

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 3 June 2004

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

RURAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this house notes the recently released South Australian Farmers Federation policy paper entitled 'Rural South Australia policy for the future—a triple bottom line for the bush'.

(Continued from 6 May. Page 2078.)

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I support the comments made in this motion moved by the member for Schubert because, unfortunately, the government failed to take up the challenge that was put forward in this exercise by the Farmers Federation. I attended in the Mall when this plan was launched by the Premier, as did a number of other members of parliament. This document puts forward a policy for the future, agriculture being one of the most important segments of our economy, and it is entitled to support because of what it gives to and has done for South Australia. Therefore it is disappointing that less than adequate resources were put forward to that section of the economy. The member for Schubert, other members and I represent rural electorates and the urban centres in them, which are important. My concern is that rural industry needs two things: first, certainty, so people can plan and invest with confidence; and, secondly, like most small business it wants less red tape, less bureaucracy and less interference, but it needs an appreciation that what it is doing is in the long-term best interest of the people of South Australia.

This plan was accepted with gusto and a considerable number of statements were made by people on the platform, but the real test was the budget, and it has failed that test. In briefly supporting this motion—and I commend the member for Schubert for bringing it to the house—I ask the house to formally endorse this document, because the needs of rural and regional South Australia include: better education facilities, so that young people who grow up in those areas have opportunities; decent infrastructure and roads; and urgent support for the tourist industry, as many small communities would not survive without it. I heard an interesting discussion on the radio this morning as I was driving in, with people raising some questions in relation to the road between Orroroo and Hawker. In my judgment it was wisely finished during the previous government or it would have come to an abrupt halt now, as have many other roads in my constituency. We will say more about that at the appropriate time so that people do not forget.

People in the rural sector are burdened by unnecessary bureaucracy, red tape and nonsense. Every time you go to do something you have some petty officialdom wanting to make life as difficult as possible. Sir Humphrey 1, 2 and 3: and you can put them in whatever order you like. Whether you want to put in a fire break or tow a machine down the road, no matter what it is, you have the fools in the EPA who are off the planet—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Name them!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: At the right time, for the benefit of the Attorney, I would be very happy to do it. If the

honourable member, the Attorney-General, her Majesty's first law officer, thinks that some of the foolish decisions they are making are in the interests of South Australia, God help the people of South Australia.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I didn't say that.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You did by your interjection.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, I didn't. I said, 'Name them.'

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, you did. All good things come to those who wait. The Attorney-General should not get too excited because he will need more than public advertising to save his soul at the next election. Nevertheless, we will deal with that. This motion, quite properly brought to the attention of the house, sets out to let the parliament know what a contribution in agriculture the rural industry has made to this state and what it can do in the future. All it wants is recognition, for commonsense to apply, and that reasonable facilities be provided to people in country areas so that they can be encouraged to get on and produce that vast amount of export income. We have seen when the right policy levers are pulled what aquaculture can do and how successful the tourism industry has been. Both these industries were promoted by the previous government.

We know what contribution the grain industry, the wool industry, the meat and livestock industry and others can make to the welfare of the people of South Australia. They create opportunities, employment and investment. I support this motion and commend it to the house. I sincerely hope that all members have read it carefully and that the government will take note of it and implement it so that the people of South Australia can receive the continuous benefits that flow from a soundly based, strong rural community that is producing huge amounts of revenue from its taxes and charges and the employment it generates for the long-term benefits of all South Australians.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I also support the motion. Like the member for Stuart, I was in Rundle Mall on the day when this document was released by the President of the South Australian Farmers Federation (John Lush) and the Premier. I would concur in the member for Stuart's comments with regard to any lack of support for the document in the budget just last week, even though the Premier was vehement in his praise of the South Australian Farmers Federation, understood their concerns, as he said in Rundle Mall, and was pleased to support this paper. All those utterances were made but, unfortunately, when push comes to shove there is no guts to back it up. As the member for Stuart has said, the farming community in South Australia—and I was one of those at one time and very proud to be so—provides an incredible amount of income and particularly export income, so it is a vital sector for this state.

People talk about the requirement to keep a car industry here in South Australia, but there is no less importance on ensuring that we keep a viable and well-resourced farming and regional community in South Australia because, like it or not, the fact is that that is where much of our income and, as the member for Stuart has said, much of our taxation comes from in this state. I am sure that many country people and the Farmers Federation are as disappointed as I am at the lack of funds in the budget for any rural or regional road programs and Outback road programs. This document states that a very healthy transport system is required to maintain the regional and farming areas. Many of my friends are in the

livestock transport industry and talk to me about the condition of the roads that they have to travel over.

The previous government did have a program: it is unfortunate that this government chooses to ignore it. As I said, the utterances of the Premier in Rundle Mall are not matched in any way by the budget document. I have pleasure in supporting this motion and believe that all members of this house should have a good read of it to see the sort of input that comes from our country farmers and the importance of the agricultural industry and primary industries to the state economy.

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I also support this motion. I have not yet had the pleasure of reading the report, but I look forward to doing so. I have a strong interest in the future of primary industries in this state. It is the most important sector as far as the South Australian economy is concerned. I share my friend the member for Enfield's concerns about the effect of National Competition Policy, particularly with regard to the Barley Board. I acknowledge the member for Schubert and his efforts in that regard, and look forward to reading the report.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): In supporting the motion, as the shadow minister for population I was disappointed to note that I was not invited at all, so I did not attend the launch of this document. However, I do disclose that I am a proprietor of rural property. Sadly, it is broad acre land and does not give the same positive amount of revenue that seems to be applauded in this report. I also disclose that I am personally known to Prof. Richard Blandy, the author of the report; and I thirdly say that everything I am about to say I have put to the president of the SAFF, Mr John Lush. This is an important document because it is a sobering reminder that there are not just economic consequences to allowing any cancellation of the country in this state. It also reminds us of the social and environmental responsibility that we have to the country and to regional parts of South Australia and that it has to us.

One disappointment in this report is that there seems to be no recommendation to involve the Australian Farmers Federation or the commonwealth government, who are major financial stakeholders, in the development and support of rural Australia. It is very difficult to imagine how we can ask for a commitment, particularly in relation to recommendation 1, that the commonwealth budgets reflect an allocation of an increase of \$100 million a year to capital works and infrastructure, if they are not even invited to the table. That is a very disappointing omission.

The second matter I wish to raise in relation to this report is the apparent reference to the population in South Australia, which suggests that there is a diminution. The facts are that, overall, both in country and metropolitan South Australia, the population increased last year by 0.6 per cent, which is not a very impressive amount, I might say. It is actually the same in the country as it is in the city, and the disappointing aspect of this report is that, in extracting the data to make an argument in support of rural South Australia, I suggest that it misrepresents the population position in South Australia.

The report asserts that, if you cut out Kangaroo Island, the Fleurieu Peninsula, the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa and even Mallala—the home town and district of the president, Mr Lush—then you look at everything outside that as being rural South Australia. I do not even dare tell my relatives on Kangaroo Island that they are now treated as metropolitan Adelaide. That is a fundamental flaw in this report. It is very

disappointing because, in my view, the argument wins notwithstanding a distortion of those statistics. This ought to be remedied to make sure that it is correctly represented before the debate ensues over the next few months.

The final comment I make in relation to this is about the government. The government has had notice of this. Importantly, the Premier met with the president, Mr Lush, at the launch of this document. He welcomed and applauded it and indicated that he would participate in its assessment and that the government would then look at the recommendations. Yet, in this year's budget, we see a staggering rejection of any commitment whatsoever to the importance of regional South Australia. That is a disgrace and it is extremely disappointing. If the Premier is really serious about having a policy which supports the development of South Australia—that is, all South Australia—then it is about time that he ensured his Treasurer put his money where his mouth is.

Mr RAU (Enfield): I do not want to take up too much time on this, other than to say that it is important for all of us in this chamber to have regard to the needs and requirements of those South Australians who do not live in the metropolitan area and whose interests are not necessarily represented by the views of people whose entire experience is the city of Adelaide. For that reason I think it is important that the honourable member has brought this forward. It is important that we give consideration to these matters.

The reason I am on my feet, however, aside from supporting that, is that I could not help noticing that the member for Bragg made some remarks about the lack of support being offered by the state government for those South Australians who do not live in the metropolitan area. If we start down that path of pointing the finger at governments that are not offering support, it would be remiss of me not to get up and point my finger at Mr Costello, the federal Treasurer, who goes out of his way to make life difficult for barley farmers, chicken meat producers and other rural people in South Australia, who are doing their best to make a living and, might I add, earning tens if not hundreds of millions of dollars in export income for South Australia.

If we are talking about support, I would like to see some support for those people coming from the member for Bragg's federal colleagues. If she wants to do something really productive, apart from being disparaging about the state government, she could get on the telephone now (she is not in the chamber now, so she is probably closer to a phone than I am), ring Mr Costello and say, 'For God's sake, lay off the barley growers, will you? Just give them their single desk. They are happy with it; we are happy with it; everyone is happy with it. Lay off the chicken farmers and, by the way, the other people that are going to have a going-over shortly such as the people who are having stamps put on their pigs and various other people, let us leave them alone too. Let's declare Christmas early for the farmers of South Australia. Let's leave them alone.' Unfortunately, I do not see that happening because, sadly enough, we do not have enough marginal federal seats in rural South Australia for her to take any notice of us, unlike the sugar farmers in Queensland.

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr RAU: Actually, a good point is made by the member for Playford. It might well be that there is quite a bit of barley in Barker. There could be a lot of barley in Barker. There might be a lot more bark in Barker than the federal Treasurer cares to consider at the minute. I noticed in the paper that the

present member for Barker (temporarily, as I suspect it might be) stepped into the breach yet again today doing something remarkable. Perhaps there is a bit of barley in Barker, and that might be enough. Maybe Barker is going to be the litmus test, and I really hope it is. What I hope even more is that the Treasurer comes to his senses and just backs off, stops this idiotic obsession he has with national competition policy and stops poking his nose into everybody else's business. I hope that he lets our farmers get on with what they do well, which is producing a good product, exporting it and making a good income for rural and regional South Australia.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I want to briefly thank the members who have contributed to this debate, particularly the members for Stuart, Light, Playford, Bragg, and Enfield. I listened particularly to the member for Bragg's comments, and I too wondered why communities such as the Barossa, Kangaroo Island, Yankalilla and other places were excluded in the report and considered to be 'outer city', not country. I know that the Barossa people would take exception to that, as would the Hills people. So, I wondered why that scenario was used. Of course, it was pretty sharp for the member for Bragg to pick that up and mention it. I certainly will send a copy of this speech to the South Australian Farmers' Federation and ask why they chose to exclude these near city communities, because I am sure they will not be too happy about being excluded.

I also note the comments of the member for Enfield made just a moment ago. I must say that I agree with most of what he said, but not all. Certainly, the National Competition Policy is causing hurt. I will say this in a true bipartisan way: I appreciate the way in which the member for Enfield and the member for Playford, and more members all the time, are being more sympathetic to the people who live in rural South Australia.

Understanding that, all politics aside, the comments that they make I am able to read and to copy and to send to relevant people, who say, 'You cannot keep going down this course.' Whether or not the member for Enfield is playing politics—and I do not believe he is—I think it will put us in a difficult position if we cannot bring about a resolution to this problem of our having to forgo competition payments.

I challenge anybody to touch the single desk, because we as politicians all know how to count. It is certainly a very important thing that the farmers want to retain, that is, their orderly marketing through a single desk. It is National Competition Policy, and it is a federal government policy which came in under a federal Labor government, Mr Keating being prime minister at the time. People say, 'We are going to change a few things.' However, once you start breaking down the principles, I am sure that every other industry will want to do the same. So, it is not easy.

As I said to the Minister for Primary Industries in the house a couple of days ago, why don't we do another report, because the Round report was not conclusive. Indeed, the report itself said that it was not conclusive and therefore the federal minister was unable to act on it. So, we should spend a few more dollars to put a report together so that the federal minister can say that this is for the common good and that it is what people want. I am sure he will recognise that. Not only will the minister forgo the next lot but we will get back the money that has already been forgone. I say, 'Why don't we do that?' That is what I am challenging the minister to do.

This was a good document, and I congratulate the SAFF on that. As I said, I and others attended this release, and I was

very disappointed to see nothing in the budget papers: no recognition, because the triple bottom line in this document was \$100 million. I do not think we expected to get \$100 million; \$10 million would have been nice, or even \$5 million. However, at least there should have been some recognition in the budget papers that this document exists, and it should contain some comment regarding a financial contribution in relation to some of the findings that were arrived at. However, there was absolutely nothing. Having heard the Premier's rhetoric when he released this document, I must say that I am not surprised, but I am cross and concerned that there was not something there. There was not even a token recognition of it in this document.

I hope that the SAFF will confide in members of parliament more, because they do not. After all, members on the other side are members of unions. They do confide when their union and the member of parliament work together. It does not seem to be the case on this side, because I am a member of the Farmers Federation. I am prepared to work closely with it, and the liaison is always healthy and helpful. However, it does not seem to have been forthcoming in recent years. In fact, we are often seen as the enemy in some of the comments they make in relation to our rural productions. I put the challenge to them. I am here. I am a member. I am happy to help. I want better liaison.

Finally, I hope that this document is not wasted. It is worthwhile and I urge those members who have not read it to do so. I will keep it close as a very useful document, a compilation of very interesting and worthwhile facts. I hope the government will do the same. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

COETZEE, Prof. J.M.

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Ciccarello:

That this house congratulates South African novelist, current Adelaide resident and former Booker Prize winner, J.M. Coetzee, on having been awarded the 2003 Nobel Prize for Literature.

(Continued from 6 May. Page 2092)

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I would like to make just a few concluding remarks. I had actually finished on the bell when we rose last time. I would like to add our congratulations to Mr Coetzee and to say how proud we are to have him here in South Australia. Indeed, we are blessed in South Australia, with the talent that we have. Last week, we saw another Booker Prize winner, Peter Finlay—otherwise known as D.B.C. Pierre—who had come home to South Australia. Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity of meeting him and listening to him, because parliament was sitting.

We have another very illustrious author in our midst today. In the gallery we have the Hon. Mike Moore, former Prime Minister of New Zealand, who also has written many treatises and is very talented. I had the pleasure also, on the weekend, of representing the Premier of South Australia to open the seminar at the Writers' Centre. Quite a number of writers were exchanging their ideas and skills. We know that writing and reading is very important, so we must do as much as we can to encourage people in the literary field.

With that, once again, I congratulate Professor Coetzee on having received the Nobel Prize for Literature and for choosing Adelaide as the place in which to make his home. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to support the motion on behalf of the opposition and commend the member for Norwood for bringing it forward. I speak as shadow arts minister, but I am sure that on behalf of all members I would like to say that all in Adelaide and South Australia should feel quite proud to have Professor Coetzee resident here. I think he is adding something to the intellectual wealth of the state through his presence.

I know that he is an admired and respected member of the academic community here in the state. His talks are well attended and sought after, and I think he adds something to the intellectual life of the city. As my friend the member for Norwood has said, we have Mr Peter Finlay here as well, and I think that Adelaide is very well off in terms of its wealth in regard to literature and writing as a consequence of the presence of both these men.

It is a concern to all in these days of technology, computers, computer games and all those distractions—for children, in particular—that writing and reading are perhaps under challenge in a way that they have not been in years past. I remember, during research for a Masters in history, being informed by the Australian War Memorial that their written records from World War I are outstanding. They have the most wonderful diaries and fantastic human records of all that occurred in the early century yet, as World War II, the Vietnam conflict and subsequent conflicts emerged, the quality of those written records has decreased as telephone calls, tapes and emails and so on have become the prevalent form of communication. I suppose that reflects the fact that writing and literature were so much more important in the lives of people 100 years ago than they are today.

There needs to be a conscious effort from parliaments, governments and oppositions to encourage writing and reading so that these skills are not lost, because they are unique. I hope we do not go down the road of becoming some sort of technological community that forgets the joy of the written word: the novel, creative writing and all that goes with it. I commend the motion and hope that all members enjoy supporting it.

Motion carried.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL AND FRINGE 2004

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith:

That this house commends—

- (a) the Adelaide Festival Board, chairman Ross Adler and artistic director Stephen Page for the outstanding success of the 2004 Adelaide Festival; and
- (b) the Board of the Adelaide Fringe, chairperson Margie Andrewartha and artistic director Karen Hadfield for jointly delivering an outstanding complementary program.

(Continued from 1 April. Page 1884.)

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I commend the member for Waite for his motion and I rise to support it. The Festival of Arts and the Fringe are two events that South Australia can be proud of. It made both the government and opposition benches happy recently when the Chairman of the Festival, Mr Ross Adler, announced that there has been a profit—although he has been a little coy about the amount. But, certainly, this festival has proven to be both an artistic and financial success and we can look forward to an even bigger and better festival in 2006. I was recently speaking to Leigh Warren of Leigh Warren Dancers, who is a member of the Festival board, and he was certainly very pleased with the way that things have gone. I single out Leigh only because

he is a personal friend whom I have known for many years since his dance company was based at Norwood Town Hall.

This year's event has certainly been very successful, with box office revenue exceeding the previous festival by some 40 per cent. The ticketed events were strongly patronised across the board, with the festival enjoying over 60 sold-out performances and with many others at over 80 per cent capacity. To date the festival has generated box office of \$3.5 million, representing over 86 000 tickets sold, and I think that is triple that of the 2002 festival. Interstate visitations have been estimated to have increased by just under 20 per cent.

As the country's pre-eminent arts festival, the Adelaide Festival makes a major contribution to the development of Australian artists and is a major economic contributor to the state due to the large number of incoming artists, visitors and conference delegates. The overall attendances, while still being compiled, have exceeded just under 300 000. I have already indicated that there has been a surplus, but we wait expectantly to hear what the outcome has been.

As part of the festival we had Writers' Week, which I certainly enjoyed, and I spent most of my time down there. We have just spoken about J.M. Coetzee, and it was wonderful to see a couple of thousand people at the writers' festival enjoying his reading of one of his works. We hope that his latest publication will achieve as great a success. Book sales over the week were up by some 20 per cent from 2002, and that will go back into Writers' Week. It is interesting to note that the Sydney Writers' Week has just been on. Comparisons are often made, but from all the reviews that I have read I think that Adelaide would still be considered to be the leading Writers' Week in Australia, and we hope that will continue.

The return of Artists' Week was also met with much excitement. There were a huge number of events on, and it was great to see that even architecture featured in Artists' Week. There were hundreds of people attending functions associated with this at both the Art Gallery and Museum and, of course, at all the various art galleries around not only the city proper but also the metropolitan and country areas. Many of the forum sessions were filled to capacity, and we may need to look for larger venues in 2006.

The Universal Playground proved an instant hit with festival-goers, and I know that I saw many of my colleagues in the early hours of the morning enjoying the activities there. This also attracted an average of some 2 000 people each night, and was particularly popular with younger audiences of the festival. Of course, we must also mention WOMADelaide, which returned to the festival for the first time since 1992. It achieved a record attendance figure of 70 077.

Attendances for WOMADelaide as a stand-alone event in 2003 were 68 000 and 64 002 in 2001. There were some concerns that, as an annual event, the numbers possibly would not be as high; however, the critics have been proven wrong. We must commend the Premier for having the foresight for WOMADelaide to be staged in our state on an annual basis, and I think we will see it only increase in popularity.

Fringe data shows that approximately 180 000 tickets were sold through Fringetix, in addition to an estimated 100 000 tickets sold by artists at the door of their events. All three events provided an opportunity to showcase the best in South Australian talent. In addition to \$100 000 for educational events, the Adelaide Festival provided \$700 000 for South Australian companies and performers. Twenty per cent of the

280 performers at WOMADelaide were based in South Australia and, of the 392 registered artists in the Adelaide Fringe 2004, 212 (64 per cent) were also South Australian. Of course, hundreds of volunteers worked on the Fringe in this financial year. The South Australian Tourism Commission's visitor centre was overwhelmed and had to put on extra staff to cope with the demand of people wanting to see more of Adelaide between their ticketed shows. Each and every one of us should take pride in this cultural success.

It is always great to see so many people out and about during the time of the Festival and the Fringe. We have a wonderful environment and climate, and we also have many facilities. Once this enthusiasm has been generated, it is very important to encourage our South Australian community to participate in artistic ventures and functions throughout the year, as we have many small companies and art galleries that need support not only through this time. Once again, I commend the member for Waite for moving this motion, which I support and commend to the house.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I thank my friend, the member for Norwood, for her contribution. I also thank the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts and the Attorney for their contributions, which were most worthwhile. I am pleased that members agree with me that the Festival and the Fringe were outstanding successes. Particularly noteworthy is the effort made by Ross Adler as Chairman to ensure the fiscal health of the Festival. Notwithstanding that, Stephen Page's outstanding artistic direction brought this Festival very much back to earth as a creative event of international significance. Of course, it goes hand in hand with the Fringe—the two are hand in glove. The Chairperson, Margie Andrewartha; Artistic Director, Karen Hadfield; and all the other members of the board should give themselves a solid pat on the back for delivering a fantastic Fringe.

Recently whilst perusing *Hansard* I came across a contribution from the Treasurer, the member for Port Adelaide, when the then Liberal government decided to put \$1 million of extra funding into the 2002 Festival. His language was quite unparliamentary and his abuse of the government most extraordinary for daring to put another million dollars into the Adelaide Festival, although we thought it worth while. It was particularly interesting to note the Treasurer's comment on that occasion, given that he has gleefully dipped into his pockets to provide \$4.3 million of extra funding for Wagner's *Ring*, which is to be staged later this year. It seems that, once one is in government, one suddenly realises the importance of the arts to the community and how important it is to support them.

In noting members' contributions at the end of this debate, I note the general recognition that, from time to time, festivals face challenges. Of course, the 2002 Festival lost its artistic director at very short notice and encountered some problems. The government made some effort to try to portray itself as having heroically come down from the mountaintop to rescue the Festival by ensuring that the 2004 Festival was a terrific event. The inference was, 'Didn't those terrible Liberals muck it up in 2002?' Members would be well aware that former Labor governments have encountered challenged festivals. From the inception of the Festival, quite a number have met financial difficulties, and artistic directors have floundered. A whole range of challenges have been encountered by both Liberal and Labor governments in running festivals.

I am sure that the arts community well recognises that this was an outstanding Festival and that the challenges of 2002 are well and truly behind us. We look forward to the 2006 Festival. The 2004 Festival has provided a fantastic base from which to advance. From here on we can go only forward, noting that additional funding will be allocated to the next Festival which, hopefully, will go even further in providing cutting-edge contributions to the artistic wealth of the nation in a way that only South Australians can. I commend the motion to the house, and I thank members for their contributions. I look forward to all members giving it their support.

Motion carried.

CLIPSAL 500

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith:

That this house commends:

- (a) the South Australian Motor Sport Board, chairman Roger Cook, chief executive Andrew Daniels, all officials and sponsors for the outstanding success of the Clipsal 500 V8 Supercar Race 2004; and
- (b) the Government for continuing to support the event and for moving ministerial responsibility of the event to the Treasurer.

