questions without notice and before grievances, unless the house determines otherwise.

As the minister knows, I contacted his office well before giving notice of this motion, so it is not in response to anything that has taken place this week. I know the house would understand that, because this motion was on the *Notice Paper* well before we broke for Christmas. However, this week highlights one of the points I wish to make. I believe there is a role for condolence motions for former members of parliament. I also think it is appropriate for former premiers' condolence motions to be held before question time. Under my proposal, the house can decide that simply by negotiation between the parties before coming into the house so that there is no argument in the house. We could easily agree that condolence motions for former premiers—or indeed any former member—could be held before question time, but I put to members that, to some extent, the workings of the house rely on our working relationship with the media. Quite often we have condolence motions for members that go late into the day and that therefore makes it difficult for the media to report activities during question time and ministerial statements. That may be positive or negative for the government or the opposition depending on the issue of the day, and that varies.

I suggest that, as a trial for the remainder of the session, we look at conducting condolence motions slightly differently. I am saying that we should still have condolence motions but that, as a trial for the remainder of this session only, we should look at holding condolence motions for former members of the current parliament—hopefully there will be none in this session—immediately after prayers, and other condolence motions could be held immediately after question time. If the house so wishes, we can have question time and then have the condolence motion afterwards. If it is a condolence motion similar to the one that we had this week for a former premier, I would support it being held before question time, because I think that those persons have reached a certain status within the system that deserves that recognition. I am not so worried about condolence motions for people who may not have reached the position of premier. My father would be an example. He is still with us, but one day he will not be, and there will be a condolence motion about him.

I am not so concerned whether that occurs before or after question time, other than the fact that perhaps the house should recognise by condolence motion that they served in this place. All I am suggesting is that for a trial, for the remainder of this session, which is not a long time and there may not be another condolence motion in that time, we try another method of handling condolence motions. I think that the current method can be improved and this motion seeks to do that.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I have sympathy for what the member for Davenport is doing and I think that we should look at it seriously. However, I urge the house to have a thorough review of a number of matters, not just in relation to condolence motions but also covering petitions. The public believes that petitions presented to parliament have a significant impact, while we know otherwise, and part of the problem is that they are never noted in here. I am not suggesting a lengthy debate, but perhaps the member presenting them could explain the petition for a couple of minutes and that would give some recognition to something that the public believes is important.

I also believe that congratulatory motions should be treated in the same way as in many other parliaments, which is noting them without debate. If a member wants to congratulate the West Brompton Football Club, I doubt that anyone would oppose it. A lot of private members' time is taken up congratulating teams, and so on. It is well deserved, but we spend too much time debating something when no real debate is involved.

I believe that what the member for Davenport is suggesting has merit. I do not believe in distinguishing between premiers and deputy premiers, or anyone else for that matter. That offends my sense of treating people equally, irrespective of whether they have been in a big white car or a little black car. As a parliament, we have not reformed standing orders significantly for at least 10 years. I draw members' attention to the fact that the Victorian parliament, which I visited the week before last, has conducted a very thorough review of its standing orders. I am not saying that we have to jump into line automatically with them or anyone else, but if members are interested that substantial publication is available online or I can give them a copy.

The point I want to make most strongly is that I support what the member for Davenport is trying to do, but let us put it into a package of reform and get on with it, because a lot of our practices in here are antiquated and we could do much better. I support what the member for Davenport is doing, but I do not believe that premiers should get precedence over humble backbenchers.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): The government opposes the motion, and I personally oppose it utterly for very sound reasons. There are a number of traditions in this place, some which are hidebound and some which do not lend to the public's appreciating, understanding or valuing what we do. However, honouring the dead is not one of them. The Australian Labor Party has a long tradition of honouring the dead in one way or another: it has always been a very important part of it. We do it sometimes in humorous fashion, sometimes in maudlin fashion, sometimes seriously, but we do it.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Bright shows the difference between the two of us: he would rather have a joke than talk about it. The tradition extends from Henry Lawson's short story, *The Union Buries Its Dead*, to the wonderful state funeral for Des Corcoran. It is a tremendous tradition and one that I do not think should be disturbed lightly. I echo the views of the member for Fisher that, if there are issues about standing orders, a comprehensive review of them might well be worthy. But, to single out the

deceased, to be shuffled out of the way, to be shuffled down the order of business so that we might get on with other business is, I think, frankly, disrespectful.

The other thing about the Labor tradition is that we are egalitarian in how we honour our deceased—from the union burying its dead to Des Corcoran. We do not believe that how high up you go on the *Notice Paper* is related to how fortunate you may have been in your parliamentary career. We do not think that is a sound method for judgment. The central issue is respect for those who went before us and who made a contribution not only to the current parliament but to this state.

Perhaps this could be combined with a comprehensive review of standing orders—something the Labor Party has supported for some time, certainly in the previous parliament, without success—but, as it stands nakedly at present, it is merely the shuffling of those who went before us down the order in order to get to question time for the television cameras to view it. For me, that is not a very good reason for disrespecting the deceased.

I wonder about this motion. Its mover has been in parliament for some time now. I know the opposition likes to ascribe many sins to us, but I do not think we have increased the rate of deaths in this place. We have not had a sudden welter of people dying in the past two years as opposed to the previous eight years. So, you have to wonder why this is important now and was not important during the previous eight years. There is no doubt that condolence motions do push back question time on occasions when a large number of members wish to speak from their hearts, and that is something we have all lived with for a very long time. But I do not think the arguments for the needs of the television crews are strong enough for us to enter into such disrespect for the deceased.

I oppose the motion: and the government utterly opposes it. I would be quite happy to embrace the suggestion from the member for Fisher for a more thorough review. I think a number of things in our standing orders are peculiar.

Mr Hanna: There is a report sitting on the table.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They say there is a report sitting on the table, and some of the things in that report I do support and I would not shy away from a thorough debate. I have always been a supporter of the sin bin—there are so many sinners here that the bin is necessary, and it would need to be a capacious one. There are a number of other things. My view is that we should modernise the language when dealing with legislation. We talk about the first reading, second reading, committee stage and third reading. What does that mean? I am sure it has tradition somewhere, but why couldn't we call it the introduction, the debate, the question period and the passing? Why could we not do that so that people understand what we are doing? There are many arguments, I think, for why we should change our procedures, but dishonouring the dead should not be our first priority.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHILD CARE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I move:

That this house calls on the federal government to immediately remove the child care cap, reintroduce capital works funding for not-for-profit child care centres and make the Child Care Benefits Scheme more accessible.

I think this is a very important issue. The provision of quality child care in this state is at a crisis point and it is an issue that goes to the very heart of how we value our children.

While the federal government makes noises about supporting families, the reality is that it is not. Our local media has highlighted on numerous occasions the desperate plight of many families that simply cannot access a place in a childcare centre. Families are booking their children in before they are born, in the hope that they will secure a place. Access to good quality child care is both a social and an economic issue. Concerningly, however, it appears to be seen more and more in the light of a business opportunity, and I will go into that in more detail shortly. I am concerned about it, as l am sure all members of this house will be. Accessing good quality child care underpins the economic wellbeing of thousands of families here in South Australia, and it will increasingly be so if housing interest rates continue to rise.

I reject the notion that it is a women's issue: child care is a family issue. It is an issue that affects the life outcomes of our children. Canadian longitudinal studies have shown that the environment in which a child develops within its first two years impacts on the economic and health status of that person at age 35. The studies have been done: the research is there; and we know that good child-care is critical if we want our children to have every chance to develop to their full potential. I was delighted to join the Premier and the Minister for Health late last year at the launch of our Every Chance For Every Child initiative. This state government takes very seriously the health and wellbeing of our children, and I am pleading with the federal government, with the Prime Minister (Mr Howard), to give our children this same priority.

I am calling on the federal government to lift the cap on child-care places. In 2001-02 the federal government put a cap on out of school hours care and family day care places, effectively a measure to keep a lid on the child-care benefit. Last year, 673 families were on the waiting list for family day care. This unmet demand was right across our state and was particularly critical in the northern suburbs, where there were 210 families on the waiting list. Similar problems existed for out of school hours care. I was particularly delighted that the federal Labor opposition recently announced a major commitment, should it be elected, to creating 20 000 new places over four years. There has been an announcement by the federal government to provide an injection of funds into out of school hours care and family day care, but it leaves a shortfall of something like 20 000 places.

During the parliamentary break over January I visited childcare centres and kindergartens in the South-East, in Port Lincoln, in Port Augusta, in Port Pirie and in Clare. I have been up to the Adelaide Hills and the Barossa Valley.

Mr Goldsworthy: We know that.

Ms RANKINE: Good. Have you been there? Have you spoken to them?

Mr Goldsworthy: I go there every day.

Ms RANKINE: You weren't there when I was there.

Members interjecting:

Ms RANKINE: I practise the same protocol your lot did. Some places had six-month waiting lists; some places had 18-month waiting lists. Some are finding waiting lists too hard to manage and simply manage it term by term. There are something like 1.5 million Australian children under five years of age, and every year 250 000 babies are born. By the time a child is in his or her second year of life, 57 per cent of mothers are back in the work force. By the age of three, this is 68 per cent. In 2001 there were over 830 000 children,

from newborns to 12 years of age, who used some part of the commonwealth government child-care system.

If Australia wishes to maintain its competitive edge in the global economy, working women and their families need support and assistance to be able to balance child care and employment. We need to lift the cap on child care so we can plan properly to meet the needs of families. In some places centres are not full; in other places there are waiting lists of about 18 months. The federal government has made some moves and that was after a lot of argy-bargy between Larry Anthony and Peter Costello. We well remember that—one person making promises and the other taking them away. Pressures eventually resulted in an increase in the family day care places out of school hours. Basically, they saw the train coming as we were heading into the Christmas holidays. As I said, there is still a major shortfall of about 20 000, places and I have already referred to those extensive waiting lists.

I would also like to talk about reintroducing funding for child care facilities. In 1997 the federal government stopped funding the capital works for not-for-profit child care places. As a result, no more new not-for-profit facilities have been built and there has been no new money for upgrades, maintenance or the expansion of existing facilities. Certainly, I have spoken in this house on a number of occasions about the devastating effect this has had in my electorate and the tenuous plight that the Salisbury Campus Childcare Centre faced as a result of actions of the previous government, as well as the fact that we needed a private organisation to step in and provide some relief for that childcare centre.

The South Australian government has been trying to help address the problems facing community childcare centres, and there have been some modest allocations for childcare provision in some of our most disadvantaged areas. I guess my real concern, and the real issue of the 1997 decision, has meant that childcare has become a market driven issue. I would refer very much to a *Business Review Weekly* report that was written in November last year about this increasing reliance on investment in childcare by private companies. I would really like to read this whole article, because it is quite damning on the moves that have been taken in relation to childcare. I do have to refer to some quotes that I think are incredibly relevant. The article starts off as follows:

> Australia's childcare boom is turing ugly. Behind the painted smiles and cuddly brand names, this $3 billion service industry is at war with itself. A *BRW* investigation reveals that big profits are drawing free-wheeling entrepreneurs into the industry. But bitter industrial disputes and claims of miserable operating conditions are creating a potent mix that will change the business comprehensively.

It goes on to state:

> . . . in 1997, the Howard government scrapped special subsidies to non-profit childcare centres, and in a single stroke, childcare was changed. Privately owned and non-profit centres could charge roughly the same fees. Now, six years later, the reality of a privatised childcare centre is hitting home. . . Allegations of leaking toilets, broken doors and missing child locks. . . signal bigger problems ahead for the privatised industry.

The two biggest companies, ABC Learning Centres and Peppercorn Management Group, are recording figures that are the envy of the market. I think that the ABC Learning Centres is the company that owns the childcare centre where a tiny baby was left alone, locked in the childcare centre very recently. The article further states:

> With profit margins of up to 50 percent and $1.6 billion of tax payers' money flowing in. . . everyone wants a piece of the. . . action. Diamond miners, dot.com pioneers and real estate agents are getting on board. . . there are few regulations governing who can start a childcare business.

In Melbourne, Carl Fitchett, the owner of a private day-care centre, Green Cottage, in Seaford, said:

> There are new people in this industry making profits in a new way. They just stick to the absolute minimum regulations and cut expenses to the bone. I get former staff saying, 'We won't work under such conditions.'

The article also stated:

> It may be a prosperous period, but 2003 has proved to be a troublesome time for the industry. In June this year, the Australian Securities and Investment Commission announced that it was making inquiries into compliance and disclosure issues at Child Care Centres of Australia, the listed company associated with Liberal Party figures Andrew Peacock and his son-in-law Michael Kroger. Although lacking experience in the industry, Peacock was chairman of CCCA and Kroger's investment bank, J.T. Campbell, had been adviser to the company.

The debate was summed up in a July issue of *Ethical Investor*, and I think this goes to the heart of the problem. The article states:

> A moral argument lies at the heart of the child care debate. Who is the client and what is the service provided to them? For non-profit child-care centres, the client is the child. For other types of child-care centres, the client is the parent or employer. The ramifications of this shift are enormous.

As a side issue, we also need to note the very poor wages and conditions of childcare workers. They receive appallingly low wages. Again, we are not talking about child care but about the child's development. These are the people with whom we entrust the development of our children. We need to recognise appropriately their valuable role in the development of our children.

The child care benefit needs to be much more accessible. The cost of child care for parents is a major problem. Long day-care costs between $35 to $50 a day, and these costs are escalating. In 2001-02, 130 000 families had a child care debt due to the flawed nature of the income estimation scheme operated by the federal government. In some centres, penalty fees of up to $10 a minute are sometimes charged for late pick-up. For many working parents, even those with two incomes, these costs are simply putting child care out of reach, and they have to rely on friends, family or other ad hoc arrangements to allow them to stay in the work force. This clearly does not make good sense.

It also makes good economic sense to invest in child care. A study by the Department of Family and Community Services found that each dollar spent by the commonwealth on child care generated $5.68 in wages for the parents while the child was in care, $1.86 in government revenue and $12.28 in total economic benefit. This research was presented at an Early Childhood Australia conference in July last year.

The benefits of quality child care for children are very difficult to measure, but we know that 75 per cent of a child's brain develops during its first five years of life. Half of all the intellectual and developmental potential of a child is established by the age of four. Quality early childhood education and care programs are a significant contributor to a child's cognitive, social, emotional and physical development. It assists with school readiness and early identification of children at risk. Affordable, accessible and quality child care promotes healthy child development, effective parenting, school readiness, competent future citizens, strong communities and social cohesion.

In summing up, child care remains under enormous pressure both in our state and nationally. Child care must be about the care and development of our children and should not be seen as an opportunity to make a quid. Community

based child care requires support as it sets the benchmark for quality care. Child care workers must be properly recognised for the very important role they play. Clearly, changes need to be made to the child care benefit.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): I thank the mover for raising the issue of child care in this House. I do not propose to support the motion, but I do thank her for raising an important issue. Child care has become more and more important as women move into the work force. This has highlighted its importance. In the late 1970s, I was involved in the development of advice to government on the establishment of the family day care services which now operate very successfully. South Australia was a pioneer in this area and the system has now been transferred to other states. We have a rather unusual situation in child care where the funding comes from the federal government but state governments have the responsibility for the regulation and application of child care as a service in the community. Most of it comprises the provision of centre based care, whether privately based, government funded or not-for-profit community arrangements.

The family day care program I refer to provides for the qualification and licensing of persons in their own home to provide care for up to six children, depending on the children's age. There are also many children provided for under the care and supervision of others in before and after-school care. This is a well used service. We also have the more informal, but no less professional on many occasions, provision of nannies either in their own homes or in the homes of the children. There is a considerable number of children under the supervision (without regulation) of relatives, friends or neighbours. This is usually on a much more casual basis and raises its own concerns.

The mover has raised some interesting points about the provision of child care, not the least of which, and I agree with her, is the poor wage structure that operates for child care providers. That is, they undertake a period of study in early childhood care but the financial reward and working conditions that they currently receive, in whatever centre or under family day care, would be seen, by today's standards, to be poor and inadequate. Certainly, it needs to be looked at. What is also concerning in this area is the very large number of young women who undertake study and commence their employment but withdraw from this career at a very early age, leaving within a year or so after having studied, trained and qualified. For some inexplicable reason they leave early. It may be that they enjoy the profession they have studied, and have a commitment to it, but that the wages may be inadequate for them to stay in it. That is a concern because it equates to a considerable amount of government funding that goes into the provision of the training of these young people who then abandon their career. There is no doubt that there are aspects of the regulation of child care which need to be looked at.

I recall occasions when, in the early 1980s, children were found to be left on the circle line bus service in Adelaide while parents went shopping. These children were left on the bus; they would rotate around and around the city and when mum or dad finished shopping they would go back on to the circle line bus, pick up their children and leave. There are also examples where children have been left in casual child care provided by stores (I will not name the stores), which has been a clear abuse of those services which are there for the benefit patrons. But, again, these children are left there for hours on end while their guardian or parent disappears—often off the premises—and then comes back some hours later. We have had some rather disturbing examples of where children have been left in an at-risk situation, and of abuse of the service that has been provided, often for another purpose. State governments need to be ever vigilant regarding that.

What the mover of this motion is attempting to do, though, is to say, 'Well, we have a pressing need for this service in the community,' with which I agree, 'and the way to deal with this is to call upon the federal government to immediately remove the child care cap.' This is a cap on the number of places that the federal government is prepared to financially contribute towards; in other words, the subsidy that enables the parent to select a childcare facility. It is not available to all childcare facilities—usually for centre based care services or for family day care, and it is, again, a different funding arrangement—but is to give families some support to enable them to have affordable child care in circumstances where the family income is insufficient to provide that. To simply remove that cap and say, 'It is now open slather and every child can come forward,' does not, I believe, adequately ensure that government funds are spent where they are needed. We need to acknowledge that, in relation to the provision of the service, we make sure that it gets to those most in need. I suggest that lifting the cap will not do that.

And if we are going to take community responsibility and provide government funding for this service for everyone, then we also need to identify what purposes it will be for. At present, I think it is fair to say that the majority of persons who access child care—particularly centre child care—do so for the purpose of undertaking remunerative employment. There are some, of course, who do it in order to undertake volunteer work but they are the exceptional few who may be able to afford to pay for the care of their children while they do such service.

There is another very important area, and that is in relation to the respite care of children in circumstances where the health and wellbeing of everyone in the family is important to enable the continued support of that child and to ensure that they are properly able to develop in the family environment. But there are other children who have special needs, and the special needs of the child mean that there needs to be some respite for the family, and it is very important that we take this area into account. So, the purpose for which the parent or guardian may place their child in child care needs to be examined if we are going to move down the road of community support and funding of the provision of this service.

I simply cannot support the motion as it stands, in the raw condition in which it has been presented. The question of costing and the equitable distribution of those funds must, clearly, be looked at.

There is another aspect to this proposal, that is, to reintroduce capital works funding for not-for-profit childcare centres. I am rather surprised to see that in this motion, when I hear members of this government here in South Australia decry the contribution that the federal government makes towards funding of private schools. They do not even make a direct capital contribution towards the capital fund development of private schools, yet this government is not only criticising the federal government for the funding they put into private schools but is also demanding, as part of this resolution, that they introduce capital works funding for not-for-profit childcare centres. It is not equitable, in a situation where you have other providers in the market for the

provision of childcare services, for the federal government to provide an inequitable and unequal opportunity for some childcare centres and not others. I find that a rather hypocritical and, again, inequitable proposal which will only serve—if it were to be passed—to make it even more unproductive and unprofitable for the private sector to survive. So, I would certainly oppose that. As to making the child care benefits scheme more accessible, even having heard the submission presented by the mover of this motion, I am not quite sure what she has in mind there for how it is to be made more accessible. I support making child care in itself more accessible, but we would certainly need more detail before I would be persuaded to support that.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I also thank the member for Wright for bringing this motion to the parliament. It is something that affects thousands of South Australian families every single day. It is important that, in this place, we debate issues that really affect people's daily lives. I am not going to repeat the excellent description that the member for Wright has already given of why this system is in a mess and why her motion speaks to the need for the federal government to urgently address this issue. I endorse her sentiments entirely. I want to speak a little about the need in my area and to expand on some of the comments that the member started to make about the importance of child care to families and children. In the south the member for Kingston, David Cox, through his work in the community, has identified that child care is a federal issue of critical importance. He recently conducted a survey and held a series of community meetings—one of which I was able to attend—to discuss with community members the issue of child care. I was really surprised as I saw so many parents coming out on quite an unpleasant night towards the end of last year to talk about this issue that is so critical to them.

Many community meetings are called in my area. When I go to most of them I know nearly everybody in the room, because they attend whatever meetings are called. This was an occasion on which the meeting non-attenders came out—the people who do battle daily with balancing work and family and who came out to say, 'Please help. I really am finding this very difficult to deal with.' It was mainly mothers, but there were also fathers in that meeting talking about their daily struggle. The need that they were identifying particularly was for out of school hours care. Certainly, it is no wonder that they were because, according to some figures issued last year (*Hansard* will show the source), in the Onkaparinga-Morphett area a total of 120 child care places have been requested by out of school hours care services. In the Onkaparinga-Woodcroft area 172 places have been requested which consist of vacation care and before and after school places, with the major emphasis being on after school hours care in the Woodcroft area.

In an effort to do any little thing that I could to support these parents, I organised a ring-around of all the out of school hours care centres in my community in case there were some a little further away from the burgeoning Woodcroft area that might have had spare places. There was not one spare place available in the whole of the Reynell electorate. They also had waiting lists, despite the fact that the age profile in Reynell is now increasing and some of the school numbers are falling. The out of school hours care is up to the gills. The out of school hours care and all forms of child care provide really important services, particularly the services that are provided in the early years of a child's life when these days most families require two people to some extent in the workplace.

Once, many people had the ambition of staying home and caring for their children until the children went to school. The issue of juggling responsibilities before and after school, as well as in vacation care, still remained, but many people thought that they wanted to give their child a start in life with their constant care. For most people in our community that is simply not possible. They recognise that they need to contribute to the economic life of their family, as well as to the care of the family. However, they are prohibited from doing that as a result of the federal government's failure to address the burgeoning child care need in our community.

I was reminded during this week, as the opposition tackled the issue of loss of full-time jobs for women, of the women in my community who have told me that they cannot even look for a full-time job because they cannot get child care. I am by no means suggesting that shifts in work force participation relate only to child care, but child care is a very important factor. In fact, I have just seen a story about a police officer in a large rural location who has deferred her return to work for over nine months because she simply cannot find child care. Our community cannot afford to deprive itself of the skills and talents of people who want to work simply because they cannot find child care.

Many research examples and plenty of evidence now indicates that child care is an effective way of raising one's children, of enabling them to develop skills, values, confidence and social experience. We are long past the days of saying, 'Woe is child care. It is all awful and we should not be funding it properly because it should not exist. It is only the absolute safety net.' Child care is not just a safety net: child care is an important part of our education and care system. I find it quite remarkable that, as a community, we think that it is our responsibility to help children to be born, to give them a few injections and to check that they are growing okay. But then we leave them to the care of very stressed parents until they get to kindy when we will give them a few sessions a week and then send them off to school.

Our community needs to take much more responsibility for supporting parents in all aspects of their extremely difficult task. We need to support them to raise children in the home. We need to support them to have children cared for appropriately and skilfully outside the home and, of course, that leads to the issue of the rates of pay for childcare workers. Childcare workers perform some of the most important jobs in our community. They are dealing with children whose skills are easily influenced and readily developed.

Those beautiful young bundles of joy are blotting papers. They see everything, they think about everything. The quality of care they receive, whether at home or out of the home, is absolutely crucial to the sort of community we will get in the future, yet we pay childcare workers—who undertake this important job—one of the lowest wages in our community. This is a total disgrace, and a reflection on our whole community values that we cannot recognise the importance of people who care for our children in a far better way.

I am really amazed that some of the skilful people I see stay in childcare jobs. Their commitment to our community is incredible. The directors of childcare centres have amazing insights into children and families. My opinion is that we do not utilise them enough. They can identify when families are struggling to address a range of issues in their lives.

They can identify when families do not quite have the understanding about some of the parenting role. They are in an excellent position to support families, and yet we pay them a pittance. We do not allow them to utilise all their skills, and we ask them to supervise staff who are working for I cannot remember how few dollars an hour, but it is very few dollars—indeed, they would probably be better off working at MacDonald's. It is time that we addressed this issue of child care, and it is time the federal government realised what is going on. This is a key issue in our community, and the federal government must deal with it.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I rise to support the intent of this motion. The member for Bragg has certainly highlighted some of the areas of concern. I rise particularly on a personal note, because without the dedicated childcare workers who helped my family—my wife and my two young children—when I was studying at university, I probably would not be in this place. One of my staff members, who recently moved house, is finding it very difficult to relocate her small child into a childcare centre nearby.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the federal government needs to fund more childcare places, but it should not be open slather. There is no doubt that more money needs to be put into assisting young families. Everyone in this place should be encouraging and assisting in producing new generations to overcome the ageing population of Australia. There is no doubt that we want to support the intent of this motion to enable young couples to enjoy what I have been able to enjoy with my two children, who are now well and truly grown up. They still cost me a lot of money; they cost me a lot of money when they were in child care in just making sure that we got them there. I cannot speak too highly of the dedicated staff in the childcare centres we took them to—both here in South Australia and in Western Australia.

The federal government and this state government need to support the staff of childcare centres in every way they possibly can. If that is by way of providing more money for wages, facilities and capital works, that is what they should be doing. Unfortunately, though, there are limits to what we can do. There has to be some user-pays to a degree but, at the same time, I do not think we need to in any way be miserly about the very important issue of the welfare of families, particularly young families. We should never lose sight that we need to see where this country of ours is going. We need to overcome the ageing population trend, and the only way we are going to be able to do that is by encouraging people to have children—and as many children as they want to have—and, if they need to provide for those children by going to work, they should have somewhere safe, well provided and well equipped and with caring staff to look after those children. So I definitely support the intent of this motion.

Motion carried.

BASHEER, Mr M.

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

That this house congratulates and recognises the service given to South Australia and football in this state by Mr Max Basheer during his 25 years as President of the South Australian National Football League.

Almost every member of this house would have a memory or a sound or even a fragrance which to them is uniquely South Australian. South Australia has one sound that has been unique and recognisable for over a quarter of a century—a sound that, we could say, has transcended generations. So it is fitting to pay tribute to what is almost a sporting icon, that is, the dulcet tones of legendary South Australian National Football League President, Max Basheer AM—the voice of football, as he has read the round by round votes in the annual count over the previous 25 years. Max Basheer, last year inducted into the South Australian National Football Hall of Fame, retired after 25 years as President and from calling the votes for our state's greatest football award. Last year Max did not read the votes for the Magarey Medal, but in past years I dare say almost every member of this house at one stage has been glued to the television and on the edge of their seat as Max read out the final few votes to decide that year's newest Magarey Medallist. Max has been the purveyor of goods news and disappointment as he presided over the count; the voice which announced the votes which led to the legendary Russell Ebert, father of 2003 Magarey Medallist Brett Ebert, being crowned as our state's best and fairest a record four times.

Max Basheer has been an integral part of the football scene in South Australia and has made an enormous impact on the preservation, advancement and enjoyment of our national game at a state level. It was Max Basheer who was instrumental in the very early days of what was to become the Adelaide Football Club as our state's entry into the national Australian Football League. The Adelaide Crows entered the AFL in 1991, but few realise that the first steps along the road to the national competition began with Max Basheer and his SANFL colleagues a full decade earlier, in July 1981. The 1981 delegation began a 10-year journey for Max, filled with challenges, pitfalls, public reaction and even litigation, but perseverance, tenacity and, most of all, a love for the game kept him and his colleagues focused on what was best for football and South Australia. Finally, in round 1 of the AFL's 1991 season, in its debut game the Adelaide Crows 24.11 (155) defeated Hawthorn 9.15 (69)—and of course the rest is history.

Max Basheer was the interim chairman of the club's inaugural board in 1990. He was also the Crows No. 1 ticket holder from 1991 to 1996. Max has closed not only his unparalleled 25-year term as SANFL president—in which he guided South Australian football through what I think we all recognise as its most turbulent era, at the same time as securing the foundations of the SANFL competition and establishing two AFL clubs, Adelaide and Port Adelaide—but also a 41-year association with SANFL administration, which began as a member of the league's tribunal. The road to his achievements has often been quite turbulent. Max survived a motion to displace him from the tribunal in his first year, when the league clubs were taking issue with his penalties, describing them as 'excessive', to eventually play a significant part in giving South Australian football its first home by moving from the SACA-controlled Adelaide Oval to West Lakes.

Wayne Jackson, the former AFL CEO, described Max as 'South Australian football. . . no decision could be made on Australian football without anyone taking into account how Max would react for South Australia', and Max's legacy is that he has made Australian football thrive amid many challenges in South Australia. The new SANFL President, Rod Payze, has been just as lavish in his praise of Max. He said:

Without apology, Max was parochial about the importance of South Australia. He always negotiated to put South Australia in its

best position. . . His legacy is we have a vibrant SANFL and two independent AFL licences in South Australia.

He has given the people of South Australia a choice of which local team—the Crows or the Power—they will follow, and that is healthy. Max Basheer bade farewell exactly 25 years to the day that he was chosen to succeed Judge Don Brebner as SANFL President. He said at the time, 'I will leave having achieved so much of what I wanted to achieve.' Many people may not know that Max was a former state amateur rover who was denied a league football career as far back as 1952, after he had graduated with a law degree from Adelaide University and at the time when North Adelaide refused to clear him to Sturt. He also said on his retirement:

I was keen for the SANFL to have its own stadium and to grow from it. AAMI Stadium has been a great investment. We are the only state league that owns our ground and for that reason we are masters of our destiny.

Max will keep one official link with South Australian football: he will remain Chairman of the South Australian Football Hall of Fame Committee. He also said of the SANFL presidency that he will not miss it. He has done it for so long that, in his words:

It is time to move over and move on. I have been very lucky to hold the position for so long, but the time is right to let it go now.

Max managed to fit his duties for his beloved game around his legal career, yet his list of achievements within the football world are most impressive, and I put on record some of the highlights.

Max was the South Australian Amateur League commissioner from 1954 to 1960, the SANFL commissioner from 1962 to 1966 and the SANFL senior vice president from 1967 to 1978; and he was on the SANFL management committee from 1969 to 1979 and served as chairman of that committee from 1978 to 1979. He was SANFL commissioner for country and junior football from 1971 to 1978. He was also chairman in 1978. He was on the Football Park finance and development committee from 1975 to 1989 and served as chairman in 1978. He was SANFL President from 1978 to 2003, therefore serving his 25 years as the longest serving president. He was with Foundation SA as a trustee from 1988 to 1992, was the South Australian Football Commission chairman from 1990 to 2003, and was on the AFL Hall of Fame committee from 1996 to 2002 and the South Australian Football Hall of Fame committee from 2001 to the present time. Max was also awarded an SANFL life membership in 1972 and was made a Member in the Order of Australia for services to the game in 1988. He was also awarded AFL life membership in 1996.

This state has been so very fortunate in having a tireless and passionate stalwart of the game in Max Basheer. His efforts have been instrumental in the promotion of South Australian football talent and in the popularity of the game in this state, which in no small way has been translated into the on-field success of our state's two AFL teams—the Adelaide Crows and last year's minor premiers, Port Power. I congratulate Max Basheer on his achievements and thank him for his efforts over 25 years in the promotion of both the great game of Australian Rules football and the great state of South Australia. I wish him well in his future and I am sure every member of this house and indeed the state will also applaud his fantastic achievements.

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I take the opportunity to formally pay tribute to a great South Australian, Mr Max Basheer, former South Australian National Football League President, who retired from his position in July after 25 years. A Member in the Order of Australia was awarded to him in 1988 for services to Australian Rules football. He is an AFL Football Club and SANFL life member and a member of the SANFL Hall of Fame. The boy from Kalangadoo has lived through and influenced the greatest period of change in Australia's national sport.