(Continued from 1 April. Page 1886.)

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I am pleased to speak on this motion. I was interested in the Clipsal V8 motor car race right from the beginning, not because I was interested in attending, but because I was a member of the Public Works Committee which considered the works at the time. When the submission first came to us I was a little alarmed that it might be yet another grandiose idea from the then Liberal government without much backing, but I was much assured by the presentation at the Public Works Committee that, right from the beginning, those involved with the Clipsal 500 were undertaking research in depth.

I see the member for Morialta sitting over there looking very amused, but I think I recall with accuracy that I was impressed. Other events had not been as well researched as this one: there was extensive market research about the nature of the market; there was a plan to start small and keep growing the event; and there were no unrealistic expectations about what the event might deliver. This was in great contrast to many of the other activities of the then Liberal government, and I was pleased that I was able to quite enthusiastically support the public works involved in the development of the event.

The research proved true: the crowds have grown from strength to strength; the reputation of the event has grown; and we are now at the situation where I am pleased to report to the house that a record crowd of 237 400 attended the event this year—and this was up some 30 000 persons from last year. Ticket sales exceeded \$5 million, up from \$4.3 million last year, and attendance on Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday exceeded records set in previous years. The Clipsal 500 Adelaide has once again set a new record for attendance at a national motor sport event. It is the largest touring car event held anywhere in the world. The economic benefit has been considerable: in 2003 over 12 000 visitors were attracted to South Australia for the event, generating about \$20 million in economic benefit for the state. Excluding this year, it is estimated the event has returned a total economic benefit to South Australia of over \$80 million over the last five years, and I am pleased that further research is

being undertaken in conjunction with the 2004 event to assess the economic impact for this year.

Significant effort on the part of the government to leverage economic benefit from the event through targeting local, national and international business people to attend for business and pleasure has eventuated. Over 100 national and 50 international guests attended the this year's event. The Premier and Deputy Premier held a range of high-level business meetings with companies including: ION Limited, Telstra Corporation, EDS, Auspace, RBR Armour Systems, Austal and Holden Limited. There was also a range of promotional events staged in parallel to the Clipsal 500, for instance, a defence industry luncheon to market the state's defence capabilities and development strategies to local, national and international representatives—these included the President of EDS, Mr Jeff Heller. There was also an automotive breakfast to market the automotive precinct at Edinburgh Park to senior automotive industry personnel.

While we are commending in the motion the economic benefits of the event, I think it is important to note that not only were economic opportunities taken during the Clipsal 500 but the Premier also took the opportunity to provide a small reward to some of South Australia's many volunteers. This year, on the Thursday, I attended the event as one of the persons assisting in the hosting of many volunteers—particularly from Meals on Wheels. This was an excellent initiative of the Premier, and I suspect that the Parliamentary Secretary who has responsibility in relation to volunteers (the member for Wright) might have had something to do with it.

I spent quite a bit of time talking to some of these volunteers, and one in particular really stays in my mind. He was a man of about 60 years who had been made redundant from SACON during the period of the SACON cuts. He told me a very sad story of how he had not worked since and was now working as a volunteer for the St Vincent de Paul Society. He was very pleased to have the opportunity to attend the Clipsal 500; it is something that he never would have seen in any other way. As I talked to him I noticed that his very clean shirt was frayed, as were the cuffs of his jumper. So, I was very pleased that our Premier had taken the initiative to enable some of these fine community members to take part in an important, exciting event. It is a bit loud and smelly; nevertheless, many people get a lot of pleasure out of it and he certainly did.

I also note that there were some important infrastructure improvements this year. Some of my colleagues refer to me as the member for toilets, because I have been involved in an initiative which has resulted in decent toilets being constructed on building sites. I was appalled by the level of toilet facilities on a number of building sites around my electorate and the hazards to individuals and the environment caused by those toilets. I embarked on a campaign which started when the previous government was there and which concluded in the time of the current government, so that we now have decent toilets on building sites. This brings me to the fact that we also have many more decent toilets at the Clipsal 500. After last year's event, the Premier promised over 200 additional toilets for the event, and indeed 235 additional toilets were provided, making a great difference to the comfort of patrons. As well as the toilets, other major improvements in infrastructure, including the doubling of overpasses and the construction of new pathways, were very well received by the public.

The continued success of the event is indicated by the fact that it has been awarded the AVESCO trophy as the best V8

supercar event each year since its inception. In addition, there are three South Australian *Yellow Pages* Tourism Awards; induction into the SA Tourism of Fame; and a few weeks ago the event was named as Australia's best major event or festival at the National Tourism Awards ceremony held in Perth.

I congratulate the South Australia Motor Sport Board, particularly its Chair, Roger Cook, and the Chief Executive, Andrew Daniels, who was there at the initial presentation of a case to the Public Works Committee and did so very well; and the Clipsal 500 team for the professional way in which they run the event and deliver an exciting format year after year. Work has already commenced on the design of an even bigger event for Clipsal 500 in 2005, targeted at continuing to grow the enormous benefits that flow to South Australia from this outstanding event.

The motion notes the ministerial responsibility, and, indeed, the Deputy Premier is the minister responsible for the Clipsal 500 event. The South Australian Motor Sport Act 1984 was committed to the Deputy Premier on 13 May 2003, and the South Australia Motorsport Board, which stages the event on behalf of the government, was established pursuant to that act. Given the range of onerous responsibilities which the Deputy Premier tackles on a daily basis, I am sure that this is a very pleasant responsibility for him, and one which he does so well—as he does all his responsibilities.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion moved by the member for Waite, and I commend him for it. I am a fan of the V8 supercars, and I have been for a very long time. I recall when I was a young lad that every September I would sit nearly all day in front of the television to watch what was then referred to as the Hardy Ferodo 1000; and before that, when the race was measured in miles, the Bathurst 500. Ever since those days I have been a fan of motorsport, particularly Australian motorsport and V8 supercars. Hopefully, if I get some free time (which is rare these days) to organise it, I would like to go to Bathurst this year to watch that race. Time is of the essence these days. If I do get the opportunity, I look forward to going there to view that race. I think it is one of those things that one needs to do in their life if they are a fan of motorsport, that is, travel to Bathurst to take in that experience. One needs to do other things in one's life, but I will not explore them here this morning.

As the member for Waite said when moving this motion (and the member for Reynell touched on this iconic Australian event), it brings significant economic benefit to South Australia. That is what the previous Liberal government was all about, and that is what the Liberal opposition is all about, that is, promoting economic benefit and development in South Australia for the overall benefit of all South Australians.

This very special motor car racing event is run over four days (Thursday to Sunday) and brings hundreds of thousands of people into South Australia to attend it. In so doing, it obviously brings more money into the economy. As I stated in my contribution on the budget, one of key drivers of the economy is the power of people to spend money—not necessarily to earn income but, rather, to spend—on events such as Clipsal 500. This event was an initiative of the previous Liberal government under John Olsen. Certainly, it has significant economic benefit—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It wasn't Dean Brown?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: No, I do not think it was. It brings significant economic benefit to South Australia. I would like to speak about the infrastructure required for the event to be run. There has been significant controversy over the years about the stands, the pit area and all the work that has to be undertaken in the Victoria Park racecourse. I think there is a fairly strong argument out there. I know some people have quite polarised views on this, but I think there is an argument that needs to be had. There could be some good reasons for leaving some of the infrastructure there. I know that is contrary to some people's beliefs. I know the Hon. Ian Gilfillan has fairly strong views on this issue, but, in order to undertake this event, it costs a lot of money to put up the infrastructure and then take it down. I think debate could continue about leaving some of that infrastructure in place. I will leave that issue there.

I think it was the Bannon government that initiated the Formula One Grand Prix's coming to Adelaide. Unfortunately, at the time the then Liberal premier of Victoria had a fairly big cheque book, and he was able to lure the Formula One Grand Prix to Melbourne. History shows that it was well recognised within the Formula One fraternity that Adelaide held one of the best racing events on the world grand prix calendar.

I do not know whether the Melbourne event has been able to achieve that status, but the V8 Supercar event and the Clipsal 500 has replaced the Grand Prix in Adelaide and has built on this town's reputation for running and managing a world significant event at a world-class level. I congratulate Mr Roger Cook, Mr Andrew Daniels and all the officials, volunteers and sponsors of the Clipsal 500, who put their time into making the event a success. I congratulate them all for the tremendous effort they have made in seeing that it is the best run event. After all, this has been voted the most successful event of the V8 Supercar calendar. Mr Roger Cook is a constituent of mine, and I have met him and look forward to our continuing relationship in the Adelaide Hills. In closing, I commend and support the member for Waite for bringing this motion to the house.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I thank my friends the members for Reynell and Kavel for their contributions. It is apparent that they agree with me that this is an outstanding event. As my friend the member for Reynell pointed out, \$80 million has been spent over five years—an outstanding effort. I note that Roger Cook and all the board are to be commended: it is unanimous and I am pleased the house supports the fantastic effort that has been made.

I am particularly interested to note that the government has supported part (b) of my motion, congratulating the government for continuing to support the event and also for moving ministerial responsibility for the event to the Treasurer. The Treasurer has done an outstanding job running the event. It has been adequately resourced, and he is to be commended for continuing it on. It was clearly a good idea of the former Liberal Government, and it was quite apparent that the Minister for Tourism, the member for Adelaide, was not interested in the event and was probably not capable of running it with anywhere near the same degree of success that the Treasurer has managed to achieve. I do not know why it has moved from tourism, where it should be, but when you look at the two ministers it is quite obvious who is the most competent and capable, and that has saved the event.

It is particularly interesting that the government has chosen not to amend my motion. It probably recognises that

what I have just said is correct. What people with the talent of the members for Napier, Enfield and Reynell are doing on the back bench, while the member for Adelaide is on the front bench, mystifies me, but this motion in itself provides part of the answer. I commend the motion to the house and hope all members support it.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I, being the member for Hammond, ask members to indulge me. I refer to the remark made by the member for Kavel, about which no other member made any comment but upon which I would want to comment but not argue, about building infrastructure on the parklands: that would not meet with my support. The parklands are there and are an open space, on which, it might be thought, we can therefore build something, if for no other reason than that they have been kept open space ever since they were first surveyed and put in place around the city. It is bad enough that government agencies, in consequence of the willingness of governments over the past 150 years, have encroached upon the parklands without principle or benefit whatever to the public of South Australia by covering them in some measure wherever those constructions have been undertaken.

I therefore do not see that it is in any sense appropriate to further reduce the area of parkland by allowing it to be covered with buildings which are for no other purpose than a motor car race. It might be better perhaps to put the motor car race through Mount Barker, Lobethal or Glenelg. I mention Glenelg in particular because, once such a structure has been erected, it is almost impossible to get it removed. I used to enjoy as a young child the view along Anzac Highway when first approaching the sea for our once a year visit to the seaside, but that is no longer available to us. We have that crazy edifice that now destroys the ambience of that area, and such would be the case in my judgment if structures were allowed on the parklands surrounding the capital city, thus destroying the ambience that the entire metropolitan area enjoys by having that green belt there. If it is good enough to do it for one sport it will be good enough to do it for others and, if it is good enough to do it for sport, it will be good enough to do it for the arts, other leisure time activities and other commercial interests of one kind or another because they are all, after all, circuses intended to make money. Pretty soon there will be no parkland left if that were to be the case.

PLAYFORD CENTRE

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): I move:

That this house notes the state government's efforts to encourage the growth of early stage information and communications technology companies through investments made by its incubator, the Playford Centre.

Members may have seen today's article in *The Financial Review* in which the Playford Centre was ranked as one of the top three business IT incubators in the nation on overall performance. In two categories it was the best in the nation. The rankings were given by the Allan Consulting Group in a report to the federal government. The report has big implications for all 10 incubators assessed by Allan Consulting because they have three weeks to bid in a competitive tender to snare an additional \$36 million for the Building on IT Strengths (BITS) program allocated in last month's federal budget. The superb result achieved by the Playford Centre puts it centre stage for further funding under the BITS

program. Only six to eight of the 10 incubators will be successful.

The BITS program was first launched in June 1999 and was designed to support the growth of information and communications technology companies around Australia. A total of \$76 million was allocated to 10 incubator firms through the BITS program and the Playford Centre received \$10 million of this funding, which represents 13 per cent of the total BITS funding. For those members who may not be aware, the Playford Centre Business Incubator, more commonly known by its subsidiary name Playford Capital, forms a key plank in the state government's strategy to promote venture capital and the growth of innovative ICT companies in South Australia. Business incubators, according to one definition, are economic development tools designed to accelerate the growth and success of entrepreneurial companies through a range of business support resources and services.

A business incubator's main goal is to produce successful firms. Small start-up companies often find it difficult to raise or attract working capital. In fact, international and national studies have shown that this is the most common reason for the failure of all small business. These firms need to invest in product and market development ahead of generating sales revenue. To grow fast they need access to patient capital, which generates a return through long-term capital gain rather than immediate and regular interest payments. These ventures are generally unsuited to bank financing as they lack tangible security and positive cash flow. They also find it difficult to attract investment from professional and corporate investors, who prefer to hold back until a company can demonstrate that its technology has been sold profitably and generated significant sales.

Early stage investment typically involves greater risk because the product and its target market are less proven. They also require more intensive monitoring, because management within the company is often less experienced. Again, this is shown by international studies. The most common reason for small business failure is not only lack of working capital but also a lack of financial knowledge which, in turn, makes the operator aware of the fact that they are under-capitalised. It is in this area that the Playford Capital Business Incubator is most successful. Playford Capital complements the role of the Venture Capital Board by investing high risk equity finance in early stage information and communications technology companies, which may lead later into candidates for venture capital investment. By supporting Playford Capital and establishing the Venture Capital Board, the state government recognises that seed and venture capital can provide significant economic benefits to South Australia.

While the number of firms suited to seed and venture capital is relatively small, they can have a disproportionate impact on economic growth. A US study by the respected Wharton Econometrics team shows that in the United States venture capital represented less than 1 per cent of the investment over a 30-year period from 1970 to 2000 but contributed to the creation of companies that represented 13.1 per cent of GDP in 2000. Other economic studies have shown that fast growing and innovative companies typically outperform other firms in terms of sales, exports, profitability and return on investment. They hire and train a skilled work force to compete in global markets. They invest in corporate research and development. The fundraising process involves

investors and professional advisers who can raise the quality of management and business acumen.

The best of these firms create success stories and positive role models, which help foster a spirit of entrepreneurship. For these reasons the government believes that Playford Capital has a role to play in achieving the objectives set out in the State Strategic Plan. In particular, our goals for economic growth, exports, creativity, commercialisation of research, and investment in science and innovation are well carried by Playford Capital. Sydney is the home of most of Australia's venture capital activity, although many venture capital firms have expanded out to Melbourne and Brisbane in recent times in response to growing investment opportunities in those states. Until recently, there were no venture capital funds headquartered in Adelaide. There are signs that this may be turning around.

The Economic Development Board noted in its *Framework For Economic Development* that Playford has gone some way towards expanding the supply of venture capital, and that the investment by Playford and some of its co-investors represents about half the new venture funding provided in South Australia in 2001-02. Playford Capital is the only state government-owned incubator in the BITS program. The state government funds Playford's running costs, allowing all BITS funding to be invested in the state's innovative early-stage ICT companies. It is now the first of the remaining incubators in the BITS program to be granted a rollover of funding by the commonwealth until mid-2006. Since August 2001 Playford has been investing up to \$450 000 of seed capital in early-stage information and communications technology companies with significant growth potential.

Like many professional investors, the Playford Centre works to support businesses with unique intellectual property and, therefore, greater market potential. This commercialisation of intellectual property is perhaps one of the most important areas in ICT industry development that Playford tries to influence. Currently, much of the nation's technology research is commercialised through licensing, which reduces the amount of working capital required to deliver a product to market.

However, licensing captures only a small portion of the intrinsic value of the intellectual property. An equally important, but often less obvious, benefit from local commercialisation of intellectual property is the growth of entrepreneurial skills that form around clusters of successful technology start-ups. The funds and business guidance provided by Playford enable technology entrepreneurs to make a larger investment in people, products and market development. This enhances the chances of success; however, it does not guarantee their success. As with any seed capital portfolio, not all of Playford's companies will succeed. However, Playford activities are helping to build a pool of people with skills and practical experience in growing technology businesses and raising venture capital. It is not only the company founders and their employees, but also their lawyers, accountants, patent attorneys and marketing consultants who have their skills enhanced by this process. That is very important in South Australia, with such a limited number of companies with head offices here. We are running people through MBA programs, accounting and marketing courses and, unfortunately, we do not have the critical mass in terms of corporate headquartering to give these people an opportunity.

This growth in entrepreneurial skills and experience contributes to the innovation and economic growth which is fundamental to the state's strategic plan. In fact, the staff at Playford have noticed a distinct improvement in investment applications they currently receive compared with a few years ago. Through the investment of seed capital and mentoring of young companies, Playford gives the creators of intellectual property greater options to commercialise their IP through start-up companies. By supporting the growth of new small companies, Playford helps the South Australian community to capture a greater share of the commercialisation value chain with the potential for employment and export growth. This complements the broader objectives of the state's Venture Capital Board. Playford's success is also reflected in the performance of Playford's investee companies. As at December 2003, Playford's portfolio companies employed over 200 people and reported annual sales revenue of \$14.5 million, including nearly \$4 million in exports. These results have been achieved by companies given a kick-start through the capital provided by Playford and other investors over a short period of time.

Investment companies in Playford's portfolio are typically born global; that is, they often possess innovations that can be applied (and, hopefully, sold) globally, which is critical given our small domestic market. Companies such as the agribusiness service provider Agrilink, signal processing firm DSpace, and network performance company Foursticks have established footholds in international markets. Many of Playford's portfolio companies have developed their technology in collaboration with academic institutions. This is technology transfer in real life. In fact, the founders of some of Playford's portfolio companies include respected academics such as Dr Mark Rice of DSpace, a world renowned expert on satellite signalling processing algorithms; Dr Jonathan Baxter of Panscient; and Dr Steve Kirkby of Maxamine.

Mobile satellite technology company DSpace based at Mawson Lakes is an excellent example of Playford's target investment companies. DSpace was founded by Dr Mark Rice and Jonathan Whalley, who chose to migrate to South Australia from England to work with the University of South Australia's Institute for Telecommunications Research and establish their own company. For those who are not aware, DSpace develops leading-edge signal processing technology that optimises efficient, reliable data communications in challenging satellite environments. DSpace's technology is absolutely world-class and has a number of applications. In years to come, a DSpace modem could be delivering high-speed internet access to soldiers in the field, cruising yachts or even the car in your driveway. The Playford Centre was the first professional investor in DSpace and played a key role in preparing the company for venture capital investment. Playford staff worked alongside DSpace management to research the size of the market opportunity, shape the company's business plan and prepare its pitch to investors. The result? Venture capital firms located in Brisbane and Perth invested about \$8 million in this local South Australian company.

The state government's funding of Playford's operating costs has enabled it to provide more intensive guidance than would have been commercially viable. Playford owes much of its success to its skilled team as well as the leadership of the Playford Board, particularly its Chairman, Mr Ian Kowalick. The government strongly supports Playford's capital bid for additional BITS funding. The government will continue to support its operating costs in order to enable it to

continue its high level of performance in nurturing young technology ventures, which are vital to the economic regeneration of this state. I urge this house to endorse Playford's bid for additional BITS funding and note that the state government supports the Playford Centre's operating costs that have enabled it to play an outstanding role in promoting the growth of innovative information and communications technology companies in this state.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to indicate that the opposition supports the motion, and I commend my friend the member for Napier for bringing it before the house. We should remember that the Playford Capital enterprise was founded in 2001 in the time of the former Liberal government with a \$10 million amount from the sale of the second tranche of Telstra. Of course, it was that sale of Telstra that enabled this opportunity for South Australia. I think it is commendable that the current government, on coming to office, has seen that this is a worthwhile program and one worth supporting, and I, along with my colleagues on this side, was delighted to see the venture supported in the budget. We note that some ambitious targets have been set. I see that the aim is to ensure that, through the BITS funding program, an additional \$3.3 million is invested in up to nine ICT companies in the coming year, and I think that is commendable.

Playford Capital is achieving its objectives for a number of equity finance investments in information communications technology. The average investment size has been a bit smaller in the past year, due to the focus by Playford on co-investment. I think that is a worthwhile strategy in their investment approach.

Playford invests relatively small amounts in early stage ITC companies, and when these companies reach the next stage of development Playford expects to participate, but expects to involve others in taking that venture forward. The increased target for 2004-05, relative to 2003-04, seems to reflect a combination of new investment and follow on rounds for earlier investment.

I foreshadow to the government that I will be exploring during budget estimates the actual amounts of BITS funding that have been expended. I know that it was about \$1.78 million in 2002-03 and the result was \$1.53 million in 2003-04, but the target was much higher at \$4.6 million. I know we have got a \$3.37 million target for next year, but it seems that we are actually investing less than what we aimed to invest.

That is interesting, because that sits with some advice that I have received from some industry operators who have approached Playford. While welcoming the fantastic role that Playford is playing, some people have put to me that it is a bit like squeezing blood out of a stone. They have a concern that the bar is a little bit higher for Playford than is required by some other providers of seed and early stage funding.

There was a bit of a perception from some operators whom I have spoken to that Playford seemed to want to hold onto its money, and not give it out in the concern that it might have no role any more, because all their funding had been provided. I am reminded of a story when I was in the army, when they said, 'You cannot possibly get a pair of boots from the Q-store, because it is the last pair of boots we have.' So, the Q-sergeant says to the soldier, 'Off you go. We cannot give you that or we will have nothing in the store.'

I sense that there might be a bit of that, and that is why I am delighted to see as a result of the Allen Consulting report in the *Financial Review* today—on page 22, for any members

who want to read it, or it can be downloaded—that there appears to be a bright future there in the way of extra funding for Playford. It is clearly performing ahead of the pack and deserves that extra federal government support, and indeed state government support, to ensure that there is an ongoing source of funds. This concern about not wanting to give out the funding you have got for fear of there not being anything to follow can be put to rest and companies can go forward and benefit.

I read with interest Playford's annual report last year. It really is an outstanding result, as the member for Napier has pointed out. To aim to realise cash returns on investments of 3 per cent and then to achieve 5.6 per cent is commendable in the year 2002-03. I will really enjoy seeing 2003-04. It is a substantially over-budget result. The ratio of investments spent on net cash overloads I guess is an area for focus.

It is interesting to see sales growth by current investees rise from a target of 20 per cent to 41 per cent in the 12 months to June 2003. I think that is commendable. The number of applications and inquiries I see was about 20 short of the 160 that was hoped for, and it would be good if there was a bountiful supply of applicants in approaches to Playford so that they had an even bigger pool of opportunities to examine.

Of course, the co-investment result, expecting a ratio of 1:2 and getting 4.1:2 with a three year co-investment target of \$5 million exceeding the previous year, and \$14.8 million of total co-investment in 2001-02 and 2002-03 is a really good result. I am sure that under Ian Kowalick's guidance with the new CEO on board now, CEO Thomas having moved on, the future is bright for Playford Capital.

As my honourable friend has mentioned, we now have a more diverse environment with the government's decision to follow the EDB's recommendations to create the Venture Capital Board. I think this is one of the good things that the government has done: to stimulate VC growth. I pick up that recommendation of the EDB and give it some money. I hope that seed money is enough to attract quite a bit more in the way of VC funding.

I read with interest on 17 June last year in the *Financial Review* positive reports about the new growth in VC available in South Australia. Dr Sexton will do a good job guiding that venture capital board, but we have now got Adelaide-based merchant bank Leaden Hall involved with, of course, the new Paragon fund that has put out its prospectus and is raising funding and looking towards targeting two pools of up to \$50 million. All of this is great.

I note my honourable friend's mention of DSpace, which I think was a really good example of a success story in South Australia. I have been out and visited their location. In fact, Jonathan Whalley, the principal, was a colleague of mine during our MBAs at the University of Adelaide, and it is really a great venture. Interestingly, they have set up alongside the university and have entered into an arrangement where they fund PHD students through the university. In return, they get the IP back for the company. They have engineered a marriage between the university and company that is mutually beneficial.

I think those sorts of marriages point to where we need to go, creating linkages so that when companies like DSpace are ready to go to later stage VC, around \$20 million, they have got such a good thing happening in South Australia with their intellectual property and its facilitation that your later stage funders are likely to say, 'Let us leave it in Adelaide. Let's invest in that enterprise in Adelaide,' rather than grabbing

that enterprise and taking it off to Sydney or Melbourne, Silicon Valley, London, or wherever the opportunity might be, and taking it away from the state. I think that from a purely parochial point of view outcomes that achieve these interconnections are likely to deliver results.

In these times of overseas study reports, I recommend that members have a look at the study report on my January trip to the United States, where I visited the California Institute of Technology. They have some very innovative ways of ensuring that the academics who invent IP get a share of the benefits that flow once the idea has gone to market. I think these are models that we, as a state, need to develop.

It is easy to get an idea to market. Ten per cent of something is better than 100 per cent of nothing, and the people who invent IP in our universities need to understand that. We need to get entrepreneurs, venture capitalists and innovators together—get the right team together—and take ideas to market.

In this whole area, where Playford does a good job, there is this valley of death between the original seed funding and later stage VC that we need to address. Playford is one way of addressing that, and I think BioInnovation SA is another success story, but we need to find ways of getting private investors involved in this process. Initially, these companies need very small amounts of money to get going; then they need a bit more and a bit more, and need VC and funding options that meet them at each stage of their growth, from the early stage to the late stage.

I commend the motion; it is a great motion. The Playford Centre is an asset to South Australia and so is the Venture Capital Board. I urge the government to go forward and further develop these ideas. They enjoy full support from the opposition in doing so. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I would like to add my remarks to that. As a member of the governing council of the University of Adelaide, I had some considerable input into the establishment of the concept that is now embodied in the Playford Centre to enable the university's company, Luminis Pty Ltd, to be more effective in the way in which it brought intellectual property and other innovations into commercial reality. These were otherwise languishing and, in effect, being stolen by societies in other jurisdictions around the world simply because no attempt was being made to take advantage of what appears to be a quite unique phenomenon in South Australian society and one that has been with us since the earliest days of settlement.

Honourable members will know, perhaps, that bar codes are a South Australian invention, as are black-and-white photocopying and colour photocopying, the mobile video-phone, drip irrigation and a number of patents relating to the plastics extrusion process that gives us high-quality, high-strength, low-cost plastic hose pipe, and so on.

In particular, though, I commend the fashion in which the member for Napier drew the attention of the house to this far more important part of South Australian innovation than any other motion commending any other institution or individual that I have heard in this house for a very long time. It is not just true: it is fundamentally vital, and of the utmost importance above and beyond anything else, that we provide the engine by which new wealth can be generated.

Playing sport with excellence is commendable in itself, but it does not do that. Performing arts to a very high standard of excellence, commendable though that may be, does not do

that, unless it is commercialised in the fashion in which the Playford Centre intends. All those things could be if we were to approach them in the same way that Montreal does with, say, Cirque du Soleil.

I conclude by adding that if we in this place, as elected representatives of the people, fail to grasp the underlying principle which is the first, foremost and single most important in all of our duties—that is, to generate wealth—we will never have the means by which we can, out of our innate compassion, seek to redistribute it. It will not be there. And it is not much fun having to express compassion and sympathy while seeing people starve and freeze to death in the dark.

The first thing to do is get innovation right in wealth generation. Our market in this state, as the honourable member observed, is inadequate to do it alone. Such business ventures as can be generated must come from those products and techniques which can be competitively marketed internationally from day one. We will not otherwise build the head office structure that the state's future depends upon. It is a vital element to the survival of the state beyond 10 years. If we fail, it will be because we failed to identify that as the most important thing, in my opinion, and pursue it through this institution and encourage those who have the ability to apply themselves to the task here in South Australia, rather than seeking greener pastures. If we do not provide the framework through which that can be undertaken, we will have failed in our duty as elected representatives.

CROUCH, Mr B.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I move:

That this house congratulates *Sunday Mail* journalist, Brad Crouch, on his SA Media Award for his exclusive report, 'A door snake and two light bulbs' published on 16 November 2003.

Sunday Mail journalist Brad Crouch is a senior and respected journalist with that newspaper and, indeed, is held in great respect by his peers in many other media outlets. In my experience he takes his job seriously, particularly his role in accurately informing the public. Like many South Australians, he is particularly concerned about electricity prices and their effect on other South Australians—most notably, their effect on low income earners. Therefore, I am pleased to move this motion to congratulate Mr Crouch on his media award, which was revealed publicly in the *Sunday Mail*, the newspaper for which he writes, on 28 March this year. I will read briefly from that article entitled '*Sunday Mail* writer wins top award', as follows:

Sunday Mail writer Brad Crouch won the award for best print news report at last night's inaugural SA Media Awards.

He won for his exclusive report 'A door snake and two light bulbs', published in the *Sunday Mail* on November 16 2003.

It revealed how struggling pensioners would receive two light bulbs and a door snake from the State Government to help ease the power prices burden.

Sunday Mail editor Phil Gardner congratulated Crouch on his award. 'The *Sunday Mail* is committed to outstanding journalism, as epitomised by Brad Crouch's piece,' he said.

I, too, join with the editor of the *Sunday Mail*, Phil Gardner, in congratulating Brad Crouch for his insightful and accurate piece that informed South Australians about this government's revolutionary plans to assist South Australians with the power price increases forced upon them by the mismanagement of this government of our state's electricity market.

It is important to share with the house extracts from the award-winning article, the full title of which was, 'Door

snake and 2 bulbs: how Conlon wants to cut power bills'. It states:

Struggling pensioners will get two light bulbs and a door snake from the State Government to help ease the burden of rising power prices. Energy Minister Patrick Conlon said the gifts, as well as an energy-efficient showerhead, were part of an energy assessment of low-income households to help them cut power bills by up to 15 per cent without sacrificing comfort. 'The free audits will look at what people can do in their homes to save power and (the Government) will provide them with a AAA-rated showerhead to cut energy and water consumption, two compact fluorescent light globes and door snakes,' he said.

The offerings come as low-income households grapple with rising bills and charges that have forced some to sell their homes, cut back on food or downgrade their quality of life. Mr Conlon said energy-saving bulbs and door snakes were preferable to increasing rebates.

Of course, that was accurately attributed to the Minister for Energy. In order to find out what South Australians thought of this innovative state government policy, the *Sunday Mail* invited them to write in and share their views—as they did—and I will share some with the house. A letter from Mr John Herring of Whyalla Norrie stated:

If this is the best the Government can come up with we are in dire trouble. The Government should honour its election promises and reduce the upfront costs of electricity. . .

Mr Geo Pantazis of Greenwith wrote, as follows:

Where does Energy minister Pat Conlon gets his figures from? I am quite sure 'two light bulbs and a door snake' would not result in a \$100 to \$500 saving. I would prefer a rebate.

Shirley Jackson of Christie Downs stated:

Wow, two energy-saver light bulbs, a door snake and even a water-saving showerhead. But who is going to fit the showerhead? The cost of a plumber will eat away the estimated savings we are supposed to make with these 'gifts'. Perhaps Mr Conlon could allocate another \$2 million to accomplish this?

S. Horton wrote, as follows:

How out of touch our politicians are is now so obvious and so is what Mr Conlon can do with his door snake and light bulbs.

Margaret Harris of Williamstown stated:

How dare Energy Minister Conlon insult us with such a demeaning idea. I suggest he urgently reduces the cost of electricity before we, the voting public, reduce the Government's power.

Many other letters were written to the editor but, regrettably, time does not permit me to put them all on the record. However, I am sure that members understand the vein of the sentiments expressed by South Australians. In fact, the letters were so numerous that they had to insert a special page in the *Sunday Mail* to accommodate them, under the heading: 'Keeping us in the dark'. How right the *Sunday Mail* got that story! Of course, after this backlash from the public, the minister had to come up with something in his defence. Initially, he went into denial, and he did so in this chamber by saying this about me:

Again, if he knew his portfolio, the member for Bright would know we do not give out door snakes.

He also said:

It is only in the fevered imagination of the member for Bright that there is a program of giving out snakes.

He then took this denial to the radio airwaves. Indeed, on 10 May this year, on ABC Radio the Matthew Abraham and David Bevan program ran a special segment on the minister's energy audits, commencing with, '*Oh Lord, please don't let me be misunderstood.*' Perhaps there is a lot of misunderstanding: that certainly was about door snakes when energy minister Pat Conlon offered them, together with energy-efficient showerheads and compact fluorescent light globes,

to help people save energy. Apparently, not many of us have taken up the offer. The minister responded that there was never a suggestion that these were offered. This is a story from the *Sunday Mail* some time ago:

I didn't offer door snakes and shower roses. What I offered is an audit.

The *Sunday Mail* stands by its comments and the accurate quotes of the minister in their newspaper. The article has now deservedly won for the journalist an inaugural South Australian media award. The proof for the *Sunday Mail* article is provided through the government's own Government Tender web site. Display Tender ESA009442 gives the detail to the public and mentions 'energy and water efficient goods. . . issued by Energy SA', 'request for tender,' 'tender state,' 'tender code,' and 'category: electrical systems and lighting components and accessories and supplies'. The description of the goods sought under that tender are: 'supply and delivery of 20 000 compact fluorescent light globes, up to 10 000 AAA rated shower heads with arms, and 10 000 door snakes.'

Those goods were put out to tender by the government and the tender was filled. So, somewhere in storage for the government, if not in government funded storage, is the balance of 20 000 light globes, 10 000 shower heads and 10 000 door snakes. *The Advertiser* then took up the cause of true investigative journalism, finding out how many of those goods had been distributed and, through the innovative resources of journalist Tom Richardson, he found that, in fact, 320 of the audits had been done, which means that 320 of the shower heads had been given away, at most (that is, provided they wanted them), up to 640 of the light bulbs, and 320 of the door snakes. So, that leaves an awful lot in stock.

Again, the minister went into denial on the airwaves and protested that the figures were wrong. He said that perhaps 1 000 of the audits had been done.' It does not matter greatly whether or not it was 320 or 1 000 audits; the fact of the matter is that the taxpayer has expended considerable funds in purchasing goods that have not yet been given to their intended recipients—low-income households—and it would appear that they are not flooding the government with requests for these goods, as indicated through the letters to the editor of the *Sunday Mail*.

On radio on 10 May 2004, the minister summed up his view of the situation in a nutshell. He stated:

The only thing that has ever undermined this program is quite a childish focus on the door snake which is about one per cent of the entire thing. But the bottom line is they are contracted to do them for two years. They will do 10 000 of them. It is a good program you know. It is embarrassing for me that the focus is on the door snakes.

The focus is actually on the energy-efficient shower heads, the compact fluorescent light bulbs, the door snakes and the audits. The minister has chosen to focus on the door snakes, but it was the minister who volunteered this information to the media, not me or any other member of the opposition. It was information that was given to the media in an interview, I understand, in the minister's office, with respected journalist Brad Crouch and three of the minister's advisers. I can just imagine the reaction of the advisers when, confronted with the question, 'What is your government doing to resolve the energy concerns of South Australia?' the minister was volunteered, 'Well, we are going to do these energy audits and we are going to give out 10 000 shower heads and 20 000 light bulbs and 10 000 door snakes.' The fact is that South Australians have not warmed to the idea. What they want is a decisive government of action, but what this government

has given them is a greater increase in electricity prices than has ever been dealt to the South Australian community by any other government, probably in the state's history.

Since this government came to power electricity prices have gone up by 32 per cent in summer peak and an average of about 22 per cent across a full year. That is a far cry from what has now become the sham of a promise, indeed, the unfulfilled promise—some public may call it a lie; I cannot say that here because it would be unparliamentary—that has made a mockery of the present situation. We need journalists in this state who are prepared to stand up and be counted, who are not prepared to allow themselves to be intimidated by thuggery and by standover tactics and who will tell the truth. We need media in this state who will openly and honestly report and be held accountable. The intent of this motion is to pay tribute to one such journalist, Brad Crouch, who has taken this issue to the fore, who has run it on the front page of his newspaper and who has gained the support of his editor. That newspaper has opened itself up to South Australians to express their points of view and has published their points of view, and woe betide a government that fails to take heed of the very important messages that have come from South Australians.

There is no intent in this debate to denigrate anyone, and I would hope the government takes this on the chin and covers this debate in an honourable way and does not attempt to debase the important issues at hand or belittle the importance—

Time expired.

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I move:

That the motion be amended to delete all words after 'congratulates' and insert 'the Social Development Committee on the Poverty Inquiry recommendation of an audit program for low income households.'

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. The point of order relates to the substance of the original motion. It is quite clear that the amendment proposed by the honourable member totally and completely changes the initial intent of the motion, which is a congratulatory motion to a journalist. The amendment deletes all reference to that. Therefore, I put to you, Madam Acting Speaker, that it totally changes the intent of the original motion. Indeed, it is a new motion.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Bedford): I am being advised that perhaps the amendment being moved by the member for Playford might need to be amended.

Mr SNELLING: By your leave, Madam Acting Speaker, I move my amendment as an addendum as follows:

After the words '16 November 2003' insert:

and congratulates the Social Development Committee on the poverty inquiry recommendation of an audit program for low income households.

The member for Bright is well known for his obsession with door snakes. In fact, he should get his mind off door snakes; perhaps get his hand off his door snake; perhaps he might stop it, otherwise he might definitely go blind.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. The rather unfortunate insinuation in the honourable member's comment to the house is totally unparliamentary and totally uncalled for. This is a very serious issue. I request that you instruct the honourable member to withdraw his derogatory comments—which are completely unnecessary.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I thought perhaps the member for Playford was insinuating that you had managed to get your hands on a door snake; and, as there are so many in stock, that may still be possible.

Mr SNELLING: For the good conduct of the house I will happily withdraw my comments. I do not know what the member for Bright was reading into my comments.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I think he wants a door snake.

Mr SNELLING: If he was inferring anything unfortunate, then I unreservedly withdraw. I do admire the member for Bright because he is the one person in this place—perhaps next to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—who has the most incredible front. He will quite happily sit there and smile his big grin knowing that everything he says is absolute rot. He does it so convincingly with absolutely no shame. I will remember the debate in this place on the privatisation of our electricity assets. I remember the division, and I remember very well on which side of the chamber the member for Bright was sitting in that division, that is, on the side of the ayes.

As a member of the previous government, the honourable member supported wholeheartedly the privatisation of electricity and the subsequent monopolisation of our electricity assets—which is the single greatest cause for our high electricity prices—and then he gets up this morning and seeks to lecture the government about what it should be doing to reduce power prices. It is rather galling. I am impressed that the honourable member is able to confect a certain level of sincerity but, nonetheless, it remains rather galling for us on this side of the chamber to have to sit through all that.

I am a member of the Social Development Committee, and it was in fact my motion in this place, shortly after parliament first sat after the 2002 election, which sent a reference to the Social Development Committee to look at the issue of poverty, particularly poverty in our urban areas. The committee spent a good 12 months looking at the issue. We heard from many witnesses, and obviously we identified that increased electricity prices were causing tremendous strain on low income households. As a result of the evidence we received, we made some recommendations.

After those recommendations, the government announced \$2.05 million to fund an energy efficiency program for low income households. The program aims to help households reduce their energy costs without reducing any level of comfort. The program consists of three elements: 10 000 home energy audits; incentives to retire old and inefficient fridges and/or freezers for up to 2 000 households; and a no-interest loan scheme to complement the audits and the fridge/freezer scheme.

I remember the discussion we had in the Social Development Committee when we were discussing our recommendations, and that was one of the recommendations. I am delighted that the government has decided to take it up. In fact, the no-interest loan scheme is something that will be introduced shortly. The retrofit kit is offered as part of the audit program and is expected to result in an annual household energy saving of approximately \$62.

The audit program is conducted in conjunction with community organisations, and six welfare organisations have been contracted to deliver energy efficiency services throughout metropolitan Adelaide and regional South Australia by January 2006. The government also increased the energy concession on 1 January 2004 by over 70 per cent from \$70 to \$120. That is the first increase in the concession since 1990.

The previous Liberal government ignored the plight of energy concession holders throughout their entire time in government and there was not one increase in pensioner electricity concessions. The increase in the concession will assist more than 230 000 South Australian households, including the extension of the concession to around 15 000 self-funded retirees who hold a commonwealth seniors health card.

The government also introduced on 29 November last year an electricity transfer rebate, and this one-off \$50 payment is made available to those eligible for the energy concession who changed from the standing offer to a power deal with cheaper electricity prices. This is certainly something about which my constituents have been ringing my office and an offer they have been taking up. Since the introduction of the scheme we have seen an enormous increase in the number of customer transfers. In November last year 12 710 customers had transferred. By the end of April 2004 nearly 50 000 customers had transferred, with 23 000 pending completion of transfer, and this represents about 10 per cent of the market. Quite contrary to the claims of the member for Bright that the government is not doing enough in the area of electricity prices, it is doing a great deal. I congratulate the minister on the tremendous effort he has put in to try to deal with the problem we have been left with by the previous government's bungled electricity privatisation. With those words I commend my addendum to the house.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I will make a brief contribution and, in so doing, really save some energy. I fully support the motion moved by the member for Bright and congratulate *Sunday Mail* journalist Brad Couch on his SA media award for his exclusive report 'A door snake and two light bulbs' published on 16 November 2003. I agree with the editor Phil Gardner. In doing so I go back to the Social Development Committee recommendation of an audit. As the Acting Speaker would know, no specifics about light bulbs, door snakes and shower heads were mentioned. As the member for Playford has rightly said, the recommendation came from a reference that originated with the honourable member to look into generational poverty.

In so doing, the Social Development Committee made a recommendation that we have energy saving audits. When the Minister for Energy got himself in trouble over the door snakes/light bulb saga, he passed the blame to the Social Development Committee. As the honourable member would know, there was much discussion in the Social Development Committee about the misrepresentation of the committee. So I am a little amazed by the member for Playford, who is trying to give an escape clause to the minister by trying to amend the motion. Let us stick to the award and not go back to the Social Development Committee.

If I had to move an amendment I would refer to the Bee Gees award for the energy minister. That would be: 'I started a joke, which started the whole world crying and later started the whole world laughing, but I didn't know that the joke was on me'. The Minister for Energy should have that award. He certainly started the joke, wanted to blame the Social Development Committee and in so doing selectively talked about the Hon. David Ridgway and the member for Hartley. He forgot to mention members on his own side of politics who are on the committee. The recommendation of the Social Development Committee had no specifics about door snakes and light bulbs. Really, the joke has backfired on the Minister for Energy, and that is what all this is about. Now members

opposite want to give him an escape clause. I give him the Bee Gees award: 'I started a joke, but I didn't know that the joke was on me.' The minister started the joke, the joke is on him, but the sad thing about all this is that there are lots of door snakes about that have not been used.

I believe in conservation and energy saving. The Minister for Energy is in a marginal seat. I suggest that he get all those door snakes and use them at shopping centres and when he is door knocking so that he is making use of something that he instigated. It would be good pre-election material and, since there are over 9 000 around, if he starts now he might get to use many of them, so at least there will be some use for the joke he started. I want to save some energy. I have used four minutes of the time of the house, and in order to save energy I will not use four minutes of my time.

Mr RAU (Enfield): It is always a great privilege to be here and to follow the member for Hartley. I was running through my mind as he was repeating the old Bee Gees standard and I was wondering whether there was any song by the Bee Gees that may have any application to him and I eventually settled on 'Jive Talking'.

That may or may not be entirely appropriate. The point is quite simply this: it is a sad moment when we spend time today in private members' time, which is very important time, dealing with this motion. Let us actually be very clear on what the motion is about. The member for Bright and his colleagues created a huge mess. So that the member for Hartley can understand it, they started a joke. What they are now doing is cheering on those individuals who are belittling our efforts to clean up that mess. They create the mess, then people belittle our efforts to clean up their mess, and they cheer them on. I suppose it is consistent to say, 'We're so proud of our mess we don't want anyone to do anything to ameliorate its impact.'

Mr Snelling: My three year old does that.

Mr RAU: Exactly! The member for Playford is right. He and I both have the joy of having young people around the house who do things very much like this. They make a mess. We have this every afternoon at my place. We go into my son's room and there is a mess: nobody ever makes the mess and there is finger pointing and all sorts of carry on about who is going to clean it up. In this case it is slightly different, because members opposite seem to be proud of the mess to the point where they are proud of the increase in costs being delivered to consumers in South Australia and they do not think we should be trying to help those consumers by advising them how they might actually in some small way ameliorate the damage that has been done to their pockets by the foolhardy privatisation that this crowd engaged in.

I must say I give the member for Bright 10 out of 10 for having the capacity to tough out things that most other people would be ashamed even to contemplate. But he comes in here and, in effect, draws attention again to the mess that he and his colleagues created and then belittles those who try to fix it up and cheers on the Hooray Henrys who are out there writing the cheap line, the easy line, the cheap shot. The Hooray Henrys are getting the big round of applause. If that is the best we can do, it is a very sad waste of private members' time.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I want to take up some of the points raised by the member for Enfield in the context of this debate. Really, the debate is about electricity assets, and the member for Enfield and other speakers have

talked about the terrible evil of having sold those electricity assets. I want to revisit that, because that is why we are talking about snakes and other matters that seem quite frivolous. I draw the member for Enfield's attention to an article from the *Advertiser* of Saturday 14 October. It was entitled 'Power investors run out of energy', 'Preliminary notice: Assets for sale.' It talks about TXU, Duke Energy, NRG and Epic Energy selling Port Augusta, Leigh Creek, Torrens Island and parts of the ETSA system as they found, lo and behold, that those assets were not the great bargain they thought they were when they purchased them.

The article talks about a \$10 billion energy sell-off gathering momentum and states that some of South Australia's biggest gas and electricity assets were on the block. It talks about the power stations, including Torrens Island, gas pipelines and electricity retail businesses being up for sale. It talks about US companies that bought heavily into the Australian energy market in the 1990s now bailing out, sparking fears of a collapse in values and uncertainty about the future direction of these businesses. The reality is that the electricity business is changing. US-run pipeline company Epic Energy said that it was putting up for sale its \$2 billion purchase of Australian assets after a battle with Western Australian regulators, and there is a message there about how you intervene in a market.