He has been dedicated to Australian Rules in South Australia, and his strong leadership has enabled the game to grow and prosper. He helped guide the league through the development of Football Park and the development of the national league. Max came on board at the time the SANFL had to come to terms with the push for an expanded VFL. He was always mindful of the long-term viability of the local competition. He protected South Australia's interests in the expansion of the VFL into a national competition, which today sees our two teams having success both on and off the field, while, at the same time, maintaining a strong local structure that is producing outstanding young players who are making their mark at the elite level.

He was educated at Prince Alfred College and is a former state amateur rover, who was denied a league football career in 1952 when North Adelaide refused to clear him to Sturt. Max was admitted to the bar in 1951, after graduating in law from Adelaide University. Max began his football administration career in 1954 as a commissioner of the amateur league and went on to hold various positions with the amateur league until 1962, when he was appointed to the SANFL as chairman of the tribunal. This began a more than 40-year association with the SANFL, with Max becoming SANFL president in 1978, and going on to become the league's longest serving president. During this time, Max has worn many other SANFL hats, some of which have included: a member of the management committee from 1968 to 1981; chairman of the Affiliated League's Council from 1970 to 1978; Commissioner for Country and Junior Football, 1971 to 1978, and chairman 1978; member of the SANFL Football Park Finance and Development Board 1975 to 1986, and chairman from 1978 to 1986; and, finally, director, Australian Football Championships Pty Ltd, 1980 to 1985.

Never one to be idle, at 76 years of age Max has been quoted as saying that he wishes to spend more time in his law practice where he is a senior partner and spend more time reading at home and with his family. On behalf of this side of the house, I formally wish Max Basheer happiness in retirement, congratulate him on an outstanding career and also being a great ambassador for the state of South Australia and all South Australians.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I would like to add my congratulations to Max Basheer and thank him for his contribution to South Australian football. He certainly has been someone who has put his life and energy into football in South Australia and, indeed, it would be hard to imagine our football scene without Max. I first met Max many years ago when I was important—I used to be the mayor of Norwood, but, more importantly, I was the no. 1 one ticket holder of the Norwood Football Club—

An honourable member: You mean you're not any more!

Ms CICCARELLO: No, I am not the no. 1 ticket holder any more. The mayor's parlour at Norwood oval was the place to be, and I often had occasion to invite Max to the mayor's parlour along with Leigh Whicker. It was great talking to Max because I used to say to him that I was the

only person whom he could look in the eye—and that had nothing to do with his honesty but the fact that we were both of the perfect height. To you, Max, congratulations and thank you for what you have done for football in South Australia. I am sure your role will continue in another vein, and you will still contribute to what is the best sport in South Australia.

Motion carried.

VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): I draw to the attention of members that present in the gallery is Mr Kenny Kramer, the man who inspired the Kramer character in the *Seinfeld* television series, and Ron Maranian. Thank you very much, welcome to our shores and we hope that you enjoy your stay in South Australia.

GLENELG TRAM LINE

Dr McFETRIDGE: I move:

That this house urges the Minister for Transport to investigate extending the Glenelg tram line to Holdfast Shores, the Adelaide Railway Station and North Terrace precinct, and preferably to North Adelaide.

This is a very important motion, particularly with the state government about to spend, at last count, $56 million on some new trams to run from the centre of Adelaide (which, we read in today's paper, is one of the best places in the world to live, according to a Nobel Prize laureate) down to another place which I consider to be as close to Paradise as you can get, my electorate of Morphett.

Ms Ciccarello: Norwood!

Dr McFETRIDGE: The member for Norwood said that we should extend the tramline out her way, and I cannot disagree with that sentiment. I would like to see the tramline extended all over Adelaide, the way it was in the late 1950s. Last year, I was very fortunate to have an opportunity to travel overseas as part of a study tour. I visited some European tram manufacturers and looked at the trams that are running overseas now. They are certainly light years away from the old H class trams that were manufactured here in South Australia—in Edwardstown, in fact—in the middle of the last century.

The H class trams really are an historic icon. We will not be getting rid of all the H class trams; we will maintain a fleet of five for tourists and for public holidays. Certainly, from speaking to the conductors and the tourists as I travel on the tram (which I try to do as frequently as possible from Glenelg, in my electorate of Morphett, to Adelaide), I know that tourists love the old trams. Unfortunately, because of the commonwealth legislation—the Disability Discrimination Act—the trams are no longer deemed adequate. Certainly, the maintenance of the trams is something into which the government is having to put a lot of money. I know the previous Liberal government put, I think, $3 million into refurbishing a number of those trams with airconditioning and repairing the coach work and carriage work to make the trams sparkle and move along the track, in perhaps not as smooth a fashion as the modern trams do but, certainly, in a very efficient way, and maintain our heritage for the people of South Australia and the tourists from overseas.

The new trams that we will be getting are something to be marvelled at. They are 100 per cent low floor trams. They will carry people with speed, in comfort and in almost complete silence. In fact, when I was in Amsterdam I was nearly run over by one of the new trams; they are so quiet you can hardly hear them coming. They mingle with the traffic, and they certainly travel through pedestrian malls without causing any degree of inconvenience. They are able to go into street running mode and mix with cars, and they are also able to go to off road mode, when they can travel much faster.

The new trams will certainly be a wonderful addition to this state. I congratulate the Labor government on its initiative to go ahead and get these new trams. I hope that initiative continues to the extent intended by my motion: that is, extending the tram line to Holdfast Shores and, more particularly, to North Adelaide. I would also like to see a loop go down behind the zoo, past the Wine Centre, the hospital, the universities and the Art Gallery. Those facilities on North Terrace are looking fantastic with the redevelopment that is going on there, and I am sure that tourists would like to see them.

The technology that is now available to run trams through historical and heritage areas is amazing. You can have trams with overhead power supplies, but there is also new technology involving a third rail where the electricity supply is provided under the tram in short sections with computerised switching gear, so that only the part of the rail that is under the tram is alive. The rails can be embedded in cushioned material in the roadway so that cars can travel quite easily and trams can travel through heritage areas without the necessity for overhead infrastructure.

When I was in Austria, I visited a city where there was a combination of trams and trolley buses. Unfortunately, the conglomeration of wires providing power to those trolley buses and trams was a visual nightmare. It was visual pollution at its worst. The thousands of people who use public transport in this state will benefit from an extension of the tramway and the introduction of new trams. Just over two million people use the Glenelg tram each year. The trend overseas to use tramways—or light rail, as it is often called—has increased, and even in Western Australia there has been an astronomical increase in the number of people using light rail. This is amazing technology, and it is advancing at a great rate. I hope to make a presentation to the Public Works Committee on the information I have been able to gather and the slides I was able to take not only to show the visual impact of the trams themselves but also to demonstrate some of the technical aspects of the construction of trams and tramways.

I understand that the main competitors for the contracts will be the three big tram manufacturers: Alstom, Bombardier and Siemens. They have some trams running in Australia. Because we are getting only nine new trams in South Australia, there will be a difficulty with volume compared with price advantage. So, we may be considering piggybacking on what is available interstate. That is not a bad thing, because all tram manufacturers are producing a very high-quality product. I would be delighted to be invited by the Public Works Committee to give a presentation on what I have seen and provide them with some technical information, because I understand that they will be reviewing the tender documents. The member for Colton, the chair of the Public Works Committee, nods his head. I look forward to receiving that invitation.

Mr Caica interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: As the member for Colton says, the receipt of additional information will help them to guide the government to bring in more and more light rail, hopefully here in Adelaide. The intent of this motion is so that the trams

do not stop in the centre of town at Victoria Square. Although Victoria Square has been refurbished, and it is a fantastic place to get off the tram and walk through the park, it would be nice for visitors and commuters to finish at North Terrace if there was a spur line to the Adelaide Railway Station to link with heavy rail. That is another thing about this new tram technology. Some of the trams can disconnect from overhead power sources and be powered by themselves. There is a possibility that they could then travel on heavy rail down to Port Adelaide without the necessity of installing major infrastructure. Some modifications may be required, but they could even go out to the northern and southern suburbs without too many alterations. This is something we can look at in the future, and hopefully the Public Works Committee will talk to me about that.

I would love to see an extension to the current tramway. It is a huge infrastructure cost in any terms for 11 kilometres of tramway at $56 million, and I congratulate the government on coming forward with this project. I noticed in the tender documents that the trams have to be up and running by December 2005, and I will be delighted to be with the Premier to cut the ribbon at the Glenelg tram stop. The benefits to commuters, tourists and the disabled people who will access the new trams will be enormous. In Germany I saw a woman, a quadriplegic, who used her chin to steer her wheelchair. She was able to go from the platform onto a tram, because the maximum step was about 20 millimetres. As the doors open on such trams any gap is narrowed between a platform or other raised area, so it is almost a completely flat surface. That woman was able to manoeuvre her wheelchair into the tram. Mothers with prams and shoppers with bags did not have to hump them up the stairs; they could get in with ease.

Those trams had huge windows, which will exacerbate the need for airconditioning in Adelaide, particularly on a day like last Saturday. However, it was fantastic to see the city sights as the tram travelled around. The first part of this tram tender is the upgrade of the tramline between Glenelg and Victoria Square, including reballasting. I hope some additional work is carried out in tidying up some of the views. Some of the old factories could use a bit of a paint and some of the trackside vegetation could do with a tidy up. I have walked from Glenelg to Goodwood alongside the tramline to look at what is going on. There is a great opportunity to create a linear park so, if cyclists felt inclined not to use the tram, they could ride their bike. The new trams there will have plenty of room for people to stand and to take on pushbikes. A huge range of seats are available and they can be modified, standardised and corporatised. I saw a computerised image of an Alstom tram for South Australia when I was in La Rochelle in France. That could be running here in two years' time. That is a very exciting.

Light rail is the way to go. It will be not free, but I should say that in South Australia there is a bit of a furphy that light rail is not greenhouse-gas friendly. Because we run our power stations mainly on natural gas, using the power generated from natural gas is a very efficient way of providing energy for light or electric railways. The new trams will be just the start for South Australia. We will see increased demand—huge demand—and hopefully not only will the tramline be extended to North Terrace and up to North Adelaide but also, as the member for Norwood said, out to Norwood and down to Port Adelaide, given the big development that has been proposed for that area. Hopefully it will go all over the metropolitan area.

Light rail is a much more flexible way of providing public transport than building O-Bahns. I do not like them because they look like great big concrete gutters. I do not think that dedicated busways to replace heavy rail is the way to go. I believe that light rail is the only way to go, and that is what is happening all around the world. Light rail is a huge boon to public transport users, not only overseas but also in other states of Australia, and I hope to see that happen in South Australia. I encourage the government to continue its good work in upgrading the tramway and I urge it to seriously consider extending the tramway as per my motion.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise in support of this motion because I think it is a good idea that the government investigates this proposal. The previous government instigated the program to purchase nine new light rail vehicles for the Glenelg tram line, and I am pleased to see that this government has continued that program and that the old trams currently operating will be replaced and passengers and tourists who travel to Glenelg will be able to do so in much more comfort. Also, there is the cost in terms of repairs and maintenance to the old trams. As historic and rustic as they are—and it is great to retain some of those elements of the community—there comes a time (like everybody's car, I guess) when you look at the amount of money you are spending just to keep them going and you realise that it is putting good money after bad, so you replace them.

However, I think one of the opportunities that was missed by the government was to have a serious look at the private provider-purchaser situation, because the supply of carriages and vehicles to the Glenelg tram line I think would have been an ideal proposal for a public-private partnership. However, the government decided not to go down that path. I think that was a mistake because, instead of moving down that path, the government has committed $45 million towards the purchase of these light rail vehicles. I think it would have been a far better idea to continue down the path of investigating a public-private purchaser agreement. However, that is the government's decision and I accept it. We all have different ideas.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And we were legitimately elected, and we are here for four years.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Nobody is questioning that. You did not win government in your own right, though. The extension of the line along King William Street to North Terrace and perhaps a spur down to the railway line, as the member for Morphett is suggesting, is certainly worth investigating. Of course, there is the matter of the cost to be considered, and an investigation would look at a cost benefit analysis of this proposal to see the likely traffic that it will carry; the cost of installing light rail and the cost of putting that down King William Street as well as North Terrace or wherever; and whether that can be justified in this day and age. That is what an investigation is all about, and it is certainly an exercise that is worth undertaking. It would then be for the government of the day—be it this one or one of another persuasion—to assess and decide whether it is in the public good to expend moneys on that or whether it is not justified.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: In the public good?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Yes; you wouldn't know that term. It is an economic term.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That sounds like jargon to me. I would have said, 'In the public interest.'

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: No, there is another argument. So, I support this motion because it is worthy of investigation, and I will be very interested to see the costings after the Minister for Transport undertakes the investigation. In the transport plan he has flagged that this idea is on the books. He does not state a time frame, which is a bit disappointing, but at least it is in the mind of the minister, and we urge him to undertake an investigation into this matter.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise briefly to support this motion and I congratulate the member for Morphett on bringing it to the house. Sir, you have not been here all that long but this idea has been around for some time. One wonders why the lines were taken up back in the 1950s. I can still remember coming to Adelaide as a young country boy and listening to the trains rattling up and down Main North Road, O'Connell Street and right out to Gepps Cross.

Then they were gone, and one wonders why that ever happened, because it was a great way to go. The most important thing about trams is that everyone knows where they go. Everyone knows the route, because they can see the tramlines in the road, so there is never any doubt whether you live near the route of a tram, because we can all see the rails. I think the idea has much merit, particularly in the way we see Adelaide now structured, with our transport options spread between the country rail terminal at Mile End, the city terminal here at the Adelaide Railway Station and the shopping precinct being 400 or 500 metres to the east. You might say that that is not very far, but it can be a bit too far for some of our older folk, particularly those who have difficulty walking.

It is a shame that many years ago we did not put an underground railway through the middle of our shopping district here in metropolitan Adelaide. Back in the 1930s we should have put in an underground extension of Adelaide Railway Station. I believe that history will show that there was an extension of Adelaide Railway Station through behind this building, along the edge of the Torrens Parade Ground, up to approximately where the University Bridge is over the Torrens. That still is a mystery: people still look for it, people still look for the history, but it is one of those myths we hear about. It is a pity, if it was true, that it was not continued under the CBD, under Rundle Street, as it was then. People could have got on an escalator in Rundle Mall, gone down the escalator onto a railway line, then round the loop to the railway station and where they wanted to go.

That is now history: we cannot go back to do that today. The cost would be prohibitive, although I have not given up on the idea. But we would need to see a massive influx of funds for that to happen. But trams are the next best option because, as I said, we know where they go, they can carry a lot of people, they are easy to get on and off and they are very reliable.

Ms Breuer: How often do you catch a bus?

Mr VENNING: I do not catch them very often. The existing service from Glenelg I have been on in the last two or three years, I suppose, but if I was able to get from my place at West Beach down to Glenelg I would certainly use it. The problem is then that I would have to park my car. But my biggest problem—and this is my fault—is that I am not aware of the bus timetables etc in the West Beach area. And I think most people are the same: they have not bothered with all the confusion of the timetables. One thing about trams is that you know where they go and you hear them coming. I am sure that, if there was a tram available, I would be using it.

I do like trams. There is something about them, even if it is a return to my childhood. I think we all have a bit of a soft spot for them. Under the previous minister (the Hon. Diana Laidlaw) we always had this grand plan, and I cannot see any reason why we cannot run at least a double tramline for one tram down the middle of King William Street, then the computers today would allow them to have only one tram on that piece of line at once, rather than have two to pass each other. Even down as far as the cathedral to the Adelaide Oval, coming around to do the North Terrace precinct and back into Victoria Square. That ought to be the very minimum. I congratulate the government on looking to achieve new trams. I presume they are being built in Australia: I am not sure about that. Someone might enlighten me about that.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby interjecting:

Mr VENNING: They are being assembled here? That is a start. Once we see these new trams on our streets I believe it will bring about a resurgence of this light rail option. And I cannot see any reason why we cannot use some of our heavy rail corridors to run these trams in. Some of these things are so obvious that we have not thought of them. I again congratulate the member for Morphett for bringing this motion to the house, because I think we have to be forever open-minded.

It makes you wonder what we did back in the 1950s when we did these things. We wrecked a lot of our heritage, we threw out our trams—you wonder who the decision makers were. I think now we are looking at saying, 'Hang on. This is a good thing.' Not only is it an efficient method of transport, it is clean, because it is electric. Also, people find them easy to get on and off. I know people hang all over them, like they do in Melbourne, which is probably not safe. But you can certainly stack a lot of people on a tram, a lot more than you can on a bus, even though it could be classed as semi-dangerous, because people hang over the sides of them. You see that in every state.

Also, in Adelaide, it would bring back some of our romantic past. Trams were always a romantic part of Adelaide, particularly with those beautiful poles right there in the middle of King William Street. It is good to see the poles replicated in O'Connell Street, the same type of pole now used as light poles. They were originally where the electric wires for the old trams hung. The standards are there. I support the member for Morphett. I think it is a great idea. Let us hope that the new trams will bring about a resurgence in our light rail transport systems.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I would like to make a contribution and I commend the member for Morphett for bringing this issue back again before the parliament. I would like the government to be even more innovative and broader in its thinking in relation to light rail than what the member for Morphett is proposing. I am sure he would support developing a light rail network throughout the metropolitan area.

I think South Australia, and Adelaide in particular, needs some visionary projects which not only create employment and stimulate business, but will help in regard to public transport. I think we still have the opportunity in Adelaide to do that. Last week I was in Sydney and travelled on the privately owned light rail system which runs from Central Station to Lilydale. That company has a plan to extend that network itself. I was intrigued, in fact I was amused, to note that they have reintroduced conductors on the privately owned tram system in Sydney when government owned

systems around Australia have got rid of conductors. I thought it was a beautiful irony, that the privately owned system has brought conductors on and closed down their ticket machines, which have a sign on them saying, 'No longer in use.' They do not need them, because they have staff on the tram.

In South Australia, in the metropolitan area in particular, you could have light rail going in, not just to Glenelg. Glenelg is a fantastic spot, but I think that what we need is a network. At the moment we have got the O-Bahn, which is good in its own right, but we have never had an integrated system here. We have never had an electric rail system, or a public transport system, that is really integrated in the way that it could and should be. I am not knocking the O-Bahn, but what we need for the decades ahead is a completely new look at an integrated light rail system which goes throughout the metropolitan area.

In particular—and I heard the member for Schubert, I believe, touching on the situation of the railway—it is unfortunate and sad that we can no longer have the interstate trains coming into Adelaide Station on North Terrace. Sadly, that option has, I believe, slipped by. The reason is not simply cost. As you know, suburban trains run on a broad gauge and the interstate ones on a standard gauge. The interstate trains have become so popular now that on a Sunday, there are three of them in at the same time. They are so long—some of them are a kilometre or more in length—that they now have to split them; certainly they do when they come into Sydney. They are getting to a point where they might have to do another split to even accommodate those interstate trains.

On a Sunday, if you were able to bring them into Adelaide Railway Station, which you cannot do because of the different gauges, you would take up, as a minimum, six of the nine platforms. Unless you spend millions of dollars expanding the railway building itself, there is no way, under present circumstances, that on a Sunday and other days, you could have those interstate trains there, even if they were split. Even if you split them, at one end of the train people would still be close to the Old Adelaide Gaol, which is interesting as an historical exhibit, but I do not know whether tourists want to get off a train somewhere near Port Road. So, sadly, that option has been taken away from us.

I note the letter from the Mayor of the City of West Torrens, John Trainer (the former speaker), and I wrote to him and to the government on this very issue. What we need to do is to integrate the interstate and country bus terminal with the suburban buses coming into the city and have the Keswick suburban rail station integrated with the interstate rail terminal and also possibly have housing built above that development. That, I think, is the best of both worlds. Some people say that Keswick is too far out of the city, but that is not the case. Keswick railway station is no further from parts of North Terrace than Spencer Street Station is from Spring Street or Central Station is from Circular Quay. The fact is—and thank goodness for it—Colonel Light gave us parklands, and Keswick railway station looks as though it is out in the countryside, but it is actually not far from the city centre at all.

The problem is that the City of Adelaide does not want that interstate and country bus terminal there, because the council wants it in its territory. Keswick rail terminal is in the City of West Torrens, which is arguing that the terminal should be in the city. However, Adelaide City Council is saying that it wants the terminal in Franklin Street. Once again, we will have another disjointed transport situation in Adelaide, and I think that is unfortunate. The city council argues that it is important to have the bus terminal in Franklin Street because of the backpackers. If you have the suburban buses coming into Keswick railway station, together with the interstate and country buses, the backpackers can get into the city more easily than they can at the moment from any point within the city, so I do not think that is a very convincing argument.

Referring back to this broader vision, my point is that I want to see the state government and the Premier get hold of this issue, because it is more important than the City of Adelaide, the City of West Torrens (important as they are in their own right) and more important than Bob Such. This issue of integrated transport should be brought into not just the current time frame but also the future. I believe it would be a great achievement for this government if it could say, 'We have finally got the interstate and country rail, road and bus connections integrated with suburban rail and suburban buses.' I think that would be a great achievement. So, the challenge for minister Wright and the Premier is really to drive this issue. It is no reflection on the City of Adelaide, but these facilities belong to all of us, and I do not think that it or any other council should call the tune on where something that serves the whole community should be located.

As to the key issue of light rail, there are plenty of options. Just recently, I have explored once again the monorail in Sydney, which I think does not get many points for aesthetics. I do not think that the steel supports would get an award from the Civic Trust. However, a lot comes down to good design, and you can combine light rail that can be elevated in tight spots—through Unley, for example (and I know that the member for Unley is credited with the idea of a tunnel). I think it would be a lot easier to have some innovative design work on light rail—perhaps even elevate it through parts of the parklands and tight spots, such as parts of Prospect Road and Goodwood Road.

The point the member for Schubert or someone else made was that some of the railway land could be used, and I believe it could. I have looked at that issue and I think there is scope for that to be done. Perhaps over time we could try to replace the suburban heavy rail with integrated suburban light rail and have a proper electrified integrated system that serves people in Burnside as well as people in Enfield, Elizabeth, the Hills and so on. The running costs are a lot less, and I think that there is a case to ask the federal government to come to the party to support a major infrastructure project of a light rail system for metropolitan Adelaide.

It helped Perth and Brisbane when they electrified their rail systems. For reasons which escape me, I am told that people here rejected the commonwealth offer and went down the pathway of having buses. I believe that is unfortunate. I commend the member for Morphett for keeping this issue going. It is time that we take action and that the government takes hold of this and drives it. People in years to come, just as we were celebrating the achievements of former premier Des Corcoran the other day, will say that the premier of this era created an electric light rail system in metropolitan Adelaide. He will be highly regarded forever and a day if he did just that. I commend this motion to the house.

Mr SNELLING secured the adjournment of the debate.

ATOMIC TESTS ANNIVERSARY

Ms BREUER (Giles): I move:

That this house-

(a) notes that—

(i) this week marks the 50th anniversary of the first atomic test conducted by the British Government when 'Totem 1'—a 10 kilo tonne atomic bomb, was detonated at Emu Junction some 240km from Coober Pedy on 15th October 1953;

(ii) the Totem trial was the start of the British Atomic Testing Program which included nine atomic weapon explosions at Maralinga and Emu Junction as well as a series of minor trials;

(b) notes that the McClelland Royal Commission concluded that—

(i) there was a failure at the Totem trials to adequately consider the distinctive lifestyles of Aborigines and their particular vulnerability to radioactive fallout;

(ii) Totem 1 was detonated in wind conditions that produced unacceptable levels of fallout and failed to take into account the welfare of the Wallatina and Welbourne Hill people;

(iii) relocating Aboriginal people to Yalata and preventing them from returning to Ooldea and places further North marked the beginning of a period where Aboriginal people were denied access to their traditional lands;

(iv) those people exposed to radiation at the test sites have an increased risk of developing cancers;

(c) expresses concern for indigenous peoples whose land and health may have been detrimentally affected by these tests;

(d) notes—

(i) the land hand-back of the area known as Section 400 is still subject to negotiation between Maralinga Tjarutja and the State and Federal Governments; and

(ii) the efforts of the State Government to hand back the Unnamed Conservation Park—a 21 000 square kilometre area of pristine bushland in the State's Far North West, as an act of reconciliation.

This motion marks the 50th anniversary of the first atomic test detonated on South Australian soil on 16 October 1953. On 15 October at 7 a.m. Totem 1, a 10 kiloton atomic bomb, was exploded in my electorate at Emu Junction, approximately 240 kilometres north-west of Coober Pedy. This detonation was the first of a series of trails conducted by the British government in conjunction with the federal government between 1953 and 1963. There were nine major nuclear weapon tests involving atomic explosions and a series of minor trials. It is not an anniversary for the state to celebrate, but it is one which we must acknowledge and remember as part of our state's history. It is from this anniversary that we continue to work towards reconciliation for the future.

The events of that time serve as a reminder of the terrible way we treated our indigenous people. It also reminds us that South Australia has done more than its fair share in shouldering the burden of nuclear waste in this country. In 1984 the Report of the Royal Commission into British Nuclear Tests in Australia concluded the following:

> The traditional owners of the Maralinga lands were denied access to these lands for over 30 years as a result of the British nuclear test program. This denial has contributed to their emotional, social and material distress and deprivation.

Our indigenous people were displaced and denied access to their traditional lands. This has continued for many years to affect these people. The radioactive fallout, or the black mist, went beyond the testing range and caused sickness.

I know many of the Kungas from Coober Pedy, the Kupa Piti Kungka Tjuta, the most senior Aboriginal women of Coober Pedy, and I have spoken of them many times in this place. Their stories highlight the impact of the nuclear tests on their community. They talk of the radiation and related illnesses affecting their community and their people; and they talk about the birth defects handed down through their children. Eileen Kampakuta Brown AM, who was working on an outback station, last year said on radio:

> We got up in the morning from the tent. . . everyone had red eyes. . . right here the smoke caught us, it came over us. We tried to open our eyes in the morning but we couldn't open them. We had red eyes and tongues and our coughing was getting worse.

Mrs Brown was awarded the Order of Australia late last year for her work in championing the cause of her people and for sharing her story for all of us to learn from. Ironically, she was awarded by the same government which is trying to locate a national nuclear waste dump in far-north South Australia. Her experiences and those of the other senior Aboriginal women have become the foundation of a strong campaign against federal government plans to locate a national radioactive waste dump in South Australia.

Most recently the campaign brought together some young environmentalists and some aboriginal elders at the 10 Mile Creek bush camp near Coober Pedy, where the senior Aboriginal women shared their stories from the time of the atomic tests and warned of the threat of future poison in the land. And on a couple of occasions in recent months I have met with Mr Yami Lester of Wallatina who, in his autobiography, clearly documents the effect the tests had on his people and how he believes it caused his blindness. And I have spoken with Anangu in the Pitjantjatjara Lands who experienced the tests.

Reports came from all over the state, including reports of contamination in the milk and the dairy at Whyalla—and I can remember those reports—so it was not just local to Maralinga and to Emu Plains: it was all over the state. Yet, interestingly, when this anniversary occurred last year and stories were broadcast of the week, leading journalists throughout Australia were actually questioning the nature of the fallout and whether it really did have any effect on Australia.

As we note the 50 years which have passed since the first tests, it is important to remember that we have not closed the chapter on these events. Nearly 20 years ago the royal commission recommended that the land forming sections 400 and 1487 and the Emu site be transferred back to the traditional owners—'subject to whatever additional arrangements for surveillance and inspection are agreed to by Maralinga Tjarutja and the two governments'. This is yet to happen, and negotiations are continuing between the Maralinga Tjarutja people, state government and the federal government.

We must make it clear that neither the Maralinga Tjarutja or the state government will accept any ongoing liability for the land. We have already paid a high price for these tests. I have visited Maralinga twice, and it is one of the eeriest places on earth. Vast, outback, beautiful Australia; and so quiet and innocent looking, but deadly. I actually stood on one of the test sites where atomic bombs exploded. I saw the official efforts to clean up the plutonium site in recent years but, sadly, I am not convinced that they were successful.

The federal government continues to impose its plans to locate a national radioactive waste repository in South Australia despite the overwhelming opposition of the South Australian people. It does not listen to the South Australian people and it does not listen to those who have experienced first-hand the impact of radioactive waste on their land.

As we continue towards reconciliation, efforts by this state government to hand back 21 000 square kilometres of bushland to the traditional owners is, certainly, a significant

step. The Unnamed Conservation Park is in the state's far north-west and takes in parts of the Great Victorian Desert along the West Australian border—some of the most isolated parts of Australia but certainly some of the most beautiful. To return this land to its traditional owners is an exciting venture and it is particularly significant given the 50th anniversary of the tests.

We in Australia should have learned many lessons from our experiences 50 years ago. I commend this motion to the house.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I rise to support this motion. Today, there was a celebration at the War Memorial on North Terrace for Darwin Defenders Day, and there is no doubt that it was the dropping of the atomic bombs on Japan that contributed in a most significant way to ending World War II. However, as we look back now, the research and the testing that went on both here and in the US—and I am not sure where else, the French kept going in the Pacific—just seems crazy. To see the long-term damage that was done to many of these sites where testing was carried out is something that we can only just shake our heads and wonder about. It is something that I find very difficult to understand: where people's attitudes were, where their minds were. Where were the intelligent people? Where were the people who should have been speaking out at the time? To just grab people from their traditional homelands and shunt them off into camps, into places where they were totally out of their familiar surroundings, is no more than just relocating refugees.

The way they conducted themselves in those days apparently seemed to be a normal attitude. We look back now and can only think, 'Well, how could that have been?' Certainly the country up north—and I speak as a member of the Aboriginal Lands Standing Committee, of which I am very proud to be a member—involved in the tests and which would have been affected by the fallout from them, is some of the most beautiful country in South Australia. There is no doubt that the long-term nuclear waste produced by the bombs is a disgrace in today's terms. Now we look back and think 'How did they do it?' and we have to cope with the results. My uncle was up at Maralinga during the tests and actually died from a very rare form of cancer a number of years ago now.

Ms Breuer: Along with many others.

Dr McFETRIDGE: His description of the tests there was something that you just cannot conceive. You wonder how they could expose people the way they did in those days and get away with it. As the member for Giles said, many other people have also died from bizarre cancers, which are certainly anecdotally, if not objectively, linked to people's exposure to the radioactive fallout from those tests.

The handing back of the land to the indigenous communities up there, particularly in the unnamed park, is something for which I hope to be able to accompany the Premier and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, along with the rest of the committee. It is great that we are at last making some amends for the injustices of our previously held attitudes which, in most cases, were held with good intent. Those attitudes are certainly outmoded now—most of them would be considered abhorrent nowadays. But they unfortunately persisted, and the results of the actions precipitated by those attitudes are something that we look back at and can only ask for some understanding and guidance in the way we conduct ourselves in the future.

I hope that, through my participation on the standing committee, I can help the indigenous people of South Australia to get their lives to where they want them to be. I emphasise that—where they want them to be. There is a lot of money being poured into indigenous affairs, both from the commonwealth and state governments, and has been for many years. I used to drive the school bus from Port Augusta High School out to Davenport Mission when I was teaching up there in the mid-1970s. Even then I would be driving around people, on the tracks and roads in Davenport Mission, who were intoxicated with alcohol and suffering from drug abuse and certainly from petrol sniffing. Nothing has changed. I find that absolutely devastating. I was able to travel through some of the communities—Mimili, Indulkana, Fregon, Umuwa and Ernabella—a couple of years ago with the members for Stuart, MacKillop and Schubert. That was a real eye-opener and I have expressed that attitude in this place.

I encourage all members of this place to seek out members of the standing committee because we would love to show people what is going on with the Aboriginal communities so that we can all act in a totally bi-partisan way to allow them to determine their own future and to preserve their most unique culture—thousands of years of culture. The tjukurpa—commonly referred to as the dreaming—is far more than that. It is not just fairy tales; it is as real as any religious belief anywhere in the world. People say that it is just dreamtime stories but it is far more than that. The tjukurpa is an integral part of the culture and we hope that the tales that the Aboriginal elders possess will be passed on to the younger members of the community. That is at peril because of the problems in the communities. We hope that those elders will be able to pass on the culture. The huge mistakes of the past, where we have displaced Aboriginal communities, where we have abused the environment—to the nth degree in this case—are something that we should look back on, learn from and move forward from.