It is very important, because Epic also owns the Moomba to Adelaide pipeline and other pipelines in WA and Queensland. It bought the Moomba to Adelaide pipeline from the South Australian government for \$304 million in 1995. Other assets in South Australia expected to be on the market back then in October were TXU's Torrens Island power station; the electricity retail businesses owned by the embattled US NRG Energy group; the two Port Augusta power stations; the Leigh Creek coal operations; and so it goes on. The article states that this was all a result of uncertainty about ownership and about unstable ownership structures.

Then we had the announcement promulgated in *The Financial Review* of 28 April that confirmed that Singapore Power would purchase Australia's third largest energy retailer, taking to nearly \$20 billion the value of deals in utilities over the past four years. They bought them from cash-strapped US and British utilities in purchases that transformed their businesses. They picked out the pieces after the once-ambitious US utilities had bought a long list of privatised gas and electricity assets, including ours but also including the Kennett government's Victorian assets, then found that they were unable to make the profits necessary to justify the prices they paid. I make the point in this debate about sausages and eggs, and so on, that the government is very happy to enjoy the benefits of having sold our electricity assets.

It is very happy to get up and talk about Standard and Poor's having given us a AA plus rating, moving towards a AAA rating. Standard and Poor's pointed out that the very first—

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: Sausages and eggs? Where are the sausages? A sausage and egg index?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: They're called door snakes, for the benefit of the member for Adelaide. Where were you born? London? Do they have door snakes in London? I don't know. They are very happy to stand up and crow about the Standard and Poor's finding, but the principal reason for the improved economic circumstance in this state is that the state got rid of debt by selling its electricity assets. The second reason is good budgets, but the first reason is the sale of

ETSA. I have a very simple question for the member for Enfield, which I also direct to the Treasurer. Given the government's assertion that power utilities and infrastructure should still be in state government hands despite the national electricity market—and we have heard more of it from members opposite in the last few minutes—did you argue in the caucus room that the Labor Party and the Labor government should express an interest in or enter into negotiations with the cash-strapped TXU Australia to repurchase its South Australian assets, reported by the Australian *Financial Review* to have been offered to the market by 'distressed sellers at cheaper prices' than those prices at which they were sold? I asked the member for Enfield whether he put that argument up in caucus, because we have heard a lot from the Treasurer and members opposite about not being able to unscramble the egg.

Well, anyone who has ever been in business knows very well that you can unscramble the eggs. In fact, the business scene in Australia abounds with examples—television stations having been purchased back by the seller some years later at a substantial discount, for instance. I could rattle off dozens of examples where people have put an asset on the market and then had an opportunity to grab it back a few years later at a significant discount. So, I put to members opposite that they could get rid of the need for door snakes. They could solve all these problems if they stood by their principles, and their principle is that it was a mistake to sell our electricity assets, and that all the problems of electricity are a consequence of the former Liberal government's decision to sell those assets. It was a terrible woe. They are happy to take the Standard and Poor's report and the AA-plus rating. They are happy to get rid of \$9.5 billion dollars worth of debt and get it down to record lows. They are happy to be able to present a budget this week that reflects buoyant economic circumstances as a consequence of the sale of those assets, even though they were recently available for repurchase at a significant discount. I ask members opposite how many of them argued in caucus that the Premier and the Treasurer should stand by their principles that they have espoused here, go out to TXU and bid against Singapore Power to repurchase the assets.

I am listening. I hear nothing from members opposite, because it is a blatant hypocrisy. The Labor Party wanted those assets to be sold. It wanted the debt reduced. If it came to government, it wanted to take over a good set of accounts. It could turn around tomorrow and reborrow the money. It could go to the financial markets, take away the billions required and repurchase the assets, quite probably at a discount of the price at which they were sold. It could take on board all those risks of competing in the national marketplace. It could take back on board the obligations to build new power stations, upgrade infrastructure and reinvest in future electricity generation and transmission. It could take all that back on board and undo the terrible and shocking mistake that the former Liberal government committed by selling ETSA. Will it do that? I would bet my house that it will not. Will members opposite stand up for their principles? No. They will be quite happy to sit here and say that all the problems with electricity are a consequence of the sale, but will they put their hand into their pocket on behalf of the taxpayer and unscramble the egg? No; they will not.

This is political hypocrisy at its best. We are sitting here today debating a motion about door snakes and light bulbs that is some benign idea of the government to help people to reduce their power costs. When? If the government owns the

assets, it could turn around tomorrow and say to everybody, 'I give you a discount.' Wouldn't it be great if we still owned the assets? Imagine who people would be complaining to. They would be saying to the Premier and the Treasurer, 'Knock our power prices down', and there the Treasurer would be with all that debt, all those assets and obligations and everyone screaming at him to knock down his power price. This is an absolute nonsense; members opposite know it. They want all of the benefits without any of the pain. I ask why did they not bid to buy the assets back. We all know the answer: they do not want them. They love privatisation. It is the best thing that ever happened to them. They walked into a dream. So, I say to the member for Enfield: think carefully about the logic of your argument, and explain to me why you did not put that case forward in caucus.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I have been very anxious to make a contribution to this debate, because I do, indeed, commend the Social Development Committee on the poverty inquiry recommendation of an energy audit program for low income households. However, I have heard some most peculiar drivel from members opposite who seem to think that if they talk about people who are important in the world they too will be important in the world. I have also heard the most amazing rewrite of history. Sir, you and I were both in this chamber when the former premier John Olsen came into this chamber shortly after the 1997 election and announced that he had now read the Auditor-General's Report which pointed out that there was a risk in the state owning its electricity assets and announced that he was going to have to sell those assets to avoid this risk.

Gradually the debate moved to the great benefits that were going to accrue to the people of this state through selling ETSA. We heard day after day about the \$2 million a day extra that was going to be available for health, housing, education, tourism development, transport infrastructure and everything you would like to think of. There was going to be an extra \$2 million a day. There was never, at that stage, any mention of the reduction in debt. The reduction in debt came later when they worked out that they had to try to save some face out of this amazing botch-up they had made.

So the record of members opposite in their recollection of history is very much akin to, in my mind, the statements of the current Prime Minister, in relation to the reasons for invading Iraq. Before we went in, it was because of the imminent danger of the use of weapons of mass destruction. We got there and discovered there were no weapons of mass destruction. So all we hear now is that we went there to release Iraqis from the human rights atrocities of Saddam Hussein. I do not question in any way that the Hussein regime committed atrocities against their people. My statement is merely about the fact that that was not the reason that people of Australia, the people of the US and the people of the UK were given for the invasion of the Iraqi people. We were told it was to save us from weapons of mass destruction.

Members of the Liberal Party have this ability to give one reason for doing something—which in my opinion was intrinsically wrong in both cases—and when they get there and discover that the pot is a different colour we get another reason, and we get that reason again and again. The ability of the members opposite and their colleagues in Canberra to rewrite history in this way is extraordinary. The member for Waite focused on all these important companies and comments about what happens about buying back and not buying back and everything else.

The Social Development Committee was concentrating on people experiencing poverty. The Social Development Committee heard evidence after evidence that higher electricity prices experienced since privatisation were causing great distress to people experiencing poverty. They consequently made a recommendation in relation to that. I understand many witnesses suggested that what should happen was an increase in concession while the government did that. They have also added to that with an incentive and support payment for people to change energy suppliers in a effort to try to find ways of reducing bills.

The Social Development Committee, I understand, also recognised that simply increasing concessions was merely a mechanism for throwing more public money into the hands of the private providers. What was necessary was to assist people experiencing deprivation because of high energy costs to reduce their energy costs. I understand they recognise that often people who are living in poverty have very inefficient refrigerators and very inefficient appliances of all sorts. They mightn't know about that.

So, the Social Development Committee recommended that the Minister for Energy examine the feasibility of a state domestic energy management strategy. The strategy would include education and information to help households reduce electricity consumption, low cost or free energy audits for low income households, free energy audit for all SAHT tenants in older housing stock and low interest loans for items to assist in reduction of energy use.

The recommendation simply related to the free energy audits for low income households. The minister has come under scrutiny for adding to that recommendation. He has accepted that recommendation which is more than was done by many ministers from the previous government who managed to ignore recommendations from various parliamentary committees. This minister adopted the recommendation and added to it. He added to it because I understand that he was aware of a program in the Illawarra where additional energy savings and bill reductions were achieved by providing people with some basic energy saving devices. These were energy efficient light globes, water efficient shower heads, and draft excluders.

So, the minister has come under derision for adding to what the Social Development Committee recommended, as well as doing it. The Illawarra program, as did the pilot programs in South Australia, indicated that the energy audit process, with the bonus of the additional giveaways, reduced bills by about 15 per cent. So, that is not just a one off hand out and giveaway. That is a continuous reduction to the bills of people who are experiencing poverty.

I was disappointed that it took so long for those energy audits contracts to be finalised. It did take quite some time. I understand that this was because it was a new concept, and therefore there were no procedures and it all had to be worked out as they went along. However, some very esteemed organisations have won the contract to undertake those audits: Anglicare, the Lutheran Community Care, Uniting Care Wesley, Salvation Army, etc. are all undertaking these contracts. My contact with the people in my area who are undertaking these contracts indicate that they are very pleased to be involved in it and that the audits that they have conducted have been very worthwhile.

I invited people in my electorate to contact me if they wanted an audit and indeed about 90 people did. I passed on, with their permission, those names to the Uniting Care Wesley that is undertaking the audits in my area and about a

quarter of those people have had the benefit of the audit. In speaking to Abbey Thonaman, who is in charge of the audits, she said that the response has been very positive, that people find the audits helpful, informative, worthwhile and make comments such as, 'I will tell my neighbour.' They have been important in increasing people's awareness of how much energy they are using. People do not always understand which appliance uses how much energy. They find that the standby—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: Will the member for Bright please cease his inane comments and allow me to continue my contribution in peace. The light globes have been welcomed. Many low income families already had started on buying those light globes, but found them very expensive and welcomed the fact that two came along with the audit.

Debate adjourned.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

A petition signed by 2 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to provide for a referendum at the next election to adopt or reject each of the recommendations proposed by the Constitutional Constitution, was presented by the Hon. M.R. Buckby.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The SPEAKER: I direct that the 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 201, 227, 305, 317, 318, 324, 333, 334 and 373.

D-DAY COMMEMORATION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I rise today on the eve of an historic anniversary to acknowledge those Normandy veterans to whom we owe our gratitude for the fight they endured for our country almost 60 years ago today. Twenty-six of South Australia's members of the Normandy Veterans' Association, led by their president Mr Charles Chatterton, were able to join the Speaker and me for lunch today here at Parliament House. It was my honour to welcome these great men to commemorate Sunday's 60th anniversary of D-Day.

I ask members to cast their thoughts back to June 1944. Europe was enslaved by the most evil tyranny. Great nations were in chains. Millions were dying in the camps. Barbarism reigned. Civilisation itself was in peril. The freedom and fate of future generations was also at stake.

It was raining sideways the day before. The storm above the English Channel did not abate, and it was considered by some to be the most perilous and daunting storm in 50 years. Yet the tides and moon made it essential to go, and a million men were waiting. And so they went in the greatest armada in world history. An estimated 2 500 died on the first day alone—that first day 6 June, D-Day.

Twenty-seven of the first 32 Sherman tanks that landed sank in the lashing seas; their crews drowned. One company

lost 96 per cent of their men in the first 15 minutes. Omaha Beach saw such carnage that General Omar Bradley thought that the battle was lost then and there. By day's end 150 000 men had landed, with 10 000 casualties. Boys who became men that day were mown down on the beach or drowned in a few feet of water. The bodies of brave paratroopers were dangling from church steeples, and the seaside towns of Normandy were smashed with many rejoicing civilians cut down in the cross fire.

'Some men were dead,' recalled former conservative cabinet minister and war veteran, Ian McLeod, 'some men wounded and howling, and some men making tea. This was war,' he said, 'and this was D-Day, and there wasn't anything like it.' Rommel had taken the day off and went home for his wife's birthday, believing that no-one would land in that storm. Hitler slept late, for no-one dared wake him before 9 a.m. By nightfall, the basis of the allied victory only a year later was lodged in the beaches and fields and towns of Normandy, and the shape of the post-war world beginning faintly, as the rain continued falling, to be known.

In a time of terrorism, when the enemy is so often unknown and unseen, and when wars are too often fought amidst controversy, we look back today at a simpler time, when evil was known to be evil and our purpose known to be righteous, and the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of lives made willingly and proudly by parents, wives and children, since our cause was just, the end was noble and the word 'liberation' had clear, uncontested meaning.

We look back, too, at a generation (and my father, and I know many of the fathers of other honourable members were among them) that possessed what John Hepworth called 'valid innocence', a quality of spontaneous decency, comradeship and communal feeling that endured bereavement, privation, smashed cities and enduring separations from loved ones unimaginable to us now.

It was truly an age of heroes and heroic commitment that, on the Normandy beaches on that terrible morning, truly changed the world—and changed it for the better—and gave humankind that breathing space; that second chance; and that era of social improvement and economic security and cultural rebuilding that we now know as western civilisation—the era that we and our children grew up in.

Thousands more lives were lost between that June and the following August to give us that blessing, that ordinary, decent life on earth that we too often now take for granted. And these fallen and surviving heroes in that great cause of freedom we salute, remember and honour today. Yours is the standard and yours is the courage to which we will always aspire. Yours is the achievement to which there is no equal, because you freed a continent, you ended a war and you gave us freedom. Your longest day gave us a better world, and we thank you.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

CHILD ABUSE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise; the copies are coming. They are late.

An honourable member: They always are.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mine very rarely are. Yesterday in this place, the Leader of the Opposition raised a very serious matter. The Leader of the Opposition said (and I

quote)—and this is from his press release, which was released later—that 'he had been approached by a former state ward who said he went to police late in 2003 with details of where the body of a child could be found. The man said that, despite assurances, police have not investigated the matter because of a lack of resources'.

Mr Speaker, I can advise the house that I have today spoken to the Commissioner of Police about this issue, and I will now quote from what I am advised is his briefing note to me, as follows:

On 24 November 2003, the Child Exploitation Investigation Section of the police received a six-page document titled, 'To: the Senate Community References Committee re Inquiry into Children in Institutional Care'. The complainant had outlined the content of the document as his personal recollections of a period between 1962 and 1968, when he was an orphan at St Stanislaus Home at Royal Park—the Congregation of the Sisters of the Resurrection Incorporated.

The document referred to a recurring nightmare suffered by the complainant, where he describes witnessing a physical assault on another boy by a sister in the order. The nightmare—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: Do you realise that you are—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I can't hear you, sorry.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No; I am not. I am providing the house with a briefing from the Commissioner of Police in response to your unsubstantiated and reckless allegation yesterday. The document—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will withdraw the remark about the integrity of the information provided by the Leader of the Opposition and continue with the statement for which the Deputy Premier has leave.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will continue with the statement, sir.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will first withdraw the unsubstantiated—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will withdraw what allegation Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The remark against the standing of the—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will now substantiate that sir, if I can have leave to continue my statement, as follows:

The document referred to a recurring nightmare suffered by the complainant, where he describes witnessing a physical assault on another boy by a sister in the order. The nightmare describes that the boy fell to the ground as a result of a blow and he did not get up. According to the complainant, the boy was never seen again at the home. His absence was allegedly explained by the sisters that he had gone to a new family.

The account given by the complainant does not leave the sphere of being a 'nightmare'. There was no factual basis to the account given. In fact, the document tendered invites the readers to, and I quote, 'Draw your own conclusions'.

The complainant was questioned at length by the Child Exploitation investigators regarding his perceptions of the nightmare and any factual content that may arise. He was invited to meet again with investigators after he had more time to consider his claims.

The complainant was advised that the matter would be investigated. Investigators made inquiries with the Catholic Church regarding any records that the Orphanage may have collected or have stored during the relevant period. The Operations Inspector from the Major Crime Investigation Section was consulted and appraised of the claims. The Catholic Church Professional Standards Group was approached by Child Exploitation investigators on 27 November 2003. Investigators were informed that there were no archival records available in Adelaide regarding the history of the orphanage and that other details of the Order may be available from the Mother General Delegate in Rome, Italy. On 3 December 2003 the absence of records was confirmed by the Director of the Adelaide Diocese.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am reading from a briefing note from the Commissioner, Mr Speaker. It continues:

On 9 December 2003, the complainant was again spoken to at the Gawler Police Station, where a considerable amount of time was spent going through his recollections. In addition to his original disclosure of a recurring nightmare involving the assault on an unknown boy, he also recounted three additional nightmares that he continually suffers.

At the conclusion of this meeting it was agreed that the complainant could assist by making inquiries to try and locate a former friend of his who had also been in the orphanage. At the same time, the investigation continued with the Catholic Church.

The Archbishop of Adelaide was appraised of the claims relating to this matter by the officer in charge of the Child Exploitation Section.

No other inquiries have been made to date. Further inquiries may be made at a future date if material of substance is provided.

Sir, the Police Commissioner has advised me that he has not been able to resolve, at this time, the allegation made by the Leader of the Opposition as to whether there was an issue of a lack of resources as it relates to this case.

As I have said to this house before, this government has full confidence in the Police Commissioner and the South Australia Police Force, and will commit the necessary resources needed to fight paedophilia. The information provided by the Commissioner for Police makes it clear that the police did, in fact, investigate these allegations. Sir, the uninformed and reckless allegations raised by the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:—and his shadow minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! When I say 'Order,' I mean come to order. Perhaps it is better to follow the example of the former premier, Des Corcoran, if the Deputy Premier seeks a role model. Whenever he hears the chair, his best advice from this day forward is to resume his seat. The chair requires, since the Deputy Premier defied the chair, that the statement cease at that point, and that the Deputy Premier now identify with absolute precision where the quotation of the report to him provided by the Police Commissioner commences in the quotation, as it is not shown in the written statement provided to the house. Does it begin with the words, 'On 24 November 2003'?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I have provided a ministerial statement to the house based on the advice of the Police Commissioner. I stand by that statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier claimed that he was quoting from the document provided by the Police Commissioner, and the house heard him in silence. Did the Deputy Premier mislead the house? Were the words used—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is not for me to decide, sir: that is for the house. But I am happy to provide the Speaker with a copy of the briefing note from the Police Commissioner.

The SPEAKER: Then the house has no alternative but to find that the Deputy Premier did mislead the house, because the Deputy Premier not only stated to the house that he was quoting the Commissioner of Police but that, when the chair asked him to verify the point he was making—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, I have made it clear that the quote from the Police Commissioner concluded, and the reference to the uninformed and reckless allegations are my comments.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will resume his seat.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I have a point of order, sir. I think there is some confusion—and I am not suggesting that the Deputy Premier was acting improperly, because ministers can vary from the material handed out—but his verbal statement

is not the same as in the document. Something is missing from the bottom of page 1 and the bottom of page 2, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER: Notwithstanding any of that, the Deputy Premier assured the house that he was quoting, and the words I recall, as I see them on the page, are as follows:

I have today spoken to the Commissioner of Police about this issue and he has advised the following:

He then said, 'And I quote'. The Deputy Premier did not indicate when he stopped quoting until the point where I felt compelled to call him to order, because the Deputy Premier at that point was beginning a debate in attack—for the second time—on the integrity of the Leader of the Opposition. The Deputy Premier was given leave to make the statement, which contains contentious material, without having established that the case referred to by the Leader of the Opposition was, in fact, the case to which the remarks of the Police Commissioner, attributed to the Police Commissioner and made by the Deputy Premier, did apply. No attempt was made to ensure that that was the case. It is assumed that that was so by the house in its hearing of the matter, but the Deputy Premier was stopped from proceeding because of the commencement of debate and the attack on the leader.

For the purposes of the house understanding what was the quote of the Police Commissioner, as compared to the words of the Deputy Premier—and there is a grey distinction—the chair required the Deputy Premier to state where the quotes were to begin and where they concluded; and that goes to the very nub of the rulings which have been given in this chamber about privilege.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise, sir. I thought it was self-explanatory in the statement, and I apologise if it was not. I went from saying:

No other inquiries have been to date. Further inquiries may be made at a future date if material of substance is provided.

I then go on to say—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Excuse me. Can I just answer the Speaker's concerns, please? I then go on to say:

The Police Commissioner has advised me that he was not able to resolve, at this time, the allegations—

So I moved to be talking about his advice to me. I then say:

As I have said to this house before, this government has full confidence in the Police Commissioner—

So at this point I am clearly no longer quoting from advice. Then I say, sir:

Information provided by the Commissioner of Police makes it clear that the police did in fact investigate these allegations.

That is my statement. I then go on to say:

The uninformed and reckless allegations raised by the Leader of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have heard that stuff.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, I have—

The SPEAKER: And that is unparliamentary! The Deputy Premier will resume his seat. I asked the Deputy Premier to state where the quote began and where it concluded. The Deputy Premier sought to exercise licence and to get away with it, in the opinion of the chair, in order to damage the reputation, as the chair sees it, of the Leader of the Opposition, in which case the Deputy Premier will apologise for creating that impression and withdraw the statement that it was a Police Commissioner's brief to him from which he was quoting. It is rather a paraphrase, quite obviously,

because no quotation marks appear in the printed document provided to me and to other members of the chamber.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, there was never an intention in my belief to attribute those words to the Commissioner at all and I was about, as the police minister of this state, defending the police force against an allegation that was wrong: that was my intent and my role as police minister. I apologise to the Leader of the Opposition if I have offended him in my defence of the police force, but that is my job as minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will withdraw and apologise without condition.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, what am I being asked to apologise for?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will withdraw and apologise without condition.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise and I withdraw profusely, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: And you will do so without rancour.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise profusely and I withdraw for any hurt caused to the Leader of the Opposition in my defence of the police force of this state.

The SPEAKER: Without condition, and that will be the last opportunity the Deputy Premier has, regardless—

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: On a point of order, sir—

The SPEAKER: The Attorney-General will resume his seat.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Understand this, Mr Speaker; understand this clearly: I accept your ruling. I will do as you ask and I will apologise unreservedly, without condition, to the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: On a point of order, sir, can you point to any place in the history of parliament, either here or in Great Britain, where it is unparliamentary for a member of parliament to make a comment on another's contribution that it is uninformed and reckless?

The SPEAKER: Yes, in this chamber leave to give ministerial statements is provided by the chamber through its standing orders to the extent that the information provided is factual and not engage in debate of any kind. What the Deputy Premier was doing was clearly engaging in debate by making remarks about the integrity or otherwise of either the actions or the person of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: So, Mr Speaker, I take that to be a ruling that in future no ministerial statement is to contain comment: it is only to contain a hierarchy or a narrative of facts.

The SPEAKER: That has always been the case: it will be the case not only in the future but has been the case in the past.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, sir, so that there is no misunderstanding in this house or by anyone else, I point out that the last quote from the Police Commissioner, now that we know where the quote finished was, 'No other inquiries have been made. Further inquiries may be made at a future date if material of substance is provided.' I interpreted that from the Police Commissioner as a potentially ongoing investigation.