There is no point in criticising the past if you are not going to learn from the past. You will not move on. It is very important that, as the leaders of the community in South Australia (whether they be indigenous, multicultural, Anglo-Saxon or from any other community), we act together to make sure that everyone in South Australia is able to achieve the benefits of living in South Australia. I have said it earlier today in this place but, without doubt, it is one of the best places in the world in which to live, and one only has to ask the Nobel Laureate about that. It is an amazing place in which to live. The indigenous communities, I hope, will benefit from the formation of the new standing committee. On a couple of occasions I have had the pleasure of meeting with other members, and the enthusiasm and desire to go out and achieve is something I look forward to fostering and maintaining. I congratulate the member for Giles on bringing this motion to the house. The honourable member is a member of that committee and, while a Liberal government federally was in office at the time, that is not to say that a Labor government would not have done similar things. I say learn from the past, look to the future. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

REVERSE MORTGAGE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I move:

That this house urges all South Australians considering any form of reverse mortgage to seek financial advice from a registered financial planner beforehand.

I raise this very important issue of reverse mortgages and how they will affect people's lives. A reverse mortgage means that you are borrowing on the equity in your home. However, you are not paying that money back: you are using that money to provide for your lifestyle, if you want to, or just to get by; to pay your rates and taxes and your everyday bills. The big problem, though, is that the interest on that loan from the banks and credit unions—I think that only one bank in South Australia is offering this facility at the moment, but overseas many financial organisations are offering reverse mortgages—is compounding all the time at astronomical rates.

The record low interest rates that we have seen under the federal Liberal government are not applied in these cases: fees and conditions apply. So, within not too many years of receiving some money from the bank in return for a share of your mortgage on your house, that interest compounds to the degree where the bank owns most of your house and, in some cases, will own the whole of your house. I worry about what will happen to these elderly citizens who have used the advantage of having some cash up front (which sounds a great idea at the time) and that money runs out. If they are disabled they may need to go into a retirement village or an aged-care facility. Deposits will be required to be paid. They will want to sell their house, but nothing will be left from the proceeds of the sale of the house to provide for their retirement, to provide for their care.

Also, I should say that, in many cases, people do wish to leave an inheritance to their children. It is very important that if people plan to leave an inheritance they should be well and truly aware of what that inheritance will be so that they can at least make qualified and informed judgments on how they institute their wishes in their will. If the interest is compounding on these reverse mortgages there may be absolutely nothing left for parents to provide for their children.

Certainly, I have been associated with an elderly couple who are not involved with a reverse mortgage, but they have, in fact, given their house—for want of a better description—to a welfare organisation in the hope that this organisation will look after their autistic son. If they had been provided with a reverse mortgage by an institution, the money would have been useful in paying for care of their autistic son now; but then, I would think, it is likely that no money would be left to provide for their son's welfare when they are unable to look after him.

They would have no asset to sell to pay people or trade with to look after their son, which is a huge worry for them. That is a bit of a hypothetical at the moment. However, it is not hypothetical to say that there are many people out there who have looked at reverse mortgages. Certainly, some of them have taken up reverse mortgages, although I am not sure of the number here in South Australia.

The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs should be out there warning people of the pitfalls of reverse mortgages. It is not just easy money and waiting for the capital gains to take care of any compounding interest. It is not that easy. We have been very lucky in South Australia that real estate values have risen drastically, so there has been some offset. However, that will not last. I do not want to see people in a situation where there will be no social justice. They are going to want to divest themselves of their assets at some stage and to pass on some sort of inheritance, but there will be absolutely nothing left. They must be made aware of the facts. I encourage all financial institutions that are considering or are at this stage using reverse mortgages as a way of enticing people into getting involved with them to inform people so that they understand what is involved. It is a complex arrangement and, in many cases, it can be a disastrous arrangement. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr RAU (Enfield): I congratulate the member for Morphett on bringing this very important matter before the house. It is a tribute to him that he has seen a very important consumer issue here and has brought it to the attention of the house. I can only endorse and support the remarks he has made and observe that this is yet another manifestation of the dreadful credit binge that is occurring in Australia these days. It is an issue which state and federal governments need to have a good look at. Of course, the federal government has more control over financial institutions, banks and such like than any of the states possibly can have. In fact, I would like to see the federal government possibly even regulate some of these behaviours.

The level of debt in Australia is growing at an astronomical rate and, sooner or later, someone will have to pay for all this debt. People are encouraged to take out these mortgages in circumstances where, because of the nature of the mortgage, they are not aware, in a weekly or monthly sense, how much they are incurring by way of charges. It is like a time bomb quietly ticking away inside their assets. As the member for Morphett quite rightly points out, by the time they either die or have to sell their property, it might be that they have absolutely no equity left. There is no such thing as a free lunch, and there is no such thing as a free loan. This is one of the most insidious and, in my opinion, evil financial products to be offered, unless possibly if you are dealing with a commercial entity which is aware, through complex accounting packages and so on, of exactly what it is doing, and it has a particular purpose.

I am very fearful that what will happen is that it will be sold to people in the same cavalier fashion as some of these other equity loans are sold to people—as if it is a magic pudding where they can just walk in, sign up for one of these things and, all of a sudden, the money starts growing on trees. Well, money does not grow on trees. What will happen eventually is that people will have their assets stripped from beneath them, and who will pick them up then? It will be the taxpayer; somewhere or other, the taxpayer will pick them up.

A lot of these people, if they are properly warned and properly cautioned in the first place, would probably not go ahead and do this. I understand that the member for Morphett is making the point that, if someone is going to do this, they need to be given the absolutely clearest warning possible, and the financial institution needs to be required to give a warning which government and consumer advocate groups believe is sufficient to make this absolutely clear to people.

I understand that it is not only in this context that these things occur. I have an understanding that, in some of these so-called retirement villages that are popping up like mushrooms around the place, there are certain arrangements whereby the people who are licensees in those retirement villages do not own the home but simply buy a licence to occupy a home. Some of the licensees in these retirement villages are paying weekly or fortnightly rates to have the garden looked after, as well as paying for electricity, gas and water, and some them, if they find themselves having difficulties in paying those things, are being encouraged to accept a similar sort of arrangement so that the equity they have in their licence is eaten away through the same mechanism; that is, their monthly or weekly fees are not taken out

of the pension but, rather, taken out of the debt that ultimately will be charged against their licence. As we all know, these licences are not redeemed for full value. These licences in many cases are redeemed for only 80 per cent of full value.

The people who occupy these retirement villages find out—or in regard to their estate—that they not only lose 20 per cent straight off the top, because of the arrangements under which the licence is granted, but also compound interest on all the fees they have not paid over a period of time. These people need to be given warning that if they enter into these types of transactions they should do so with their eyes open, understand what it is going to mean. Compound interest is a very simple concept, but people do not seem to appreciate the effect of compound interest, even of modest interest rates over time. Even if we were talking about a five, six or 7 per cent interest rate, over a number of years it does not take long for that to accumulate to become a very substantial financial mountain.

The member for Morphett is to be congratulated for bringing forward this matter. I hope that, consistent with the very sound sentiments that lie behind this motion, when this parliament comes to deal with real estate issues in the broader sense, the member for Morphett will bring the same very sound, well-reasoned thoughts to bear on those topics. These problems exist elsewhere in different forms in the real estate industry. I know the member for Morphett is a person who is paying special interest to these issues. I have had a number of conversations with him about some of his electors who have had problems in a range of areas, for example, strata titles, and so on—

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr RAU: No, he likes Holdfast Shores. That is the one little chink in his armour. He blindly defends Holdfast Shores, but I think he has to do, because if he does not defend it he really has nowhere to go. So I do not get too hostile with him on that. Except for that one area—Holdfast Shores—where he has a problem, he is pretty good on these issues. I think this shows that he is actually focusing his mind on these things, and I do not think the parliament can do anything more than warmly endorse his bringing this to the chamber. It is a marvellous thing to see and I look forward to similar, public spirited, consumer orientated, positive motions from the member for Morphett.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I rise to support the member for Morphett's motion. I commend him for his insight into this issue. I speak with a reasonable amount of experience on issues such as this, having been a banker for some 22 years, eight or nine years of which as a bank manager or branch manager. The banks and financial institutions have increased their range of products progressively over the years and have marketed those particular banking products to their customers. This is one of those products that has evolved over the years through the work of some fairly entrepreneurial marketers within the banking and financial institutions industry. I fully support the comments the members for Morphett and Enfield made as they covered the issue and subject matter very comprehensively.

I will not speak for my whole time, but will make some points. This is what is regarded in the banking industry as security lending. If you have an adequate margin or equity in your property, the banks are quite comfortable lending on that margin or equity, usually with the proviso that you have the capacity to repay it, while meeting principle and interest payments over an agreed term. But this looks at the equity one has in one's property and creates an overdraft or set amount of money that is lent and the interest capitalises, which means that the interest is charged, it is added to the principal and then further interest is charged on that increased debt.

If you plotted the debt on a graph it would be parabolic, which means an ever increasing upward curve. That means that the loss of equity in a property occurs at an ever increasing rate. Members point out quite correctly that, if an aged person looks to sell their property and move into a retirement village or an aged care facility without fully understanding the ramifications of the reverse mortgage product they have availed themselves of, they will find themselves in a situation where they will not have enough money from the realisation of the sale of their home property to be able to move into a smaller facility that meets their needs as their years increase.

It may be all right to a degree (I am not in favour of this product at all), and it could be manageable in some individual cases with interest rates as they are at the moment, but what would occur in the climate that we saw back in the mid to late 1980s? I hope and trust that the Australian commonwealth government never puts us into the interest rate environment that we experienced then, but interest rates do not have to move much to have a significant effect on a large percentage of the population. We have seen that with the small interest rate movements in the home loan market. Interest rates only have to move a quarter or half per cent and to have a dampening effect on the real estate industry market as well as the building of new homes. When financial institutions are looking to sell a product like this we must look at what occurs in a rising interest rate market. The result is that the equity loss in somebody's property is accelerated.

The member for Enfield raised the point that it is incumbent on the federal government to have a good look at the products that financial institutions and banks are marketing and to regulate what they do. I know they do this to a certain extent, but the government does need to take on a social conscience frame of mind with these issues and have a good look at what the banks are intending. The motion of the member for Morphett refers to seeking financial advice from registered financial planners before people consider availing themselves of this reverse mortgage product. However, we have to bear in mind that financial advisers are not only in the business of giving advice on financial matters but are also in the business of marketing, too, and for every product that they sell they receive a commission. I know that, at the outset of the meeting, they have to advise what the commission will be, but they are in the business of selling banking and associated products to make their livelihood.

This reverse mortgage product could be used favourably as a short-term measure for financial assistance. You could compare it to a Visa Card, Bankcard or Mastercard facility which banks offer but, coming from a banking background (and you could say a conservative banking background), I believe that, if you cannot afford to make principal and interest repayments, you should not be borrowing that money. As I said, it might appear to be affordable and attractive when interest rates are low but, when they rise, it only exacerbates the problem and further accelerates the reduction of the home owner's equity in their real estate asset. I would like to sound quite a loud word of warning on this issue. I do not believe that the bank I used to be employed by offered this product and, as the member for Morphett said, he believes that at the moment the St George Bank is the only financial institution offering this product. I would warn potential borrowers to be

extremely careful and seek independent advice from someone other than a financial adviser. I would go to a taxation accountant or someone such as that to seek advice on this matter before I considered signing any documentation to avail myself of this product.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I compliment the member for Morphett for moving this motion. I am pleased that members, including members opposite, support this motion. I think all of us in this parliament hear examples about people being taken down, and we know that there are so many crook schemes and that people often have false hopes and do not understand what they are going into. I am not seeking to use that terminology for this, and I do understand how people in their retirement (and perhaps well into their retirement) do not have the opportunity to pay back loans, but at the same time they need a loan either to move into another dwelling, a retirement village, or whatever, and maybe they need bridging finance in the interim. Perhaps they have to raise $100 000 or $120 000 to go into a particular institution and they do not have that money, and they are still holding onto their own home. I do not know the exact circumstances, but whatever the case it is certainly a trap if the interest is compounded. It is something that I do recall learning in mathematics way back when and I thought then, 'Why would anyone fall into a trap of compound interest? You couldn't be so ignorant', yet you see it happen far too often.

I certainly support the motion moved by the member for Morphett. I think I have highlighted in this house previously that people should seek to ascertain what these pawnbrokers charge in interest. I was confronted with that situation first-hand as a result of an acquaintance who hocked some goods with a pawnbroker. He wanted to sell them, but he had already hocked them by the time I answered the advertisement. I said, 'Look, I can take them out of the pawnbroker's for you if you come down with me.' This was a very well known, reputable pawnbroker in Adelaide and the suburbs, and I worked out that this person was paying interest of 300 per cent. I said to this chap, 'The house that we have just left, is that your house?' He said, 'Yes, I've bought it.' I said, 'Do you own it?' He said, 'No, I'm paying off a huge amount.' I said, 'It would have been much simpler for you to take out a small loan'—and we were talking about a couple of hundred dollars. He said, 'No, I want to keep that right in case I ever need a loan really badly.' As I said, he was paying 300 per cent interest, and I was shocked. I think he had only had the material hocked for about five days, and I reckon I had to pay out something like an extra $30 or $40 for what it had already cost him in interest.

Everyone needs to be very aware of these things—in fact, perhaps we should bring in a motion, member for Morphett, to urge all South Australians considering hocking or pawning their gear to also seek financial advice before they do so. I am very happy to support this motion.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I am also very happy to support this motion. It emphasises something that we seem to have forgotten in Australia for a while, and that is the importance of consumer education and that education being relevant to the problems that people are encountering at the time, and to different age groups. This motion refers to a particular problem that is often encountered at the moment by older people in our community, and it is really important that we consider the way in which consumer information is targeted to older people. They need completely different information from the information needed by a young person buying their first car, for instance, entering into their first rental agreement for a flat or looking at their first hire-purchase agreement. I would like to take this opportunity to urge the commissioner for consumer and business affairs to review the education programs that he undertakes, to take into account what the member for Morphett has said and to take into account the need to have targeted consumer information.

The other aspect of this motion relates to financial planners. They are not a body that is really understood, and I would urge the commissioner to also consider providing information to the community about financial planners and their role in our new society. I will cease now so that we can deal with this important motion today.

Motion carried.

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

KNEEBONE, Hon. A.F., DEATH

The SPEAKER: It is my melancholy duty to inform the house that the Hon. Frank Kneebone died yesterday. However, we will not be conducting condolence motions today, if for no other reason than the Premier is inadvertently caught on parliamentary duty in Perth. The house will be advised about that in due course.

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 132, 136, 193 and 199.

KPMG SURVEY

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I rise to inform the house about the results of an extensive new survey by one of the world's largest and most respected accounting firms which places Adelaide among the most competitive cities for business in the industrialised world. Yesterday, KPMG released its 2004 Competitive Alternatives study in the United States. Competitive Alternatives is the KPMG guide to comparing business costs in North America, Europe and Asia-Pacific. The report measures the combined impact of 27 cost components that are most likely to vary by location, as applied to specific industries and business operations. The eight-month research program covered 98 cities in 11 countries: France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States, Australia and Japan.

More than 2 000 individual business scenarios were examined analysing more than 30 000 items of data. The basis for comparison is the after-tax cost of start-up and operation for representative business operations in 12 industries looking forward over a 10-year time horizon. Results are based on the combined results for a group of comparable cities in each country and are expressed in comparison to the baseline results of the United States. Canada is the overall leader followed very closely by Australia, both having business costs approximately 8 to 9 per cent below those of the United States.

This is a great result for Australia, but Adelaide has done even better. Within Australia and the Japanese cities surveyed, Adelaide is the number one most competitive place in which to do business. Of the 98 cities surveyed around the world, Adelaide is placed 10th. In several key industry sectors it ranks even higher. We are rated second of all cities for the production of plastic products. In food processing, automotive parts, metal components, software design and content development for the internet, we are rated number three out of 98 cities throughout the industrialised world. This report will be read and studied by thousands of businesses throughout the world. As we speak, it is appearing in media reports around the world.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am happy to congratulate Dean Brown on his efforts, for which he claims credit. KPMG's United States Strategic Relocation and Expansion Services Division will be commencing a speaking tour throughout the United States and Europe on 23 February to outline the results of this study. This government intends to add as much value as we possibly can to this unlimited and extremely valuable exposure of our state and our capital city on the world stage. We have a great story to tell about South Australia, and this government intends to tell it.

The Premier has announced that he will be writing to 5 000 chief executive officers worldwide telling them about our competitive advantages in Adelaide and South Australia. Working closely with Robert Champion De Crespigny and the Economic Development Board, the Premier will also be launching a major advertising and promotion campaign nationally and internationally to draw the survey to the attention of prospective investors and so show that South Australia is a great place to do business. Meetings to plan this promotional drive have already commenced. I am sure that all members will agree that this is an opportunity to capitalise on an outstanding scorecard for South Australia from a respected international commentator. Their view is backed up by recent upgrades in the state's credit rating by Standard and Poor's and by Moody's, with Standard and Poor's signalling that we are on course for a AAA credit rating. Some people question the value of a good credit rating, but it is very simple: AAA is about investment, investment is about jobs and jobs are at the heart of this government's policy.

We all know about the great opportunities that exist in this state. We must now ensure that the rest of the world knows that, when it comes to competition, there is no city greater and more competitive in this nation and, when it comes to a comparison of cities throughout the world, there is a state and a city in the top 10, and that is Adelaide, South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand the enthusiasm with which the news has been greeted, but it does not have to be sustained and echoed that long.

OPERATION AXIOM

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I advise the house that, after the commencement of the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act in April 2003, the South Australia Police entered into a joint operation, Operation Axiom, with the Department for Correctional Services to collect DNA samples from the state's prison population, including prisoners on home detention. Operation Axiom started on 16 June 2003 and established three dedicated police prison testing teams, supported by prison staff. The teams travelled to all the state's prisons as well as to the district offices of the Department for Correctional Services Community Corrections. Most testing was completed by 30 September 2003. As at 30 October 2003, prison testing teams had collected DNA samples from 1 187 eligible prisoners in South Australia and, for the benefit of the member for Bragg, I advise that that includes Bevan Spencer Von Einem. The operation also identified 41 prisoners who did not previously have their fingerprints recorded on file in South Australia.

On only one occasion did the teams use a low level of reasonable force to obtain a DNA sample. The use of reasonable force is allowed by the relevant act, and its minimal use during the project is a far better result than outcomes interstate. The operation exceeded assessment indicators because there were no injuries to police, prison workers or prisoners, no complaints were received by the Police Complaints Authority or Ombudsman about the operation, and the operation was completed ahead of schedule and within its original budget estimate.

The samples have been submitted to Forensic Science South Australia and are in the process of being profiled and entered into the DNA database. The Assistant Commissioner (Crime Services) has recognised the professionalism and personal dedication of police and prison personnel working in this operation by awarding certificates of commendation and certificates of appreciation respectively.

Forensic Science South Australia is profiling DNA samples from prisoners and putting the profiles onto the DNA database. Those profiles are being matched with DNA from crime scenes. The matching is subject to rigorous control and testing procedures before being provided to South Australia Police DNA Management Section for further investigation. An initial batch of 10 matches between crime scenes and DNA samples collected from South Australian prisoners have been quality assured and provided to the South Australia Police for use. Of those 10 matches, four are offences for which the person has been previously arrested and the crime cleared up. These were offences of robbery, armed robbery, sexual assault and serious criminal trespass. The remaining six matches are: an armed robbery in October 2001; a sexual assault (rape) in January 1997; a sexual assault (abduction and rape) in August 1992; an arson in May 2002; a serious criminal trespass (shopbreaking) in July 2001; and a serious criminal trespass (housebreaking) in September 2001. After analysis by the DNA Management Section and the State Intelligence Branch, these matters will be sent to the appropriate area for investigation.

Forensic Science South Australia has now provided about 300 match reports for processing and investigation. Matches continue to be provided regularly and the police are prioritising matches with more serious crimes for investigation. Finally, I am pleased to advise the house that I have entered three ministerial arrangements—two with the commonwealth and one with New South Wales—to allow the exchange of DNA profiles with those jurisdictions. Negotiations are well advanced to enter similar ministerial arrangements with other jurisdictions.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Upper South-East Project, Implementation of—Report.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. On 24 July 2003, Chubb Corporate Risk Services, on behalf of WorkCover, interviewed a Dr Gadd regarding a claimant, Mr Thompson, a former diver of Port Lincoln. I believe the transcript of that interview may reveal a breach of privilege. It is clear from the transcript that the WorkCover investigators are trying to establish whether the doctor will reconsider the claimant's capacity to work given certain activities the claimant has undertaken. The transcript indicates:

WorkCover say: 'All right. What about as far as writing letters, formulating letters, those types of things, did he ever discuss anything like that with you?'

The doctor says: 'On occasion yes but I wouldn't expect him not to be able to do that, because I would assume he would do that in his time and therefore may be able to do it in several bites rather than all in one hit.'

The transcript continues:

WorkCover say: What about letters of complaint to members of parliament, to managers of insurance companies to WorkCover themselves? Ongoing issues in relation to, as I say, freedom of information requests and the fact that he identifies certain documents that haven't been provided to him from the volume of information that he's received. Quick look at those if you will.

The transcript continues:

WorkCover say: Some letters of complaints, some letters to ministers, to shadow ministers, the relevant bodies within WorkCover and a freedom of information application. Again does that concern you, is that how he presented to you?

I believe that the transcript indicates that WorkCover and/or its agents are using letters written to members of parliament in an attempt to persuade doctors to reassess the capacity of the complainant's ability to work. My concern is that this may breach a privilege of members of parliament. If a member of the public knows that by writing to an MP the letter may be used against them by WorkCover, they will not approach members of parliament because of fear of being victimised by WorkCover. It will restrict us in our capacity to carry out our roles as members of parliament within the parliament.

Further, if the members of parliament themselves know that, by approaching WorkCover or the minister with the letter from a constituent, it may be used against the constituent, we ourselves will be restrained in approaching WorkCover or the minister on that issue or, indeed, in using that information within the parliament. Mr Speaker, I will give you a copy of the transcript and ask that you consider whether there is a prima facie case of breach of privilege.

The SPEAKER: I look forward to getting that information and, whilst I am tempted to remark upon it at this point, I think it might be wiser for me to consider the matter over the ensuing three days of the weekend, along with the other matter on which I have yet to report to the house. I will do that on Monday.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: AGENTS' INDEMNITY FUND

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I bring up the 46th Report of the Economic and Finance Committee on the Agents' Indemnity Fund Interim Report.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

WORKCOVER

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Given that the Speaker is considering a matter of privilege in regard to WorkCover's treatment of letters of MPs, will the minister immediately instruct WorkCover, its employees and agents not to shred any documents or materials associated with the case of Mr Jeff Thompson of Port Lincoln?

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not sure that the question is in order. In fact, I think that in the circumstances it is more appropriate that, on behalf of all members, whilst the matter is under deliberation here and sub judice, the chair orders that not the minister but WorkCover will not interfere with any of the files that may be relevant to any consequential inquiry this house may choose to place on foot, pending the opinion preferred by the chair on Monday.

COMMONWEALTH BANK SURVEY

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is to the Treasurer. What are the findings of the Commonwealth Bank's recent survey into Australia's economic outlook, and what are the implications for South Australia?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I thank the member for Enfield, a noted enthusiast on all things economic. For a lawyer, at least, I think he does a very good job. For the house's information, I bring to members' attention a recent presentation made in here in Adelaide by the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, because I have been sitting here watching a fairly inept performance by the opposition over recent days, and they have been niggling away in a very negative fashion about our economy, about employment and about the general state of economic conditions in South Australia. I want to put an end to the opposition's tactic of talking down the economy by bringing to the attention of members the good news that is being reported about our economy by many private sector people.

An honourable member: Which bank?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Commonwealth Bank of Australia, which has prepared a presentation on the Australian economy with a particular focus on South Australia. Whilst the opposition has been talking down the economy, let us see what the Commonwealth Bank says about our state, and in particular the Commonwealth Bank senior economist. The bank said in this presentation given here in Adelaide to business just a few days ago:

South Australia is set for a strong 2004. Firm job markets, large grain crops and rising business investment.

Sir, that is not from an opposition who are about scaremongering, scare-tactics and negativity: that is from the chief economist of the CBA. And what do they say about the construction industry in South Australia? In their presentation, graphically portrayed, they said:

South Australia's construction pipeline is reasonably strong. Private sector will build $400 million of development in the next few quarters.

And, of course, we heard the negativity from the shadow minister for tourism in recent days. The Commonwealth Bank report also says that we will see:

Commercial and hotel approvals remain firm.

So, right across the economy we are seeing significant improvement and significant strength. The Commonwealth Bank goes on to say, and it confirms Treasury and other advice given to government:

South Australia's residential building approvals are at their peak.

Not for many years have we had such a consistently robust housing construction and residential market here in South Australia. But there is more good news. We have heard things about our unemployment rate. The Commonwealth Bank of Australia says:

South Australia's unemployment rate is at 6.5 per cent, a near 20 year low.

That is what the Commonwealth Bank says about unemployment: not the negativity or nonsense of members opposite that would have us believe that our economy is on a decline, that our economy is on its knees. These are independent forecasters.

The report from the Commonwealth Bank's senior economist goes on, and talks about retail spending. In its presentation to businesses here in Adelaide, the Commonwealth Bank says:

South Australia and Queensland have the strongest spending growth.

They say:

South Australia's retail sales are 30 per cent higher since January 2001 and 8 per cent higher than a year ago.

Thirty per cent higher retail sales than when members opposite were in government. That is what this Labor government has delivered to this state's economy: stronger retail sales and thousands more jobs in the retail sector. We have not just produced a strong economy but we have freed up shop trading hours. We know that members opposite were not capable of big reform, were not capable of delivering reform agenda, but this government, this Premier and the Minister for Industrial Relations delivered substantial shopping hours reform in this state and, as we know, predicted jobs growth there will be significant.

Mr Speaker, not only is the Commonwealth Bank of Australia contrasting with the negativity of members opposite but, of course, the Access Economics *September Quarterly Investment Monitor* said:

Projects listed as committed or under construction were valued at $5 billion for South Australia alone.

Access Economics states:

South Australian demand has surprised Access Economics with its strength of late. While state unemployment remains within cooee of its national equivalent, forward indicators of the job markets are solid and the pace of recent investment spending augurs well for a pick-up in output. Retooling of the state's car plants (re investment in its defence-based industries) and the continual upgrade in winemaking capacity and facilities have combined to force to drive South Australia's share of equipment investment notably above its share of national output.

That was a quote from Access Economics in a recent report—on top of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia. In addition, we have seen rating agencies upgrade our credit rating, and Standard and Poor's say that we are within reach. The work of this government has put us within reach of a AAA credit rating to boot.

The final piece of brilliant news—great news—for this state, echoing our economic performance and, of course, showcasing it to the world, is that to which I referred earlier, the KPMG Investment Report. This government, driving this economy, has positioned South Australia, and Adelaide in particular, at No. 10 in the world as a competitive city in which to do business. Importantly, under this Labor government Adelaide stands at No. 1 as the most competitive place in which to do business in this part of the world. I say that that is the work of good government and, despite a pathetic opposition attempting to talk down our economy in South Australia, I look forward to continuing more good economic news.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Given that it has been revealed that WorkCover has had secret files on the partner of at least one WorkCover claimant, how many files does WorkCover have on partners or family members of other claimants? On 8 January this year, Mr Jeff Thompson's wife lodged a freedom of information application seeking documents disclosing where she was present in any video or other evidence. Mrs Thompson also sought all information relating to her held by WorkCover. On 6 February she received WorkCover's response, which disclosed that 11 documents existed. WorkCover has refused to disclose seven of those documents. Mrs Thompson, of course, is not a claimant of WorkCover.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I will check the allegation that has been made by the opposition on this occasion. We need to put this in perspective. The need to protect the workers' compensation scheme for those employers, employees and others who do the right thing is, obviously, an important part of the scheme. WorkCover does have a compliance and investigation unit. If—and I say 'if' quite deliberately—WorkCover staff are doing the wrong thing, that will be addressed at a managerial level.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): As a supplementary question, will the minister give the house an assurance that WorkCover investigators were not asked to investigate how I received a copy of WorkCover's March 2003 quarterly report, and that no file on that issue exists? I was informed last year that such a request had been made for an investigation to take place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am happy to check that for the Leader of the Opposition. Generally speaking, it is not appropriate for me to comment on individual claims and issues. I am happy to check that detail. Last year, of course, what the opposition was asserting and wanting me not to do was to get involved in the day-to-day business of WorkCover. This year, of course, they are now asking the opposite.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I have a another supplementary question. Will the minister undertake to check whether any files on this issue exist, and, if they do, will he have all copies delivered to the Speaker by close of business today?

The SPEAKER: Can I clarify what the leader is asking? They are the files relevant to the remark contained in the inquiry he made in the first instance relating to correspondence between his office and constituents—is that the case?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I have information that a request had been made to investigate how I came into possession of the quarterly report for the March quarter last year.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Well, I am not precisely sure what the Leader of the Opposition is asking for. It appears,

once again, with regard to WorkCover, that the Leader of the Opposition is going on a fishing exercise; and no, I will not give that assurance.

The SPEAKER: Can I tell the minister that I direct WorkCover, since the matter under consideration impinges on parliamentary privilege, not to interfere with and to hold all those files in abeyance pending the outcome of my deliberations, the chair's deliberations, over the weekend on the matter. Those files must remain intact.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Sir, I agree with you, but I did not interpret what the Leader of the Opposition just asked me to be specific to that. I am happy for the Leader of the Opposition to repeat the question, but you, sir, gave an earlier ruling in regard to that and I agree with it; I have no dispute with that. I am just not certain what the Leader of the Opposition is now trying, in his fishing expedition, to ask me. If he wants to repeat the question, I am happy to take it.

The SPEAKER: For the purposes of clarification, the chair points out that the chair understands the leader to be inquiring about why WorkCover set out to investigate how the Leader of the Opposition—if the Leader of the Opposition—came to be in possession of papers relevant to WorkCover and its dependencies, whether they are claimants or plaintiffs, or how ever else you may wish to describe them. That seeks to undermine the privilege which the public has vested in members of parliament and in the institution of parliament to do its work as an institution and to do their work as members of the parliament on behalf of the public in whose interest privilege is established.

Accordingly, having had to make those remarks, it has driven my mind in the direction of revealing something of the nature of my view of the inquiry already made by the member for Davenport. There is some serious misconception in prospect within the management of WorkCover that it is free to go anywhere and do anything, including intimidate both members of the public and members of the parliament, in the course of pursuing its inquiries through its compliance division. That, where it relates to parliament, is entirely improper, and it is for that reason that I direct that none of those files be interfered with until after a considered opinion is provided to the house on Monday. The chair recognises that the minister understands the gravity of that position and that, should WorkCover not otherwise come into possession of the information of proceedings today, the minister will undertake to appraise them of it.

DENTAL SERVICES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is to the Minister for Health. What are the oral health outcomes for South Australian concession cardholders in recent years; and have waiting lists and waiting times been reduced since 2002?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Florey for this very important question, because I noted an article in today's *Advertiser* that stated that, in 2002, 90 000 people were on the dental waiting list, that those lists were growing, and that people on the public list have higher rates of tooth decay than do private patients. As everyone would probably remember, the Commonwealth Dental Scheme was scrapped by Prime Minister Howard in the 1996 federal budget, costing South Australia $10 million per year.

Ms BEDFORD: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. No-one can hear the answer to this question. I am sorry, sir; the noise is just incredible.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Health has the call. I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: As I was saying, the Commonwealth Dental Scheme was scrapped by Prime Minister John Howard in the 1996 federal budget. This cost South Australia $10 million a year, and that was half the total budget for general dental care for cardholders in this state. As a result, dental waiting lists exploded from 53 800 in mid 1996 to 107 000 in the year 2000, under the watch of the member for Finniss. It was not until dental care had reached crisis point that the member for Finniss finally acted to increase state funding, and we welcomed that when it occurred. Despite this, waiting times continued to grow and peaked in mid 2002 at 49 months. This government has allocated an extra $2 million each year—$8 million over four years—as we promised in the election campaign. Since 2002, the number on the waiting list has fallen from 90 000 to 62 000 in December 2003. Waiting times have also fallen—and I repeat 'fallen'—by 30 per cent to 34 months. However, this still is not good enough.

As the member for Finniss rightly says, we need commitment from the federal government. We need restoration of commonwealth financial support for public dental services which the Howard government scrapped in 1996. The reinstatement of commonwealth support for dental care is Mark Latham's federal Labor policy, and I must say that I am very pleased that the member for Finniss is now publicly urging the Prime Minister to do another policy flip-flop and support Mark Latham. The article today also reports that the focus for treatment in public clinics was on emergencies and extractions rather than on preventive care. Over the period reported to 2002, that was the case. The additional state funding under this government and reorientation away from emergency care has resulted in a 53 per cent increase in the provision of general care, and the rate of extraction has fallen by 18 per cent.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): My question is again to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Will the minister explain why, just three weeks after the Hon. Angus Redford from another place wrote to WorkCover on behalf of Port Lincoln diver, Mr Jeff Thompson, and just one day after Mr Redford first raised the issue by way of a question, WorkCover seized Mr Thompson's medical records? Mr Thompson has been on WorkCover for a number of years and the very day that WorkCover chose to seize his medical records was three weeks after the Hon. Angus Redford wrote to WorkCover and just one day after Mr Redford raised a question in the house.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): The question asked by the shadow minister makes the assumption that the events are connected. I do not know whether a connection or otherwise is a huge point. As I said before, WorkCover does have a compliance and investigation unit—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bright!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: WorkCover does have a compliance and investigation unit and I would have thought that the opposition, as well as employers and employees who do the right thing, would want that. In regard to information, if an investigation is going to occur, information is sought,

and that is obviously a routine course of business. An investigation is occurring—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: It could be a range of circumstances. An investigation has occurred and that investigation should take its due course. As I said before, if this particular unit—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz: If you don't know, why don't you find out?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Just shut up, Dorothy. If this unit is not going about its business properly, obviously that will be dealt with, as it should be.

WATERPROOFING ADELAIDE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Minister for the River Murray. Now that the government has negotiated a deal to save the River Murray, what other initiatives could be taken at a local level to secure Adelaide's water supply in the future?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for the River Murray): Members opposite laughed at the suggestion that work has been done to help save the River Murray, but I am very proud of the work that has been done and the campaign to save the River Murray. A lot more needs to be done, and I acknowledge that. In addition, apart from the River Murray there are other watercourses and other water resources in South Australia that need to be looked after, and the Mount Lofty Ranges is prime amongst them. That is why the government is developing a 20-year strategy to waterproof Adelaide and make South Australia a world leader in water conservation.

Earlier this month the government released the Waterproofing Adelaide discussion paper, and consultation and public meetings will take place over the next year, with the final strategy due for completion in March 2005. This is a very important piece of policy making that is being undertaken. The paper looks at options for reducing water use, better management, alternative supplies and additional regulations.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The member for Unley was particularly critical of this document, but I remind him that on his party's web page from which I extracted this information this week, his party refers to a proposal called Water for the Future: An Integrated Water Strategy for Adelaide. In an interview with Miles Kemp on 20 January 2001, the member for Unley said:

> CSIRO has told me they can come up with a strategy that within 20 years South Australia could wean itself from dependence on the Murray.

That policy position, which the opposition had in government, is very similar to the position that we are taking, and we are working on it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Unley!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I hope that it is a bipartisan position. It is a cause of chagrin that the member for Unley attacks it when it is put into the public domain. The member for Unley and the opposition do have a policy position that could lead to the saving of water. Their position is to increase the cost of water, at least that is what the headline of *The Advertiser* on 19 January said. The member for Unley came up with a proposition to increase the cost of water as a way of saving water. I asked my department for advice about how much we would have to put up the price of water to get a saving. We are trying to get a saving of about 20 per cent—I think that was the figure the member for Unley put.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, I have the answer. I am glad the member for Bragg asked that, because she will be very interested in this. I have asked for advice, and the advice I got from my department is that modelling has been done by Sydney Water, a New South Wales water company, which indicates that a 1 per cent increase in the price of water would reduce water use by .3 per cent. In other words, to achieve a 20 per cent reduction in water by using pricing alone, you would need to put up the price of water by a staggering 67 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Sydney Water says this. This would increase the water bill for an average family from $218 every year to $364, an increase of $146. That is the Liberal Party's policy initiative: that is what they would do to conserve water. The government's approach is to improve the management of our water supplies and to change people's behaviour through conservation. The measures my colleague the Minister for Administrative Services has put in place have begun to work and the people of South Australia have responded magnificently and are saving water.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, sir. In his answer to the question the minister clearly quoted a study that has been done for his department by Sydney Water, and he selectively quoted the figures. I ask that, in accordance with your previous ruling, the study be tabled in this house so that we can all see it in its entirety.

The SPEAKER: Is the document to which the minister referred when quoting those figures a document already in the public domain?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Mr Speaker, I did not actually quote from any document. I had my own notes. I said I had sought advice from my department and my department found a study done by Sydney Water which indicated a particular thing. If I am able to access that document for the member I will certainly find it for him, but I do not have the document myself and am relying on advice provided to me by my department.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Is WorkCover under police investigation for stalking in connection with the Thompson case?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I will check that detail for the member and get back to him.

IDENTITY THEFT

Mr SNELLING (Playford): My question is to the Minister for Consumer Affairs. What information has the government been giving South Australians about ways to protect themselves from identity theft?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Minister for Consumer Affairs): I am pleased that the member has asked this question, because it is most topical. As members would be aware, the South Australian Parliament passed identity theft legislation recently that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —was a first for Australia. It was based on solid research about similar law in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom. The government has been more than happy to list many practical things that people can do to protect themselves from identity theft. This information is listed in the consumer advice section of the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs web site. Information about identity theft is grouped under several main headings, including what to do if you suspect you are a victim of identity theft, case studies and ways to protect your personal information. I particularly recommend the contents of the web site to the member for Bragg, whose public pronouncements about identity theft vary from month to month. Indeed, most recently, the member for Bragg wanted us to use the identity theft provisions to charge, on indictment, teenagers who are impersonating themselves to get into nightclubs.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Impersonating older versions of themselves.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: That is right, yes, impersonating older versions of themselves. Alas, if I can explain to the member for Bragg, the identity theft laws that we passed deal with offences preparatory to terrorism and milking people's bank accounts, not impersonating an older version of oneself at Heaven.

In November, the member for Bragg said that 50 percent of identity thieves were welfare cheats, whereas last week she said that it is the under-18 year olds who are the greatest abusers of identity fraud in this state. By contrast, the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs website contains simple, practical and accurate information about ways that people can protect themselves and their families from identity theft. Those methods include: never responding to any emailed request purporting to be from your bank about sending your PIN number and password by return email; checking your credit report once a year, that is, checking it with a credit reference association; shredding or tearing up invoices or receipts that may contain personal information before they are thrown away; and checking each bank statement as soon as possible, since many banks have a time limit for claiming refunds for unauthorised transactions. I commend the website to the house.

RETAIL SECTOR JOBS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Given that shopping hours have now been deregulated for several months, does the minister support the Premier's consistent claims that this move has increased jobs by several thousand within the retail sector and the Deputy Premier's statement today that thousands of jobs have been created in the retail sector?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): What, of course, the government has been able to achieve by breaking the back of the debate that no government, of either political persuasion, could break for 30 years is to provide the opportunity for mums and dads to be able to shop together. Of course, we have seen not only Sunday trading but additional hours during the week as well. While that debate was on we had a range of people, particularly from the retail sector, making a number of claims about how many jobs that would create. The Premier said at the time that he would want to see evidence of that. We want to see more people employed as a result of this major reform brought about by a Rann Labor government and we would hope that the claims that have been made by the retailers about additional employment does in fact occur. It is still relatively early days in the time that this has been in place, and we would hope and expect that the jobs come through as a result of this important piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER: Order! Can I help the minister ever so kindly, by reminding him and others that they must refer to members of this place by their title or their electorate. As much as the rhetoric sounds good, it is not appropriate to transgress, otherwise the line is breached and what was black becomes grey and is soon white. The honourable member for Unley.

TAYLOR, Ms J.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Will the minister explain to this house the treatment of senior public servant Ms Jennifer Taylor, which resulted in her seeking employment interstate? Ms Taylor served the previous government with distinction as the head of the Office of Employment and Youth. However, having taken a series of leave for a total of two months her departmental head, Mr Greg Black, then came to an arrangement where she worked at home for the following four months. As a consequence, she pursued other career options and was the preferred candidate for a very senior Victorian government position. Although she was recommended for that position, at the most senior levels of the South Australian government, the appointment did not take place following Mr Black's input.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank the member for Unley for his question. I am not in a position to comment on the employment details of members of staff; as he would know as a minister, my relationship is with the CEO. From a personal point of view, I have no knowledge of any of these activities, but I imagine that the CEO conducted himself in a proper and timely manner.

CHILD CARE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services explain the powers she has in relation to the regulation of the out of school hours care sector? Last year there was a well-publicised incident of a 5-year old child leaving an out of school hours care program unattended.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): This is a very important question, because it deals with the safety and welfare of South Australian children. In South Australia no registration or licensing process applies to out of school hours care services. In the case of the Mitcham Hills Out of School Hours Care Service Incorporated incident mentioned by the honourable member, that was a non-profit private service. While the practice of my department is to validate those out of school hours care programs that operate on public school sites against nationally agreed health and safety standards, there is no legislative control over out of school hours care programs in South Australia. The Layton review into child protection recognises the importance of the OSHC programs. Also, the casual nature of the out of school hours care work force and the high turnover of staff in this sector increase the vulnerability of children attending these programs and adds weight to the argument for a strong monitoring and enforcement regime.

In the case of the Mitcham Hills service, I am advised that the service has complied with the undertakings that it gave to my department at the time arising from the investigation of the October incident. However, the state government believes that, in the interests of strengthening standards of protection for the welfare of South Australian children, it is necessary to legislate to provide a regulatory basis to enshrine common minimum standards across the whole sector. I am pleased to announce to the house that the government will move in that direction. I have asked my department to prepare a discussion paper that will form the basis for consultation with the childcare industry about the appropriate regulatory environment.

The rationale for the proposal to introduce such regulation to the OSHC programs is based on the need to protect the health and safety of all children in care programs, the need for a system in which external complaints and breaches of standards can be acted upon effectively, and the need to ensure the public confidence necessary to attract children into school-age care programs that enhance their health and wellbeing. I believe this will increase public confidence and provide a basis for improved community capacity to support children's health and wellbeing. It will also ensure that we have a controlled and monitored environment for the introduction of any extra out of school hours care places to South Australia.

LAND TAX

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Has the Treasurer changed his mind about the need for land tax reform? During a radio interview on Radio 5AN on 13 January the Treasurer said, 'I don't feel any overwhelming argument to reform land tax.' The Treasurer went on to say that if people's property values had increased to such an extent that their land tax had risen he was sorry, but it should be recognised that they had also had a rise in personal wealth. I have received many letters regarding massive land tax increases—as have other MPs—and, as one taxpayer said:

> Nobody with an investment property or a holiday home has received any financial gain from the increased values unless, of course, they have sold the property they own.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I have to say that, with 18 minutes to go on the fourth sitting day of question time this week, I finally get a question about land tax, not from the Leader of the Opposition, not from the representative of the shadow treasurer in this place (the member for Davenport) but from the party whip, and I thank the honourable member for the question.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am not being critical of the honourable member, but I thought that, perhaps the member for Hartley, who held a forum in his electorate about this matter, might have asked me the question. The interesting fact is that the shadow treasurer asked a question about this in the upper house, I think, from memory, on Monday. So, questions about this matter were asked by opposition members in the upper house, but it has not been a sufficiently important issue that opposition members felt they should confront me with it in this chamber.

The SPEAKER: Can I help the Acting Premier? The question is whether he has a change of heart. He does not have to comment on the merits or otherwise of inquiries directed to him, nor should he refer to debate in another place.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I am interested because the opposition has been stirring the pot and has held a public forum on this very matter. Of course, from my reports they did not commit themselves to cutting land tax.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Oh, because they are not in government. The land tax issue, like a number of property-based taxes, has been impacted upon by the strengthening property market running longer than any of us had forecast. My colleagues and I are framing a budget, which we are bringing down at the end of May. Matters such as this are appropriately for the budget cycle, and I have no intention of flagging in this place or publicly what I intend to do, if anything, in the forthcoming budget on land tax or any other matter.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Will the Treasurer review the manner in which land tax is assessed on investment properties owned by South Australians for retirement funding? The Liberal Party has been contacted by many South Australians who are complaining about what they feel is an unjust system for property taxes, including a 72-year-old self-funded retiree whose land tax bill has risen from $800 to almost $10 000 in two years. The gentleman in question lives in his own property at Lockleys. Ten years ago he inherited his family home at Henley Beach, which has been in the same family for more than 50 years. He lived in it as a youth and intends passing it on to his children as their inheritance. In a letter to the Liberal Party, he states:

> Having additional property is not necessarily the prerogative of the wealthy. Many working families have purchased a property for financial security in their later years. The recent land tax impost by the government can best be described as excessive and, in my case, extortion.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I thank the member for—

An honourable member: Kavel.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Kavel. I hear so little from that honourable member in this place I could not recall his electorate! I wonder whether members opposite gave the same concern to the very same category of taxpayers. When in government in 1994 the Liberal Party, under the leadership of the deputy leader, dropped the threshold from some $80 000 to $50 000. It is not this government's tax threshold: we are administering tax thresholds put in place by a Liberal government, by members opposite, by the member for Finniss, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. No wonder his head is bowed, because it was the member for Finniss in 1994 who brought the threshold down from $80 000 to $50 000—where it is today. Let us not hear this nonsense from members opposite. They gave us the land tax system we have in this state. That is the system we are administering. With respect to the balance of the question, my earlier answer stands.

CRUISE SHIPS

Mr CAICA (Colton): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. How does our state benefit from cruise ships visiting South Australia?

The SPEAKER: It is an interesting question, but we do not need a travelogue.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for Colton for his interest. I suspect many of his constituents enjoy the sight of cruise ships, and they will be pleased to know that there has been a 30 per cent increase in the number of cruise ships coming to South Australia over the last three years. In fact, the visiting cruise ships are quite a spectacle in themselves, and Outer Harbor has been revamped to receive them over the last few years. Those 12 ships coming this season will bring 17 500 passengers and 7 000 crew to visit Adelaide and also to fly into the regions on short trips to Kangaroo Island, the Barossa Valley and even as far as Port Lincoln. In fact, this week two cruise ships—the *Seven Seas Voyager* and the *Astor*—have come to town and been parked at Outer Harbor for the day. This increase in cruise ship activity has been brought about largely by the activities of the SATC to attract cruise liners to our state. This has been possible because the port facilities are both safe and welcoming; and the welcoming nature of our reception to the cruise ship passengers is significant.

This is one of the fastest growing tourism sectors in the world, with an 8 per cent increase per annum in cruise ship travel, equating to $17 billion around the world. The fact that the passengers are so pleased with the reception they receive in South Australia is a reflection on the people of Adelaide, Semaphore, Henley Beach and Port Adelaide who are actively involved in choirs and bands and setting up the shopping facilities within the terminal, which comprises a series of product outlets for clothing, jewellery, indigenous art, souvenirs, wine and food. It is particularly enhanced by the Riverland Tourism stand, which promotes local produce and travel.

Those people who come to South Australia have benefited from an increase in investment in Outer Harbor in setting up the trading village and, most especially, the collaboration on the Meet and Greet program which was set up by the SATC in partnership with the Port Adelaide Enfield council and the Adelaide City Council and which coordinates volunteers. These are the same volunteers who go to greet the Ghan and who are seen around the streets of Adelaide. Anyone who was out and about shopping yesterday perhaps would have seen large numbers of white and green clad meeters and greeters with hats to match who were greeting the coachloads of passengers who were being brought to Rundle Mall. They were brought to shop on shuttle services run by private transportation, public transportation, prearranged tours and day tours, and large numbers of taxis; in particular, coachloads were brought to Rundle Mall and the passengers spent the morning shopping and the afternoon in the art gallery. The reason cruise ship visitation is so significant is not just that money is spent by the tourists: it is also the provisioning of the ships and the opportunity to showcase South Australia and encourage those visitors to come back again for a second trip—which many of them do.

LAND TAX

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Does the Treasurer stand by his comments, as reported in the *Advertiser* of 23 December 2003, that 'tremendous wealth has been earned by the wider community through property valuation increases'? A constituent has written to me advising that 44 years ago she and her late husband purchased five subdivided blocks of swamp land downstream from Mannum, where they reclaimed the land and established a small boat mooring business. At the age of 74, this widow funds her retirement from the boat mooring business. Her taxable income in 2002-03 was $10 741; her land tax bill for the same year was $8 300. Two years ago, she was forced to sell one of the blocks to maintain the moorings and now she writes:

> I have no wish now or in the future to sell any more of my land as I consider it a legacy for my four children who have always been of considerable help to me maintaining the property.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I certainly stand by the statement that there has been a significant increase in the wealth of this state through rising property values, and that is a very good thing, and that is what you get when you get good government; that is, good economic management, a focus on good budget outcomes, a good focus on job creation, and things such as property value increases spread throughout the wider community, and that is a good thing. I say to my good friend the member for Schubert, a good question, I certainly have no criticism of that, but the last two or three questions in question time in the first week back since the break involved the importance the opposition puts on the land tax issue in this parliament. I will be happy to let everyone who wants to know where the Liberal Party stands on this issue; that is, for one whole week they barely bothered to ask me a question until the very end of a long parliamentary week because that is where their priority lies.

As I said, we are administering a land tax system put in place by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Finniss, who dropped the threshold—

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will come to order! The subject matter, with the tolerance of the chair, has already been provided to the house gratuitously. This is not the subject of the question. The question, if it must be answered at all, I guess has been answered.

Mr VENNING: As a supplementary question; does the Treasurer consider a 74-year old widow whose self-funded retirement income of $10 741 a year is almost eclipsed by her land tax bill of $8 300 to be a person of 'tremendous wealth'?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member asked, if I recall correctly, whether I stand by comments in the *Advertiser* that were (to paraphrase him) talking about the general wealth creation in our community from rising property values. Yes, I do. In the case of this particular person, I do not know the specific details of this case and I do not presume to make comments and judgments about individuals at all—that would be quite wrong. This is an attempt by members opposite to conjure up this particular anomaly or issue as if we are seeing some recent occurrence. We have had a land tax regime for many years in this state brought about by the then premier, now member for Finniss and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps he can explain why he sought to drop the threshold. As I said, I deal—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Oh, the State Bank. The opposition are back on their attack line—the State Bank. I would have thought the State Bank would be wearing a bit thin, but, as I said the other day, it has been a long week. I have copped a lot of criticism. I got a little bit from my own side, a lot from members opposite and plenty from the community, so why not finish the week off by blaming me for the State Bank.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Will the Treasurer refer the issue of land tax payable on commercial properties and the impact that increasing property values will have on commercial tenancies to the Economic Development Board? A September 2003 Property Council of Australia policy position paper on land tax identified several flaws in the land tax system, including that the legal liability for land tax mostly falls on commercial property owners, that because capital is mobile land tax directs investment flows away from commercial property to other assets and international property, and that taxing regimes are an important consideration when investors are choosing to invest their capital, particularly superannuation funds.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I do not refer matters such as that to the Economic Development Board. If the board chooses to make comment about that or investigate that matter it is at liberty to do so.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: They are very smart.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They are very smart people. Members opposite, understandably, have raised matters to do with the impact on residential investment properties for constituents and questioned whether we should cut the tax. Now they are suggesting that we should cut land tax for commercial properties. I say again to members opposite that at some point they will be called to account, and I hope the media will do it. They have just floated the idea of cutting the tax; they have not committed to it. What other tax are they going to increase? What government service are they going to cut? Are they going to blow out the debt?

An opposition can be lazy, but it is no good being lazy with policy and taking the cheap, easy, opportunistic line in opposition. Members opposite have to tell us what tax they are going to increase, what services they are going to cut or whether they will blow out the debt. I may be wrong, and I certainly stand to be corrected, but other members with a longer memory might recall another issue concerning land tax and what Mr Griffin, who was then legal adviser to the Liberal Party, did about land tax payable on Liberal Party headquarters when it was subdivided into a whole lot of titles to get it below the threshold. I might have my facts entirely wrong and I could be talking about another issue, but I do recall an incident when the Liberal Party—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will come to order. His comments have nothing to do with the question.

LOCAL ROAD FUNDING

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning. What were the major outcomes of discussions on intergovernmental issues at the Local Government and Planning Ministerial Council held in Perth earlier this month?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I thank the honourable member for her important question. There was a crucial outcome in relation to the vexed question about which the member for Unley has been campaigning for a long time, and I was aware of it when I was minister for local government, as now is minister McEwen. I refer to the question of financial assistance grants which are received for our councils and which are derived from the federal government and, in particular, our share of local road grant funding.

Most members would be familiar with the statistics. South Australia has something like 11.7 per cent of the national local road network yet we receive only 5.5 per cent of the funding, despite having about 8 per cent of the national population. That was an important breakthrough at that meeting. It appeared at one stage that the states that had the most to lose, that is, New South Wales and Victoria, were troubled by the recommendations of the Hawker report. Its mandate was to consider these matters on a revenue neutral basis, and those states could see that they would be losers out of any readjustment in favour of South Australia. The federal minister opened the door enough to let through a crack of light by suggesting that the outcome may not necessarily have to be revenue neutral.

That changed the whole tenor of the debate and, instead of a range of measures that it could be argued were about pushing this issue off the agenda for some time, there was an immediate resolution to consider these issues in late April 2004. It is on the agenda. A crack of light has appeared. The federal government has indicated that the outcome may not necessarily have to be revenue neutral, and that has brought the large states to the table. There is an enormous amount of work to do, and I pay credit to the work that has been done by both sides of politics and by minister McEwen in his preparation for this meeting. There could be an opportunity for us to get a resolution of this longstanding issue. On a bipartisan basis in the lead-up to the April 2004 ministerial council meeting of local government ministers, we should put a joint position to our federal colleagues and bring to bear any influence we have on the other states.

SOUTH COAST DISTRICT HOSPITAL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Yesterday the member for Finniss raised a number of issues concerning funding for surgery and surgery lists at the South Coast District Hospital. This year, country health region budgets increased by an average of 4.83 per cent, and I wish to provide the house with specific information about budgets for surgery in Victor Harbor and how they are managed. Surgical lists and operating theatre planning are carried out at the South Coast District Hospital in collaboration with the surgeons, in accordance with a very extensive and agreed set of protocols. This year the initial budget for fee for service surgery at the South Coast District Hospital was $428 000, and surgeons were provided with advice about their individual fee for service budgets in July 2003. This process was introduced two years ago because surgeons felt it would give them the ability to schedule their lists over the financial year.

Monthly budget reports are issued by the hospital to keep surgeons informed, and there is regular communication between the hospital and the surgeons. The important point is that, while the hospital aims to manage services within budget, there will be no denial of access for any emergency or urgent surgery capable of being done at Victor Harbor. This has been confirmed by the Area Health Manager, who has—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Mr Speaker, I am having a great deal of difficulty getting through this with the interjections of the member for Finniss.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has leave. I do not want to make life miserable for other members but, if they persist in attempting to do that to the minister, that will be the consequence.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Thank you, sir. This has been confirmed by the Area Health Manager, who has confirmed that, while lists may be changed for a variety of reasons, including changes made by the surgeons, any request for urgent surgery is facilitated. The scheduling of lists is a collaborative and ongoing process. In January, the hospital executive contacted five out of 27 surgeons who were overspending their budgets to rearrange lists. This is not a new process. It is responsible management. Surgeons who are in this position have the opportunity to adjust their lists and add urgent cases to any other list to ensure that they are managed in a timely manner. Surgeons over budget in January were also advised that the private hospital was not affected. Surgeons make the clinical call and may move a non-urgent case in order to accommodate an urgent one. It is the surgeons who maintain the lists.

In January, the budget for surgical activity was increased by $90 000, bringing the new total to $518 000. This is an increase of 21 per cent over the previous financial year. The Area Health Manager has confirmed that there has been no denial of access for any emergency and urgent surgery capable of being undertaken at the hospital, and this will continue to be the case. One specialist who had overspent his pro rata budget in the first six months had four forward lists cancelled, and the member for Finniss told the house yesterday that this resulted in the cancellation of surgery for nine cancer patients and two other patients requiring urgent surgery.

I have been advised by the Area Health Manager that, while the hospital was not previously advised that these patients were urgent, it has agreed to arrange lists with this specialist for any urgent surgery (including for these patients) to be undertaken. This is expected to be finalised today. The South Coast District Hospital's surgeons and doctors have worked collaboratively for many years managing their surgery lists, and this year the budget for surgery has been increased by 21 per cent. The member for Finniss could have established this information by telephoning his own hospital, but of course instead he went for the cheap headline.

EASTERN MOUNT LOFTY RANGES

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: Yesterday, the member for Finniss asked me a question about the prescription of the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges and I undertook to get a response for him. As members would be aware, the government intends to prescribe the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges. The proposed area lies within the catchment of the River Murray Catchment Water Management Board. I must say that the boundaries of that board were established by the former minister for water resources, the Hon. Mark Brindal. This proposal continues the work commenced by the former government to manage the state's water resources and is in accordance with the Water Resources Act 1997. The current water-based levy provisions were introduced with the enactment of the 1997 act during the former government's term of power.

There are 19 prescribed areas across the state, and most of these prescribed resources have had water-based levies introduced. The River Murray Catchment Water Management Board currently has a water-based levy in place for licensees in the prescribed areas within its boundary, such as the River Murray prescribed watercourse and the Angas Bremer prescribed wells area. The rate of the levy in these prescribed areas is 0.35¢ per kilolitre of water allocated. The revenue raised goes to the board to fund its water management programs, which include: preparation and implementation of water allocation plans; water use efficiency and irrigation management (including on-farm assistance to improve irrigation water use efficiency); and salinity, flow and water quality management.

If the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges region is prescribed, any decision to raise a water-based levy would be made on the advice of the River Murray Catchment Water Management Board (or its successor). I point out to the house that this process was put into legislation by the Liberal Party when it was in government. The board would make a recommendation to the minister that he or she should establish a levy. The amount of the levy would be set out in the board's annual review of its catchment water management plan and must be considered by the Economic and Finance Committee of parliament.

Given that the board currently has a water-based levy in place for licensees in its prescribed areas, it could be expected that the board would seek to implement a levy in the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges if that region is prescribed. Similarly, it is likely that any such levy will be consistent with the levy rates in the board's other prescribed areas. If the region is prescribed and water allocation planning its commenced, it is likely to be another two to three years before licences are issued and a levy could be implemented. It is important to note that the act specifically states that a levy cannot be raised on water used for stock and domestic purposes. Ensuring a sustainable resource base to support production in the region has a cost. The imposition of a levy on commercial water use (that is, non-stock and domestic use) to pay for that sustainable management is not unreasonable.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Perhaps the member should express his conflict of interest before he interjects on this issue.

SOUTH COAST DISTRICT HOSPITAL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister for Health in her ministerial statement said that the member for Finniss could have established information by telephoning his own hospital. I point out to the minister that I met with the CEO of the South Coast District Hospital last Friday and had a discussion with him for about an hour and a half on a whole range of issues. So, any suggestion that I had not spoken to the CEO is quite incorrect.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

MEALS ON WHEELS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I had the distinct pleasure yesterday of attending the Glenelg North Meals on Wheels kitchen where I accompanied some of the staff there to serve their one millionth meal. I would like to thank Cam Pearce, the CEO of Meals on Wheels, for inviting me to serve the one millionth meal to Miss Vanda Crofton of Maturin Road, Glenelg. We had morning tea, and I was able to inspect the kitchens and talk to some of the staff. Mrs Margaret Jones and Mrs Faye Veale, Kitchen Supervisors, and Mr Tony Eitzen, Branch Chair, were very helpful in explaining the way in which they organise the kitchens and the state-of-the-art equipment they use. They remarked that the Holdfast Bay council health inspector had scheduled a two-hour visit and by the time he checked off everything on his list there was not one thing that he had to tell them to correct, and he was exemplary in his remarks. That is an indictment of the dedication of the volunteers involved in Meals on Wheels.

I understand that Meals on Wheels in South Australia has served over 35 million meals. They do this at a cost of about $4.50 a meal, because they use volunteers. Unfortunately, the Victorian government has introduced legislation so that volunteers are no longer used in Meals on Wheels kitchens, and the cost of meals in that state has risen by about 50 per cent to over $6 a meal, but volunteers still deliver the meals. We have volunteer cooks and volunteer drivers and helpers to deliver the meals to the thousands of South Australians who benefit from this service.

I spoke to some of the volunteers and some of the paid staff at Meals on Wheels about the new Australian and New Zealand Food Standards, which the federal government has introduced and which have been ratified by the state government. The standards that have been introduced under the new Food Act (which we passed through this place last year) will have a huge effect on the way the kitchens are managed. The volunteer staff are concerned about the shift in liability. They do their utmost to make sure that nutritious meals are prepared and served hot to recipients. They are concerned that they will be forced into a situation similar to that in Victoria where they will not be able to provide meals unless they come from certified suppliers, and that will reduce the number of suppliers so that some people's businesses will suffer as a result of these regulations.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: I am informed by the member for Finniss that the former Liberal government gave an undertaking that the volunteers at Meals on Wheels would not have to suffer under the draconian Australian and New Zealand Food Safety Standards, because some of these standards are right out of the ballpark. I hope the Labor government does exactly the same thing because, if the caring, compassionate and considerate outlook of these volunteers for the people to whom they deliver is in any way harmed, I can see many of these volunteers saying that it is just not worth it and they will have to stop this service.

I was lucky to attend a general meeting of the Brighton Meals on Wheels at which people were awarded badges for 15, 20, 25—and in one case 35—years of dedicated service to Meals on Wheels. This is a service which all South Australians should support. I admit that I have not had an opportunity to go out and help deliver meals, other than this one millionth meal. I certainly will be going and making a point of assisting in the kitchens where I can and, if I can be of assistance to Meals on Wheels in my area, I will offer to deliver some meals, because I was very impressed by the way the kitchens are organised and the dedication of the staff. It was certainly a delight to go down to Maturin Road and visit Miss Crofton and deliver this one millionth meal. I commend Meals on Wheels, the staff at Glenelg North and the other branches around the state, as well as Cam Pearce for his efforts.

GATECRASHERS

Mr CAICA (Colton): Last Saturday my wife and I went to a wedding and, earlier in the week, my son James asked whether he could have a small party at home with about 20 guests, including his older cousin and a couple of his friends who are about 19 years of age. We were a little bit apprehensive about the idea because we would not be home: however, we trust and love our son and when I thought about the circumstances when I was growing up, I was certainly left to my own devices and was proven to be a trustworthy son. So, whilst we were apprehensive, we thought everything would be all right—and everything did go all right for a period of time. But things went horribly astray, and I want to focus on what happened.

It seems that after a period of time there might have been 50 people hanging around the front of the house who wanted entry to the party and, of course, they were told, 'No, it's a private show. You are not invited. Please go away.' There was milling around, drinking, hoon driving and circumstances such as this. I also understand that, inside in this small private party, according to our neighbours, everything was going well and everyone was well behaved. There was a little bit of loud music but certainly the behaviour was appropriate. Most people outside milling around respected the views of those people inside the party—my son James and his cousin—and did not come in.