The SPEAKER: I take the Deputy Premier at his word that he will provide to the chair a copy of that statement.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As I said, I am happy to provide that, sir, to the house. I said at the beginning that I was basing my statement on a briefing note from the Police Commissioner. I could have walked in here and read exactly word for word. To the best of my understanding, it is, bar a slight—

well, I will let people make up their own mind, but a minister of the Crown is entitled to give to this parliament information that the minister sees fit. I have explained and detailed the advice provided to me by the Police Commissioner, sir. I added my own words to it and paraphrased one paragraph of the Police Commissioner's statement where he says:

I am not able to resolve the allegation of a lack of resources at this time.

As I look at my statement, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I just thought I would clarify that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier now seeks to expand into debate in justification. What the Deputy Premier said quite clearly at the outset was that he was quoting the Police Commissioner, and the record will show that to be so. The Deputy Premier himself makes the remark that ministers are indeed entitled to say as they will, and I remind him that so did minister Ingerson and so did premier Olsen.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Excuse me, sir: you have made reference to a premier who was found to have misled the house, I understand, and a further minister. Are you putting me in the same category?

The SPEAKER: We'll see.

Mr BRINDAL: On a further point of order, I do not wish to hold up the house on this matter but I point out respectfully to you that the document from which the Deputy Premier quoted was entitled 'To the Senate References Committee re the Inquiry for Children in Institutional Care'. I, too, was a witness before that committee and I understood that that committee and its records were covered by the privilege of another parliament. I would ask you, when you are looking at this matter, to please investigate the circumstances under which a privileged document came into the possession of the police force.

The SPEAKER: Notwithstanding that, I will deliberately and consciously pursue the line of inquiry the member for Unley has referred to.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: May I just say as I hand this to you that I have noticed one paragraph concluding in this advice—may I just explain this to you, sir?

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier does not have the call.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: May I seek the call, sir?

The SPEAKER: Does the Deputy Premier seek to be heard in explanation?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER: Then seek leave of the house—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I seek leave to be heard in explanation, sir.

The SPEAKER: —to make a personal explanation.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am reading—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will seek leave of the house to make a personal explanation.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I had thought that in the delivery of my statement I had made clear, and I accept that to yourself and others maybe that was not the case, that I was basing my statement on a piece of advice from the Commissioner where I was quoting to the best of my understanding from it. There is one slight variation that does not alter the

substance of it at all but, given the rulings that you are making, I note that the Police Commissioner's statement reads: 'I am not able to resolve the allegation of a lack of resources at this time.' My statement—and it is me speaking my words, not his and, as I said, I was then paraphrasing and using my own words—was:

The Police Commissioner has advised me that he has not been able to resolve at this time the allegation made by the Leader of the Opposition as to whether there was an issue of a lack of resources as it relates to this case.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Notwithstanding what the Deputy Premier has chosen to describe the variance as being, namely 'insignificant', it strikes me that it is a very significant variation. Accordingly, it is noted. It is time to move on with the review of the information put before the house, as I have undertaken to do.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Can I ask whether that paper from the Police Commissioner has been formally tabled and, if not, can I ask that it now be formally tabled, as it was quoted from?

The SPEAKER: You can. It is a document from which the Deputy Premier was quoting. Given the request, it is so ordered.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have already indicated I am quite happy to do that.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have it here and I said that I would table it.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is not any necessity for the Deputy Premier to justify or debate the decision.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:
By the Minister for Gambling (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

Rules—
Bookmakers Licensing (Responsible Gambling) Rules
2004—No. 2 of 2004.

GUARDIAN FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am pleased to report the appointment of Pam Simmons as the state's first Guardian for Children and Young People. Ms Simmons is known for her work as a social policy advocate through her position as Executive Director of the South Australian Council for Social Services, and it is this background of advocating for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged in our community that equips her so well for this important role. The guardian will be responsible as advocate for children and young people and will monitor children under the guardianship of the minister. As guardian Ms Simmons will independently monitor the circumstances of children in out-of-home care and their quality of care as well as provide me, as the statutory guardian, with advice on whether the needs and interests of children are being met. The government is pleased that Ms Simmons, who has considerable experience in the area of social policy, has agreed to accept this significant position. The guardian's role will also seek to ensure that the child protection and alternative care systems and other related

government services such as health, education and funded non-government services are child-focused and work for children in out-of-home care to improve their outcomes.

The position will focus particularly on the needs of highly disadvantaged groups of children and young people in out-of-home care such as indigenous children and children with disabilities. The guardian's role will also be to identify any systemic reform necessary to improve the quality of services offered by government and non-government agencies for children and young people in out-of-home care. The position represents a combination of key recommendations of the landmark Review into Child Protection by Robyn Layton QC which was commissioned in March 2002 by the Rann government. This significant position will soon be complemented by the establishment of the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee, which will examine the circumstances surrounding a death or serious injury of a child and recommend improvements where appropriate.

QUESTION TIME

POLICE, RESOURCES

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Police. Does the minister stand by the fact that my allegations regarding a lack of resources for police were uninformed and reckless, when they were direct quotes from emails from a member of the South Australia Police Force? On 19 December the police sent an email to a witness which stated:

I just wanted to advise you that due to other investigations and an acute shortage of staff, I have not been able to dedicate much time to this matter.

On 13 February, a further email states:

My sincere apologies for the delay in contacting you. To be honest, I have not been able to devote any time to your matter in recent weeks due to inordinate workloads.

Now, think about apologising.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I made it clear, consistent with the Police Commissioner's advice to me, that at this stage the Commissioner has not been able to resolve the allegation made by the Leader of the Opposition that there was an issue of resources. I have said that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Excuse me.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Today. Excuse me.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have just asked for a copy of the Leader of the Opposition's press release to be brought down to me.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: Why?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Why, he says; because the allegation yesterday—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley is out of order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I was confronted yesterday with an issue raised in this house by the Leader of the Opposition. I say in my statement that yesterday in this place the Leader of the Opposition raised a very serious matter. I then went on to say, sir, and I made reference to his press release—a press release put out by the leader of the opposition that says this:

'Police fail to act on abuse homicide claim'. That was the statement.

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Newland just said, 'Hear, hear!' When the leader of the Opposition says that the police have failed to act on an abuse of a homicide claim, I ask the Police Commissioner to respond. I wanted to know whether that allegation was correct. I detailed in my statement a response from the Police Commissioner that made it clear to my satisfaction that the police did, in fact, act on this claim. That was the allegation: the allegation was that the police failed to act. I defend the police of this state, because I am satisfied that the police did in fact act, and did in fact act responsibly and in detail.

That is the allegation raised by the Leader of Opposition. That is the allegation I refute in my statement. Regarding the allegation about a lack of resources, I have said that the Police Commissioner has not yet been able to resolve that matter. I cannot be any more honest and open than that. But I can say this: that the Leader of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier's assertions may well be factual, but they do not go to the nub of the question. The inquiry was about whether or not the Deputy Premier stood by his allegation that the leader was reckless and whatever.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I stand by my accusation that the leader was both reckless and uninformed when he makes claims that police failed to act on a homicide abuse claim. I stand by that. Absolutely I stand by that. And, as I have said concerning the issue of the resources, the Commissioner will come back to me with further advice on that allegation. I have not either refuted or accepted that allegation, because I have not yet had advice on it. On the release put out by the police—

Ms Chapman: Did you ask him?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, the member for Bragg is saying to me that Commissioner—well, I do not know what the criticism of the Commissioner is by the member for Bragg. However, it is my job, I would have thought (and please correct me if you do not think it is my job, but if the Leader of the Opposition is to make a statement that police failed to act, either in this house, or outside of this house) to seek advice from the state's Police Commissioner and give that to the house. The advice was clearly that they did act and the allegation was wrong. I believe I am able to say that it was both uninformed and reckless.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I have a supplementary question to the Minister for Police. Does the minister assert that either the emails referred to in the leader's question were not sent, or that they were not from the police?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry, what was the question again? I didn't hear.

The SPEAKER: This is question time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, it is, sir, and I answer questions to the best of my ability, but sometimes I do not hear everything that is said in this place.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has asked a supplementary question and I invite the member to repeat it for the benefit of the Deputy Premier.

Mrs REDMOND: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question to the Minister for Police was: does the Minister for Police assert that either the emails referred to in the leader's question were not sent or that they were not from the police?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I assert neither. I do not know. I have not seen those.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No. Mr Speaker, the allegation was (and I quote again from the Leader of the Opposition's press release, following his raising this matter in the house), 'Police failed to act on abuse homicide claim', and the member for Newland says, 'Hear, hear!'—

An honourable member: Uninformed!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That, sir, in my opinion, is uninformed and reckless and I stand by that.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order. Accusations of impropriety against other members, such as 'uninformed' and 'reckless' are normally covered under our standing orders by substantive motion. They are the matter for debate. You have already asked that these words be withdrawn. I ask him not to repeat them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the assistance of the Minister for Administrative Services. In answer to the point of order, there is clearly a misunderstanding. The material to which the Deputy Premier was referring was different from the material to which the Leader of the Opposition has taken exception. I think that it is well and truly time to move on from that point.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I have a supplementary question. Will the Minister for Police explain why he excluded one line from the Commissioner's briefing where he says, 'I am not able to resolve the allegation of a lack of resources at this time'? That has been taken out of this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I thank the Deputy Premier for his observance of my calls for order. The question has already been answered by the Deputy Premier of—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: Not as to why it was taken out of the statement.

An honourable member: He said it!

The SPEAKER: My clear recollection is that the Deputy Premier stated that there was a variation. Honourable members are entitled to draw their own conclusion as to why the Deputy Premier chose to omit it. His reasons are best known to him.

ONESTEEL

Ms BREUER (Giles): Will the Minister for Infrastructure provide an update on planned work at the OneSteel steel-works in Whyalla?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): I thank the member for Giles for that question, and take the liberty of saying that I recognise that the member is a tremendous champion for the City of Whyalla. The question is such a good one, because OneSteel plays such a huge role in the City of Whyalla and in the wider South Australian economy. Whyalla has long had an association with the steel industry, and tomorrow a new chapter will begin which will guarantee that lifeblood of the city for a further 20 years. Tomorrow OneSteel will start work on a relining of its blast

furnace. This is a huge undertaking, which has involved massive investment and intricate planning and will take military-style precision to complete. OneSteel has formed a project team that includes experts from around the world and a specially trained work force of more than 400, who will be working around the clock seven days a week for the next 65 days. The total amount invested in capital and building inventory exceeds \$170 million, and that is a tremendous statement of confidence in this state and its economic future, and it is a tremendous statement of confidence in this government.

The relining involves the extraction of the old lining inside the furnace and replacing it with newer, more modern technology that will improve the efficiency of the furnace. The current ceramic bricks will be replaced with copper staves that will mean an increase in the overall volume of the furnace. While the new furnace is exciting news for the state, for the people of Whyalla and for OneSteel, we should pay tribute to the management and staff who managed to keep the old furnace going for close to a world record performance. The current blast furnace is recognised as the second longest running blast furnace in the world.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Where is the first?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I think there might be one in Korea; I am not sure. We all knew that that blast furnace's life was coming to an end, and the knowledge that the steel industry may not be there in the future was a terrible sword hanging over the head of Whyalla. We now know that it is there for 20 years, and one of the things that we have already seen is that house prices in Whyalla have increased very significantly, because people know that they have a future. It is tremendously good news—an investment of \$170 million that secures the future of the town, a future that we applaud and we wish to see built upon. I thank the member for Giles for such a serious and worthwhile question.

POLICE, RESOURCES

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Police aware that his insinuation in his ministerial statement that the witness had failed to provide information is incorrect? I quote from the statement made by the Deputy Premier, where it states:

At the conclusion of this meeting it was agreed that the complainant could assist by making inquiries to try and locate a former friend of his who had also been in the orphanage.

It went on:

No other inquiries have been made to date. Further inquiries may be made at a future date if material of substance is provided.

In an email to the witness dated 13 February, the police state:

You still have my word that I will conduct all agreed inquiries, such as contacting that particular person.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): As I have said to the house, that is the advice given to me by the Police Commissioner, so the Leader of the Opposition's question or criticism is of the Police Commissioner, and I will ask him to respond. What concerns me is that the press release issued yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition states:

In parliament today, Mr Kerin said that he was aware of a case where the under-resourced child exploitation investigation section of the South Australia Police had failed to investigate the alleged homicide of a state ward who may have died as a result of child abuse.

I cannot think of a much more serious accusation or allegation, namely, that the police force of this state 'failed to investigate an alleged homicide'.

An honourable member: Selective reading.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No; I read the whole paragraph.

An honourable member: Yes; but read the rest of it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No; I said that, namely:

In parliament today, Mr Kerin said that he was aware of a case where the under-resourced child exploitation investigation section of the South Australia Police had failed to investigate the alleged homicide of a state ward who may have died as a result of child abuse.

On advice from the Commissioner of Police, that is untrue. As he said in his statement to me, at this stage he has not been able to resolve the issue or the allegation of a lack of resources. I acknowledge that very issue in my statement. I have not hidden it, nor have I ducked it. I am awaiting advice from the Commissioner on whether or not the allegation about resources can be substantiated. I will say this: given the allegation that the police failed to act on a homicide, one can be left to draw one's own conclusions about whether or not the other allegation is correct. However, we will wait for that judgment on advice from the Police Commissioner. I can think of nothing more serious than an MP coming into this place and alleging that our police force failed to investigate an alleged homicide. I did what I thought was right, and I stand by that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, sir. The minister is now just ranging over a debate. I refer to standing order 98, and I ask you to bring the Deputy Premier to order.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier has clearly finished the answer.

MENTAL HEALTH

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the government agree that the provisions of the Mental Health Act in relation to compulsory treatment orders are currently failing to protect patients and the public adequately from the consequences of serious mental illness?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the honourable member for this important question. Mental health reform is a priority for the government, and we have a major reform process under way both in the development of capital facilities and in the provision of services, and I will update the house in that regard. Over the next four years, new or upgraded mental health facilities are being constructed or planned at the Flinders Medical Centre, the Repatriation General Hospital, the Lyell McEwin Hospital, Noarlunga Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Women's and Children's Hospital and Modbury Hospital. The government is also committed to an upgrade of community based support. The Mental Health Act 1993 needs reform to keep pace with these contemporary developments. The government's mental health reform process has highlighted the need for legislative review. It is important that the legislation protects the rights of mental health consumers and supports best practice in the delivery of mental health services. We have contracted the services of Mr Ian Bidmeade, who is pre-eminent in this area, to undertake this review. It is envisaged that a response to the government about future directions on the legislation will be available in 2005.

CHILD ABUSE

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Minister for Police received any further information from the Commissioner's office after the memo from which he quoted? At 12 o'clock today I spoke to the Commissioner and gave him information that supersedes that in the memo.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): Are you saying that the statement from the Police Commissioner—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This briefing note was provided—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The advice that I have tabled in the house and read to the house was provided to my office by the Police Commissioner. I do not know at what time precisely. I will endeavour to identify that. I have had two or three telephone conversations with the Police Commissioner this morning about this—and this was but a minor matter in terms of the context of other material we have been discussing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is one of a number of matters. If the Leader of the Opposition is now saying that he has information that supersedes this advice, and that this advice is now no longer correct on the basis of information that the Leader of the Opposition has—is that the issue? I will now ask the Police Commissioner to provide me with advice as to whether or not what he has given me has been superseded by something said to him by the Leader of the Opposition, because the Police Commissioner has not discussed with me a conversation that the leader is referring to.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: A supplementary question, sir: is the Minister for Police aware that as of 12 o'clock today the Commissioner was not aware of the fact that the emails which were referred to yesterday even existed?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I don't know.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Look, come on, get real. Are we talking about emails or are we talking about an allegation that was put out into the media yesterday that the police failed to act on a homicide case—and they did not fail to act.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was explicitly about emails.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And that is what I am addressing, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Then leave the rest out.

FLEET SA, VEHICLE ACCIDENTS

Mr SNELLING (Playford): My question is to the Minister for Administrative Services. What is the trend in vehicle accidents for Fleet SA vehicles?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): I thank the member for Playford for his question. I am pleased to report the advice that I have received is that, to the end of May this financial year, the rate of accidents and incidents involving Fleet SA vehicles is trending downwards. Since 2000-2001 accident data relating to Fleet SA vehicles has included an additional category of incidents which covers events such as minor car park damage and/or vandalism. I am advised that in 2000-2001 there were 5 632 Fleet SA vehicles and the number of recorded accidents and incidents was

2 741, an incident rate of 48.7 per cent. The comparable figures provided to me indicate that in 2001-2002 there were 5 650 vehicles and 2 653 recorded accidents or incidents, which is a nominal incident rate of 47 per cent. In 2002-2003 there were 6 110 vehicles and 2 756 recorded accidents or incidents, giving an incident rate of 45.1 per cent. Members may be aware that from 2002-2003 onward the figures include Transport SA vehicles which had previously been managed by AH Plant.

Although only the figures for the first 11 months of the 2003-2004 financial year have been collated, I am advised that if the average number of recorded incidents per month remain at the same level then the comparable figure for the full year will show an incident rate of 40.8 per cent. I am advised that over these years the average cost per recorded vehicle accident or incident has declined from approximately \$940 per incident in the 2000-2001 financial year to approximately \$829 per incident so far in 2003-2004. The information provided to me in relation to insurance costs is that the current average insurance premium levied by Fleet SA is \$408 per vehicle per annum.

I am advised that this compares to an indicative insurance premium per vehicle in the commercial sector of approximately \$426 per annum. Over the last few financial years, the number of vehicles recorded as Fleet SA vehicles has increased, and the scope of reported accidents has been widened to include incidents. However, based on the figures that I have been given, I am pleased to report that the rate of accidents and incidents measured against the total number of Fleet SA vehicles has been reducing.

CHILD ABUSE

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Premier aware that of the 80 cases of sexual abuse reported in the Anglican Church's inquiry only two of these were known to police; and does he agree that this indicates that the majority of people involved in such matters are reluctant to approach the police?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I think what we have learned from the Anglican inquiry is that there was—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier does not need the assistance of the member for Morphett.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, sir. What we have learned from Justice Trevor Olsson's inquiry is that there was an extraordinary culture of cover-up within the church. Also, what we have heard is that there was a culture of cover-up in terms of dealing with the chaplain, John Mountford. Any of those people from the church or the community—I do not know who they were; I can only go on what I have read in the report—who aided and abetted the escape of that paedophile priest, in my view, aided and abetted evil. Let us make no bones about this—

Mrs REDMOND: I rise on a point of order, sir. The point of order is the relevance of this answer in relation to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition about the number of sexual abuse claims and the two that had gone to the police; and whether he agreed there was any likelihood that people would go to the police.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call. It will please the chair immensely if the Premier sticks to the subject matter, rather than put at risk a fair trial for someone who may yet be charged with such an offence to which he refers.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, sir. If it is true that 80 cases were not reported to the police, then the answer is they should have been—which is why we are changing the law of this state, unlike the previous government—to make it mandatory.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, sir. That is clear and deliberate debate.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I have a supplementary question. Given the apparent reluctance of sexual abuse victims and their families to approach the police or phone the police hotline, will the Premier himself set up an independent confidential paedophile hotline (as the Anglican Church did) beyond the jurisdictions of FAYS and the police?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): The honourable member raises this crucially important issue of child abuse, and what he is really raising is the question of the adult survivors of child abuse. I think it is probably worthwhile pausing for a moment to recollect that many people in our community who have suffered sexual abuse at the hands of adults will be struggling with the issue. I know that some of these revelations are actually quite close to home, as we have seen in the popular press recently.

The very first step that is being grappled with is openness. I remind the house that it is important to think through the steps that have been taken along the way to ensure there is this openness about what has happened. The first thing this government did when coming to office in March 2002 was to commission an inquiry into the child protection system—that was the very first step. There was no screaming headline about this matter; we chose to act.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: On a point of order, sir, the question asked of the minister was explicit: will the government be prepared to have a hotline outside the auspices of FAYS—yes or no? That was the question and the minister is not answering it.

The SPEAKER: Notwithstanding what might have been sought by way of answer, the minister must nonetheless address the substance of the inquiry about an independent hotline. In the course of making those remarks he is not compelled to answer yes or no, but debating anything peripheral to it is disorderly. To that extent the point of order is upheld. To the other extent, questions which invite yes or no may get a yes or no, but equally they may get a maybe. The minister.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: To reflect on the government's decision about whether one would set up a hotline of that sort, it is necessary to consider the other mechanisms put in place to consider these issues, and that is what I sought to bring to the attention of the house. Many of these flow from the Layton report and quite properly they are recommendations made and accepted by us. I have previously drawn to the attention of the house the child serious injury and death review committee, a newly established special investigations unit within the Department of Families and Communities. It was in interim operation in February and came into full operation in May. Its remit is to deal with broad issues concerning cases of abuse in alternative care. We have today announced the guardianship process. When one considers the appropriate way of dealing with these matters, a number of issues come to mind. The first is making sure we do not prejudice any criminal investigations afoot.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The honourable member suggests that somehow it is a cop-out to say that we should not prejudice criminal investigations. I would have thought that it was a matter of the highest public interest in the first instance to bring those culpable to justice. I would have thought that this was an issue where we should not play politics but think about what is a sensible response to an extraordinary amount of pain. Adult survivors of abuse have very special needs. It may be that the criminal justice system either has failed them or is not equipped to deal with the nature of their issues. It may be that the civil justice system, the next possible way they can resolve the matter, is also unable to deal with their circumstances.

That leaves a legitimate question about how one deals with the adult survivors of sexual abuse. I will explain the way the government is dealing with this. In the recent budget we allocated funds for additional counselling services for such persons, and this may in itself be insufficient. It may be that people are requesting a forum before which they can make their points publicly. The member for Unley understands this, because he advocated as such in November of last year before a Senate committee set up to look into questions of institutionalised care. He made those submissions, and they are very similar to the ones he has been making to this house. That senate committee has also heard evidence from a range of other individuals. That Senate inquiry is due to report on 21 June. There has been a range of responses to this very difficult question of the adult survivors of sexual abuse. There is no doubt that it will be the case that the system has failed many young men and women who are now adults, but the solution will not be to come into this place inflaming the debate by playing politics with the lives of those abused children.

JUVENILE ABSCONDERS

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. How many children at the McNally Training Centre, its preceeding institutions or any other juvenile detention facilities in this state have disappeared while absent from the institution and in the care of others and what were the names of those people in whose care the children were when they absconded? There have to be records of absconding juveniles from the juvenile justice system. There should also be records of the people in whose care those juveniles were when they absconded.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): Within the limits of the information that I am permitted to give to the honourable member, I am happy to provide that information. The use of it for the assistance of the honourable member puzzles me but I am happy to bring that to his attention, subject only to those restrictions that this very house would have placed upon us in terms of child protection legislation.