But at about 11.30 p.m. about 11 or 12 youths decided they were going to gain entry. Despite being asked not to come in, they decided to come in and enjoy the festivities—unfortunately, at the expense of those already there. Unfortunately, they were less than respectful and did not pay attention to what is good social behaviour. As I said, this was around midnight, maybe a little bit earlier. The boys in this group of about a dozen were all about 18 years. In the half hour they were there, they forced one of the lads on his knees and said, 'You apologise.' The young boy asked, 'Apologise for what?' We assume it was because he looked at them the wrong way. They stole CDs and, when asked to return them, were told, 'You can get half of them back.' The leader of this group had a knife and brought it out. Despite the fact that there was no fighting or anything like that, one of the boys (one of my son's mates) got a minor cut on the arm. It was not a serious cut but, still, it was a wound from a knife. And on the way out they damaged my wife's car.

They left after about half an hour. I thought, 'Why would they leave when, seemingly, they are having a good time at the expense of others?', and it was because James had rung the police and done the right thing. I congratulate the police for getting there in a very short period of time. I also congratulate some of James' mates, in particular his cousin Dale, and Stewie and Alex and a few others, for not provoking the situation further. They let these people do what they

wanted on the basis that they knew that if they provoked them further they would want nothing more than to have a fight. So, I congratulate them on being rational and sizing up the situation and saying, 'They are only going to cause trouble,' because it would have been very easy to have given one of them a thumping and then all hell might well have broken loose. So, they chose not to inflame the situation and I congratulate them for that and am very proud of their efforts in that regard.

There is a problem, I understand, with party crashers in Adelaide and throughout South Australia. How do they know a party is on? Text messages. They mill around out the front. I am coming to understand, from discussions I have held since that time, that indeed some people hire security guards to ensure that these gatecrashers will not gain entry. So, on occasions, you have to hire thugs to ensure that thugs do not come in.

One of the points that I want to make is that it happens quite often. I guess that the major point that I want to make is: what is the future for these people who do not have self-esteem or a level of respect for other people's properties and the way other people conduct themselves? What will happen to these 16, 17 and 18 year olds who do not have that level of self-respect? In my view, they will become anti-social adults. It is extremely important that we look at mechanisms by which processes can be put in place for early intervention and early identification to ensure that these people do have the level of self-esteem and respect required to respect other people. It might well sound like rhetoric at this point in time and I do not know how it will occur. I applaud what Mark Latham and the Premier have said in respect of education and young adults, but I know it has to be a whole-of-community effort to ensure that we produce children who understand what is proper behaviour and what is a proper social outlook on life.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): First, having listened to the contribution of the member for Colton, I sympathise with him and his family for that happening: it is one of those things that should not happen. I have arranged a 21st birthday party for my daughter this Saturday night. It is totally unacceptable and we have to all work together to ensure that that is addressed. I do not think that any family having a function should have to put up with that, and the notion of having to hire security guards to have a function in your own home is unthinkable in this day and age and is certainly an issue that needs addressing.

I would like to address WorkCover and, Mr Speaker, will be careful not to cut across the areas that you are looking at. I think that, overall, WorkCover is a major concern at the moment. I think that financially, claims management-wise, and in a whole range of other areas, WorkCover has some major problems. Bruce Carter took over as chair late last year, and I hope that the board and management can work together to get on top of some of the issues. I think it will require a fair effort to turn around some of the things that are happening because at the moment it seems that several areas are somewhat out of control.

Some doubts about the modes of operation were expressed today. It is up to courts or other tribunals in the future to decide some of these issues, but some of the allegations have been quite worrying. We have been told over the last few days the story about the wife of a WorkCover claimant who was interviewed by detectives from Adelaide CIB and an investigation into whether or not WorkCover had breached section 19AA of the criminal law act which relates to stalking. I know they have been to see police and interviews have been held. Basically, as I said, it is up to the police and the courts to work that out, but it is a pretty serious breach and carries a penalty of three years' gaol, and we hope that WorkCover has a good review of the way they handle these cases.

In relation to the issue of the surveillance of this same couple when they holidayed in France, we do not argue about the legitimacy of WorkCover's taking reasonable measures to ensure that the scheme is not rorted. We all agree with that and if, in fact, it can be shown by WorkCover that in these instances that is what happened, so be it, but suggestions made to us and other calls which have come in today as a result of some of the publicity that has occurred are worrying. There are other instances of alleged stalking and several other issues which need to be followed through to ensure that if, in fact, they occurred, they do not recur.

I think that the mode of operation of WorkCover needs to be thorough and they need to ensure that people are not rorting the system; but, also, first, they have to ensure that they stay well and truly within the law and, secondly, they need to respect the rights of South Australians. There are some malingerers on the system and it would be great to see them weeded out, but there are also a lot of people in the system who have been injured, and legitimately injured, in the course of their work and it is not good enough if they are then stalked or molested or intimidated as they go about trying to go on with or rebuild their lives: I do not think that is fair. Let us see what comes out of some of the current investigations.

However, I think there is quite a bit of room for concern over some of the issues that have been raised with us. We will wait with some expectation to see what the minister may bring back to the parliament. The minister basically has a range of obligations with WorkCover. To ensure that this is cleaned up is one thing, but we really do need to get busy on WorkCover. We have been told recently that there will not be quarterly reports. I find that extremely disappointing. I think that quarterly reports are the accountability mechanism, because, as we saw last year, WorkCover can blow out by about $400 million in one year. If, in fact, the 2003-04 year will not be reported on until the end of 2004, then that is 18 months of operation without any checks or balances as to how the scheme is travelling financially. I do not think that is good enough. Claims management is also seen as a major issue.

Time expired.

HOMELESSNESS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I want to commend the *Southern Times* Messenger for its front page article, 'Generation Gap: big housing hole hurts homeless.' All the Messengers are covering the issue of lack of homes in their current editions, and I was pleased to see the effectiveness of the story from the south. Members who have been here for a while will know that, during the period of the previous government, I frequently raised the issue of the sale of Housing Trust homes and the way homes were not being replaced.

The Hon. Dean Brown: The number of homes dropped further during your government.

Ms THOMPSON: We lost 8 000 homes during the period of the previous government. The minister during that time constantly refused to acknowledge that there was a problem. He spent all his time arguing about whether I had got the last 10 digits right in my figures. He did not deal with the problem. I recognised that the previous minister had the same problem as the current minister.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I rise on a point of order. I wonder if it is parliamentary for the Deputy Leader to keep shouting 'hypocrite' across the floor?

The SPEAKER: No, but it is not unparliamentary; it is disorderly. I did not hear the remark. The honourable member for Reynell.

Ms THOMPSON: To start with, I recognise that the previous minister had the same problem that the current minister has to deal with, that is, the reduction in commonwealth funding through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. I overheard members opposite in their discourse, and it was approximately 8 000 homes that were lost during the period of the previous government. I do not mind how many times I have to say it. It will not stop me talking about the problems that the opposition caused. There are plenty more days in which I can spin out this discussion about the problems that we have in housing caused by the Howard government combined with the competence of the previous government and their failure to acknowledge how so many people were hurting.

The current minister is addressing the problem. She at least acknowledges that there is a problem. The Premier acknowledges that homelessness is a major issue and referred it to the Social Inclusion Unit. Unfortunately, problems that were created over eight years do not get solved in two years, and this is a problem that the opposition has yet to acknowledge. I think it is important that we recognise the personal disasters that are caused by the loss of the 8 000 homes under the previous government. The fact that we could not turn that around in an instant is not to be wondered at when they had already set the direction. The turning around of the Queen Elizabeth still takes some time.

In the south, there are 981 young people on Housing Trust waiting lists. Forty of those have been assessed as being in crisis. Many people wonder how they get there. For some of them, it is because they have been kicked out of home. There seems to be a notion among some members of the community that they have an obligation to provide for their children until they are 16, and that, after that, it is out you go. This is particularly a problem where there are stepfathers present. They seem at times—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: Of course, not always, but at times they seem to resent the presence of another young man, in particular, in the house and kick him out at 16. I also speak to young people who very reluctantly leave home, or at least stay away for long periods of time, because they get beaten there on a frequent basis. They have people in their home who get drunk or are affected by drugs, and they beat them. So, they do not feel safe at home. Those are just some of the people who are homeless. Others are young people who set out to start a family, but there is a problem. One of them loses a job, and they simply cannot keep up their private rental payments. I would be very happy to continue these remarks on another occasion.

Time expired.

ASBESTOS REMOVAL REGULATIONS

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Before I bring up an important issue in my area, I would like to refer to the Treasurer's comments about a meeting that was held in my electorate and the fact that I had not come up with a question. I want to apologise if I misled the house, because, on Monday, I did the first grieve for the opposition, and it was on land tax. So, I think the Deputy Premier should apologise. It is a pity, because—and I quote from *Hansard*:

> I am pleased that the Treasurer is listening, and I am sure that the Minister for Infrastructure briefed him on the outrage with which he was faced at that community meeting. A common problem for all was the fact that the land tax thresholds have not been increased in line with large property value increases.

So, I wanted to put that on the record. Obviously, I gave him too much credit. He was not listening on Monday.

Today, I want to bring up a problem about which a constituent, Mrs Helen Meyer of Magill, contacted my office concerning the demolition of old housing stock in the area which often contains asbestos. She is angry at the lack of regulation of owner/builders compared with the regulation of areas of public buildings and licensed asbestos removal companies. She feels that there appears to be a lack of protection for the public and that the current legislation focuses only on occupational health and safety aspects.

I understand that the government has signalled that it will introduce a SafeWork SA bill this session. Mrs Meyer is very concerned about the demolition in the vicinity of her home of old housing containing asbestos. I went out to see the problem in the area and I looked at one particular demolition site. She considers that infill developments, and I agree with her, will see an increasing number of such cases. She has spoken to Workplace Services inspectors and considers the existing legislation inadequate, as renovation work undertaken by individuals is not regulated.

In her letter to me she states that anyone can remove up to 199 square metres of asbestos sheeting from any one building without having a licence and without any requirement for public liability coverage. Although there are guidelines, individuals are not required to comply with safety guidelines. In comparison, contractors must be licensed and comply. Mrs Meyer considers that current legislation is focused on workers and employees and does not protect the wider public. I understand that the asbestos register also relates only to non-residential property, as my constituent has also highlighted, and it is inconsistent in addressing asbestos related risk in public buildings whilst not doing so for private homes.

I believe that a broad legislative approach is necessary in order to address these issues associated with demolition by unlicensed persons, including owner/builders, which may give rise to hazards for neighbours. Given that we have regulations through the EPA designed to protect neighbours from noise—for example, lawn-mowers in the early hours of the morning and on a Sunday—it would seem overdue that as far as practicable neighbours should be protected from dust arising from demolition, including where asbestos materials are encountered. But it is not only asbestos: there are other materials such as fibreglass insulation and general dust which may cause problems for asthma suffers, etc. Perhaps there could be letterboxing. There should be a warning so that if someone is walking with their child in a pram and they know that there will be or has been a demolition in the area, then they can avoid it. Neighbours specifically should be given

warning when such work is to be undertaken in order to take appropriate precautions. Owners should be informed of hazards in a more systematic way and precautionary measures put in place. There could possibly be a community education campaign. A review of current threshold levels requiring professional removal should be undertaken. Clean-up of sites should be undertaken in a prompt manner so that demolition waste does not remain on site, and perhaps we should look at making sure that this compliance takes place with building approvals. I commend Mrs Meyer for bring it to my attention.

BOYS, MALE ROLE MODELS

Mr SNELLING (Playford): One of the biggest concerns that I have in my electorate is boys who are growing up without any male role models, and I am ashamed to say that, to a large extent, boys who clearly do not have any male role models in their life are the source of many of the problems in my electorate. They tend to hang around in gangs, they leave school early and they have fairly low rates of training or of going on to further eduction. As a recent father of a son—my previous two children were girls—it has amazed me how different boys are from girls, even at such a very young age, and how they have very different needs. My son has very different needs and has a very different personality from that of his two older sisters. I have been rather a fan of the author Steve Biddulph—who, I think, is a psychologist by profession—whose book *Raising Boys* has been quite an inspiration to me. I do not agree with quite everything he has to say, but he has done a very good job of highlighting the importance of boys having daily interaction with either their father or some other male role model.

I bring this up because yesterday the federal leader of the parliamentary Labor Party, Mark Latham, gave a fairly wide-ranging speech to the National Press Club. I do not want to caricature the speech, because it was not merely about boys and their need for male role models; however, what he did say on that subject was very interesting, and I will quote from that speech as follows:

> Those who have suffered most from the decline of social and personal relationships tend to be boys. Their school retention rates lag well behind girls. Their literacy levels are lower. And in disproportionate numbers, they are the victims of drug overdoses, road trauma and youth suicide.
>
> Our boys are suffering from a crisis of masculinity. As blue-collar muscle jobs have declined, their identity and relationships have become blurred and confused. We need to give our boys a new centre to their lives—one grounded in community support and mentoring.
>
> But this isn't just about boys. Girls need our help too. They have a different set of problems, from sexual assault to bulimia and worries about body image. Young women need stronger relationships and self-esteem to help them deal with these issues.
>
> In practice, however, people talk more about the trouble with boys because it is more visible. It's on our streets and in our public places. And when things go wrong, very often the victims are female.
>
> We all have an interest in overcoming this problem. There are one million single mothers in Australia with sons entering adolescence who know better than most how boys can benefit from the steadying influence and discipline of a male role model.

Mr Latham then goes on to talk about mentoring as a way of overcoming this crisis, which he has rightly identified. I would also add to that that I think that perhaps we need to look at why so many boys are growing up effectively fatherless, and—while I could speculate—I would be very interested to know what the reasons are for that problem.

I would also like to highlight a program in my own electorate which, I think, is doing something to overcome this crisis in masculinity. It is the vocational education program and, in particular, the doorways to construction and engineering skills program at the Para Hills High School. It is doing so much for young men at that school to help and encourage them to stay at school and to continue their studies. It is giving them studies which are more relevant to them, which are something that they enjoy and which encourage them to stay at school. This program is open not just to boys, of course, but it is particularly aimed at those boys who do not find much excitement in sitting in a classroom all day.

CROWN LANDS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Page 3—After line 5 insert new clause as follows:

Minister to advise lease holders of effect of Act

2A. (1) The Minister responsible for the administration of the principal Act must, as soon as practicable after the commencement of this Act (and, in any case, within one month of that commencement), ensure that a written notice is sent to each person who has made a relevant application advising him or her—

(a) of the effect of this Act; and

(b) of the person's right to withdraw the application.

(2) In this section—.

'relevant application' means an application under section 212 of the principal Act to surrender a perpetual lease of land and purchase the fee simple where—

(a) the application was lodged before the commencement of this Act; but

(b) the lease has not been surrendered.

No. 2. Page 3—After line 24 insert new clause as follows:

Insertion of s. 34

6A. The following section is inserted after section 33 of the principal Act:

Rent may be paid in advance

34. Despite any provision to the contrary in this Act or any other Act or in a perpetual lease, the lessee may pay instalments of rent due under the lease in advance of the times specified in the lease (provided that such instalments are in respect of a period not exceeding 25 years).

No. 3. Page 4—After line 17 insert new clause as follows:

Amendment of s. 212—Power of lessee to surrender lease and purchase the fee simple

9A. Section 212 of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsections(2) and(3) and substituting:

(2) If an application is lodged under this section—

(a) in the case of an application relating to a perpetual lease of land situated outside of Metropolitan Adelaide or a prescribed miscellaneous lease—the application must be dealt with in accordance with Schedule 14; or

(b) in the case of any other application—the application must be dealt with as follows:

(i) if the Minister approves the application, the board must recommend to the Minister, and the Minister must fix, the sum at which the fee simple of the land may be purchased and must give written notice of that sum to the applicant;

(ii) the applicant must, within three months after the giving of such notice, notify the Minister whether he or she accepts or refuses the terms offered;

(iii) if the applicant accepts the terms offered and, within one month(or such longer period as may be allowed by the Minister) after notifying the Minister of that acceptance, surrenders the lease and pays the purchase money and any other fees that are payable in relation to the transaction, the applicant is entitled to receive a land grant for the land.

(3) In this section—

'Metropolitan Adelaide' has the same meaning as in the *Development Act 1993;*

'prescribed miscellaneous lease' means a miscellaneous lease of land that is used for cropping or is of a class prescribed by regulation.

No. 4. Page 4—After line 27 insert new clauses as follow:

Amendment of s. 225—Leases and agreements may not be transferred, assigned or sublet without consent of the Minister

10A. Section 225 of the principal Act is amended by inserting '(other than a perpetual lease)' after 'lease'.

Amendment of s. 226—Non-validity of agreements to transfer etc leases and agreements

10B. Section 226 of the principal Act is amended by inserting '(other than a perpetual lease)' after 'lease'.

Insertion of ss. 227A and 227B

10C. The following sections are inserted before section 227A of the principal Act(which is now to be redesignated as section 227C):

No consent required to transfer etc perpetual lease

227A. Despite any provision to the contrary in this Act or any other Act or in a perpetual lease, the consent of the Minister is not required to the transfer, assignment, subletting, encumbering or mortgaging of a perpetual lease, except where the Minister holds a mortgage over the lease.

No fees payable in respect of transfer following death of lessee

227B. Where a perpetual lease is required to be transferred because of the death of the lessee, no fees are payable under this Act in respect of the transfer.

No. 5. Page 5, lines 1 to 7(clause 13)—Leave out the clause and insert new clauses as follow:

Amendment of Schedule 3

13. Schedule 3 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out paragraph VI of clause 2;

(b) by striking out paragraph III of clause 3.

Amendment of Schedule 12

13A.(1) Schedule 12 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out paragraph XVI of clause 2;

(b) by striking out paragraph III of clause 3.

Insertion of Schedule 14

13B. The following Schedule is inserted after Schedule 13 of the principal Act:

Schedule 14—Freeholding of perpetual and prescribed miscellaneous leases

Interpretation

1.(1) In this Schedule—

'contiguous land'—see subclauses(2) and(3);

'council' means a council within the meaning of the *Local Government Act 1999*;

'non-residential land' means land that—

(a) is not used for residential purposes; or

(b) is more than one hectare in area;

'residential land' means land that—

(a) is used for residential purposes; and

(b) is one hectare or less in area;

'statutory encumbrance' means any of the following:

(a) an Aboriginal heritage agreement entered into under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988*;

(b) an agreement relating to the management, preservation or conservation of land lodged under Part 5 of the *Development Act 1993*;

(c) an agreement or proclamation registered or noted on the title to land immediately before the commencement of the *Development Act 1993* that is continued in force by virtue of the provisions of the *Statutes Repeal and Amendment(Development) Act 1993*;

(d) a heritage agreement entered into under the *Heritage Act 1993*;

(e) a heritage agreement entered into under the *Native Vegetation Act 1991*;

(f) an access agreement entered into under the *Recreational Greenways Act 2000*;

(g) any other encumbrance created by statute and prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition;

'waterfront land' means—

(a) land extending from the low water mark on the seashore to the nearest road or section boundary, or to a distance of 50 metres from high water mark(whichever is the lesser distance); or

(b) land extending from the edge of any other navigable waterway or body of water in the State to the nearest road or section boundary or for a distance of 50 metres(whichever is the lesser distance).

(2) For the purposes of this Schedule, land will be regarded as being contiguous to other land if the land—

(a) abuts on the other land at any point; or

(b) is separated from the other land only by—

(i) a road, street, lane, footway, court, alley, railway or thoroughfare; or

(ii) a watercourse or channel; or

(iii) a reserve or other similar open space.

(3) A group of parcels of land constitute contiguous land if each parcel is contiguous to one or more of the other parcels in the group.

Minister must approve application

2. On receipt of an application to which this Schedule applies, the Minister must approve the application and—

(a) give a written offer to the applicant—

(i) specifying the amount payable by the applicant, in accordance with this Schedule, as the purchase price for the fee simple of the land to which the application relates; and

(ii) setting out any other terms and conditions applicable to the purchase of the fee simple of the land; and

(b) provide, with the written offer, a notice advising the applicant to obtain professional advice in relation to the application and the terms and conditions proposed by the Minister.

Purchase price

3.(1) Where this Schedule applies to an application for the surrender of a lease and the purchase of the fee simple of land, the purchase price for the fee simple of the land will, despite any provision in the lease, be fixed in accordance with this clause.

(2) Subject to this clause, the purchase price for the fee simple of land on surrender of a lease will be the prescribed purchase price.

(3) If—

(a) an applicant lodges more than one application relating to non-residential land at the same time; or

(b) a number of applications are lodged at the same time by different applicants relating to land that—

(i) is contiguous land or is situated within the same council area; and

(ii) is used for the purpose of carrying on the business of primary production; and

(iii) is managed as a single unit for that purpose,

the purchase price in relation to each application will be the prescribed multiple purchase price.

(4) If the applicant is a council and the land the subject of the application is used to provide community services or facilities, the purchase price that would otherwise be payable under this clause in relation to the land must be waived.

(5) If the land the subject of the application is subject to a statutory encumbrance, a pro rata adjustment must be made to the purchase price payable under this clause in relation to the land by applying the proportion that the area of the land that is subject to the statutory encumbrance bears to the total area of the land(and rounding the resulting amount to the nearest dollar).

(6) If the lease contains a provision fixing a purchase price in relation to the land that is less than the purchase price that would (but for this subclause) be payable under this clause in relation to the land, the purchase price will be the amount fixed in accordance with the lease.

(7) In this clause—

'CPI' means the Consumer Price Index (All Groups) for the City of Adelaide published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics;

'indexation factor', in relation to an application, means 1 or the quotient obtained by dividing the CPI for the quarter ending 30 September in the year immediately preceding the year in which the application is lodged by the CPI for the quarter ending 30 September 2002, whichever is the greater;

'prescribed multiple purchase price', in relation to an application that is lodged at the same time as other applications in accordance with subclause (3), means—

(a) where not more than six applications are lodged—an amount calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$\frac{\$2000}{N} \times IF$$

(b) where more than six applications but not more than 10 applications are lodged—an amount calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$\frac{\$2000 + [\$300 \times (N - 6)]}{N} \times IF$$

(c) where more than 10 applications are lodged—an amount calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$\frac{\$3200 + [\$200 \times (N - 10)]}{N} \times IF$$

Where—

is the indexation factor for the application;

N is the total number of applications lodged at the same time(in accordance with subclause (3));

'prescribed purchase price', in relation to an application, means—

(a) in the case of residential land—an amount calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$1 500 × IF

(b) in the case of non-residential land—an amount calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$2 000 × IF

Where—

IF is the indexation factor for the application.

Other terms and conditions

4.(1) Subject to this clause, an offer under clause 2 may specify such other terms and conditions in relation to the surrender of a lease and the purchase of the fee simple of land as the Minister thinks fit.

(2) If the land the subject of an application to which this Schedule applies is waterfront land, the offer must not require the applicant to obtain a survey of the land or to pay the costs of survey of the land.

Resolution of disputes

5.(1) If an applicant objects to the terms of an offer made in accordance with clause 2, the applicant may notify the Minister and the Minister must refer the offer to an independent person (appointed by the Minister on terms and conditions determined by the Minister) to review the offer and to determine whether it complies with this Schedule and is otherwise reasonable.

(2) A person reviewing an offer under this clause may make such recommendations to the Minister in relation to the offer as he or she thinks fit.

(3) The Minister may, following a review, revoke the offer the subject of the review and issue a new written offer in accordance with clause 2.

Acceptance of offer and completion of purchase

6.(1) An offer made in accordance with clause 2 in relation to any land remains valid for three months from the date on which the offer is sent to the applicant, or for such longer period as the Minister may allow.

(2) The applicant may accept the offer by giving a written notice of acceptance to the Minister within the period allowed by subclause(1) .

(3) If an offer is accepted by an applicant and, within 12 months of the Minister receiving the written notice of acceptance, the applicant completes the purchase by—

(a) surrendering the lease; and

(b) paying the purchase price; and

(c) satisfying any other terms and conditions of the offer, the applicant is entitled to receive a land grant for the land.

(4) If the Minister is satisfied (by such evidence as the Minister may require) that an applicant will suffer financial hardship as a result of being required to complete the purchase within the time specified in subclause (3), the Minister must allow the applicant three years (or such lesser period as the applicant may require) within which to complete the purchase.

No. 6. Page 6—After line 3 insert new clause as follows:

Transitional provision

15.(1) Section 212 of the principal Act, as amended by this Act, applies in relation to a relevant application as if that application had been lodged after the commencement of this Act.

(2) In this section—

'relevant application' means an application under section 212 of the principal Act to surrender a perpetual lease of land and purchase the fee simple where—

(a) the application was lodged before the commencement of this Act; but

(b) the lease has not been surrendered at the date of commencement of this Act.

ZERO WASTE SA BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

MOTOR VEHICLES (SUSPENSION OF LICENSES OF MEDICALLY UNFIT DRIVERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 44.)

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise to indicate opposition support of this bill. This is a fairly sensitive issue out in the community and, as the minister indicated in his second reading explanation, when this area of the Motor Vehicles Act was amended in 1999 to implement the National Driver Licensing Schemes section 88(1) and (2) allowing the registrar to impose and remove a licence suspended, this area was inadvertently removed.

This bill puts back into the act a provision which was there prior to 1999 and, for that and other reasons, the opposition supports it. It is, however, a very delicate area because it places upon a medical practitioner, a physiotherapist or an optometrist quite a level of responsibility in informing the registrar that a person no longer has the faculties that make them a competent driver on the road. Of course, we all know that, at some stage of our life, that will probably happen to us. We hope that it will be as late as possible so that we maintain that independence, but it is an area when, in their older years, many people lose that independence and, obviously, try to hang on to it for as long as they can.

However, as a result, it places the medical practitioner or other health professional in a position of some difficulty. Often that health professional is the family doctor and, of course, people rely on their driver's licence to go to the shops and do various other social activities. The doctor is then suggesting they can no longer undertake to drive themselves. It is an area in which the medical fraternity, I know, would love a different outcome. It is for that reason, following discussions in our party room, I undertook some research as to what happens in other countries, namely, New Zealand and other states, as well as England.

That research indicated that everywhere bar England the same process is used as is used here, but in England the matter is referred to a regional board, which will determine

whether the person is fit and able to drive a car. That takes the decision out of the hands of the family doctor, optometrist or physiotherapist. It does remove that one section but, of course, that does introduce another level of bureaucracy which adds to the cost, so I would not be recommending we go down that path at all. As I said, while we can try to move the responsibility away from a health professional, that cannot occur because they are the only people who are medically qualified to give a professional opinion on whether someone is fit to drive.

Of course, a family member can always advise the registrar that they believe their father, mother or a person within their family is not capable of driving. The registrar can then advise the person that, within 14 days, he intends to suspend their licence and that they will then need to provide medical evidence to show why that cannot happen. That person then has the ability to go to their doctor, and if the test the doctor undertakes shows they are still quite capable to drive they would be able to keep their licence. However, if that is not the case, this then gives the registrar the ability to suspend the licence.

A person can appeal to a review committee if the registrar suspends the licence, and if that review is not a positive outcome the person can appeal to the court. A system is in place whereby they can seek justice if they believe they should be able to continue to drive. An instance arose when we were discussing this matter, and I spoke with the minister's staff about it. Perhaps the minister can answer my question in his reply to this debate. A person goes to their family doctor who decides that that person should not continue to drive. The person then goes off to another doctor who has no family history whatsoever, and we have been told that this situation has occurred.

That doctor will then say, 'Yes, I believe you are fit to drive.' You then have conflicting opinions. A judgment needs to be made but who makes that judgment? I am aware that the minister should be able to provide that answer, and I ask that, in his reply to this debate, the minister put that on the record rather than requiring a committee on this bill. The registrar receives a number of notifications each week and, as the minister has said, that is running at around 50. This is a significant issue. For instance, if someone has suffered a stroke or some other medical impairment, which means they are not in a fit position to drive, the registrar does need that power to be able immediately to suspend a licence on notification from the doctor or from some other source.

That person could potentially be a danger on the road and cause the death of or severe injury to some other person or themselves. The opposition has pleasure in supporting this bill. As I said, the provision was part of the old bill and it was then inadvertently removed. I believe that this measure gives the registrar the power he requires to ensure that the licence of those people who are not capable of driving on our roads can be suspended following due process.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I think that, in some ways, in our society the right to drive a motor vehicle is probably issued too lightly, and I think that people have come to regard it in a less than serious manner. I say that because, for a start, we have a situation which this bill does not address—and I do not seek to amend it to try to address it—where people lose their licence disqualified and immediately rush into court and get the licence reinstated. I make that comment after receiving information this week where a constituent has done exactly that, and I think that is one area where the law needs to be tightened up.

If you are disqualified because you are unsuitable as a result of your behaviour on the road, that is, infringement of road rules, you are disqualified. However, we find not only with P platers but with other drivers that they rush off and the magistrate reinstates it and, basically, devalues the purpose of the disqualification. In terms of medical incompetence or people being medically unfit (and, I must say, I did not realise this until I received a letter from someone who went to hospital), someone can receive treatment and, as a result, be disqualified from driving a motor vehicle.

I must confess, I was not aware of that provision. However, I was talking to one of my colleagues in this place who is a lawyer and he said, 'Yes, that is the case. If it comes to the attention of a medical practitioner when you are within a hospital you can have your licence taken away if there is an assessment by the professional that you are not suitable to have a licence.' I do not think we want anyone driving or on the road who is unfit. I suspect that many people who have a licence and who are driving are unfit. I believe that a lot of people who drive but do not have a licence should not be on the road either, and that is another aspect that needs to be addressed.

What we have, because it particularly relates to more senior members of the community, is a reluctance to take a hard line in relation to people who are medically unfit. A former employee of the department of transport (as it was years ago) told me at the end of last year that when he worked there they were told to stop being hard on people who would otherwise not get a licence, because it was politically unpopular. As a result, he believes the whole system was watered down. I cannot check whether or not that allegation or accusation is 100 per cent correct, but he said that eight or 10 years ago there was a lot of flak about people losing their licence because they were deemed to be medically unfit. He claims that at that time people within the department were to 'back off' and 'go easy' on people who would otherwise not be able to keep their licence.

On the one hand, we have this political pressure not to upset elderly members and others who might otherwise lose their licence, but, on the down side, the cost is that people lose their lives or get seriously injured. We have had a few cases where people have been on the wrong side of the South Eastern Freeway. There have been other situations where people have run over their spouse. There are times when some people might be tempted to run over their spouse, but it is not a nice situation when people who are incompetent are drivers. We see it all the time; people laugh it off and say, 'That old fogy,' or whatever, when they have driven into a house or harmed people.

Recently, we had a serious situation interstate when someone went in a childcare centre and caused serious injury to some young people. That person was not particularly old and I am not in a position to judge the merits of that case, but my point is that there is a serious aspect of having people driving who should not be driving. We opt out or wimp out because we do not want to upset people, but then we put other people at risk with their life or wellbeing. I think that is completely unethical behaviour on our part and by the people who administer the system.

This measure will not address the shortfall and the shortcomings of the current licence arrangements. Many people out there do not have a licence, so they will not get their licence suspended. We take seriously the situation of

people who drive an unregistered vehicle, because there is no third party insurance cover, at least after a limited time. But we do not seem to take as seriously the fact that people are out there driving who do not have a licence at all or who do not intend to get a licence. A few years ago we had the situation where some people could not be penalised much, because they did not have a licence in the first place. We need to take seriously this matter of licensing drivers, and not put at risk innocent people in the community and other road users, whether they be pedestrians, cyclists, in vehicles or whatever, because we as legislators and people in administration take the easy way out because we do not want to upset people and possibly lose their vote. That is unethical and unacceptable in my view.

I would be interested to see a detailed study carried out to determine how well the current system is working in terms of people being assessed as suitable to drive. From what I hear anecdotally a lot of people are being classified as suitable to drive when they either cannot see properly or have some medical problem; yet the medico or another practitioner is under pressure to sign and authorise that person to continue to drive. I ask the minister and his department to have a close look at how the system is currently operating. If we look closely at it, I think we will find there are a lot of loopholes in relation to who is driving when they should not be, and I think that matter needs to be addressed. I support this provision. Once again, I highlight the fact that in our society we need to get more serious and place more value upon having a licence as a privilege rather than its being something that is 'easy come, easy go', which seems to be the attitude of a lot of people in our community.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I wish to contribute to this debate by telling a story about a constituent and her experience with her daughter Ella. It is the Wood family that I mention. Ella Wood aged four years was struck and killed on 31 August 1999 by a reversing car. Ella's grandmother had stopped at the supermarket to get milk after picking up Ella and her sister Tilly from their day schools. Whilst Ella's grandmother was retrieving the girls' school and kindy bags from the boot, a driver reversed his car into the car space they were already parked in. Ella's grandmother was injured and, sadly, Ella was killed. As Robyn Wood's family lived across the road from the supermarket, Robyn could hear the screaming and the chaos from her family home. She raced to the scene of the accident, only to find her daughter Tilly screaming and her daughter Ella lying lifeless on the pavement. Paramedics tried to revive Ella at the scene, but without success.

Like most young girls Ella was fascinated with fairies: she loved to dress up and was a chatterbox, and her parents have commissioned the Ella Wood Fairy Foundation in Ella's memory—a charity to help children recovering from road accident trauma and families involved in such trauma. Ella will always be missed desperately by those who had the privilege to have her in their lives, even though it was for such a short and precious time. The elderly driver of the car that killed Ella was over 70 years of age, and it was the opinion of Ella's parents that that driver was not competent to drive. I am not making any judgment about that, but the reality is that elderly drivers all eventually will reach a point in their physical and mental state which renders them unsuitable for being on the road. It is simply a matter of time and ageing. The question is the extent to which the law recognises that and takes action to save the lives of other innocents from such elderly drivers.

I commend the bill and the comments made by my colleague the member for Light and the minister in his second reading. An oversight is being rectified and it is a step forward in ensuring that other young lives like Ella's are not lost because of someone who should not be driving on the road. I ask the minister to consider going further and looking into the matter in more detail and perhaps coming forward with some further amendments.

Some of the issues raised with me by my constituents, Ella's parents, were to do with whether there ought to be a charge of driving with undue care or attention. We know there is such a charge and the then government and former minister Laidlaw in another place in October 2001 introduced such a measure—death caused by negligent driving—with a range of penalties under amendments to the Road Traffic Act. A series of fines and penalties were put in place for causing death. But it appeared to my constituents that the law at the time of Ella's death was unable to mete out the appropriate justice required in cases such as their daughter's. A charge of driving with undue care seemed a minor charge compared with the loss of their daughter. Action to rectify that by former minister Laidlaw was a step in the right direction.

Will the minister look into the matter further and at whether there is a need for any further initiative in the law to protect families, particularly to provide a sense of justice to parents who have lost a loved one at the hands of an elderly driver, who perhaps should not have been on the road, so that they feel there is a moment of truth and justice and facing each other in a courtroom where the offender can say, 'I am sorry' and where the parents of the dead can accept that apology? My constituent's parents felt that they missed that opportunity. Nothing happened. As I understand it, no charges were laid as a consequence of their daughter's death, certainly no charges that resulted in court action.

My constituents also raised with me the issue of driving tests for drivers over 70. As in many cases, the alleged offender can refuse to give a statement if it was an accident. The argument is, 'Look, it was just an accident.' There are certain things that an offender over 70 can do, if you like, to get out of being charged. My constituent's concern is how this could have occurred and what measures could be put in place to minimise the chance of this occurring again; that is, someone refusing to give a statement and, if you like, getting off having to face any sort of charge on the basis of simply not wanting to make a statement: 'It was an accident. We killed this person; no offences were committed. It was an accident in the car park', or whatever, and therefore that case is never brought to justice. We amend the law but there are many ways to get around the law, and I ask the minister to look to see whether there are ways to tighten that up.

There is also an issue of safety standards in car parks where many of these accidents occur. In fact, I have had direct experience with this. As the house might remember, (I think I have recited it before), I had an elderly driver over 70 charge out of the car park outside my office in Mitcham, through Cafe Bongiorno (which is adjacent to my office), crash through the tables and chairs in the cafe—the day before, a mothers' club had been sitting at those very tables with their prams and all their children (thankfully on the day she crashed through in her out-of-control car the tables were empty)—knock down the wall between the restaurant and my office, drive straight through the office, wreck the office, nearly kill my assistant and her trainee, drive my trainee

through the wall into the travel agency beyond—thankfully she was not killed—and seriously injure two people in the travel agency. It was like a war scene. Three facilities—the restaurant, my office and the travel agency—were wrecked in the process. On any other day it could have resulted in the death of any number of people.

The elderly driver, an old lady, had leant down to pick up her handbag, her foot had found the accelerator, she had mounted the kerb, driven straight through the restaurant and the other three offices and was still revving the engine when finally she was stopped by masonry and steel. This has happened twice in the Mitcham Shopping Centre, on one occasion involving the same person. I know that you can quote statistics and say that the majority of accidents are caused by young people, but I put to the house that a significant number of accidents are being caused by elderly drivers who should not be behind the wheel. Their mental and physical state simply renders them unsuitable to continue driving. I note the point made earlier by my colleagues; that is, it can be very stressful to say to an elderly person, 'We are going to take your licence away.' It can be very stressful, and I acknowledge that: it is not something that should be done lightly at all.

However, I ask the minister and the house whether we could do it better and save some lives by tightening up the system. My understanding is that section 80(1a) of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 provides for the registrar (with the approval of the minister) to direct that all applicants for the issue or renewal of a licence or a learner's permit of a particular class must undergo such tests or furnish such evidence as to ability or fitness to drive a motor vehicle, or a motor vehicle of a particular class, as the registrar may require.

I know this amendment puts the onus back on the medical practitioner to provide an appropriate report, and that is a good thing. But what about cases where a relative, a friend or someone who has observed the elderly person's driving habits—or an officer of the motor vehicles registration department when this person comes in to renew—forms the view that the person should not be on the road, or should at least be tested? I know there are all sorts of opportunities for vexatious or mischievous accusations, and so on, to be made about a person's driving competence; I know there are challenges there. But I put to the minister that placing all the onus on doctors may not be the only way to go. For example, if a police officer pulls up an elderly driver and forms the view that that person is incompetent to drive, can the police officer direct that that person be tested annually from that point on? If a concerned child or grandchild of an elderly person knows and has witnessed that the mum or dad or grandma or grandpa is an unsafe driver, can they cause such a test to occur? We need to look at it.

I note that the Joint Committee on Transport Safety that reported to the other place on the driver training and testing inquiry (the report was printed and tabled in October 1999) had some interesting recommendations and points to make on this subject. Its conclusions and recommendations were quite interesting (I refer to page 46 of the report). The committee acknowledged the evidence it had heard—and in recent coronial findings—that doctors do not report medically unfit drivers as often as they should do. The committee also noted the Coroner's remarks concerning the implementation of action stemming from recommendations made by driver development officers when conducting practical assessments and from concerns raised by police officers in relation to drivers—the very point that I made earlier.

In addition, the committee noted the Coroner's comments on restricted licences. The committee was aware that section 81 of the Motor Vehicles Act empowered the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to issue restricted licences in terms of locality, type of vehicle and/or specific equipment fitted or other conditions in the interests of road safety. These are all options that I urge the minister to consider in making a judgment about whether he should come back to the house with some further initiatives to improve road safety.

I urge the minister to read the report of the committee to which I have referred, particularly its recommendations with respect to dementia; its recommendations that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles consult relevant medical experts when notifications are received from general practitioners concerning drivers diagnosed with dementia; and the need for the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to work with such experts to develop procedures. I also urge the minister to note the observations in the report that a lot of work has been done on this issue at the Repatriation General Hospital by Dr Jane Hecker and by other medical experts in the state. That work might provide some guidance as to the future legislation that might be appropriate.

I commend the bill, but I ask the minister to consider whether we ought to find a way to keep older, unsafe drivers off the road by extending the net, if you like, beyond that of simply medical practitioners to include police, officers of the department of motor vehicles and perhaps some other process. I acknowledge the sensitivity of the matter and I also acknowledge that it will be hard to develop such a mechanism but, in the interests of families such as the Woods family, it would be a worthwhile measure that might result in the saving of lives and make the roads safer for all. I commend the bill, and I will be supporting it.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank all speakers for their contribution. There were not a lot of speakers but, certainly, every person who spoke has obviously researched this bill, has thought carefully about it and has made a significant contribution. Before I go into some of that detail, I thank the opposition for its support. There is no need for me to recount what I said in my second reading explanation, except to say that the contribution that was made by the shadow minister is exactly correct. This bill simply seeks to redress legislation which was passed in 1999 and which inadvertently removed powers that previously existed.

I also congratulate the shadow minister on his careful analysis of this measure, because he was correct when he said that this is a delicate and sensitive issue. Of course it is. The Registrar is not in the business of taking away someone's driver's licence. The Registrar works very closely not only with individuals but also with the medical profession, and the sensitivity of this measure is well articulated. I take the point that was made by the shadow minister that this is done in the same way everywhere around the world except England, where a regional board has that responsibility.

The shadow minister also spoke about the process that is in place, which is important, in regard to a review and an appeal. The shadow minister also asked me an important question about what happens if two doctors have a different opinion on the same individual. It is a very pertinent question, because that may occur. It is important that I bring to the attention of the house that Transport SA has a medical

consultant who works with the two doctors in that situation to resolve a position where one doctor says one thing and another doctor says the opposite. That needs to be resolved as amicably as possible between all parties. If a resolution cannot be reached there is an opportunity for further testing to be requested.

I will also pick up some of the points made by the member for Fisher and the member for Waite. We all know that the member for Fisher is very passionate about road safety, and he is one of the great supporters of road safety in this house and in the community. He comes forward with a lot of good ideas and he challenges us, rightly so, to get out of the square and to make sure we take a holistic view, whether in this or other areas, and I very much appreciate that. That is a good thing, because we need to keep challenging people at a departmental level not just to come up with good ideas but also to look beyond the square. I will pursue some of the issues that the member for Fisher raised, and I appreciate his contribution and the ongoing support that he has provided consistently in this very important area of road safety.

The contribution by the member for Waite was also a very serious one, and I will take on board some of the issues that have been raised. I can probably answer a couple right now, but those I cannot answer I will make sure are considered carefully. It is important to bring to the attention of the house that the Registrar can act on reports from relatives or police, and does so with care. A fair point has been raised by the member for Waite, because a lot of people are not aware of that. We, as parliamentarians, should make that known. This is a sensitive issue which needs to be handled with care.

The other thing, of course, that the member for Waite spoke about in a general sense, which I already have committed to, is in regard to how else this can be assessed and the other areas we should be looking at. I am pleased to be able to report to the house, and I think members are aware, that the government has been not only proactive and brought forward legislation last year and made some changes in the delivery of the budget in regard to ensuring that there is some money quarantined for road safety and important intervention such as state black spots, shoulder sealing and so the list goes on, but we have also, as I have said, just this week received 25 recommendations from the Road Safety Advisory Council, chaired by Sir Eric Neal. Last year the council was charged by the government with the responsibility of coming forward with recommendations that the government can consider for phase 2 of its road safety package. I have spoken briefly to the shadow minister and he will have a briefing next week, I think, about that and, obviously, we would hope that, as a parliament, we can constructively progress that issue in the foreseeable future.

But the important point that I would like to make in regard to the contribution of the member for Waite is that, in addition to those 25 recommendations, the Road Safety Advisory Council has identified 13 areas that it will do further work on, and one of those areas is fitness to drive. I will not read all the information provided by the council, but it has established a fitness to drive task force to investigate the issues associated with determining fitness to drive and the current South Australian practices in regard to older drivers. So, that work is already under way and I think that would please the member for Waite.

We know this is a delicate and sensitive issue and obviously the balance must be right. It needs to be treated with care, and the government appreciates the support of the opposition and wishes this bill speedy progress.

Bill read a second time.

The SPEAKER: My view of the legislation is that it is essential but fails to go anywhere near far enough—not so much in the narrow preoccupation of those members who have debated, but within the confines of the act as it is at present, and that it should extend as countenanced in part 2, division 4, section 80 so that it would be possible for the registrar to address a problem which has already been identified as very serious and accelerating in its significance. The problem to which I draw attention is that of driving whilst addicted to a substance which clearly impairs the physical capacity of the individual to drive when they are 'high' or 'stoned', on substances such as amphetamines, opiates or tetrahydrocannabinol. In my judgment, the act should spell out a process by which people who have passed their learners permits and then seek to obtain P plates have to have a blood test and, if there are threshold levels of any of the trafficable substances otherwise described elsewhere and known at any time to impair capacity to drive, they should then go away, clean themselves up and come back and have another blood test which demonstrates that the background levels in their metabolism are so low that they are incapable of having an addiction to that substance or have not used it any time recently.

Secondly, and more importantly, if anyone is involved in a crash as a driver and one of the people who was in one or more of the vehicles—he can only be in one, of course, but there may have been more than one person injured—is required to be taken to hospital, then the drivers involved in such a crash should be subject to a blood test and the same provisions. Equally, if the property damage exceeds $2 000, the drivers must be subject to a blood test, in my opinion, and demonstrate through that test that they are not currently taking and/or addicted to those substances.

The recent statistical information provided to society—that is, all of us as a community and more especially us as legislators—clearly shows that it is time to act. That growing body of evidence has been publicised and alarm has been expressed by those experts who have seen the damage that arises in consequence of it. I suspect that it is probably at least as serious as driving in a 50 km/h speed limit zone at more than 60 km/h in the consequences for the wider community. It is for that reason that I would want to move amendments in the course of the committee to achieve that result, were it the intention of the house to go into committee.

I trust that members understand what I see as a far more serious problem that we should be addressing through this legislation, by which measure we take it upon ourselves through the law to suspend the licences of those people no longer medically fit to drive. Someone on drugs is not medically fit to drive.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The SPEAKER: If members will forgive the pun, this is the clause where the rubber hits the road on the matters to which I was drawing attention in the course of my remarks. Quite reasonably, I think, I had expected that the government would have already been alert to the implications of those problems to which I have drawn attention, namely, people who are under the influence of amphetamines, opiates, tetrahydrocannabinol or any other banned substance under the Controlled Substances Act which can and does impair their capacity to drive. Such substances, in the main, impair the

capacity to drive for a much longer period than drunkenness, in that they adversely affect the psychological disposition of the individual to assess risk accurately and also impair reflex action—some of them—far more dramatically for extended periods of time. That is the reason why we remove the licences from people who habitually drive when they are above .05. It is their reaction time, and their ability to think and react to the danger having once identified it.

Yet, there is nothing anywhere in legislation at this point that enables us as a parliament to give to the police force the power to remove that risk—it is not only a risk to the rest of the community—to remove that cause of death, to remove that cause of serious injury, to remove that cause of property damage, and to address the problem of personal injury that results from someone who is smacked off out of their brain being able to drive. We fail in our duty, if we think it is only those who have developed an infirmity as a consequence of age. In my judgment, that is not as serious as someone who is, in consequence of not just habit, but addiction, permanently impaired in their capacity to drive because of substance abuse.

I therefore ask the minister to tell us what the government has done (to date) in this regard and when we can expect some resolution of these concerns that I have expressed, which arise not just out of my own perceptions but rather out of my discussion with both medical practitioners who are expert in this area as well as some members of the community who have lost a member of their family and who discovered on the grapevine, as it were, that the person who was driving the vehicle that caused the crash was indeed not drunk but otherwise affected by a substance other than alcohol to the extent that they were incompetent to drive. Certainly, if you put them on roller skates or skis, they would have fallen over straight away. So, can the minister please explain.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the member for Hammond for not only that question but also his earlier contribution. This is a very important issue—have no doubt about that. Of course, when the government came forward with its road safety package last year, our priority at the time, in regard to drugs, was alcohol. What we knew then and know now is that testing is more sophisticated and there is greater certainty. However, I said—I am not sure if I said this in the parliament, but I certainly said it somewhere—that this was an issue that the government would be looking at and would certainly be bringing forward next year, which, of course, is now this year.

Mr Venning: This has been on the *Notice Paper* for over a year.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That may well be correct. Of course, what we do know is that alcohol is the more significant problem, and that is what we have acted upon.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Well, we do know that, because we have the research that backs that up. What we also know is that work is going on in Victoria (which the shadow minister well knows about) and we need to get those results as they will have some influence on our thinking. The department is considering introducing the ability to perform a drug test, and it is also working on what form that provision should take. Whether that turns out to be a recommendation along the lines that the member for Hammond talks about, I am not sure, because obviously I did not have that recommendation. However, we will take account of his significant contribution. As I said, we will also be monitoring random drug testing trials that are happening elsewhere with a view to bringing forward recommendations in the near future.

Mr Venning: They're not trials. They have been doing them for years.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Well, I just wish that the member for Schubert was as enthusiastic about the rest of the government's road safety package as he is about drug testing. However, there is no simple answer and there is no quick fix. If the honourable member has done all this work that he is talking about, would he please bring it forward so that we can see the details. When we do introduce legislation in this area, it is important that we get it right, and it is important that we are on the mark if it is to be effective.

Mr Venning: It is on the *Notice Paper*.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: It may well be on the *Notice Paper*—big deal! The point that needs to be made is that work is being done. We very much appreciate the important contribution made by the Speaker, which will certainly be taken into account and supplied to the department to consider when it makes recommendations to me.

Of course, the other area that is being looked at closely by the Road Safety Advisory Council is just this issue. I said earlier that fitness to drive was one of the 13 areas that the council has put forward as areas on which it will be doing further work and making recommendations to the government about. I highlighted fitness to drive as being one of those 13 areas, and drug testing is another.

I acknowledge the member for Schubert for putting this matter on the *Notice Paper*—and good on him for doing so. It is an important issue, and we have to get it right. We have to ensure that, when we do introduce legislation, we have all the available information before us; that we have the research from Victoria and other places; and that we get the policy right.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr VENNING: I acknowledge the contributions made by the Speaker, the member for Hammond, and also the minister, and I thank him for the compliment he paid me in relation to the work done on this subject. I wonder whether it is in order for us to be discussing these issues, because there is a bill in my name on the notice paper on this very subject. Irrespective of that, I want to distinctly clarify that there are two issues here. First, though, I take issue with the minister's saying that alcohol is a much bigger problem on the roads than drugs. I question that. Most people are aware and responsible in relation to alcohol and driving. And, as we know, because it is tested, a very low proportion of people who are drinking and driving are actually detected for that, when you consider how many people are driving and how many of us do have a drink. But we know that, of the huge proportion of people who are drug-driving, none are detected and, as the member for Hammond said, it should not be allowed to continue.

There are two issues that we must not confuse here, and the minister has said that we are looking into research on the matter. Yes, we are, but only on the random road-side drug testing, not on the blood testing that the police used to be able to undertake here in South Australia. We are the only state in Australia that does not allow its police force to request a

blood test for drugs. Why is that? We did give our police that permission until 1996; why did we take it away? It was a Liberal government. I do not know the answer, but someone may be able to tell me. It was when we brought in the Forensic Procedures Act and it was taken away. Irrespective of that, this government has been in power for two years and I have been making these requests of the government for nearly 18 months, but we are still the only state. Instructing the police should be easy even tomorrow—and I notice that the police commissioner made comments about this just a week or two ago. It should be easy to implement the change quickly, even by regulation, to allow the police to request a medical officer or a hospital to take a blood test from a person whom they reasonably suspect to be under the influence of a drug. That is the blood testing; that is easy.

The other issue is the road-side random testing, which is usually done by a saliva swab test. This is what the Victorians are trialing at the moment, and I know the Tasmanians are doing that as well. I agree with the minister that we should be watching that very carefully, and even buying a couple of machines ourselves and just trialing it, as you just said. We do not know the thresholds of these machines to detect legal and illegal levels of a drug. But that is well down the track. We ought to be in it ourselves and be part of that decision. I do not want to see people confused.

I think the member for Hammond did not discuss the issues, because there are two separate issues: blood testing by police on the one hand, which is a very concise and exact testing for drugs, and the police can take that over straight away, as has every other state in Australia; and on the other hand we have the road-side random drug testing by this new technology, which is being trialled now. We should be in there; the machines are not excessively expensive. I do understand that the cost of each test is expensive, at approximately $50 per test, so whether it will ever become a true random test I do not know. I have this matter on the *Notice Paper*, and I intend to proceed with it next week. I believe this has been going for 12 months and, if the minister is saying that we are considering this, well, I think that time is up. It is too important an issue to let it drag on, and I thank the member for Hammond for raising the matter and the minister for his kind comment a moment ago.

The SPEAKER: My remarks are made under section 80 of the principal act, as referred to in clause 4. Section 80 provides:

> If, in the opinion of the Registrar, it is desirable that the ability or fitness of an applicant for the issue or renewal of a licence or learner's permit, or of the holder of a licence or learner's permit, to drive a motor vehicle should be tested, the Registrar may require the person to undergo such tests or furnish such evidence of ability or fitness to drive as the Registrar directs.

I am not one for pussyfooting around, but in some measure the power already exists under this provision. Subsection (1)(a) continues:

> the Registrar may, with the approval of the Minister—

and I want the minister to tell the house if he does approve—

> direct that all applicants for issue or renewal of a licence. . . who are of a particular class must undergo such tests, or furnish such evidence of ability or fitness to drive a motor vehicle.

Again, in no small measure, the power is there to do what I want to do. As the member for Schubert does not want, I do not want police to conduct, on the road, random blood tests. No. I am saying (and I think that the member for Schubert is at one with me on this) that no-one should get a licence, a permit or a P plate to drive in the first instance unless they have had a blood test that shows them to be clean and therefore not addicted and not habitual users of amphetamines, opiates or tetrahydrocannabinol, whether it is in hash oil or from smoking raw or any other form of marijuana (cannabis sativa is the botanical name).The section that we are amending by this clause, section 80, continues:

> (2) Medical tests required by the Registrar under this section must be conducted in accordance with the guidelines published and adopted by the Minister by notice in the *Gazette* and the results of the test must be applied by the Registrar, in accordance with any policies published or adopted by the Minister by notice in the *Gazette*, in assessing the person's competence to drive motor vehicles or motor vehicles of a particular class.

In this case it is motor vehicles in general. Subsection (2)(9) provides:

> (a) A person fails to comply with a requirement of the registrar under this section; or
> (b) the registrar is satisfied—
> (i) after considering results of tests or evidence required under this section; or

We delete subparagraph (ii) and put in its place, 'from information furnished to the registrar by a health professional or from any other evidence received by the registrar, that a person is not competent to drive a motor vehicle or a motor vehicle of a particular class'. That power might cover what we need. I am asking the minister to comment on whether he believes that is so. He acknowledges the legitimacy of my concern and that of the member for Schubert. Under this provision:

> the Registrar may—
> (c) refuse to issue a licence or permit to the person; or
> (d) refuse to renew the person's licence or permit; or
> (e) suspend the person's licence or permit until the person satisfies the Registrar, in such a manner as the Registrar directs, that he or she is competent to drive. . .

Whilst I think the power is there, I want the minister to state his view of whether it is there and, if it is not there, to put it there, because section 80 clearly is the place in which it is possible for us to address the problem. The minister may have evidence unknown to me that enables him to come to the view that it is not as serious as alcohol. I think that it is hidden seriousness because of the inadequacy of long-term data brought about by the deliberate irresponsible determination of ministers of transport over more than two decades, after I first drew attention to this problem early in the 1980s during the time the Tonkin government was in office.

I quoted in this chamber then the Suffolk County studies of the late 1960s and early 1970s, and I have kept abreast of those follow-up studies that have replicated the findings of the Suffolk County studies. Suffolk County is in the state of New York on Long Island. I conclude my remarks by reminding the committee that the government, federally and here in South Australia, says that it is tough on drugs. It says that it wants to go to war against bikie gangs, many members of which get their money from peddling drugs. Well, if they want to get the bikies off their bikes and solve a lot of the problems with those gangs, this would go a long way toward doing it, because it would dry up the market.

I believe that far more people who are otherwise presently willing to yield to the temptation to take controlled substances that are really unlawful—all of them—would not do so if it meant they were suddenly going to lose their driver's licence. They would stop it, and that would dry up the bikies' revenue. So, a good many of the people involved in that trade, I am sure, if they are members of a gang, would themselves, if they are involved in it, be using it and encouraging others

to do it as a means of financing their own habit. Well, I reckon it would get bikies off their bikes because, at present, they are off their face, and we are copping the consequences.

We have not done the research because we are too politically correct. We are unwilling to accept even the slightest hint of a jibe that we are killjoys. Damn it, this is not killing joy; this is killing us. I think that, in road traffic terms, the problem gives the term 'pothole' an entirely new meaning. Therefore, in all sincerity, I ask the minister to tell us whether he believes that this clause in the principal act—section 80 as I have read it to the house—does indeed make it possible or, if not, what amendments to it or the schedule might be necessary.

Finally, if there are such amendments, will he give a commitment to bring them back before the budget estimates committee because, during the course of estimates, I am sure, the topic will raise its head again. And it is not an ugly head: it is a head of serious consequences if we continue to do nothing about it.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the Speaker for his contribution; once again, a valuable contribution. He has raised a good point, because on the face of it what he is putting to me may well be the case. It is possible and I will seek crown law advice about that. So, I thank him for that contribution. Obviously, I will pursue that and I will share that advice with him as soon as I get it. Good point though it is, this is an important area which we will pursue. I certainly will give a commitment to the Speaker that I will come back with this at the earliest opportunity. I will certainly do my best to do that before the budget estimates. Obviously, I cannot guarantee that right here and now, but I can give a general commitment that we will do it as soon as possible and, if it can be earlier than that, well and good.

To heighten people's certainty that the government is serious about this issue, I talked about one of the recommendations that has been put forward by the Road Safety Advisory Council—the one that I mentioned before about drug testing—as being one of the thirteen. Another one of the thirteen is a recommendation to look at reintroducing blood testing for drugs. These are important issues. The member for Hammond has made some very good points. To pick up the member for Schubert's question about why this was taken away in 1996: that pre-dates me from the point of view of being in the parliament. I am happy to go back and look at that for the member for Schubert but, off the top of my head, I do not know the answer.

However, I can highlight to the house that both of those are specific recommendations that have been brought forward by the Road Safety Advisory Council. I will give you this assurance: even if they had not come forward with those recommendations, and I am pleased that they have, this has been under active consideration by the government. I take the member for Schubert's point that it has been on the *Notice Paper* for some time. I appreciate his putting it on the *Notice Paper* and I appreciate his sincere conviction, which I share. I think we are all pretty much talking from the same hymn sheet. I think we have to make sure that how we bring it in is the right way. Certainly, I will commit to the Speaker to do that as soon as possible.

Mr VENNING: I want to clarify that I was not originally speaking in exactly the same way as the member for Hammond in relation to requiring a blood test on application of a licence, but I have no problem with that personally. It is a very strong move—stronger than I was prepared to consider originally. I think that it has some merit and that it would certainly deter people from partaking of drugs some time before applying for a driver's licence. I think that is additional to what I was trying to do which was, first, to give police the power to request a blood test and, secondly, when the technology has caught up with us, to enable roadside testing for drugs. I wanted to clarify that, although I have no difficulty with it. However, I think that issue has to go back to individual caucuses because I think it is a new subject.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST TRANSFER OF LANDS

Adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. M.J. Wright:

That this house, pursuant to section 16(1) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 1966, recommends that allotment 21 in the plan deposited in the Lands Titles Registration Office No. DP58704 (being portion of the land comprised in Crown record volume 5407 folio 615) be transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust (subject to an easement to the South Australian Water Corporation marked A in the deposited plan and to an easement to ETSA Transmission Corporation marked B in the deposited plan).

(Continued from 23 October. Page 645.)

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise to indicate the opposition's support for this motion. This motion arises out of the construction of the Berri Bridge in the late 1990s on land owned by the Aboriginal tribe of the area. This land was particularly important to the tribe, and the former minister for transport (Hon. Diana Laidlaw) agreed to swap for another piece of land the land which the Berri Bridge would occupy, which was acceptable to the local Aboriginal tribe. This motion refers to that section of land. The opposition supports this motion, and it has been known for some time that this move would come forward. It ensures that the Aboriginal tribe of the area has an area of land they can use, which, I am advised, is quite open and on the river bank. I am sure the tribe will get enjoyment from it, and it will compensate them for the land taken up by the Berri Bridge. The opposition has much pleasure in supporting this motion.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I acknowledge the comments just made by my colleague. This piece of land is in my electorate. I want to thank the minister who, last year, when this bill was introduced into this house and I asked the question, 'Where is this land?' did not know, because it was not in the legislation. So, I thank him for withdrawing it, and it is now quite clear. I also acknowledge the traditional owners of this land, the Ngarrindjeri people who, we presume, are the owners of this land.

I want to pay tribute to the previous minister, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, who spoke to the people involved, and they agreed to the swap and the bridge went ahead; and we now have a bridge. The question could be asked: why was the same thing not done at Goolwa when we had all that trouble down there with the Goolwa bridge? There has been a lot of cooperation, which has been good. The bridge is a bit like the Darwin railway line: it was on the agenda for many years and never happened. But it is there now. It would not have been built without the cooperation of the people. The land is situated opposite the township of Swan Reach on the Murray and is right near the ferry landing. As the member for Light has just said, this has occurred because the Berri bridge has

been built on their land. The local Aboriginal people have now fenced this land and are caring for it. These people are some of the last remaining indigenous people along the river.

The land is of some significance to the local Aboriginal population; they already own the piece of land alongside it. Their cooperation brought about the building of this bridge. I pay tribute to our former colleague Mr Ken Andrew, who was the member at that time. This bridge has actually brought the Riverland together. It is a pity that this achievement was not recognised at the subsequent state election when they chose to chase a mirage called Teletrak.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The bridge is still there but the other—well, I leave it to you! I do not want to go any further. I thank the Ngarrindjeri people for their cooperation in this matter and I pay tribute to the previous minister. We do have a bridge and it is a positive outlook. I thank the minister for delaying this matter until we sorted it out so we knew exactly what we were talking about.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for Light (the shadow minister) and the member for Schubert. It is not exactly correct. The member for Schubert knows the high esteem in which I hold him—and I say that sincerely. It was not that I did not know where the land was, but it would be fair to say that the motion did not define it. I apologise for that. When asked by the member for Hammond and/or Schubert in those circumstances, because it went through previously to rescind it, I did not have the slightest hesitation, and I thank and acknowledge the member for Schubert for bringing the matter to the attention of the house. That was the only proper thing to do. We did that without hesitation. I apologise because the motion should have had a map with it so that not only I knew but also everyone could identify what we were talking about.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: For clarification the land is adjacent to the land at Swan Reach. I think the Speaker was checking that point, and he is not back.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.27 p.m. the house adjourned until Monday, 23 February at 2 p.m.

Corrigendum

Page 1122, column 2—
Line 2—After ‘should’ insert ‘be’.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 16 February 2004

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL HORSE TRIALS

2. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**

1. With respect to the 2002 Mitsubishi Adelaide International Horse Trial's survey:
   (a) how many spectators were from interstate, regional South Australia and overseas, respectively;
   (b) how many accommodation bed-nights were attributed to these spectators and what was the average 'spend' during their stay;
   (c) how many staff were employed and how many volunteers were on hand;
   (d) was expenditure information on feed, pharmaceuticals, horse transport, stabling, livery, farriers and veterinary fees gathered and if so, what are the details; and
   (e) what was the estimated dollar value of local, interstate and overseas media coverage generated by this event?
2. How many spectators attended the Trials in each of the years 2000 to 2002?
3. How many staff were employed at the Trials in 2000 and 2001?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: 15,100 'in-scope' adults and 3,500 children attended one or more days of the Horse Trials. (In-scope refers to those visiting the city specifically to attend the cross-country day and/or staying a substantial part of the day).