HOSPITALS, ELECTIVE SURGERY

Mr CAICA (Colton): My question is to the Minister for Health. How many extra procedures are being carried out at our metropolitan hospitals following the government's announcement on 23 March 2004 of an extra \$5 million for elective surgery?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): On 23 March 2004 the government allocated \$5 million to fund an additional 1 085 elective surgery procedures to be completed

in Adelaide's eight major metropolitan hospitals and also at the Gawler hospital. Current indications are that most of these procedures will be completed by the end of June, depending of course on the build-up of emergency demand as winter sets in. Of the additional operations scheduled, the Royal Adelaide Hospital has completed 112 and plans to have all 208 completed by the end of June. Flinders Medical Centre has completed 33 and plans to have all 82 allocated procedures completed by the end of June. The Women's and Children's has completed 20 procedures and plans to have all 65 allocated procedures completed by the end of June.

The Lyell McEwin will have all 10 additional procedures completed by the end of June. The Queen Elizabeth has completed 75 and all 142 extra procedures are scheduled to be done before the end of June. Noarlunga has completed eight procedures and will have 25 to 30 completed by the end of June. It is working with the Flinders Medical Centre to complete another 90 procedures for Flinders' patients. I am very pleased to see those two hospitals cooperating in the south. The Repatriation General Hospital has allocated 56 of the additional 80 procedures to be completed by the end of June and the remaining 24 to be carried into July.

Modbury will complete at least 100 of the additional ear, nose and throat cases that were allocated there before the end of June, with the remaining 100 carried over into July. The Gawler hospital has completed 67 of the extra ear, nose and throat procedures and ophthalmology procedures to date, and the remaining 111 are scheduled to be completed by the end of June. Our hospitals are doing more work, and in the period from July 2003 to March 2004 26 498 people were admitted from the booking lists, an increase of 460 admissions when compared with the same period last year. The additional procedures now being undertaken will add to this increase.

CHILD ABUSE

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier now make the same call for extradition for Mr Rick Marshall as he did for Mr Mountford and, if not, why not? The Premier told this house on Tuesday 1 June 2004 that:

The chaplain in question, who has been identified as the Reverend John Mountford, should be located and extradited to face charges.

Mr Rick Marshall has a victim who has publicly sought justice for some time. The victim has named Mr Marshall as I now name him in this place. The assertion was aired on public television and no legal action has been taken to refute the claim. The case involves allegations of—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member now strays into debate.

Mr BRINDAL: I will try not to, sir. Allegations have been made on television of kidnapping, false imprisonment, drugging, threats to the life of the victim, and continual and wilful sexual abuse. Mr Marshall has now fled this state.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): If the honourable member would like to give me the details that he has, I will ensure that the Police Commissioner is given those details immediately. Obviously, if this is someone whom the police are seeking, I would encourage any state or nation to cooperate with extradition.

TOURISM, OUTBACK

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What major event is being planned for the year 2005 to assist in promoting tourism to South Australia and, in particular, the great South Australian Outback?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for West Torrens for his interest in this matter. Today in Adelaide we announced the 2005 Great Australian Outback Cattle Drive. Tomorrow there will be a joint launch with the federal Minister for Tourism, Joe Hockey in Melbourne.

Thousands of cattle were herded down the Birdsville Track in legendary numbers in times of old. The 2002 recreation of this historic event was an extraordinary success, with 600 head of cattle and 120 horses travelling along the track and camping as they went. The experience was an extraordinary one for the international travellers who joined in this event, which was owned and managed by Australian Major Events.

This year the event will be marketed extensively in the UK, across Europe and in the United States, with SATC negotiating exclusive arrangements for holders of American Express cards who will have the first opportunity to register their interest and book for the cattle drive. The cattle drive is expected to have 12 per cent of visitors coming from the international market, just as in the previous inaugural event, and we expect about 55 per cent of those attending to come from interstate. As before, the event will last six weeks, but there will be the opportunity to take four, five and six day tours.

The track will go from Birdsville to Marree—a 514 kilometre route—with supporting events in communities along the way in Birdsville, Mungerannie and Marree. As with the previous cattle drive, the event will be an astounding opportunity to showcase the Outback, produce economic benefits to regional areas and be seen as a gateway into South Australia. It is a particularly timely moment to launch the event, because the media in Europe and North America have been replete with views of the South Australian Outback through the windows of The Ghan train. There will be opportunities to mark both The Ghan route and the Outback cattle drive as a way of positioning South Australia as the Outback state.

YOUTH, SECOND STORY

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Health. Have there been any investigations into the Second Story youth health service as a consequence of complaints from families about children as young as 12 years old being connected with older paedophiles under the auspices of programs run by Child and Youth Health?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I am certainly not aware of any, but I will look into that matter and bring an answer back to the house.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My question is also to the Minister for Health. Has the Youth Health Service Second Story program at any time facilitated in any way free and underage access for youths questioning their sexuality to licensed gay bars frequented by older men and women?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Again, I am unaware of the answer to that question today.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I am just saying to you I am not aware of the matters that you raise, and I will certainly investigate them and bring an answer back to the house as soon as possible.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My next question is also to the Minister for Health. What control arrangements does the minister have in place to ensure that paedophiles are not active within the Inside Out Project and other programs run by the Second Story, under Family and Youth Health, given that the programs include children as young as 12, alongside adults as old as 26?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I will certainly also take that matter on notice, but if the member for Waite has any information that he would like to provide to me that could help me in this matter, I would be very grateful to receive it. I will certainly be looking at the matters that he has raised, and I will bring answers back to the house.

CHILD PROTECTION WORKERS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Will the minister advise the house how long it will take to fill the extra positions for child protection workers announced by him last week? Last week the minister announced additional funding of \$148.1 million over four years, specifically directed at providing more case workers in the child protection area, in particular 186 workers in 2004-05. However, the opposition has received advice that there are no skilled people available to fill new positions.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I thank the honourable member for her question; it is a very important question. It is probably based on a bit of a misapprehension. Not all of the positions that are being sought are social worker positions.

Mrs Redmond: What are they?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: A range of therapists, psychologists and youth workers. We are doing a number of things because we have anticipated this issue. There is, of course, around the nation, quite a call on child protection workers, and we have anticipated the difficulty that we are likely to run into in seeking to recruit. The first thing that we are doing is engaging in a very fast track recruitment process. We had a meeting with the Public Service Association the day after the budget to speak to them about work we had already had in train about the way in which we are seeking to call these positions. We have also found that the person's specification and descriptions are not of a type which are likely to facilitate the quick processing of people into these jobs. So, we are looking at a way of streamlining that process.

That work has commenced and is going well. We hope, I think, to be advertising broadly, across the whole of Australia and in all of the areas where we are likely to be able to recruit these workers. We are looking laterally at some of the skills. One of the issues that has been raised with us is that the skills for the people who work in this child protection area need to be broad: they need to have strong life skills. It is an important element of being able to ascertain and deal with families in distress, being able to understand their circumstances. So, that work is occurring. We are very keen to have these people on the ground as soon as we possibly can.

Initially, there will be a period of induction and training. We have been allocated this money through the Treasurer's very generous budget allocation. We are very keen not to hand him back any money into general revenue, so we do want to spend this money from day one. We will be aiming to have these people on the ground as soon as possible. Certainly 1 July would be nice, but we are hoping to be able to do it at that time line.

CHILD ABUSE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is again to the Minister for Families and Communities. Will the minister now inform the house if any of the three families specifically referred to by the minister in his ministerial statement of 25 May were the subject of investigation by FAYS officers prior to the death of the three babies? In reply to my question seeking this information on 26 May the minister stated:

I am more than happy to supply an answer on notice to that question. . . I am anxious to ensure that this house is fully informed about these matters.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): And I shall do so, sir.

BABY DEATH, VICTOR HARBOR

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): When will the Minister for Health respond to my question of 26 May in relation to whether the baby at Victor Harbor, who is now deceased, was seen by the Every Chance for Every Child program, and whether the family was identified as a family needing extra assistance under that program?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): The question was asked a few days ago. The request for information from the department has gone in and we will answer it as soon as we get that back.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I have a supplementary question. On Monday this week I also asked a very simple question of the minister about the total debt for this current year in the public hospitals: I have not had an answer to that, and I ask the same question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question does not address the same subject matter—it is not supplementary.

Mrs REDMOND: I also have a supplementary question in light of the minister's answer. Can the minister at least advise whether there is yet a reporting and information-sharing procedure between staff involved in the Every Chance for Every Child program and FAYS?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: From memory, that was part of what you asked me earlier on. I will get you the answer as soon as I have the information, and we are getting that together now.

Mrs REDMOND: I have a further supplementary question, Mr Speaker. Does the minister agree that this matter is urgent and that non-follow up of questions such as these leads to situations such as we have today, where full investigation of past issues becomes impossible?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is out of order. Questions cannot invite ministers to agree or disagree with anything, notwithstanding the feelings that any honourable

member may have about a subject matter. That is not an orderly question.

MINISTERIAL DOCUMENTS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Industrial Relations advise when I will receive an answer to my question of 23 March 2004 relating to any of the minister's staff, former or current, disposing of ministerial correspondence upon leaving the transport portfolio? On 23 March the minister advised that:

... I will make some inquiries on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition and I will come back with a detailed response to his question.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I thank the leader for his question. The Minister for Transport has made a statement about that—perhaps he missed it.

LAND TAX, DECEASED ESTATES

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): When will the Treasurer give me an answer to my question of 23 September 2003 in relation to the total income from land tax from deceased estates received by the government in 2002-03? The home of a deceased person, upon being bequeathed to a beneficiary who already has a principal place of residence, is subject to land tax prior to the disposal of that property. In *Hansard* of 23 September 2003 the then minister for administrative services undertook to raise the matter with the relevant government minister and bring back a response.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I will follow that up, but I would have thought that that would have been answered in the end year results that have been released. However, I will follow that up and get back as quickly as I can.

BASIC SKILLS TEST

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): When will the Minister for Education answer my question of 27 May in relation to the basic skills test, in which she said at the time:

... I will try to answer it and get the information back to the member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The curiosity of the member for Bragg has barely been timed for the minister to find the information sought, if the minister does not have it to hand, though it surprises me the detail ministers carry in mind when answering questions from their own backbench about detailed matters but that quite often they have no knowledge about anything asked by members of the opposition. I am referring obliquely to the practice of Dorothy Dixers which, regrettably, calls into sharp contrast the capacity for memory as compared to that of preparation in a deliberate sense.

COAST RADIO ADELAIDE

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Transport advise the house when she will respond to my question regarding the outcome of the Australian Maritime Group's evaluation of Coast Radio Adelaide and the government's response to any of the issues that the report identified some months ago. In reply to my question, the minister stated:

I will check on that correspondence and bring back a considered reply.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): On behalf of the Minister for Transport, who is not present in the chamber, I will bring back a reply. I do not have that detail in my mind.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that the Minister for Transport is in this chamber, and when a question is being asked I imagine that he would take—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport—

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I apologise. I am quite happy to apologise when I am wrong.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! All members accept.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE, ANTI-TERRORISM EQUIPMENT

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): When will the Minister for Emergency Services provide an answer to my question of 27 May about how much funding the government has received from the federal government for anti-terrorism equipment and training within the Metropolitan Fire Service and whether these funds have been fully utilised? In partial response to my question, the minister replied that 'It is an issue that is taken very seriously,' and that he would be happy to bring back a report.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has hardly had time to wash himself. A week is not sufficient time for a minister to provide an answer in many instances. It may well be a feature of government policy to answer within two days, or within five days, or whatever. However, the general rule is that it needs to be more than a week or so before members can rise and seek information about the date upon which they can anticipate a reply of a factual nature.

WINE INDUSTRY, REBATE

Mr VENNING (Schubert): When will the Treasurer respond to my question of 24 May (which is well over a week ago), asking—

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It is a serious question—whether he will assure the wine industry that the state government will not remove the cellar door rebate. In reply to my question, the Treasurer stated: 'I will get a detailed answer for the member shortly.'

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): How sad that they have to ask these types of questions! The answer is being compiled. However, I was made aware of a letter which I received on 30 May from the Winemakers' Federation about this very matter and which I thought I should share with the house in answer to the question. It states:

Dear Deputy Premier,

With the dust settling on the Federal Budget, I thought it would be appropriate to take the opportunity to thank you for your efforts in securing an outcome for Australia's (and South Australia's!) wineries.

As you know, about 18 months ago, the Federal Treasurer challenged the Winemakers' Federation to gather the support of all State Governments for the policy, and to forgo any windfall in favour of the policy. Your early and decisive support was crucial for the policy outcome and your advocacy with your state colleagues also assisted in delivering their support—once again crucial for the final outcome.

Notwithstanding the issue of State rebates yet to be resolved, I wanted to record my sincere appreciation for your efforts on behalf of the Australian wine industry.

I thought I would share that with the house and my colleagues. I look forward to similar correspondence from my cabinet colleagues over the course of the next month as they ponder their budget allocations, but we will get you more information as quickly as we can.

TEACHERS, COUNTRY SCHOLARSHIPS

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise why the government has reduced the number of country teaching scholarships to 78 compared with 95 last year? Last year 25 young school leavers and other people studying to become teachers from my electorate of Flinders were granted scholarships. This year we have been able to secure only 11 scholarships.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Penfold for her question. The issue of finding suitably qualified staff for country positions is a very important and deeply vexed one. One of the issues that we have noticed is recruitment, and we are actively recruiting through this scholarship program, but we have also recognised another problem, because we have realised that one of the significant issues in country schools is retention as well. So, we are now moving to a more intense mentoring, induction and support mechanism by which those young people who are trained can stay in the profession. So, whilst the numbers might fluctuate from year to year, we are hoping that with a higher retention rate there will be more teachers on the ground, in the schools, where she would want them to be.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, SEPTIC TANK EFFLUENT DISPOSAL SCHEME

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for State/Local Government Relations advise the house when the government is going to increase funding allocations to the Local Government Septic Tank Effluent Disposal Scheme to bring funding into line with SA Water sewer schemes funding subsidies? The Local Government Septic Tank Effluent Disposal Scheme, which is jointly funded by state and local governments, now has a 30 year waiting list.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for State/Local Government Relations): I am delighted with that question. In fact, if I had thought of it I would have got someone on this side to ask me a dorothy dixer so that I could indicate to the house that yesterday the Local Government Association—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I should have thought of it. You know that I have a practice of having no dorothy dixers asked, but it occurred to me that this is such a good question that it gives me the opportunity to put this on the record. Just yesterday the government, in association with the Local Government Association, agreed on a strategy in terms of how we move forward on STEDS. I will now need to take that to my cabinet colleagues, and equally John Legoe is going to take that back to his association. You would also know that I brought back into the budget an appropriate level of funding which the previous government had dropped out of the budget. What we are now doing is looking to work with local government in a sector-wide approach, and I am

sure that we are going to have a lot more good news about that in the very near future.

POLICE, RESOURCES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, I apologise to the house as I have done a bit today for not having a written copy of this statement. During question time the Leader of the Opposition asked a question about a telephone call that he made to the Police Commissioner at roughly noon today. I think (and I stand to be corrected) that in essence he asked whether that telephone conversation therefore supersedes or alters the advice provided by the Police Commissioner in the statement that I provided to the house. I have spoken to the Police Commissioner and his advice to me is that the statement that he gave to me, which was the basis of a ministerial statement which I provided, stands, and he stands by that advice provided to me.

FORESTRY, SOUTH-EAST

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: This ministerial statement relates to forestry in the South-East. The history of this issue began over three years ago with natural resource management groups, water management agencies and a range of water user groups expressing concerns about the impacts of forestry expansion on the water resource of the Lower South-East and the lack of accountability. The Water Resources Act 1997 did not provide an acceptable mechanism for dealing with the impacts of land use change on water resource sustainability.

The issue was the subject of significant regional debate. Following advice from stakeholder representatives' meetings held in the latter part of 2003, I concluded that a new management system was needed to account for the impacts of commercial forestry on water resources in the Lower South-East. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the contribution made by a number of stakeholder representatives. The spirit of cooperation that generally prevailed during the stakeholder meetings convened to help to find a resolution to this complex and difficult issue.

The industries directly involved in the meetings included the hardwood and softwood forest industry, irrigators from a range of industries, and organisations such as the South Australian Farmers Federation, the Construction Forestry Mining and Energy Union, the South-East Catchment Water Management Board and the Limestone Coast Regional Development Board.

In a statement on the house on 17 February this year, I indicated my intention to introduce regulations to take effect from midnight to make commercial forestry in the Lower South-East accountable for its impact upon the region's water resources. Since that time there have been no significant development applications for land use changes to commercial forest; therefore, it has not been necessary to make the regulations retrospective. I am now able to advise the house

that the appropriate regulations were approved by Her Excellency the Governor this morning and will come into effect today. The regulations are identified as the Water Resources Variation Regulations 2004, and a complementary regulation, the Development (Referrals—Commercial Forestry) Variation Regulations 2004.

Under the management approach to be adopted, commercial forestry in the region is prescribed as a water affecting activity under the Water Resources Act 1997, and will require a permit. This will be managed concurrently with development approvals for land use change, requiring all such development applications to be referred to the Minister for Environment and Conservation for direction. The management approach is based on an agreed total area of plantation for softwood and hardwood within each water resources management area. The areas are calculated to ensure that the impact of that development on reduced recharge to the ground water system does not affect existing users, while securing sustainable management of the resource.

Provision has been made for approximately 59 000 hectares of the total forest expansion before there will be any need to secure water allocations to offset the impact of further expansion. This provision allows for the currently estimated commercial forest estate of 135 000 hectares to be expanded by approximately 45 per cent. The areas for the expansion opportunity will be discussed and confirmed with the plantation industry when they have provided an accurate inventory of the extent and location of the current forest estate, relative to the region's ground water management areas.

The expansion opportunity has been estimated on the 2002 forest estate and will be reconciled to that reference point. Excluding the area covered by native vegetation, the current forest estate occupies nearly 14 per cent of the Lower South-East landscape that could be considered accessible to the industry. The dedicated expansion right will allow commercial forestry to expand to nearly 20 per cent of that accessible area without a need to secure offsetting water allocations.

Further expansion of commercial forest beyond the 59 000 hectares, or in water management areas where the area set aside for forest development has been reached, can be accommodated by the forest proponent offsetting the impact on the water budget by securing and quarantining an appropriate water allocation for the life of the forest land use.

By its own assessment this provides the forest industry with significant certainty regarding its opportunities to expand for approximately 10 to 15 years, although actual industry growth will be determined by the plantation industry's ability to secure suitable land, market opportunities and the prevailing investment climate. Farm forestry is excluded from requiring a permit where it is restricted to less than 10 per cent of the farm title area. The management of direct extraction by commercial forests from the water table is not incorporated into the management approach at this stage.

This issue requires further technical assessment and policy development. The results of the current CSIRO project that is investigating the impacts of forestry on water resources in the Lower South-East will be closely examined when it concludes later this year to provide input to any policy development.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (INTERVENTION PROGRAMS AND SENTENCING PROCEDURES) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to grant a conference as requested by the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council named the hour of 4 p.m. on Thursday 3 June 2004 to receive the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly at the Plaza Room on the first floor of the Legislative Council.

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

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

AUSTRALIAN GIANT CUTTLEFISH

Ms BREUER (Giles): I will speak today of an issue of importance in Whyalla, that of the cuttlefish spawning area there. Whyalla is fortunate to have on its doorstep a unique biological event. Scientific experts and divers from around the world have stated that no similar large scale aggregation of cuttlefish occurs elsewhere as it does in Whyalla. It is in Whyalla's interest to see that the cuttlefish aggregation is protected. Scientific film making and tourist aspects of the aggregation are growing on a yearly basis, and it has a positive economic spin-off for our region. Recently it had a diving weekend, with divers from all over the world visiting Whyalla to see this unique event.

From an ecological perspective, the cuttlefish represents an important link in the food chain, supporting a number of important commercial and recreational species in our area. A return to the practices of the recent past where a short-term and unsustainable commercial gain was sought at the expense of all other values will not be supported by the Whyalla community in future. A few years ago a commercial fishing person came into the area and took out hundreds of thousands of tonnes of cuttlefish from that area, and depleted the stocks almost to the ruination of that species.

This issue of adequate protection for the unique cuttlefish has dragged on for a number of years. This government certainly received negative publicity at a national, state and local level, as did the previous government, over what is perceived to be the slowness of the response when it comes to providing additional protection for the spawning aggregation.

It is time we pulled out our finger and seriously examined the proposal to extend that protected area. The rocky coastal strip adjacent to the Point Lowly lighthouse and to the north of Point Lowly also needs to be included in the protected area. Currently a protection offered for a period of the year includes octopus and squid.

It is my understanding that they were included to simplify compliance issues at the time the seasonal ban was introduced. Given the presence of our compliance officers in Whyalla and the fact that they now have access to a boat—and I am very pleased about this—the need to include octopus and squid should be reconsidered. Removing squid as a protected species in the designated area will reduce the current wastage of squid in False Bay. The wastage happens because squid is caught as by-catch when commercial

operators are targeting fin fish. Much of the squid returned to the water does not survive this. I understand that the University of Adelaide is conducting research on cuttlefish in South Australia and that the recommendations arising from that research will assist PIRSA in formulating policy.

I am concerned that, if we wait for the outcome of the research, further damage will occur. In this instance we need to adopt a precautionary approach and extend that protected area now. I fear that Adelaide-based individuals do not fully appreciate the importance of this world class aggregation. I am sure that, if they did have a full appreciation of the spawning aggregation we would not have the procrastination we have had to date. Divers, documentary crews from overseas and the marine science community recognise the importance of the spawning aggregation. They also recognise the need to extend the protection zone and are surprised that we have not acted in a timely fashion to provide additional protection for this unique event. I urge the minister to seriously consider this and seriously consider the issue for our region.

Today I also want to talk about the snapper competition that is held in Whyalla each year. It is a wonderful event, and this year the community was absolutely buzzing with the number of people who came into our community. Business and tourism flourished and it was a wonderful event. However, I have grave concerns about the number of fish that have been pulled out of our gulf during this fishing competition: grave enough concerns to call a meeting of concerned bodies to look at this issue for the future. I do not want to see the competition abolished, as it is a great competition, but we seriously need to look at the way that it is run and look at measures taken in other communities with similar fishing competitions that are able to do this sustainably and keep their stocks.

If we fish out our fish, then in a couple of years' time we will have none of these snapper that people are coming to Whyalla from all over the state to look at. This year, more than 3 000 fish 30 years old were taken out of our waters. Some people returned fish, but there were reports of fish dead in the water where people had returned them but they had died anyway. It is a serious issue for us. It is a wonderful competition, but we have to be very careful about our fish stocks.

CHILD ABUSE

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): This state is where I was born and it is the place in which I hope to die. Whatever love I have for this country, my love for Australia is based on this city and this state. Yet this city has a legacy—and it is not a proud legacy. It is the legacy of the Beaumont children, the bodies in the barrel, the Truro murders and the murders of those young men dubbed the 'Family murders'. It is also the state of Magistrate Liddy, Bob Brandenburg, Reverend John Mountford and Ric Marshall. Some 12 months ago, as a result of calls by the Leader of the Opposition for a royal commission, I started to get a trickle, which has turned into a stream, of people coming into my office, as I know you have, sir, over the years. Even after careful analysis and questioning of the many tragedies, there are matters that cannot be explained away other than by using words like 'dereliction of duty', 'neglect' and 'bias', when it comes to the actions or inactions of the Department of Family and Youth Services.