Approximately 83 per cent of visitors to the Horse Trials were from metropolitan Adelaide, with 9 per cent from regional South Australia, 7 per cent from interstate and 1 per cent from overseas. The 8 per cent from interstate and overseas equates to 1,060 visitors.

Interstate and overseas spectators visiting specifically for the Horse Trials, stayed a total of 8,226 nights in Adelaide and 173 nights elsewhere in South Australia.

Overseas visitors spent on average $1,067 per adult during their stay and interstate visitors on average $756 per adult.

Australian Major Events employed 1.8 full time staff to stage the 2002 event. Part time assistance was also provided by other Australian Major Events employees working in the operations, marketing, PR and sponsorship units.

Approximately 350 volunteers assist with the Horse Trials, the majority of these assist on Cross Country Day only.

No, that specific information was not gathered.

Print media (newspapers and magazines)

SA print:	$228,549
National print	$ 3,518
International print	$ 49,118
	$281,185

Radio

SA Radio	$166,890
National Radio	$ 332
International Radio	$ -
	$167,222

Television (TV news and features)

SA TV	$383,614
National TV	$ -
International TV	$ -
	$383,614

A complete market research study was not conducted in 2000 however detailed 2001 and 2002 visitor in-scope numbers are outlined below:

	2001 Total (adults)	2002 Total (adults)
Thurs – Dressage Day 1	1,300	780
Fri – Dressage Day 2	1,640	1,620
Sat – Cross Country	10,330 (police estimated attendance at 45-50,000)	14,050 (police estimated attendance at 45-50,000)
Sun – Show Jumping	3,070	2,070
Estimated total attendance	16,500	18,520
Total Visitors	11,650	15,100

Total visitors is less than total attendees as some visitors attended the Horse Trials on more than one day

In 2000 and 2001 Australian Major Events employed 1.5 full time staff to stage the 2000 and 2001 event respectively. Part time assistance was also provided by other Australian Major Events employees working in the operations, marketing, PR and sponsorship units.

TOURISM, MARKETING IN CHINA

9. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What funds and resources are allocated to promote this State's tourism in China, has any research been undertaken into this matter and have resources been redirected from other overseas offices to support this promotion?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) has allocated $200,000 to the marketing of South Australia as a tourism destination in China in 2003-04.

The SATC has made a commitment in 2003-04 to appoint a part-time account manager based in the Australian Tourism Commission (ATC) office in China. This will be timed to coincide with the reinstatement of major marketing activities in China, a country that is currently recovering from the SARS epidemic. The SATC is currently participating in 'market maintenance' activities such as trade training, and will continue to co-ordinate this from the Singapore office until the in-market representative is appointed.

Having a presence in China will enable South Australia to capture some of the extraordinary growth in visitation from this country prior to the SARS outbreak. Indications from the ATC are that the Chinese market is slowly recovering from the SARS outbreak and they are optimistic about growth from this market.

ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL HORSE TRIALS

14. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What feedback has the Department received from the announcement of the defunding of the Adelaide International Horse Trials?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The Mitsubishi Adelaide International Horse Trials remains a Government sponsored event, but a partnership has been entered into with the Equestrian Federation of Australia and the equestrian community to manage the Mitsubishi Adelaide International Horse Trials.

The equestrian community has taken back 'ownership' of the event in its new form and expressed delight in its new configuration and management style.

JOINTLY FUNDED EVENTS

24. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What are the details of any event which will be funded jointly by the South Australian Tourism Commission and the Arts Portfolio in 2003-04?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) and Arts SA are jointly funding the following events:

- Adelaide Festival of Arts
- Adelaide Fringe
- Feast Festival

ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL HORSE TRIALS

26. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Did Australian Major Events direct sponsors of the Adelaide International Horse Trials to divert their financial contribution to the Rugby World Cup and if so, why?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Australian Major Events (AME) has not directed sponsors of the Mitsubishi Adelaide International Horse Trials to divert their financial contribution to the Rugby World Cup.

When an alternative location for the Mitsubishi Adelaide International Horse Trials was being investigated, the Adelaide City Council (ACC) sponsorship would not have continued.

At that time one option canvassed with the ACC was using part of their global annual AME allocation for a free community event in the city at the time of the 2003 Rugby World Cup

ACC's overall sponsorship of AME activities includes a number of events such as the Jacob's Creek Tour Down Under, Credit Union Christmas Pageant, World Solar Challenge, Tasting Australia and Mitsubishi Adelaide International Horse Trials.

The sponsorship arrangement with the ACC requires AME to provide alternative opportunities to Council should AME discontinue its association with one or more events.

FEDERAL—STATE PROGRAMS

34. **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. M.D. RANN: Responses to these questions asked during the 2003 Estimates Committee have been printed in the 'Replies to Estimates Questions' *Hansard*.

NGAPARTJI

70. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**

1. How many meetings occurred between the stakeholders of Ngapartji between March and December 2002, which Departments were represented and was an alternative plan for Ngapartji presented to the Minister or Department and if so, what are the details of this plan?

2. How much notice was given to Ngapartji informing them of the Government's decision to discontinue funding and what happened to any surplus funding?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:

1. There were two meetings during the period in question. The first meeting was an informal discussion with the Minister for Science and Information Economy held on 17 October 2002. The purpose of the meeting was for the Chair of Ngapartji to discuss the general directions of the organisation in anticipation of future Commonwealth funding being made available.

The second meeting was held on 11 December between officers from the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (DFEEST) and the Board and management of Ngapartji.

An alternative plan was presented to DFEEST officers at the 11 December 2002 meeting. In addition to continuing current activities, the alternative plan proposed four new initiatives.

- Highway to Home initiative proposed to use four transportable communication units incorporating four wheel drive vehicles and high-end communications and software. There was no allocated Commonwealth funding source for this program.
- The Sustainable Regions Internet Access Centre proposed to establish an Internet Access and Training Centre in the Elizabeth Town Centre. Ngapartji sought $2.5 million from the Commonwealth's Sustainable Regions fund. The local advisory committee responsible for the State's allocation of Commonwealth funding did not support this initiative.
- Wireless Precinct. An initiative to create a wireless precinct in the West End in collaboration with mNet Corporation and Xone Pty Ltd.
- Digital Graffiti Elizabeth and Surrounds was an initiative to deliver a multi media scholarship programmed for at risk youth in the northern suburbs. This project required significant stakeholder contributions to be viable.

The four proposals were never fully scoped.

2. Ngapartji did not receive any recurrent State Government funding. Following the Federal Government's decision not to continue funding Ngapartji beyond calendar year 2002, the Ngapartji board approached the State Government on 11 December 2002 requesting funding of $1 million p.a. for three years. On 10 March 2003 the State Government informed Ngapartji that the request for additional funding would not be forthcoming. On 11 March 2003 the Ngapartji board met and agreed that the company's business would be wound down.

On 30 June 2003 a liquidator was appointed and the formalities regarding liquidation are in progress.

AUSTRALIAN CENTRE FOR INNOVATION AND SIMULATED SOLUTIONS

75. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What were the results and recommendations of any consultancy undertaken to ascertain whether an Australian Centre for Innovation and Simulated Solutions should be implemented?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have been advised:

- A final report from Hudson Howells, contracted to undertake the consultancy, was provided to the Office of Economic Development on 4 April 2003.
- The report found that establishing the Australian Centre for Innovative and Simulated Solutions (ACISS) could be warranted if the Royal Australian Navy's Air Warfare Destroyers were built in South Australia, but that this work alone would not sustain ACISS as a commercially viable entity.
- Government funding to keep ACISS operational would be above acceptable levels.
- The report also highlighted opportunities in the area of surveillance, which is being investigated by the Office of Economic Development.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

110. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Will traffic lights be installed at the Grange Road and Frederick Street intersection at Welland and if so, what are the details?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Transport SA has reviewed the operation of the intersection including vehicles turning counts, an analysis of available crash statistics, studies into the adequacy of the existing traffic controls, together with on-site observations.

The layout of this intersection is well defined with Frederick Street traffic controlled by 'Stop' signs. There are no sight distance restrictions along Grange Road if the vehicle is positioned at the stop line bar.

Transport SA considers that this site is operating satisfactorily in its present layout and has no plans to install traffic signals at this time.

PORT RIVER EXPRESSWAY

112. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**

1. How will the third Port River Bridge be funded?

2. Will the Aviation Museum site be acquired during construction and the Museum relocated and if so, to where and at what cost, and what is the size and value of the residual site?

3. Are there any plans to demolish Wharf Sheds 5 and 8 in the near future if so, what are the details?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

1. Stages 2 and 3 of the Port River Expressway project will, in addition to toll revenues collected, be jointly funded by the Federal and State Governments, subject to approval by the Federal Government. A formal application will be made on the basis of a 50:50 State/Federal funding approach. The level of funding will be based on sharing the shortfall in toll revenues over 30 years, for the proposed Public Non-Financial Corporation, which will own and operate the bridges. The Federal contribution takes into account all project cash flows modelled including capital costs, operations and maintenance costs, financing costs with an offset against the revenue collected from tolls. The Federal Government contribution will be

provided 'up-front' with the State Government providing some funds during the construction phase and then managing all costs and collecting all revenues during the operations and maintenance phase.

2. The existing Aviation Museum hanger is located on land owned by the Commissioner of Highways with storage and a workshop in sheds leased from the Commissioner and the Land Management Corporation (LMC). There is no residual value in the land, as it will be entirely occupied by the new Expressway.

The feasibility of relocating the Museum to land adjacent the Railway Museum is currently under consideration. The proposed site is an unused rail corridor, which is currently held in the name of the Minister for Transport and will be transferred to the project to facilitate the relocation. The Port River Expressway budget allowance for the land, hanger and contents relocation and building of the new sheds is approximately $1.2 million.

3. Wharf Shed 5 is on the southern side of Dock 1 and hence outside the Port River Expressway requirements. It is managed by LMC as part of the Port Waterfront Redevelopment project. Part of Shed 8 is on the Port River Expressway alignment and will be demolished in the first quarter of 2004 to ensure that the site is available to the contractor when the contract is awarded, expected to be in the middle of 2004.

Under the proposed Development Agreement between the LMC and the Port Waterfront Redevelopment consortium, Newport Quays, LMC will be required to deliver cleared sites to the developer and this will entail the demolition of Shed 5. LMC is likely to seek the necessary approval to demolish the shed once the Development Agreement is signed.

ROADS, USE

113. **The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:**

1. Are there any plans to use Old Mt Barker Road as a recreational road and if so, what are the details?

2. What proposal has Transport SA put forward regarding the upgrade of Brlttania Roundabout?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The role and function of Old Mt Barker Road, between Devils Elbow and the Measdays interchange, is primarily that of a local road providing access for local residents and patrons of the Eagle on the Hill Hotel.

Transport SA has met with local residents and discussed traffic management options to change the road to be more consistent with its new role, but there are no plans to use this road as a recreational road. Consultation has also been undertaken with local Councils and other key stakeholders.

The options under consideration provide a lower speed limit, a pedestrian path and bike lanes, which would complement the proposed recreational facilities, ie. the Eagle Mountain Bike Park and the Yurilla Walking Trail. Transport SA has prepared traffic management options which I am currently considering.

The Department of Transport and Urban Planning has prepared proposals for at-grade treatment schemes for Britannia Corner, in lieu of the high cost of the underpass scheme proposal developed some time ago.

At this time, Britannia remains an unfunded project, no specific timing for implementation has been set by Government—that will be done through the budget process.

However, a funding allocation has been made for 2003-04 to advance consultation on the at-grade scheme proposals, and to determine an option to take to a preliminary design and updated estimate in preparation for future implementation.

SPORT, RECREATION AND RACING PORTFOLIO

132. **The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:**

1. How many of the recently announced 600 job cuts will come from within the Sport, Recreation and Racing Portfolio?

2. Which areas in this Portfolio are currently under review, who are the consultants undertaking those reviews and what is the respective cost of each review?

3. Are there any programs contained within the Government's compact with the Member for Hammond allocated to this Portfolio and if so, what are their respective costs and will these costs be met by new or existing funding?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

1. We understand this comment to be attributed to the 2002-03 State budget papers, and the Recreation, Sport and Racing portfolio within the Department for Administrative and Information Services contribution will be two full time equivalents.

Review Description	Consultant	Total cost
State Association House Review	Connor Holmes Consulting Pty Ltd	$ 25,000
Review of programs and services for people with a disability by recreation and sport organisations and community groups funded by the ORS.	Shirley Brown	$ 29,600

There are no programs contained within the Government's compact with the Member for Hammond with respect to the Recreation, Sport and Racing portfolio.

TRAILS PROGRAM

136. **The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Why was funding for the Trails Program reclassified from operating to investing in 2002-03, what portion of this funding was actually expended and what proportion of funding is expected to be expended during a non event year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The Trails program is classified as investing in accordance with the appropriate accounting treatment that applies to the nature of the financial transactions within the program. This classification recognises that the expenditure to date will extend the life of the existing asset or trail network base.

The expenditure for 2002-03 for the Trails program was $1.978 million.

The funding available for 2003-04 is $800,000.

GRANTS PROGRAM REVIEW

139. **The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:**

1. What are the recommendations from the Grants Program Review and when will they be implemented?

2. What changes been made regarding equitable distribution of funds across the 47 State electorates?

3. What is the individual breakdown of each program for 2003-04 and 2004-05?

4. How many Review submissions were received from sporting organisations?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The following table highlights all Review recommendations and the decision as to whether the recommendation has been accepted or not accepted. All accepted recommendations will be implemented from the next funding round.

Recommendation	Decision/Comments
In relation to the funding programs generally	
1. It is recommended that the ORS grant programs should continue to achieve outcomes related to sport and active recreation programs (rather than non-active recreation outcomes).	Recommendation is accepted and will be implemented.

Recommendation	Decision/Comments
In relation to the Active Club Program:	
2. It is recommended that the organisation eligibility criteria be broadened to include community based not-for-profit organisations that are conducting programs and services that meet sport and active recreation outcomes.	Recommendation is not accepted.
3. It is recommended that the notional allocation of funding equally across the 47 State electorates be discontinued.	Recommendation is not accepted.
4. It is recommended that grants be allocated based upon the relative merits of each application, which should include the use of appropriate socio-economic indicators.	Recommendation is not accepted.
In relation to the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program:	
5. It is recommended that the program principle be changed to read 'to ensure the provision of sustainable facilities that meet community needs'.	Recommendation is accepted and will be implemented.
6. It is recommended that the maximum funding amount for regional level facilities be increased to $500,000.	Recommendation is accepted in part – the maximum funding amount will be lifted to $300,000.
7. It is recommended that an annual fixed application period be introduced.	Recommendation is accepted and will be implemented.
8. It is recommended that the project eligibility criteria be broadened to include the funding of feasibility studies.	Recommendation is accepted and will be implemented.
9. That the existing assessment criteria to be amended to include the use of appropriate socio-economic indicators when assessing the need for the project within the community.	Recommendation is accepted and will be implemented.
In relation to the Management and Development Program:	
10. It is recommended that funding be segmented into three streams: Stream 1 - State Association/Peak Body support Stream 2 – Special Initiatives Program Stream 3 – Targeted Initiatives Program	Recommendation is accepted and will be implemented.
This recommendation is subject to priority being given to Stream 1 and that the level of priority be determined by the ORS following industry consultation.	Recommendations are accepted and will be implemented.
11. It is recommended that under Stream 1 – State Association / Peak Body support:	
11.1 That funding be distributed to State associations and peak bodies through the development of a categorisation system, whereby organisations with similar characteristics (or comparable capacity) receive similar levels of funding.	
11.2 That the ORS works in consultation with industry representatives on the development of the categorisation system.	
11.3 That funding be used to respond to the identified core priorities of the organisation that are consistent with Government policies and priorities.	
11.4 That funding under this approach be structured to allow a flexible system of financial support.	
11.5 That reporting obligations of funded organisations be simplified under individual cooperative agreements.	
11.6 That funding be allocated for up to three-years.	
12. It is recommended that under Stream 2 - Special Initiatives Program:	Recommendations are accepted and will be implemented.
12.1 That funding be used for a range of strategic and innovative programs and services.	
12.2 That any not-for-profit agency that oversees the delivery of sport and active recreation services and programs to the wider community be eligible to apply for funding.	
12.3 That specific reporting obligations be detailed in an individual funding agreement between the ORS and the recipient.	
12.4 That funding be allocated for up to three-years.	
13. It is recommended that under Stream 3 - Targeted Initiatives Program:	Recommendations 13.1, 13.3 and 13.4 are accepted and will be implemented.
13.1 The ORS has the capacity to seek 'expressions of interest' on targeted initiatives.	
13.2 That any person, group or entity seeking to provide sport or active recreation services should be eligible to apply.	Recommendation 13.2 is not accepted.
13.3 That specific reporting obligations be detailed in an individual funding agreement between the ORS and the recipient.	
13.4 That funding be allocated for up to three-years.	

2. There will be no changes to the notional allocation of funding across the 47 State electorates.

3.

2003-04	
Active Club Program	$1.880 M
Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program	$3.297 M
Management and Development Program	$6.673 M

The 2004-05 budget is yet to be finalised.

4. A total of 56 public submissions to the Grants Program Review were received, of which 39 were from sport and recreation organisations.

MEDIA MONITORING UNIT

141. **The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:**

1. How many people are currently employed in the Media Monitoring Unit, how many are employed under ministerial contracts and how many full-time positions were there in 2002-03?

2. What is the Unit's total budgeted expenditure for the next 12 months and what services are provided to the Premier, Government Ministers, Labor Members of Parliament, ministerial staff and electorate staff, respectively?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. The Media Monitoring Unit is now known as the South

Australian Government Media Monitoring Services (SAGMMS), and comprises eleven full-time media monitoring positions. The SAGMMS currently employs ten media monitors. All media monitors are employed under Ministerial Contract arrangements.

2. The total budgeted operating expenditure for the SAGMMS in 2003-04 is $860,000.

All Members of Parliament (MP's) may choose to receive News/Talkback Radio Précis, emailed three times a day, Monday to Friday, including:

- Written summaries of all relevant items from radio news bulletins monitored between 6.00 am and 6.00 pm; and
- Summaries of all relevant program interviews and significant talkback calls conducted at any time.

This means the government, through SAGMMS, provides a 24-hour/7-days per week coverage that is available to all Members of Parliament at no charge to MP's. Under the previous government, no service was provided to Opposition Members.

In addition to the above, the Premier, ministers, and their selected senior staff receive regular radio news and talkback program summaries, emailed hourly (7.00 am to 6.00 pm), Monday to Friday, including:

- Radio news summaries covering 7.00 am to 12 noon, Saturday and Sunday;
- TV news/current affairs summaries;
- SMS (text message) notification of significant items; and
- Video of programs and full transcripts are available upon request.

WATER RESTRICTIONS

142. **The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** When will the proposed water restrictions education program targeting people of non-English speaking background commence?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The Drought response education and advertising campaign commenced in June 2003.

Phase two of the campaign has included a major TV, radio and press advertising campaign to encourage water efficiency throughout the community. The radio ads are in various languages to match programs on 5EBI, 5PBA, Radio Italia, Radio Dorifos (each 80 spots over 15 weeks) and Radio ENA (720 spots over six months). All press ads feature the contact details and logo for the Interpreting & Translating Centre. This logo is easily recognised by people from non-English speaking backgrounds.

A statewide mailout has included a brochure with a range of different languages—as advised by the Interpreting & Translating Centre—encouraging people who speak languages other than English to contact the centre for translations of the important information.

SCHOOLS, STURT STREET COMMUNITY

159. **Ms CHAPMAN:**

1. How many students have enrolled at the Sturt Street Community School in 2004 and do families living in the city will have priority enrolment and what were the enrolment advertising costs?

2. What are the current and future estimated renovation costs planned for the school?

The Hon P.L. WHITE:

1. As at 20 January 2004, there have been 82 enrolments for the 2004 school year from childcare to year 3.

Enrolment priorities for the School are outlined in the flyer entitled 'Sturt Street Community School Initial Enrolment Policy'. This flyer is included in the enrolment pack.

First enrolment priority will be given to children whose primary residence is in the Adelaide City Square Mile (Post Code 5000). Second priority will go to children of families where both parents/guardian (or sole parent) work or study and where one parent works or studies in the Adelaide City Square Mile (Post Code 5000).

Children of newly arrived family families who participate in English language programs and who need childcare in order to participate in those programs will receive third priority.

The estimated enrolment advertising costs are $14,810, which includes print and radio advertising and other publicity for the school such as brochures, banners and publicity boards.

2. On top of the published figures, I have given approval for a community facility. Costing for this facility is being undertaken in consultation with other bodies including the Adelaide City Council.

PEDESTRIAN TUNNELS

171. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What action has or will be taken to ensure that pedestrian tunnels under roads and railway stations in the Metropolitan area are accessible by disabled persons and has a survey been undertaken to see if the tunnel gradients are suitable for wheelchairs, motorised wheelchairs and scooters?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Pedestrian tunnels under roads and at railway stations in the Metropolitan area are the responsibility of Transport SA, TransAdelaide or local authorities.

As such, I am only able to comment on facilities for which Transport SA and TransAdelaide is responsible.

Whenever an upgrade or new installation of a pedestrian tunnel is undertaken on a Transport SA road, Transport SA's current practice is to incorporate the appropriate Disability Discrimination Act Guidelines for access.

Transport SA has a very limited number of these facilities and the need to undertake Disability Discrimination Act assessments will be included as part of the routine structural assessments of these facilities.

TransAdelaide is aware of the need to provide wheelchair access to railway stations and has undertaken an initial assessment to identify the highest priority disability access issues.

The suitability of subway ramps for wheelchairs, motorised wheelchairs and gophers is being addressed by either closing subways and providing at-grade compliant pedestrian crossings, or leaving the subway in place and providing alternative at-grade compliant pedestrian crossings.

There are some stations where removing the subway may not be a suitable solution because of reduced sighting distances for approaching trains at pedestrian crossings. In this case longer term strategies must be developed to ensure that the rail system is fully accessible and these are currently being developed in conjunction with the Office of Public Transport. The longer term strategies will form the basis of disability access action plans for agencies such as TransAdelaide, with progress monitored by the Office of Public Transport

When major upgrading work at railway stations is undertaken, there is compliance with the Disability Standards for Accessible public transport.

SPEEDING FINES, HUTT ROAD

177. **Mr BROKENSHIRE:** How many speeding motorists were detected along Hutt Road - Adelaide since March 2003, what were the range of excess speeds detected, how much revenue was recovered and what were the comparative details for the six month period prior to this date?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The introduction of the 50 kph default speed limit commenced on 1 March 2003 with a three month education campaign. SAPOL introduced a policy of only issuing expiation notices or reporting drivers for serious breaches during the education period, which operated from 1 March to 30 May 2003.

The speed limit along Hutt Road, Adelaide is the 50kph default. The following tables outline the detections from 1 March 2003 to 31 August 2003 and from 1 September 2002 to 28 February 2003. It should be noted that 118 drivers received cautions during the education period.

Speed camera offences issued and expiated for the period of 01-03-2003 to 31-8-2003 - Hutt Road, Adelaide

	Issued		Expiated	
Offences	Number	Amount $	Number	Amount $
Exceed default speed in built up area by up to 14 kph	910	134,430	612	90,892
Exceed default speed in built up area by 15-29 kph	274	62,432	171	39,138
Exceed default speed in built up area by 30-44 kph	2	680	1	340
Exceed default speed in built up area by 45 kph or more	1	340	0	0

Total		1,187	197,882	784	130,370
Notices withdrawn during Education Phase	Less	118			
New Total		1,069			

Speed camera offences issued and expiated for the period of 01/09/2002 to 28/02/2003 - Hutt Road, Adelaide

	Issued		Expiated	
Offences	Number	Amount $	Number	Amount $
Exceed default speed in built up area by up to 14 kph	194	26,838	153	21,165
Exceed default speed in built up area by 15-29 kph – Owner	45	9,702	31	6,683
Exceed default speed in built up area by 30-44 kph – Owner	1	319	1	319
Total	240	36,859	185	28,167

HOLDFAST SHORES DEVELOPMENT

178. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** How much land tax and stamp duty has been raised from properties associated with the Holdfast Shores development and what is the percentage return on investment for Government funding of the development?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:

1. The Commissioner of State Taxation advises that to determine the exact amount of land tax and stamp duty raised since the commencement of the Development is an extremely difficult and resource intensive exercise.

In relation to land tax, this would involve identifying and examining the individual circumstances of every owner of each property (i.e. all apartments and marina berths) in the Development since the project began in 1997, whilst also taking into consideration factors such as exemptions, where the owner may be entitled to a principal place of exemption, and the aggregation principles, where the owner may own more than one property in South Australia.

However, in a report tabled on 15 September 2003, in relation to a inquiry undertaken by the Economic and Finance Committee into, inter alia, the Development's return to Government, it is stated that the increased income in water/sewer rates and land tax associated with the commercial development will total approximately $400,000 per annum. I am advised that the Chief Executive, Department of Administrative and Information Services, provided this information to the Economic and Finance Committee.

In relation to stamp duty, RevenueSA provided the Economic and Finance Committee with information for their report, which was based on the initial purchase price of each property sold in the Development between December 1999 and February 2003, obtained from the Major Project Group, Department of Administrative and Information Services.

Based on this information, RevenueSA was able to estimate that the following stamp duty would have been paid on properties sold within the Development:

Ramada Plaza Pier Hotel & Suites	$3,083,944
Marina Pier Berths	$102,445
Marina Pier Apartments	$1,411,130
Marina East Precinct	$1,505,365
Lights Landing Precinct	$475,278
Holdfast Quays Precinct	$250,660
Holdfast Quays Marina Berths	$ 61,040
Total	$6,889,862

RevenueSA advises that this information does not include the stamp duty paid on properties on-sold (where there may have been significant capital gains), any assignments of interests in contracts prior to settlement, or duty payable on mortgages entered into to finance the purchase of property. Nor does the information include stamp duty paid on leases of retail, hotel and entertainment tenancies.

2. In relation to your second question, I am advised by the Department of Treasury and Finance that in order to facilitate the development of Holdfast Shores, the construction of Glenelg Harbour and Adelaide Shores Boat Haven were undertaken by the Government for a total cost of $19.4 million. The return to the Government on this investment is dependent upon the timing of sales revenue achieved for the retail components.

In February 2001, the former Government approved a variation to the Holdfast Shores Development Agreement that included a estimated final distribution sum of $7.75 million, of which $3.66 million would be payable to the Government. The Holdfast Shores Consortium revised the amount payable to Government to $1.9 million later in 2001. This amount was included in the forward estimates for 2001-2002.

The delay in the sale of the retail precinct meant that the expected return of $1.9 million was not realised in 2001-2002. The latest revised advice provided to me in April 2003 forecasts the return to be $1.4 million, payable in 2005-2006. This will deliver a 7.2% return to the Government on its investment.

It is noted that the issue of the Development's return to Government has also been broadly discussed in the Economic and Finance Committee's report.

179. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

1. How is the construction of the proposed nine storey apartment complex on the former surf club site at Holdfast Shores consistent with the project's original master plan and will the proposed entertainment precinct and infrastructure require additional funding from the Government or the City of Holdfast Bay?

2. What other changes have been made to the original master plan during the project's first two stages?

3. Why were the funds generated from Stages 1 and 2A insufficient to fund Stage 2B and why was the Ramada Plaza Hotel site sold to developers rather than being allocated to fund Stage 2B?

4. Will Magic Mountain be compulsorily acquired by the Government if Council consent for redevelopment is not forthcoming?

5. Will the Government compensate the City of Holdfast Bay for any loss in rate revenue resulting from the proposed closure of Scampis Restaurant, Magic Mountain and the Colley Terrace car park and how much public land will be converted into private ownership under the Government's proposal?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. The Holdfast Shores Development is being implemented by the Holdfast Shores Consortium under a Development Agreement entered into by the previous Government in November 1997.

The Holdfast Shores Master Plan was amended by a Variation to the Development Agreement with the Holdfast Shores Consortium by the previous government in February 2001.

The Master Plan included a revised footprint for the Hotel as has been constructed. It also included a site for a residential building alongside the Hotel on that area currently occupied by the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club.

The developer's proposal is therefore within the spirit and intent of the Holdfast Shores Master Plan.

No government or Council funding will be required. The development including the proposal to demolish Magic Mountain and turn that area into a substantial landscaped public open space will be privately funded.

2. The other change in the Master Plan relates to the building known as Light's Landing situated at the southern side of the marina. Originally proposed to consist of a Tavern, Private Club and serviced apartments, it now consists of retail tenancies and residential apartments. The previous government also agreed to this change.

3. Each stage of the Holdfast Shores development is packaged as a stand-alone project and it only proceeds if it meets the financier's investment criteria in its own right.

It was never intended that Stages 1 and 2A would fund the Entertainment Precinct. To the contrary, the original project budget contained in the 1997 Development Agreement in fact suggested there would be a significant surplus from the entertainment area.

That has not turned out to be the case.

Attempts to attract an operator for the hotel development site under the pre-existing arrangements were not proving successful. The previous government made the decision in 2001 to sell the Hotel site in an endeavour to attract the required developers/investors to the project. A sale of the site was negotiated for a price in excess of the development margin anticipated under the Development Agreement.

In 2001 the land for the proposed residential building alongside the Hotel was excised from the Hotel site before it was sold and included as part of Stage 2B for the following reasons.

(a) It prevents the developer from completing the apartment building without fulfilling the obligation to complete the Entertainment Precinct.

(b) It is recognised that the apartment building component will be necessary to make the delivery of a new family entertainment area financially viable.

4. The government has no plans to compulsorily acquire Magic Mountain.

5. Scampi's Restaurant is outside the area of the developer's proposal and remains in the ownership of the Council. It is understood though that the Council may possibly demolish that building in the future.

The government will not compensate Council for any losses in revenue from Magic Mountain and the Colley Terrace car park. Any reduction in income will be offset by rates revenue from the overall project.

The area of the apartment building is approximately 1,973 m² and will transfer to private ownership.

The area of the entertainment building is approximately 2,395 m², which together with the adjacent outdoor entertainment component of approximately 1,447 m², will transfer to private ownership although it will remain open to public thoroughfare and enjoyment by the community.

The balance of the area will remain in public ownership including the proposed new landscaped public open space area of approximately 5,200 m² to be created on the existing Magic Mountain site.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

180. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** How many patients were treated at the Flinders Medical Centre Emergency Department in 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03, and for each year:

(a) what were the average waiting times;

(b) what percentage were classified as 'triage one' and how many of these patients could have been adequately treated by out of hours general practice; and

(c) how many 'triage one' patients would be classified as repeat patients and how many had a primary psychiatric or altered conscious state due to drug and alcohol abuse?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The number of patients treated at the Flinders Medical Centre (FMC) emergency department are as follows:

Year	Occasions of Service
2000-01	50,267
2001-02	50,088
2002-03	49,629

(a) Information about average waiting times has not been kept during this period.

(b) The percentage of cases classified as 'triage 1' is listed below. No triage category 1 patients could be adequately treated by out of hours general practice. Of all patients treated in the Emergency Department at FMC, it is impossible to say which of them could have been treated by a GP without reviewing all the case notes. It is the duty of a hospital Emergency Department to treat all patients presenting.

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Triage category 1	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%

(c) Over the three year period, there were 39 triage category 1 patients who had presented to the ED within the seven days preceding their category 1 presentation. The vast majority of these were not predictable or preventable.

The following table shows the number of triage category 1 patients that presented with a psychiatric or altered conscious state due to alcohol or drug use.

Triage category 1	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
With psychiatric or altered conscious state	45	40	45

Approximately 10 per cent of triage category 1 patients had a psychiatric or altered conscious state due to drug or alcohol.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

182. **Mr BROKENSHIRE:** How is the Government assisting the Country Fire Service financially on their loss of Public Benevolent Institution status and does the South Australian Ambulance Service have the same status?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

The SA Country Fire Service lost its Public Benevolent Institution (PBI) Status in July 2000.

The SA Country Fire Service sought to reverse this judgement without success.

In recent months the Australasian Fire Authorities Council (AFAC) has submitted a paper to the Board of Taxation (in relation to the Charities Bill Exposure Draft) seeking PBI status for Volunteer Emergency Services Organisations to be created within legislation.

As a consequence of losing PBI status, the SA Country Fire Service is financially impacted by the requirement to pay fringe Benefits Tax (FBT).

The SA Country Fire Service is fully funded to meet its current FBT obligation.

It should be noted that CFS Groups, whilst without PBI Status, do have Deductible Gift Recipient Status.

In regards to the South Australian Ambulance Service, in February 2003 the Australian Tax Office advised SAAS that it's PBI status is to be revoked. SAAS has negotiated to retain its PBI status until 31 March 2004.

SPEED DETECTION DEVICES

183. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:**

1. Are speed detection devices classified as revenue raising or road safety devices?

2. Are police officers instructed to give priority to operating speed detection devices and issuing infringement notices over other policing duties and are they given quotas on the number of infringement notices issued?

3. Why was there a speed camera operator's vehicle parked between the Port Augusta and Wilmington turn-off on the right hand side going towards the turn off, on 11 November 2003 and why was the vehicle partly obscured?

4. Why is there often a police car parked on the side of Highway One near Crystal Brook at night with the lights turned off and who authorises its presence there?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

1. Speed detection devices are road safety devices deployed as part of the strategy to reduce excessive speed and establish a firm base for long-term change in driver attitude to speeding. Cameras are deployed to road locations assessed as constituting a safety risk through factors including a high crash history or the potential to contribute to collisions; in response to speeding complaints or for safety reasons at locations where the use of other speed detection methods or equipment is not the preferred option.

2. The Police Commissioner advises that Police officers are not instructed to give priority to operating speed detection devices and issuing infringement notices over other policing duties, nor are they given quotas on the number of infringement notices to issue.

3. The Police Commissioner advises that on 11 November 2003, SAPOL's Traffic Camera Unit deployed a speed camera to the northern area of the State, one location being between the Port Augusta and Wilmington turn-off. As standard practice, deployment locations are based on an intelligence assessment of locations which have a 'road safety risk', or locations which contribute to a 'road safety risk' at another location.

Where speed cameras are deployed to rural areas they are, on occasion positioned under trees and partly obscured. This is done to contribute to the safety of speed camera operators from passing traffic, particularly heavy vehicles and to provide some protection from the heat especially in remote areas in the north of the State.

4. National Highway One is a major arterial route extending through the mid north area of the State referred to by the South Australia Police as the North East Local Service Area (NELSA).

The Police Commissioner advises that Police from NELSA and other specialist South Australia Police sections undertake speed detection and static patrol duties along the Highway in line with recognised road safety strategies. Traffic policing necessitates elements of deterrence through a visible presence as well as enforcement. The presence of the police vehicle at the location described, with its lights turned off, is consistent with enforcement activity, particularly relating to speed detection and policing of the heavy vehicle industry. Unless some obvious danger exists, it is not a requirement for police to illuminate their vehicle lights at night whilst safely undertaking these duties.

PATAWALONGA BARRAGE GATES

184. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** When will the walkway over the Patawalonga barrage gates be upgraded to enable the safe passage of wheel chairs, prams and cyclists?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

There are no plans to upgrade the walkway over the Patawalonga barrage gates in the foreseeable future.

TRAMWAY CROSSINGS

186. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** Which tramway crossings were recently identified by the State Level Crossing Safety Strategy Advisory Committee as being of an unusually dangerous nature and will the cost of any upgrade be funded from the track upgrade budget required for the new trains?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Four tramway crossings on the Glenelg tram-line have been found to require upgrading:

- Goodwood Road
- South Road
- Marion Road
- Morphett Road

None of the crossings are regarded as unusually dangerous.

The crossings will form part of a comprehensive program to carry out upgrading found to be required at level crossings across the State. Funding will depend on the timing and relative priority of the works to be undertaken.

SA WATER

187. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** Does SA Water intend charging Strata Title and Company Title Unit Holders a supply charge on a per meter basis rather than per unit holder basis and if not, why not?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. Under the Waterworks Act 1932, all properties, including Strata Titled Corporations and Company Titled groups, which are available to water and sewer mains are subject to rates, irrespective of whether they are connected to the mains or not. The provision of public utilities, such as water and sewerage mains, are of benefit to the whole community and as such individual water and sewerage rates are applied.

As each unit is separately assessed by the Valuer-General and share a common water supply from one water meter, a supply charge for water is charged in respect of each unit. Charges for water usage can be sent to the nominated Strata/Company Titled Corporation of the property, or equally divided amongst all the units, or apportioned between the units on a percentage basis as determined by the Strata/Company Titled Corporation and included on the individual owners' accounts.

EPA LICENCES

188. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What processes are being put in place to support Local Councils taking over responsibility for policing and monitoring EPA Licences?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The EPA has a long held view that there is a need to enlist the support of local government in the administration of the *Environment Protection Act 1993* (the Act).

The EPA is prepared to facilitate a partnership with any Council prepared to take the lead role in the management and enforcement of environmental issues associated with “non-licensed” activities within the council area. Essentially this relates to Councils looking after complaints arising from activities on domestic, retail, commercial and industrial premises (non-licensed) that cause or have the potential to cause environmental nuisance.

However, there has never been any intention to give local government responsibility for policing and monitoring EPA licences.

In 2000, the EPA conducted a Trial Partnership Program with three councils to share environment protection responsibilities. The councils included Adelaide City, Adelaide Hills and Port Adelaide Enfield. The trial sought to:

- Foster a partnership approach between Councils and the EPA regarding environmental management and protection issues.
- Identify the resource needs and costs to Councils to investigate environmental complaints about issues arising from premises that are not required to be licensed by the EPA.
- Develop a support package for councils.
- Determine the most efficient ways to provide environment protection services to local communities.

The results of the trial were released in August 2002 and found that:

- The roles of Local Government and the EPA in responding to environmental issues should be clarified, via proposed amendments to the Environment Protection Act.
- Mechanisms should be available to Local Councils to recover costs associated with responding to environmental issues. Both these issues are included in the proposed Environment Protection (Miscellanous) Amendment Bill, which the Government consulted on during 2003 and anticipates tabling in Parliament prior to June 2004.
- The EPA should continue to provide, via its Local Government Support Unit, assistance to Councils in the areas of technical assistance, general legal advice, equipment, training and IT/administrative support.

HOME DETENTION

191. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** Are there any plans to change prisoner eligibility for home detention and if so, what are the details?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: In my current capacity as acting Minister for Environment and Conservation I can advise that the South Australian EPA recognises that two-stroke engine exhaust has the potential to adversely impact aquatic ecosystems, including fish populations. Accordingly, the recently published EPA Code of Practice for Vessels on Inland Waters states that "*The use of 2-stroke engines for watercraft is discouraged due to potential contamination of waters by oil and exhaust emissions. It is projected that emission standards, which set pollution levels for engines of watercraft, will be introduced by 2010.*" It is anticipated that these emission standards will be enforced by the *Environment Protection (Water Quality) Policy 2003* in due course.

The timeframe for introduction of emission standards reflects the complexity of developing national standards that incorporate current scientific understanding, the need for national consistency on waters crossing state boundaries and a suitable period to enable existing operators to adapt to changing standards. The approach to regulation has been to set emission standards rather than simply targeting two-stroke engines. This approach will not only capture polluting two-stroke engines, but also other poorly performing engines.

SCHOOLS, BOOLEROO CENTRE

193. **The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** Why has the Booleroo Centre District School's ecologically sustainable water development project been delayed and what action will the Department take to rectify the situation?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The Booleroo Centre School's ecologically sustainable water development project was contingent upon the availability of the nearby dam. I am informed that the project has not proceeded because the owner sold the proposed dam site in October 2003 ending any prospect of progressing the concept further. However, I am also informed that the school has allocated the money to a water saving irrigation/system for the school oval and gardens. These works are to be carried out in conjunction with the redevelopment and rebuilding being done at the school.

HOUSING

195. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

1. What are the Government's long term plans to address the housing needs of our ageing population?

2. How are the homeless being assisted and what relief is available?

3. How are individuals struggling with rent payments and mortgage repayments being assisted?

4. Will the number of Housing Trust units and homes available for rent be increased?

The Hon. S.W. KEY:

1. People's housing needs and preferences change and vary according to age, stage of life, income, culture, location of support networks, and number of children. Therefore, diversity of housing types and housing environments that are responsive to changing demographics and the economic climate are required.

The ageing of South Australia's population is a key demographic trend. Providing appropriate housing with access to facilities and services and, in some cases, that are designed so that personal care can be linked to the household, are a major challenge for government.

The State Government made an election commitment to the development of a State Housing Plan to identify solutions to market failure and to articulate clearly the purpose and focus of government intervention in the housing market. The plan, which is being

developed through a process of extensive consultation, will outline a direction for housing in South Australia over the next 10 years and strategies required to ensure that all South Australians have access to safe, secure, appropriate and affordable housing. It will include strategies to increase the supply of quality low cost housing stock, seek to improve service delivery methods and encourage industry development.

The draft plan will be considered by Cabinet in 2004. The terms of reference of the plan, copies of discussion papers and submissions received in the planning process are available on the Department of Human Services internet site at www.dhs.sa.gov.au/statehousingplan.

How are the homeless being assisted and what relief is available?

2. The state's social housing agencies prioritise housing allocations to those in greatest need, namely Category 1 applicants, many of which are people experiencing homelessness. In 2002-03, Category 1 applicants received 2,928 of 5,531 (53 per cent) of all social housing allocations.

Reducing homelessness is a key priority of the Government's social inclusion initiative and this issue was referred to the Social Inclusion Board on its establishment in March 2002.

The Social Inclusion Board has provided a report and action plan on how to reduce the number of people sleeping rough in South Australia by 50 per cent during the life of the Government.

$12 million was provided in the state budget, over four years, to provide initial funding to address homelessness in South Australia from 2003-04 to 2006-07. Cabinet is considering the report and action plan and reviewing funding allocations to ensure a full program of initiatives can be implemented.

Key areas for these initiatives include:

- the creation of new boarding house style accommodation;
- the provision of long-term supported accommodation;
- improved management and coordination of the care of homeless people with complex and multiple needs;
- transitional accommodation for vulnerable people; and
- the establishment of an outreach support program.

In addition, a major reform package for Supported Residential Facilities (SRFs) has been announced. $11.4 million has been approved to fund a comprehensive strategy to support the needs of 1200 vulnerable people in SRFs.

3. The Commonwealth, through Centrelink, provides rental assistance to eligible South Australians. Individuals and families who are struggling with rent payments may apply for assistance.

The South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) also provides financial assistance to households who are experiencing instability, poverty or difficulty accessing the private rental market under its Private Rental Assistance Program. $14.3 million was spent in 2002-03 to assist 31 800 people. For 2003-04, $14.7 million has been allocated to administer the program.

Whilst rental assistance is an important element of housing assistance, of more significance is the provision of social housing within which affordable rents are guaranteed.

South Australia invests considerable effort into the provision and maintenance of social housing in order to provide affordable and appropriate housing opportunities for low income earners, low income families and other disadvantaged people.

Government social policy does not extend to direct ongoing subsidy for mortgage assistance but HomeStart Finance offers a range of mortgage products tailored to the needs of low to moderate income earners.

HomeStart Finance develops, markets and manages home finance initiatives to increase home ownership opportunities for South Australians. The HomeStart Loan is tailored to the needs of people on low to moderate incomes. As at 30 June 2003, HomeStart had provided 15,284 loans valued at $720,382,540, including 2,466 new loans totalling $194 million in 2002-03.

HomeStart also manages loans advanced by the SAHT to enable tenants to purchase their SAHT homes.

4. 350 new Housing Trust homes will be constructed in 2003-04 as part of the SAHT Capital Program and an additional 18 homes will be purchased.

A further 1,400 houses will be upgraded and retained through a range of programs that produce new or modified stock from old.

The Urban Renewal, New Build and Redevelopment, and Capital Maintenance Programs will produce new or renewed housing either from large scale redevelopment projects (Urban Renewal Program with the Newbuild Program) or from small scale 'pocket' redevelopment projects (Better Neighbourhoods Program—part of the Newbuild and Redevelopment Program). In addition, the Capital Maintenance program constructs houses where appropriate land parcels can be generated for special needs or purpose built housing.

Pockets of public housing throughout the metropolitan area between Darlington and Gepps Cross are being redeveloped through the Better Neighbourhoods Program. These small-scale redevelopments aim to replace obsolete housing with new energy efficient adaptable homes.

As many allotments as possible are generated from these pockets of obsolete stock with some allotments sold and the proceeds reinvested in the construction of new public housing on the remaining allotments. The program is largely self-funding and overall new housing costs are kept relatively low.

Urban regeneration and area renewal projects improve the social and physical environments of traditional public housing areas, and are undertaken in conjunction with other State agencies and Local Government, community agencies and private industry.

Flow-on benefits arising from urban renewal projects include:

- the creation of local employment and training opportunities, with associated economic impacts;
- encouragement of partnerships and a cross-government holistic approach to urban regeneration; and
- the promotion of good practice in energy efficiency and environmental management.

Major Urban Renewal projects for 2003/04 are occurring at Gilles Plains, Hawksbury Park, Kilburn South, Risdon Grove, Westwood and Whyalla Norrie.

HOUSING TRUST, WHITE ANTS

196. **Mr HANNA:** Is there a Departmental budget allocated to address the treatment of white ants in Housing Trust buildings and if not, why not?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Funding for the treatment of white ants in South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) properties is incorporated into the responsive maintenance budget. The level of expenditure to treat and repair white ant damage to SAHT properties is approximately $0.800 million per annum.

SCOBIE, Mr

197. **Mr HANNA:** What action has been taken to address the concerns of Justice Gray in the Supreme Court case regarding the sentencing and rehabilitation of Mr Scobie?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

1. The Department for Correctional Services has implemented, and Mr Scobie has to date been complying with, all of the conditions imposed on him by the court.

ATRIZINE MONITORING

198. **Mr HANNA:** Which Government agency is responsible for the testing and monitoring of Atrizine and other persistent organic pollutants in the Hill's aquifers?

The Hon. J.D. HILL:

1. The *Environment Protection Act 1993* and its associated *Environment Protection (Water Quality) Policy 2003* provide the most specific legal provisions relating to pesticide contamination of water resources in South Australia. From a legal perspective it is therefore the responsibility of the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) to conduct monitoring, management and control of pesticides in the Hills' aquifers.

In relation to the Hills' aquifers, the EPA currently conducts monitoring for pesticides in the Willunga Basin and Barossa Valley and acts as a referral body for testing undertaken by SA Water. SA Water routinely tests reservoirs as part of its water supply risk analysis. Such monitoring includes analysis of Atrazine and other pesticides.

SCHOOLS, CRAIGMORE HIGH

199. **Mr HANNA:**

1. Why did the Department decline an offer by the five transferred Craigmore High School teachers to have the Special Investigations Unit investigate any alleged misdemeanors?

2. Why did the Department provide the names of the five teachers to the *Advertiser* before the teachers were notified of their transfers?

3. What justification can be given for the removal of one of the teachers who achieved the highest class SACE results for the

previous year and previously recognised for teaching excellence by the Department?

4. Has one of the subject teachers recently been promoted to Coordinator at Craigmore High School for term 3?

5. Why was the Chairperson of the School Council able to access a confidential Departmental document and why was this document withheld from other staff members including the five transferred teachers?

6. Are the replacement Science and Year 12 History teachers trained to teach in these areas?

7. Why were the two Occupational Health and Safety Default notices issued to the Craigmore High School Site not acted upon by the Department?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE:

1. I am advised that at no stage did the Chief Executive consider it necessary to have the department's Special Investigations Unit investigate the individual teachers.

As you would be aware the grounds and the reasons for the Chief Executive's decision to transfer the teachers were subject to review by the Supreme Court where they were held to be valid decisions which were necessary to be made in the best interests of the school students and the school community.

2. I am advised that the department did not provide the names of the five teachers to the Advertiser newspaper before the teachers were notified of their transfers. I am further advised that throughout this process, the department has acted with full respect to the rights of the five teachers whilst maintaining its obligations to the students and school community of the Craigmore High School.

3. The Chief Executive took those steps he felt were necessary to ensure that the well-being of all students at Craigmore High School and particularly those students in years 11 and 12 were maintained. The Supreme Court ruling vindicated the Chief Executive's decision.

4. I am advised that one of the teachers subject to transfer had been placed in the position of coordinator on a temporary basis prior to the decision of the Chief Executive. All teachers are now at new schools for the 2004 school year.

5. I am advised that a decision was taken by the Chief Executive to provide the chairperson of the school council with a draft copy of the review into the school in light of the important role in school governance undertaken by the school council.

6. As part of making the decision to transfer the teachers, detailed consideration was given to ensuring that replacement teachers be adequately trained and be of an appropriate standard to ensure that no student suffered disadvantage. In addition, extra measures were put in place to assist students, including bringing in university students to mentor and tutor year 12 students.

7. I am advised that the department followed correct processes according to legislative requirements in dealing with the default notices relating to Craigmore High School.

ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS

200. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What are the current and future arrangements regarding the privacy and security of patient's electronic health records?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: All staff employed in public hospitals and health centres have a statutory obligation, under the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976, to maintain the confidentiality of patient information. Staff cannot divulge any personal information relating to any patient, obtained in the course of employment, other than as may be authorised or required by law or by their employer.

In respect of information privacy principles, state agencies are required to comply with Cabinet Administrative Instruction 1/89 'The Information Privacy Principles' (IPPs) which is administered by the Privacy Committee of South Australia.

Recognising the interaction between the public and private health sectors, the Department of Human Services (DHS) has introduced a Code of Fair Information Practice, which establishes a framework for the appropriate collection, use, storage and disclosure of personal information. The Code is based on the National Privacy Principles that are legally binding on the private health sector via the Commonwealth Privacy Act 1988. The Code is applicable to DHS and its funded service providers (including public hospitals and community health services). It also contains additional privacy requirements relating to 'sensitive' and 'health' information.

The Open Architecture and Clinical Information System (Oacis) is the major electronic health system operating in the public health sector. The system provides computer based integrated clinical information for use in the care of patients by doctors, nurses, allied health professionals and key support staff. Oacis is currently in use in seven of the eight metropolitan public hospitals. It is not a complete electronic patient record because it does not include all the information that may be found in a patient's medical record. However, it does provide the platform for a comprehensive electronic patient record in the future.

Access to Oacis is strictly limited to 'authorised persons' within the health care sector and varying access levels are granted depending upon the need of the clinical user to perform his/her job. Each year, every user is required to sign an access and confidentiality agreement. Failure to do so will deny the user access to the system. The Oacis audit trail provides a transactional record of access to patient data and can answer questions including:

- Who accessed the patient data?
- What patient data was accessed?
- When did access occur?

There are high levels of security in place to protect the Oacis system from unauthorised access and ensure it is available for use in the care of patients, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Oacis is located on a secure network separated from the Government Wide Area Network, known as StateNet, by a firewall. The data centre where patient information is stored and processed has the highest level of protection based on the South Australian Government's Information Technology Standards. The Auditor-General performs an audit of the data centre every two years to ensure compliance with the standards.

BOATING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION

203. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What is the status of the mapping of inland and coastal waterways project that was entered into with the Boating Industry of SA?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The Boating Industry Association was provided with funding through the South Australian Tourism Commission's Tourism Development Fund to assist with the production of up to date navigation literature for the River Murray.

The artwork, maps and charts were completed in May 2003 and editing of information relating to the various areas is currently being undertaken, along with ground checks of 200 maps.

CLASSIC ADELAIDE RALLY

204. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** How many international and interstate people attended the 2004 Classic Adelaide Rally?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: No figures are available until after this year's event is held in November 2004. The Classic Adelaide Rally is not a 'ticketed' event, however, entrants' figures for the 2003 Classic Adelaide Rally have been estimated by Silverstone Events to be:

International: 60
Interstate: 365

TOURISM, INFRASTRUCTURE

205. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** How much has been spent on tourism infrastructure on the River Murray and its feeders, what are the projects and how much was spent on each project?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: For the past five financial years, from 1999-2000 to 2003-04, the South Australian Tourism Commission has provided funding for 30 different tourism infrastructure projects along the River Murray totalling $1,907,867.

Details of each project and the grant provided appear in the attached appendix.

Appendix

Infrastructure Projects Funded by the SATC on the Murray River and in Surrounding Towns

2003-04

Project name:	Birds Australia Gluepot Reserve Interpretive Centre Fit out (Stage 2)
Tourism region:	Murraylands

Level of SATC input:	$50,000
Project name:	Pomberuk Cultural Centre – Murray Bridge
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$50,000
Project name:	Saunders Gorge Sanctuary
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$4,965
Project name:	Riverland Signage
Tourism region:	Riverland
Level of SATC input:	$6,234
Project name:	Signage at Karoonda Pioneer Park Nature Trail
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$1,200
Project name:	Development of Murray Valley Trail Route
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$23,300
Total	$135,699
2002-03	
Project name:	Coorong Boat Ramp/Mundoo Channel
Tourism region:	Limestone Coast/Fleurieu Peninsula
Level of SATC input:	$50,000
Project name:	Goolwa Wharf Redevelopment
Tourism region:	Fleurieu Peninsula
Level of SATC input:	$1,250,000
Project name:	Tailem Bend Visitor Information Centre
Tourism region:	Limestone Coast
Level of SATC input:	$20,000
Project name:	BIASA Grey water Trial
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$5,000
Project name:	BIASA Snag Buoys
Tourism region:	Murraylands and Riverland
Level of SATC input:	$5,000
Project Name	Federation Walking Trail Murray Bridge-Mannum
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$243
Project Name:	Murray Bridge Tourist Drive
Tourism region:	Mobilong Rotary Club I/Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$3,200
Project Name:	Avoca Dell Redevelopment
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$25,000
Project name:	Graetz Lookout Upgrades
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$16,825
Total	$1,375,268
2001-02	
Project name:	Big Bend Sustainable Recreation Concept Plan
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$1,400
Project name:	Swan Reach Demonstration Site
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$20,000
Project name:	Pedal Prix Gantry
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$30,000
Project name:	Harvest Corner Backpackers
Tourism Region:	Riverland
Level of SATC input:	$50,000
Total	$101,400
2000-01	
Project name:	Berri Tourist and Interpretive Centre
Tourism region:	Riverland
Level of SATC input:	$50,000
Project name:	Coastal mapping and Murray Lower Lakes
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$40,000
Project name:	Riverglades Community Wetlands Boardwalk
Tourism region:	Murraylands
Level of SATC input:	$3,000
Project name:	Pedal Prix Track Extension—Murray Bridge
Tourism region:	Murraylands
SATC Input:	$50,000
Project name:	Truro Information Bay
Tourism region:	Murraylands
SATC Input:	$2,000
Project name:	Information and Interpretive Centre at Gluepot Reserve (Stage 1)
Tourism Region:	Riverland
SATC Input:	$50,000
Project name:	Mannum Wharf extension

Tourism Region:	Murraylands
SATC Input:	$19,000
Project name:	Maynard's Landing Lookout upgrade
Tourism Region:	Murraylands
SATC Input:	$13,500
Project name:	Wellington, Raye Street Tourism Development
Tourism Region:	Murraylands
SATC Input:	$2,000
Total	$229,500

1999-2000

Project Name:	Overland Corner Hotel Toilets
Tourism Region:	Riverland
SATC Input:	$16,000
Project Name:	Navigational and Mooring signs
Tourism Region:	Murraylands/Riverland
SATC Input:	$50,000
Total	$82,000

AUSTRALIAN MAJOR EVENTS

206. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**

1. Will Australian Major Events continue to support the Jacob's Creek Golf event after the 2004 agreement ends and if so, how?

2. What were the attendance figures for the 2002 Rose Festival, what was the sponsorship allocation and what were the Australian Major Events breakdown and costs of services provided?

3. What will be Australian Major Event's ongoing commitment to each of the four managed major events in terms of years and sponsorship?

4. Which events either managed or sponsored have returned the best value for investment and which events will be retained next year?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:

1. Discussions between Australian Major Events (AME) and Jacob's Creek, the naming rights sponsor for this event, are continuing regarding its sponsorship and AME's contribution is subject to results of these discussions.

2. The attendance figures for the 2002 Rose Festival were provided in the previous Question on Notice 50/3/308HA which was tabled on 27 November, 2003

Total monies received for the 2002 Rose Festival is as follows:

AME Contribution	818,985
Sponsorship	168,500
Other Revenue	266,273
	$1,253,758

AME breakdown and costs of services provided were:

Salaries & Wages	187,411
Advertising & Promotion	291,948
Operating Expenses	190,146
Event Operations	584,253
	$1,253,758

3. What will be Australian Major Events' (AME) ongoing commitment to each of the four managed major events in terms of years and sponsorship?

Provided they continue to provide a viable return on Government investment, AME is committed to managing the Jacob's Creek Tour Down Under and Credit Union Christmas Pageant annually and the World Solar Challenge and Tasting Australia biennially.

The specific commitment and sponsorship for each event is linked to forward budget appropriations. Hence, at this stage, AME is committed as follows:

- Jacob's Creek Tour Down Under—$1.7 million in both 2003/04 and 2004/05; $1.75 million in 2005/06, 2006/07 and 2007/08
- Credit Union Christmas Pageant—$375,000 in 2004/05; $400,000 in 2005/06, 2006/07 and 2007/08
- World Solar Challenge—$145,000 in 2004/05 (for 2005 event); $300,000 in 2005/06; $150,000 in 2006/07 (for 2007 event); $300,000 in 2007/08
- Tasting Australia—$450,000 in 2004/05 (for 2005 event); $1.05 million in 2005/06; $450,000 in 2006/07(for 2007 event); $1.05 million in 2007/08

4. Which events either managed or sponsored have returned the best value for investment and which events will be retained next year?

The highest return on investment (ROI) for a recent managed event derives from the Jacob's Creek Tour Down Under, which in 2003 provided a ROI of 7.3:1, based on Government expenditure of $1.7 million and an economic benefit for the State of $12.5 million (excluding media).

The highest ROI for a recent sponsored event derives from the Southern University Games, held in Adelaide in July 2003, which provided a ROI of 20+:1, based on Government expenditure of $250,000 and an economic benefit for the State of $5.9 million (excluding media).

The managed events in 2004 are:

- Jacob's Creek Tour Down Under
- Credit Union Christmas Pageant
- World Solar Challenge (to be staged in October 2005)
- Tasting Australia (to be staged in October 2005)

The sponsored events in 2004 are:

- World Fireball Championships
- AAPT (Tennis) Championships
- Jacob's Creek Open Golf Championships
- WOMADelaide
- Australian BMX Championships
- World Aerobics Championships
- Australian Beatles Festival
- International Space University Summer Session
- Australian Transplant Games
- Adelaide Horse Trials
- Australian Garden Festival
- Australian Horticultural Media Awards
- Classic Adelaide Rally
- SOSA: Ring Cycle.

TOURISM, FUNDING

207. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**

1. What amount of funding did each of the 12 tourism regions receive in line with the regional funding guidelines in 2001-02, 2002-03 and how much was spent in each region in 2002-03?

2. What was the amount of funding allocated in regional tourism in 2001-02?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:

1. In 2001-02 and 2002-03, a total of $2.13 million was provided to the State's twelve tourism regions.

Region	Total
Adelaide	$190,000
Adelaide Hills	$140,000
Barossa Valley	$190,000
Clare Valley	$140,000
Eyre Peninsula	$215,000*
Fleurieu Peninsula	$190,000
Flinders Ranges & Outback SA	$215,000**
Kangaroo Island	$190,000
Limestone Coast	$240,000***
Murraylands	$140,000
Riverland	$140,000
Yorke Peninsula	$140,000
Total	$2,130,000

* $50,000 was provided as special allocation funding to Tourism Eyre Peninsula to be used towards product development.

** $50,000 was provided as special allocation funding to Flinders Ranges and Outback SA to be used towards product development

*** $25,000 was provided as special allocation funding to Limestone Coast Tourism to cover the additional responsibility of marketing the Coorong.

In 2002-03, the twelve tourism regions spent the full allocation

of funds provided to them in line with the Regional Funding Guidelines.

2. In 2001-02, the $2.13 million as outlined above, was included in a total of $13,384,500 in regional tourism overall.

208. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**

1. What funds and resources are allocated to promote this State's tourism in China, has any research been undertaken into this matter and have resources been redirected from other overseas offices to support this promotion?

2. How will the State's tourism be promoted in Asia, Japan, United Kingdom and America, respectively?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:

1. The South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) has allocated $200,000 to the marketing of South Australia as a tourism destination in China in 2003-04.

The SATC has made a commitment in 2003-2004 to appoint a part-time account manager based in the Australian Tourism Commission (ATC) office in China. This will be timed to coincide with the reinstatement of major marketing activities in China, a country that is currently recovering from the SARS epidemic. The SATC is currently participating in 'market maintenance' activities such as trade training, and will continue to co-ordinate this from the Singapore office until the in-market representative is appointed.

Having a presence in China will enable South Australia to capture some of the extraordinary growth in visitation from this country prior to the SARS outbreak. Indications from the ATC are that the Chinese market is slowly recovering from the SARS outbreak and they are optimistic about growth from this market.

2. Refer to QON 10 response tabled 24 November 2003.

ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL HORSE TRIALS

209. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** How much correspondence has been received regarding the announcement of the defunding of the Adelaide International Horse Trials?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The Mitsubishi Adelaide International Horse Trials remains a Government sponsored event.

ACCOMMODATION FACILITIES

210. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Are accommodation providers experiencing low accommodation yields due to an over supply of accommodation facilities and if so what are the details?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The results of the Survey of Tourist Accommodation (STA) conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that the number of hotel, motel and serviced apartment rooms in South Australia increased by 13 per cent from the March 2001 quarter to the June 2003 quarter.

The STA results also show that comparing the year ended June 2003 with the year ended March 2001 yield per room night supplied (measured as total takings from accommodation divided by the total room nights available for sale during the period) increased by 6 per cent—slightly below the increase in CPI for Adelaide of 8 per cent over this period.

While the industry overall has performed well to absorb the increased capacity during a period of rapid expansion the 4 and 5 star sectors in the Adelaide Tourism Region have grown by 37 per cent and 61 per cent respectively between the March 2001 and the June 2003 quarters and have experienced a contraction in yield of 9 per cent and 11 per cent respectively between the year ended March 2001 and the year ended June 2003.

These sectors will experience improved profitability as demand grows however in the immediate future marketing by the South Australian Tourism Commission will continue to target the high yield sector both here and interstate to directly support the operators of 4 and 5 star accommodation product in the Adelaide Tourism Region.

AUSTRALIAN MAJOR EVENTS

211. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Which new events are being considered by the Tourism Commission and which existing events have been earmarked for cancellation, reduced funding from the Australian Major Events Calendar?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: In 2002-03 $33.45 million in direct economic benefit to the State was generated by events which were managed and sponsored by Australian Major Events (AME). AME will continue to bid for major events that will deliver a return on investment to the State, particularly as the Government has approved an increase in AME's ongoing base funding of $2.5 million from 2005-06.

Due to the highly competitive nature of event bidding, events under consideration or targeted specifically for bid activity will not be made public until the decision making process commences or when it is strategically advantageous and possible to do so.

Event sponsorship agreements are continually reviewed, usually at the completion of each event, to ensure that the taxpayers' dollar is getting an adequate return on investment.

BRESAGEN, RELOCATION

214. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What will be the impact of the Bresagens relocation overseas in terms of job loss, turnover and the Biosciences Precinct?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The impact of Bresagen's relocation is yet to be determined. BresaGen is a public company leasing property from the State Government and continues to occupy the site at Thebarton.