There has arisen from this a point that I started to ask questions about today that makes some of the allegations of child abuse seem almost insignificant, as important as they are, against an allegation that we were indeed, at least for a time, a state of take-away children. The allegations are so horrendous as to be frightening. Those allegations include young people for whom the state had a duty of care, whom the state had incarcerated, taken from McNally on weekend leaves, returning drugged and complaining of sexual abuse, but they were not the sort of person who was ever listened to or of whom any notice was taken or who would have even been believed because of their veracity in a witness box. And the persons they allege to be the perpetrators of these atrocities are some very highly placed people in Adelaide.

What is even more frightening, as if that was not bad enough, is that it has been said to me, not once but from repeated sources, that some of these people never returned. I asked a question today about how many absconded youth there were and in whose care they are, because nobody has denied the allegations of Ky Meekins that he was abducted from this state, forcibly held for three months, that his life was threatened and that he got back to this place after escaping. Mr Meekins believes that if he had not escaped that he might not have returned.

There is an allegation that some young men were not so lucky and, maybe like the Truro murders, are yet to be discovered until we find a perpetrator who alone knows where they might be. In the meantime, we have assumed that they have simply absconded. I believe that there are wards of the state for whom similar non-accountability can be alleged. I do not say that every person who is missing may well have been used as a sexual toy, discarded and murdered.

I have spoken to previous ministers about this, and about how easy it would be to report an offender from McNally who absconded and what little action would be taken—

Ms Ciccarello: Why didn't they do anything about it?

Mr BRINDAL: Because the matter was not raised until very recently and because the cabinet table around which I sat, for the benefit of the member for Norwood, never discussed this matter. I can assure the member for Norwood that, had this matter been discussed by me or any of my cabinet colleagues, I would have pursued it, and I hope they would have pursued it as passionately as I now do. The minute this matter was drawn to my attention, I am raising it in this chamber.

I only hope that, not only for the sake of those young men who may have been deprived of their lives, but also for the sake of this state and this chamber, that there is no force at all in the allegations and that they are proved groundless. It is quite simple. The state should be able to account for the children whom it incarcerated. The state should be able to account for its wards. If it cannot, why not? If it cannot, why has it not checked up on what might have been their fate? This issue threatens to get out of control. It is deadly serious and no-one is joking about it. It is not party political but it needs a royal commission.

Mr CAICA (Colton): For a period of time, but particularly over this week, the focus of the house has been on child abuse and child protection. It is a serious issue that requires a whole-of-community approach to rectify it which, of course, involves all levels of government playing a lead role. During this week, as a result of this particular focus of the house, I have sought and read a mountain of material on the despicable nature of child abuse. I have come to realise that

child abuse is far too common and seemingly entrenched in our society.

The issue of institutionalised child abuse has been raised, debated and opinionated by many members and, dare I say it, even politicised during this last week. I have not entered into the debate and had not intended to do so, but, given the fact that I have read some material, I am speaking now. One of the common themes of child abuse, as I have read in the documentation, is the abuse of power and trust by those in trust, a reluctance and denial of those in authority to acknowledge or deal with the abuse, and that official responses from organisations and institutions are more concerned about the institution and protecting the perpetrators than for the children with whom they had been entrusted.

I know I do not have a great deal of time, but I would suggest that the focus of the house has perhaps been a little too narrow. I say that with the greatest respect. That is not to say that the churches, government agencies, community organisations and, indeed, those who were in control when these crimes had been committed ought not be nailed to the wall, because they should be; and those who are now adults who suffered child abuse ought to have their justice.

In saying that I think the focus has been a bit too narrow, I must say that I have looked at some of the data that is available. It is very hard to compare data across the various jurisdictions, because different states do it somewhat differently, depending on how they are judged and how such crimes are substantiated.

One thing that I have come to realise is that the levels of reported child abuse are only the tip of the iceberg, and that it is far more widespread than I had ever imagined. Thankfully, today it seems that there is certainly more public awareness and, indeed, a call by the public to demand justice and demand that this matter be properly addressed—and that can only be a good thing. Previously, it had been hidden and continued to be hidden. There was an acceptance of it.

I would now like to focus in the little time left on what I believe to be the narrow focus of the house in dealing with and discussing this matter. The fact is, it seems, that the majority of sexual and other forms of child abuse are family connected; that is, they happen in the home, they happen with parents, step-parents, family friends and relatives within the home. In fact, these numbers are probably far greater than those cases of abuse that have occurred under institutionalised care.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: No. I have said that you have got to look at it in its totality. We are focusing on just one aspect of it, when it would seem that the statistical data that I have read suggests that anything between 50 and 80 per cent of total child abuse and sexual abuse cases happen in the home. I have not seen any debate this week that looks at addressing that specific matter. How do we deal with it? I do not have the answers.

We look at the institutions, and it is those institutions on which we have relied and which we have entrusted the children, including state agencies, that themselves have been implicated in the protection of these people. We know that the public is now demanding that the problem be fixed. But how do we fix this prevalent nature of child abuse which is seemingly entrenched and which happens, in the main, in the home? As I said, I do not know. It seems to me that the 'Stranger Danger' or 'Danger Stranger' was not such an on-the-mark promotion, because the dangers are likely closer to home.

I conclude by saying that I do welcome the government's commitment with respect to the money that is being put into child protection. I welcome the announcement today by the minister of the appointment of Pam Simmons as the guardian for children and young people. We are a government, but we need the support of the opposition to make sure that we approach this in a holistic way and look at all aspects of child abuse, so that we can prevent and reduce this despicable crime.

I look forward to a whole-of-community effort in addressing child abuse. I look for the support of the opposition. This matter ought not to be politicised, and the focus needs to be not only on institutions but on all aspects of child sexual abuse and other forms of child abuse. It is the only way in which we will succeed in addressing the problem.

POLICE, DRUG TESTS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise today to speak on an issue that I believe is very important to our community, that is, to give our police officers the ability to order drug tests. I have sought advice, when preparing my speech, to ensure that my comments comply with standing orders. I am most concerned that the private member's bill appearing in my name has been on the *Notice Paper* since 3 December 2003. Every attempt that I have made to have this issue debated fails. I do not know if the government is deliberately smothering it or avoiding it, but what other deduction do we make when a bill as important as this is, particularly when you listen to the government's rhetoric about being tough on drugs, is not being addressed?

I was asked to hold off the debate on this matter, as the previous minister wanted to go to the races, the Magic Millions, and the next opportunity to debate it was the following week. Of course, the incoming minister did not want to debate the issue because she was new. I gave the government the benefit of the doubt, but nothing has been done or said since to assist me in getting this matter voted on.

I have again moved this motion so that it can be discussed and debated on 30 June, but there is no absolute guarantee that we will put this motion to the vote even then. Madam Deputy Speaker, you know of my discussions with the Speaker. I think the whole matter of private members' time needs to be revamped. What we are seeing now, I say, is an abuse, a gag which is implemented by smothering important motions with lightweight political graffiti.

I believe a commonsense approach to this would be that motions and bills brought forward by private members should be allowed to remain on the *Notice Paper* for four sitting weeks only before they are debated and put to the vote. Short of that they should be passed in the affirmative. I also believe that speaking times should be reduced in private members' time; apart from the movers, all other speakers' time should be reduced. Surely, if you cannot say it in five minutes you are being verbose. I do understand that some issues would need longer, and I believe an extension of time could occasionally be granted. Much of it is repetitive political claptrap.

I raise this matter today because every time I look in the paper and see another drug-related death on the roads I shudder and question my own input into this matter. It is just not right that people can take drugs—cannabis being the most popular but I note that amphetamine usage is on the increase—and that these users can drive their car knowing that they cannot be detected or apprehended. We need only look

in yesterday's *Advertiser* on page 13 to see the story of the Longden family, and I grieve for them with the loss of their wife and mother. Surely, it is time for us to act and give police back the powers that they used to have to require blood tests where they think they are justified.

I also want to raise another road safety matter, and that is the need for street lighting at the Sturt Highway and Murray Street intersection at Nuriootpa. It is very dark, yet this is the main intersection where the Barossa meets the Sturt Highway. All the other intersections have lights on them for night time vision, but not this one. We have already seen tragic accidents at this location, and we desperately need lights. The minister has been looking into it, but nothing seems to happen. I do not know why this time has gone by without our seeing this matter addressed. This concerns me greatly because, as you pull across this intersection, a large truck coming down the highway cannot see you side-on and they plough straight into the vehicle.

I make this plea to the government: this is a very dangerous spot and people are losing their lives; if other more minor intersections have lights on them then why not this one? After all, it is the major intersection of the Sturt Highway and the Barossa Valley. I know that the Barossa police are very conscious of this and have raised the matter with me, but we still do not have it addressed. I hope that the minister will address this and that we will see lights there very shortly.

CHILD ABUSE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): I commend the member for Colton for advising the house today of his understanding of the problem of sexual abuse and the way that the major incidence of sexual abuse occurs in the home. Unfortunately, this is something which I have known for many years through my previous work before coming into this house and which I have had confirmed from the organisations with whom I have worked. I have indicated to a number of members opposite privately that their emphasis on institutional sexual abuse, severe and traumatic as it is, has been distracting attention from our being able to work together to deal with the extreme problem of sexual abuse in all the areas in which it occurs. I have spoken about the issue in this house before, and I spoke many times about the fact that one of the community organisations in the south for survivors of sexual abuse had almost been defunded by the previous Olsen government. Its funds were cut so much that it had to move away from the premises it had in the Noarlunga Health Village. It was, fortunately, taken up by another community organisation; however, the funds were so small that they were no longer able to provide the individual counselling support to victims and families that had previously been provided and had to look instead to setting up a support group.

The support group has been very important in assisting the members, but it has not been able to do the work that had previously been undertaken by skilled counsellors. Unfortunately, the funding level of this group had been so low that prior to its folding several of the workers had found that they had to leave their positions because of the stress that they experienced in dealing with the traumatised victims of sexual abuse. I have met with those groups on several occasions. All of them had been abused by friends or relatives. They found that this abuse lived with them on and on, as does the abuse experienced by people who were victims of institutionalised abuse. We have to look at the whole issue of child sexual abuse. We have to work together and not seek to score

political points calling for royal commissions, etc., when we have recently instituted more to do with child protection than has ever happened in this state before.

I am really very tired of hearing the debate that has been going on, the debate that is ignoring the widespread number of victims, particularly those who were abused within their families. It is very serious indeed that children were abused by organisations in whom they and their parents put their trust; it is even worse that children were abused within their own families. Many of those children—now adults—live with nightmares, as do the victims of institutionalised abuse. They find that they are unable to trust people. Many, in fact most, of the victims are women and they find it very difficult to form long and enduring attachments with men. They pass their on trauma to the next-generation: their children also often have difficulty forming long and enduring relationships. Indeed, many of the children who, unfortunately, come under guardianship of the minister are themselves children of victims of child sexual abuse.

Discussions with Freda Briggs many years ago alerted me to the fact that 'stranger danger' is indeed something that has to be treated with caution. Children have so much emphasis put on the danger of strangers that they, unfortunately, overly trust some of those near and dear to their families who do abuse them and whom they cannot trust. It is time that we worked on the whole picture of child abuse and child protection. The Layton report has set out the direction, and the government has committed to funding those recommendations. We know it will not be easy. It has been pointed out in this place that simply finding the expertise to deal with this issue is not easy, but we will meet the challenge.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TAPESTRIES

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): On 19 July 1995, a year after the celebration of the centenary of women's suffrage, I referred to the two tapestries in this chamber. I said that they have a place in our history but that they were out of place in this chamber. I also said that, if we wanted to promote the cause of women, we should have in the chamber the portrait of the first woman elected to this place, and I am really pleased that I am looking at a portrait of the Hon. Joyce Steele—

Ms Chapman: Hear, Hear!

Mr SCALZI: —the first member of the House of Assembly who also became the first minister for education. This was acknowledged by the member for Bragg. Indeed, I believe she was the member for that area. I believe that portrait makes a more powerful statement, as does the portrait of Anne Levy, the first female president of the Legislative Council, which hangs in the corridor amongst those of other presidents.

I am not against the tapestries: I was talking about whether women could be portrayed in this place in a way that would be in keeping with the history of the chamber. I am pleased that that has happened. It would also be appropriate to have a portrait of Molly Byrne, who was also elected to this place and who was a member of the Labor Party. At the time, I also referred to the clear glass panels in this chamber. I suggested that South Australia's history be portrayed in the panels in chronological order, beginning with the Dreaming of our indigenous past.

Proclamation Day could also be depicted, as could the settlement of the first German settlers who have contributed so much. We could also have a leadlight window of the first parliament and another depicting other migrants who have

contributed to this place. In addition, it would be appropriate to have a stained-glass window portraying women's suffrage in 1894. We have an excellent history.

I draw this to the attention of the house because, at the weekend, I was fortunate to attend the Australasian Study of Parliament Group in Western Australia. The Speaker also attended and gave a keynote address on 'Parliamentary reform: the wish list and the reality'. A contribution was also made by the Deputy Clerk, Malcolm Lehman, and Penny Cavanagh, the Education Officer, who spoke on 'Parliament and the People and the Role of Deliberative Polling in the South Australian Constitutional Convention'. Dr Clement Macintyre, and Dr John Williams from the Law Faculty of the Australian National University, also presented a paper entitled 'Lost Opportunities and Political Barriers on the Road to Constitutional Reform in South Australia'. Members from other chambers across Australia also presented papers.

I believe that it is important that members of parliament attend these conferences, and I found this conference most informative. It is important that, as a member of parliament, I am informed on constitutional matters and the role of parliaments in the commonwealth. I know that those who attended from South Australia also found the conference very worth while, and they were a credit to this place in addressing the conference. I commend the President of the Australasian Study of Parliament Group, Mr Kevin Rozzoli, who also delivered an excellent paper.

However, I return to the issue of the stained-glass window, as we have just completed History Week and Reconciliation Week.

Time expired.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Thursday 24 June at 10.30 a.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I move:

That Standing and Sessional Orders be and remain so far suspended as to provide that government business has precedence over other motions on Thursday 24 June and for any business remaining in that category at the adjournment of the house today to be set down for consideration on Thursday 1 July.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): This is not the preferred option of the Liberal Party. We had been asked to give our views on it. We have been told that the house (and this is in the official diary of members of parliament) is to sit both Thursday and Friday. It is also on the official government listings that have been issued. Therefore, I believe that we should stick to that, unless there is a formal notification that that has changed. However, there has been no formal notification that the Friday has been dropped off.

I do not want to make a big issue of it, but I do say that the opposition was asked and the opposition expressed its view. I understand that the minister quite clearly gave notice of this motion yesterday, but I was not aware of that because I was still under the misapprehension that we were going to sit on

the Thursday and the Friday. I think there are two issues here. First, there is the matter of the rights of private members in this house. I do not believe a government has a right to suddenly withdraw private members' time. It is a view I have held for a long time, in both government and opposition. I believe that, in setting out the rights of members in this house, if time is allocated to private members then that should be respected, and certainly it should have the agreement of both sides of the house if you are going to withdraw that right.

The second point is that the formal program was out there and that has been changed without any formal notification to members, apart from this motion that in fact that extra day has now been withdrawn. The motion actually says that we are withdrawing private members' time on the Thursday. I presume the minister, and he might like to clarify this, is also indicating that he is not going to sit on the Friday.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We sent a note out about two weeks ago, or at least a week ago, saying that we would not sit on the Friday.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have not seen that. I have the program that indicates that we sit Thursday and Friday. I am sorry; I am not quite sure where that notice has gone, because I have not seen it. As I said, I had discussions with members on this side of the house and with the Leader of the Opposition and it was our expectation that we would be sitting on the Thursday and the Friday. It would appear that others did not see the notice as well, otherwise I am sure they would have drawn it to my attention.

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

I do not want to spend a lot of time debating this except to say that what has occurred, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows this full well, is that, after notification that one of the forecast sitting weeks would be taken up by a conference for presidents of legislative councils and speakers of the house, we had to cancel that week. As a result of that we had to add that week in somewhere else. A week was added and it was notified to all members here that we would add the week 28 June to 1 July to sit. The consequence of that was that had we stuck to the original two sitting days, in order to pass the budget after estimates, we would have sat on Thursday and Friday and come back on the Monday.

God forbid that we should let commonsense intrude into these arrangements, but it just struck me that perhaps if we got rid of private members' time we would not have to sit the Friday and those members in country electorates, predominantly opposition members, might actually get back for the weekend, if they are coming back on Monday. I apologise to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for such a reckless intrusion of commonsense into the approach to sittings of the house.

Can I say that I understood the position of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, that he wanted to have private members' time and sit the Friday and get members back on the Monday. I did not agree. As I understood it, on consulting the others and the Independents, they did not agree either. It does not cost us anything at all to do private members' time on the Thursday and sit on the Friday, but I think it is a dreadful inconvenience for those who like the member for Flinders have to travel many air kilometres to get to work here. I can also say that, on this notion of the sanctity of private members, under this government private members have more time allocated to them than they have ever had in the past. They have more private members' time as a

proportion of sitting than they have ever had in the past. Of course, if you sit a full week, part of that week on a Thursday is given over to private members. But the peculiarity is that you are only sitting the one day, so why would you do it? I am in the hands of the house, but can I urge that the house adopt what I would suggest is perhaps in the mind of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition some dreadful reckless intrusion of commonsense into the sittings.

Motion carried.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council gave leave to the Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development (Hon. P. Holloway) and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (Hon. T.G. Roberts) to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

SUPPLY BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMPLAINTS BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's message.

(Continued from 31 May. Page 2324.)

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I move:

That the amendment to amendment No. 25 be insisted upon; and that the disagreement to amendments Nos. 2, 4, 5, 9, 13 to 16, 18 to 21, 23, 26 to 35, and 37 to 42 be insisted upon.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that a conference be granted to this house respecting certain amendments from the Legislative Council in the bill; and that the Legislative Council be informed that, in the event of a conference being agreed to, the Hons D.C. Brown, R.B. Such, Ms Redmond, Ms Thompson and the mover be the managers on the part of this house.

Motion carried.

PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.J. Atkinson:

That the report be noted.

(Continued from 26 May. Page 2257.)

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I was speaking previously to the motion that the report be noted. The opposition on behalf of a WorkCover claimant raised an allegation that WorkCover had breached parliamentary privilege by misusing a letter that the WorkCover claimant sent to the minister responsible for WorkCover. The claim of a breach of privilege relies on the minister's also being a member of parliament. The allegation was that a letter from the WorkCover claimant to the member of parliament was used by WorkCover to disadvantage the WorkCover claimant in his claim in a way that would, if it were widely known, make members of the public more reluctant to write to members of parliament; so that was the argument for breach of parliamentary privilege.

The Privileges Committee discovered in its inquiries that the WorkCover claimant wrote many letters to people in authority about his WorkCover claim. He claimed to have suffered, as a result of his work, the loss of his cognitive abilities. One of his many letters, I think to WorkCover, was copied to the minister; that was the letter to the minister, drawing the minister's attention to the WorkCover claimant's letter to someone who was handling his WorkCover claim. WorkCover then tendered that letter before a doctor and asked, 'Could a person who claims to have this level of cognitive impairment write a letter such as this?'

In the committee's view, that was maybe a misuse of the letter, and it would be desirable that WorkCover in future not use a letter to a member of parliament for that purpose, but we do not think it appropriate to make a finding of breach of parliamentary privilege in these circumstances.

I would like to add my view—and perhaps my view differs from that of the rest of the committee members—that the letter was written to the minister not in his capacity as a member of parliament. We all know that with the exception of a very small and never used, or rarely used, loophole in the Constitution, all ministers in South Australia have to be members of parliament. Nevertheless, the letter copied to the minister was sent to him in his capacity as the minister. The WorkCover claimant was not a constituent of the member for Lee. The letter was not sent to him in his capacity as the member for Lee, or in any way related to the member for Lee's duties in the house.

So, an additional reason for not finding a breach of privilege in my view, although not in the view of the opposition members, would be that the letter was not sent to the minister in his capacity as a member of parliament, and that is indicated by its merely being a copy of a letter that had been sent to the person handling the WorkCover claim. Nevertheless, it is useful to apprise WorkCover of its obligations with respect to handling correspondence from the members of the public that comes to it via members of parliament, so WorkCover is in no doubt as to what are its responsibilities.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): As the member who raised this matter I thank all members and officers of the committee for their work in this regard. The committee found that WorkCover or its agent had not breached the privilege of parliament. It has sent a warning bell to WorkCover and other agencies to monitor carefully the way their agents or officers undertake their role. It is clear to me from the report that on reading the transcript the doctor would have got the impression that WorkCover did have letters to shadow ministers written by the WorkCover claimant. At that point WorkCover did not have letters from shadow ministers and therefore the agent might have given the doctor the wrong impression. I am sure we would all be concerned if it was a regular practice of WorkCover or any other government agency to go out of its way to misrepresent the facts to doctors in trying to achieve a certain result in relation to a WorkCover claim. I am pleased I raised the matter and that the committee took evidence and heard witnesses. That has not always been the case with privileges committees in this place. I thank them for their work.

At my meeting with Bruce Carter, the Chairman of WorkCover, the other day I was surprised when he made the comment that he was pleased that the committee found that WorkCover had doing nothing wrong. I put to Mr Carter that, if agents are misrepresenting to doctors what documents they

hold, he might want to review whether it is an appropriate practice of WorkCover. Certainly, if I was a chair of WorkCover it is not a practice I would be endorsing as standard. I thank members of the committee for their work which is certainly appreciated and which has served a useful purpose in firing a warning shot across the bow of WorkCover and other government agencies.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): The member for Heysen and I served on the privileges committee, and I wish to thank the Clerk of the house, who ably served that committee under the stewardship of the Speaker of this house. I also thank the house itself for its indulgence in agreeing to the continuing effective adjournment of submitting a report on this matter so that we could comprehensively and thoroughly investigate this matter. As I have not previously served on a privileges committee in this house, I am unable to say what is the usual practice. However, as was touched on in the report, representatives from WorkCover and their legal representative attended before the committee at its request and I thank them for their cooperation in attending, answering questions on this matter and the production of a significant amount of documentation that had been called for.

The Attorney-General has summarised the factual matters presented before the committee, but I acknowledge the significance of why the matter came before the committee at all, as raised by the member for Davenport. It is quite clear in the transcripts provided and referred to in this house that, when reference was made to the interviews transcribed, the WorkCover representative had quite specifically stated at the commencement of one of his lines of questioning, 'What about letters of complaint to members of parliament, to managers of insurance companies, to WorkCover themselves?' Proceeding with a further line of questioning he states, 'Some letters of complaints, some letters to ministers, to shadow ministers, the relevant bodies within WorkCover and a freedom of information application...' and he continues. It was quite clear from that information that what was being presented to the relevant witness was that there were multiple letters in existence to specific members of the parliament and to shadow ministers.

As was clear at the time of the hearing of the privileges committee, that was erroneous. First, the agent at the time had only ever had the one letter referred to by the Attorney-General, that being a letter from the complainant to a minister; and, secondly, no other letters as referred to were in existence at that time or presented to the witness, who was a medical practitioner. It was certainly a matter of importance to be resolved and properly investigated. Whilst the committee was satisfied that there had not been any breach of privilege, once that information came to light it was pretty clear that there could not have been a breach of privilege in relation to these circumstances. Nevertheless, it was the committee's view, as has been identified, that 'WorkCover should take more care to ensure that the principle of privilege referred to above was understood and that any potential for it to be breached was avoided.'

The committee did have the opportunity to view a number of other files in the course of considering the general processes that were in place to ensure the proper protection of documents in relation to any material that might be received that related to or was a letter to a member of parliament, and the processes to ensure that information was kept on separate files and that the opportunity for there to be a breach would be avoided. It is fair to say that the committee

was pleased to note the processes that were in place in relation to ensuring that it would minimise any opportunity for there to be a breach. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to serve on the Privileges Committee. I thank the house for enabling us to comprehensively consider this matter, because it is quite clear that breach of privilege, which is really a privilege of this house, is not interfered with and that, as members of parliament, we are not impeded in representing the constituents of South Australia.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (ABOLITION OF THE DRUNK'S DEFENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 February. Page 1358.)

Mrs HALL (Morialta): The debate surrounding the drunk's defence, as we know, has raged for years. It is a policy issue in which I have maintained a particular interest, specifically because of the effect on and the interest of women and, sadly, of children because, as we know only too well, the reality is that too often women and children are the victims of drunken behaviour, assault, violence and worse, and that should not be condoned in any sense. I speak on this bill, as the Attorney would well know, as a non-lawyer, therefore I will not attempt to pursue the finer legal points, because I am sure they will be covered in great detail by lawyers in both houses on both sides of the chambers. However, if I were sitting on a jury and listening to an argument being put that the defendant should not be held responsible for his or her actions because they were drunk, I have wondered how I would assess that. I like to think that I would apply commonsense.

Therefore, without all the legal jargon and interpretation, I would not believe them. Simply put, I believe that people should be held responsible for their actions, and I suspect that 99.5 per cent of the community would share that view. However, I would have to say that this bill gives me some significant and serious concerns, because I do not believe that the government has demonstrated that it is going to make any real difference. The government, in my view, has made it more complex and has failed to explain in understandable language just how it is going to work. The government claims that there is a problem with the existing law, and now it is going to fix a problem that many say does not exist in reality. In simple language, you could say that this bill provides a non-existent remedy for a non-existent problem.

I have no doubt that this bill is more about politics than it is about the law, and I say that because previous debate in this chamber over many years has shown that the use of the so-called drunk's defence is extremely rare. In fact, it is argued that it has never been successful in South Australian courts. A number of the changes and perceived problems of our justice system are created by the passage of time and societal change. In my view, many of the perceived problems dealt with in this bill have been created by the Rann government. At least to date we have not been subjected to the chest-beating approach of the Premier and his call for an Eliot Ness approach to this one. Even now, though, we have eight foreshadowed amendments that have been tabled since the introduction by the Attorney: just to complicate the bill a little further.

There is absolutely no doubt that over the years this government now and in opposition has muddied the waters

by creating this perception that many offenders get off because they claim they were drunk or high on drugs when they committed the crime—and that was from Labor's 2002 election policy. The reality, as usual, is quite different from Labor's spin. The abolition of the drunk's defence sounds easy but, to the interested observer or perhaps a member of a future jury, it is simply a matter for this parliament to rid our law of the possibility of using drunkenness as an excuse for committing an offence. To the interested observer or the potential juror it is a black and white issue: you are either for the drunk's defence or against it. It is, however, as we know, an issue of significant complexity that was alluded to by the Attorney in his second reading explanation.

As he explained, criminal offences are made up of specific elements, referred to by the Attorney as physical elements and fault elements, which must be satisfied before a conviction is to be made. As I understand it, that translates into act and intention. Difficulties arise when generalities are applied to the criminal law, which is extremely complex and unsuitable for such an approach. It is in this context that I express concern that the amendments proposed by this bill will do little to improve complex legal principle that has been shaped over the years by common law. It sounds good, but is it more than just good old—and very predictable—Labor spin? The community expectation in my view is this: people who voluntarily get drunk and commit crimes should not and cannot be acquitted on the ground of that intoxication.

There are, of course, mountains of legal argument to be scaled before one can come to a resolution on this issue, and it would be helpful if the community could be given more realistic and factual information on some of the legal issues involved. For example, a detailed explanation may discuss the issues of the rights of individuals (that is, the right to drink alcohol), the elements that make up various offences (that is, the fact that intoxication arguably goes to the very heart of intention), and the structure of our legal system. All that should be preferably communicated in non-legal jargon.

For now, I would suggest that generally members of the public adopt the entirely reasonable position that being drunk is no excuse for one's actions and, therefore, it follows that everyone is and should be responsible therefor. I am aware and understand, however, despite Labor claims to the contrary, that acquittal on the basis of the so-called drunk's defence is extremely rare to the point of non-existence in South Australia and that the situation in this state has been grossly overstated by the former Labor opposition and the now Attorney-General for some years.

We go back to 1990 to the report of the House of Assembly Select Committee on Self Defence which we know did not proceed very far. In 1992, the Hon. Martyn Evans introduced a bill to implement a recommendation of the select committee and the Labor government did not adopt it. Then in November 1996, the now Attorney-General introduced a private member's bill. In October 1997, in the Australian Capital Territory, the now famous and notorious Nadruku case, after drinking 28 schooners, six to eight stubbies and half a bottle of wine, Nadruku savagely bashed his wife and two other women. Charges of assault were dismissed, as we know, on the ground that he was too drunk to form the necessary criminal intent to commit assault and, understandably, that caused widespread public outrage.

We then went to October 1997, when New South Wales and the ACT abolished the defence; then December 1997, when we had the then second shadow attorney private member's bill. We know that the former attorney-general, the

Hon. Trevor Griffin, held very strong legally based views on this issue and provided persuasive reasons for his stance. He consistently maintained that existing laws provided sufficient protection. In addition to the views of the former attorney-general, a substantial block of professional legal opinion supported the view that a change to the law was not necessary. They maintained that the status quo had worked.

However, as we well know, political pressure continued. There are three main arguments that I understand have been submitted for the professional position. I am sure that we have all heard them, but they range from the general criminal law requiring proof by the Crown beyond reasonable doubt that the accused not only did what was prohibited, but also did so voluntarily and had the fault required by the offence.

Secondly, there is no evidence that the Nadruku case is anything but an isolated incident. Thirdly, any solution may well be as bad as or worse than the problem it seeks to cure. The problem in the law is not new; it has been the subject of constant discussion in courts and law reform bodies and among commentators for a century or more.

The inescapable fact is that all time and energy has not produced a solution to the problem which is satisfactory and works, let alone works simply. All options for change are complicated and will require a great deal of explanation to juries and, indeed, will lead to more appeals and more retrials.

The common law position in South Australia, in my view, is rather well encapsulated by Justice King in *R v Longman and Schulz* in his summing up to the jury. I would like to quote that because I think the words are very appropriate. He stated:

Intoxication is not an excuse for crime. Many people do things when they are drunk that they might restrain themselves from doing if they were sober, but there is an old saying that a person must answer when sober for what he does when drunk, and that is how the law is. Drunkenness in itself can never be an excuse for a crime. If a person did the forbidden act and had the necessary intention that he is guilty of a crime, even though he wouldn't have done so if he had been sober and wouldn't have formed the intention if he had been sober.

I think that those words are pretty good, given that they come from a former Labor attorney-general and a former chief justice. So, the question to ask is: why change from the position developed by the common law, a position that is seen to be more than appropriate? The Attorney has argued that as a matter of policy the principle as contained in the decision handed down by the High Court in the case of *O'Connor*, as referred to in the second reading speech, is wrong. The result of that decision of the High Court majority in that case ruled that intoxication could be used to deny that the accused has had any kind of fault element for any kind of offence at all. I would contend that the government's election policy went beyond an objection to the legal principle of the matter and claimed in a somewhat less articulate but highly charged and emotive way that:

Too many offenders get off because they claim they were drunk or high on drugs when they committed the crime. Getting drunk and assaulting people and getting off because you were drunk doesn't make sense. Not only is the law unfair to victims, it is inconsistent. It doesn't hold in drink driving cases where the law specifically forbids the excuse.

As a parliament, surely what we want to achieve is a simpler, fairer result and one that you can understand, not a legal playground for defence lawyers. I am not convinced, however, that the changes contained in this bill will provide better results or a safer environment.

I am particularly unconvinced by the government's rationale for change but, if it does provide a safer environment, particularly for women and children, and essentially brings us in line with other states, I guess it is worth a try. But heaven help us when and if they are applied. Indeed, in South Australia, the only instance in memory where an accused was acquitted on the basis of being so intoxicated as to be unable to form the requisite intent is said to be the case of R v Rigney which dealt with the actions of a prison escapee. That case was decided by a judge alone and, as I understand it, is not considered to set a precedent for cases of a more serious nature. Nowhere to be found are the offenders getting off of assault charges because they are drunk or high. The other quote that I would like to use refers to the former attorney, who said:

No case involving the so-called drunk's defence has ever been successful before a jury in a South Australian court.

He then goes on to say that there is no record of any other case where intoxication was a successful defence in a South Australian court. He goes on to outline how the reality, other than the Rigney case, has ever been upheld. Therefore, in my view, it is wrong to tug on the emotions of the public for political gain, but this government persists in doing so. Why would anyone want to change or reform a law unless it improves it?

I have a real concern that the government will claim that these amendments will make everything better: that violence in our community and the expectation in relation thereto will diminish, and that it will provide greater protection, once again, in my view, unrealistically raising expectations. We know that there is no excuse for anyone, drunk or sober, to assault others. I certainly support that principle which makes offenders accountable for their actions. As outlined by the former Attorney-General in one of the multitude of briefing documents on this topic:

We do not punish people just for what they do. We punish them for what they choose to do.

I believe the community today has no time for the excuses of drunks who commit offences. In terms of drink driving, for instance, we know that the number of deaths and injuries on our roads has helped shift public sentiment to the point of intolerance. We now have mandatory loss of licence for people convicted of driving under the influence. The magistrate, as I understand it, has no discretion, as the advertising has proclaimed regularly, 'Drink, drive, and you'll be sorry.' That is fair enough. If only, however, it were that simple. Clearly, it is not. I do look forward to seeing the fall-out and the implications from the passage of this bill.

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I rise to briefly support the bill. It has long been an issue of disgust in my electorate that there should be an excuse under law for committing a crime by reason of being so drunk or high on drugs that one was unable to form the necessary intent to commit the offence. This has been a long issue, both in this parliament and in the previous parliament. It pleases me very much to see that the Attorney has brought in this legislation, and I look forward to its swift passage.

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

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

Motion carried.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): The opposition will be supporting the principle underlying this bill. The complexity of the bill is reflected in the Attorney-General's lengthy second reading speech. It is significant that the Attorney-General chose to read only the introductory paragraphs of that speech. By this device, he avoided uttering publicly the words which appear in the final paragraph, as follows:

This is undeniably difficult law, but it always was difficult law.

Those words give the lie to this Attorney's glib statements over the years about this issue. He has sought to mislead the public into believing that this is a simple issue to which there is a simple solution. The Attorney's own actions and utterances over the years show that he has only a superficial understanding of the issues.

The opposition has been informed that the Attorney personally gave instructions to include in the title of this bill the misleading words 'Abolition of Drunk's Defence'. That instruction is further evidence of his unworthiness for the title of 'first law officer of this state'. The title of this bill is misleading. Contrary to the title, this bill does not remove the capacity for an offender to escape conviction for a criminal offence on the ground that a person was so intoxicated that the offender could not form the requisite criminal intention.

This bill only limits, but it does not abolish, the circumstances in which self-induced intoxication may be used by an accused person to defend a charge. Moreover, the bill never mentions drunks. The final word in the bill, as introduced, did contain one solitary reference to drunkenness. However, the Attorney-General now has himself tabled an amendment to delete that word.

This bill will not even refer to drunks, let alone abolish the defence of drunkenness. During the committee stage in another place we will be moving an amendment to delete the words 'Abolition of the Drunk's Defence' and insert a more accurate and honest description, such as 'self-induced intoxication provisions'.

I do not propose to detain the house with a lengthy analysis of the history of the law, or a description of the bill's provisions. That task will be admirably undertaken by the Attorney's advisers, who prepared the second reading speech. We thank them for that, but I do urge interested members to read what the Attorney chose not to read.

When this bill reaches another place the shadow Attorney-General will have the time to provide a more detailed account of reasons why the parliamentary Liberal Party has decided to adopt the principle in this bill. I will confine my remarks to placing on the public record the Attorney-General's form on this issue.

The first approach of the then member for Spence to the question of self-induced intoxication was a bill which he introduced in 1996. That bill uncritically adopted the language of a bill which had been proposed by the 1990 Select Committee on Self Defence and which the then member for Elizabeth, the Hon. Martyn Evans, had introduced in 1992.

Rather than give my description of this 1996 bill, I quote the member's own words from his second reading speech on 28 November 1996. It provided:

A person charged with an offence, who was in a state of self-induced intoxication at the time of the alleged offence, should be taken to have had the same perception and comprehension of the circumstances as he or she would have had if sober and to have intended the consequences of his or her acts in so far as they would have been reasonably foreseeable by that person if sober.

Three comments must be made about that first bill. The first is that the bill provided that a person should be found guilty of murder even though that person did not have the requisite criminal intent—a point which its mover did not seem to appreciate until now. Secondly, the bill now before the house is far different in approach from the simplistic prescriptions contained in the first bill. However, in his utterances on this topic the Attorney is still suggesting to the public that the concept is the same: it is not. Thirdly, the house should note that the title to that first bill introduced by the member for Spence was the Criminal Law Consolidation (Intoxication) Amendment Bill—the title, at least, is an honest description of the bill.

The bill was flawed and fortunately it lapsed. However, notwithstanding its obvious flaws, the member for Spence reintroduced it in December 1997 in an effort to exploit the publicity given to the ACT case of Nadruku. I do not need to traverse the detail; that has been covered in other presentations to the house. Realising that his bill was defective and that he had not done the work to refine it, the member told the house, 'I am not wedded to this particular method of abolishing the drunk's defence.' He claimed to be happy to adopt the version used in New South Wales (that was back on 4 December 1997). In parliament the member made the extraordinary admission that he had only just discovered section 19A(8) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. That section deals with causing death by dangerous driving, and subparagraph (8) provides:

Where at the trial of a person for an offence against this section it appears that the defendant was, or may have been, in a state of self-induced intoxication at the time of the alleged offence but the evidence adduced at the trial would, assuming that the defendant had been sober, be sufficient to establish the mental elements of the alleged offence, the mental elements of the alleged offence shall be deemed to have been established against the defendant.

I am not kidding—the evidence is all there as presented on 4 December 1997. This was a startling confession more than a year after he started lecturing the public about the niceties of the law of self-induced intoxication. Once again, the member demonstrated his ignorance of the complexity of the law by inferring that this subsection provided a model for revising the law. I ask members to note how far the current bill is from that provision. In July 1998 the then Attorney General, the Hon. K.T. Griffin, issued a 44-page discussion paper entitled, 'Intoxication and criminal responsibility'. Two bills for discussion were appended to that report. They were designated Bill A and Bill B. Bill B empowered the court to find an intoxicated person guilty of an alternative offence called 'causing harm through irresponsible drug use.' The penalties were: 20 years where the offence would otherwise have been murder; 15 years where the offence was non-consensual sexual intercourse; and 10 years, or two-thirds of the maximum prescribed penalty, for other co-relative offences.

It was not a preferred or proposed bill; it was merely put up for discussion. Indeed, the paper itself then outlined its weaknesses, as follows:

- it would encourage compromised jury verdicts;
- it is impossible to properly align any appropriate penalty with any rational scale of offending;
- it would engender more trials and more issues at trial;
- it would lead to increased necessity for expert evidence on behalf of the prosecution and hence the defence;
- it would be likely to require the prosecution to prove a causal link between the intoxication and the crime; and

- it lacks any coherent penal rationale, because self-induced intoxication is simply not a reliable index of criminal blameworthiness.

Notwithstanding those impediments, but realising that his own bill was hopelessly flawed, the member for Spence completely abandoned his bill and substituted Bill B during the committee stages. So, out with his, and 'I will take in Bill B.' This was not a serious effort at law reform: it was simply a political stunt.

I should mention, though, that the private member's bill had been criticised in written submissions from Michael Abbott QC of the Bar Association and Mr David Peake, chairman of the criminal law committee of the Law Society. Their submissions were measured, careful and well argued positions. It is interesting to see the response of the person who now holds the office of Attorney-General. He said, 'The drunk's defence has been a good little earner for both Mr Abbott and Mr Peake over many years.' This was a reprehensible response, typical of this Attorney-General: do not respond to the arguments; just attack the person. If the person happens to be a lawyer, accuse him of merely being interested in his fees. Moreover, that type of response trivialised the whole issue. It clearly demonstrated that the member was not interested in understanding the complexities of this issue: he was simply looking for a cheap headline. Notwithstanding the genesis of Bill B, the Liberal members of the House of Assembly decided to support it and it passed on the voices without dissent.

On 3 November 1998 the DPP, Paul Rofe QC, had the temerity (and some would say the courage) to write to all members to say that, in his view, none of the proposal (which included Bill A and Bill B) were better than the existing law. He expressed the following opinion:

It is fair to say that all the alternatives will require a cumbersome and complex direction to the jury. It will also result in juries opting for an alternative, when the reality of the situation is that, had that option not been available, they would have convicted of the principal offence.

In December 1998, attorney-general Griffin introduced another bill that had the effect of incorporating a new part 8 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Section 268 provides that a person who becomes intoxicated in order to strengthen his or her resolve to commit a crime cannot escape conviction, and section 269 provides that an accused person must specifically request the judge to address the jury on the issue if he or she wants to raise it. This bill duly passed both houses with grudging support from the member for Spence. However, ever political, he threatened Liberal members that he would 'summon the genie of populism' (to use his expression) over the next three years—a statement he made on 24 March 1999 and on which he certainly attempted to deliver.

The bill presently before the house is a more sophisticated, more subtle and more acceptable law than any that the member for Spence introduced or promoted. The Attorney-General must finally acknowledge that this issue is far more complex than he has ever admitted. Why else is he even now introducing amendments to his own bill? This is a very different bill from that filched from Trevor Griffin (Bill B). That bill created the alternative offence of 'criminally irresponsible drug use', with a graded scale of penalties. This bill creates the alternative of 'causing serious harm by criminal negligence', which has not yet been introduced into the criminal law of this state. That offence does, however, appear in proposed new section 23 of the Statutes Amend-

ment and Repeal (Aggravated Offences) Bill which passed through this house in May 2004 and which is presently being debated in the other place.

As the house knows, the Liberal opposition opposed the introduction of the new offence of causing serious harm by criminal negligence. I will not go through the reasons again, except to say that negligence is best left out of the criminal law. There is a civil remedy of negligence which, of course, prevails. I ask the Attorney to indicate in his response why the proposed penalty for the alternative offence of 'causing serious harm by criminal negligence' for an intoxicated offender, where death does not result, is four years, whereas, under proposed new section 23 of the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Aggravated Offences) Bill, the penalty is five years. Attorney-General, why is there a lesser penalty for the intoxicated offender?

In the meantime I indicate that, consistent with our position on the Aggravated Offences Bill, in another place we will move that the alternative offence in this bill be designated 'recklessly causing serious harm', with a maximum of 15 years for a basic offence and 19 years for an aggravated offence. As I said at the outset, we support the principle of this bill. I note that the member for Morialta has outlined its importance in relation to those whom we seek to protect, but the Attorney has turned it into a publicity stunt. We think it is a far better bill than the one which Liberal members in this place supported in August 1998.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

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

Page 2, after line 11—Insert:

- (a) Section 267A—before the definition of consciousness insert:
alleged offence means the offence with which the defendant is charged but also extends to any other offence of which the defendant could be found guilty on the charge;

We have two amendments to this clause. Our consultation proved that there is an ambiguity in the bill in the phrase 'alleged offence'. A key provision turns on what is the alleged offence. It is possible to read it in two ways. The first is very precise: it would refer to the sole offence actually charged in the indictment. It was not intended that way: it was intended to mean any included offences as well. If it does not mean that, the operative provisions will not work. So, 'alleged offence' has to be defined to provide clarity. That is what the amendment does.

Amendment carried.

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

Page 3, line 12—Delete '(and includes death)'

The provisions of the bill are designed to ensure that, where a prosecution for murder cannot succeed because the accused was so intoxicated that he or she could not form the intention to kill, or other form of malice aforethought, the result should be guilt of manslaughter by criminal negligence. It was pointed out in consultation that the way that the bill was drafted to achieve this result created in effect a manslaughter clone. Instead of simply referring back to ordinary manslaughter under the act, the bill re-enacts a form of manslaughter identical in content and penalty. This is unnecessary and confusing. It might lead to different sentences being imposed, so we should get rid of the clone and refer to the

same usual manslaughter. This is the reasons for amendments 2, 4, 5 and 6.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5.

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

Page 4, after line 10—

Insert:

- (2a) However subsection (2) does not extend to a case in which it is necessary to establish that the defendant—
(a) foresaw the consequences of his or her conduct; or
(b) was aware of the circumstances surrounding his or her conduct.

Intensive consultation revealed that the way in which the bill seeks to achieve its general objectives was more confusing than it should be; in particular, it did not set out the circumstances in which, in a general way, the rule of conviction did not apply as opposed to circumstances in which it would. It left the latter to be worked out by implication. We felt that this should be made explicit. The amendment enhances the example, which was drafted to make the point explicit but obviously did not achieve the objective for some, and says that the general rule of the irrelevance of intoxication does not apply in cases other than basic intent.

Amendment carried.

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

Page 4—

Line 24—

Delete 'serious harm' and substitute:
death

Lines 31 to 36—

Delete these lines and substitute:
the defendant may be convicted of manslaughter and liable to imprisonment for life.

After line 36—

Insert:

- (3a) If—
(a) the objective elements of an alleged offence are established against a defendant but the defendant's consciousness was (or may have been) impaired by self-induced intoxication to the point of criminal irresponsibility at the time of the alleged offence; and
(b) the defendant's conduct resulted in serious harm (but not death); and
(c) the defendant is not liable to be convicted of the offence under subsection (1) or (2); and
(d) the defendant's conduct, if judged by the standard appropriate to a reasonable and sober person in the defendant's position, falls so short of that standard that it amounts to criminal negligence,

the defendant may be convicted of causing serious harm by criminal negligence.

Maximum penalty: Imprisonment for 4 years.

Amendments carried.

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

Page 4, line 40—

Delete 'drunkenness' and substitute:
intoxication

The amendment replaces the word 'drunkenness' with the word 'intoxication'. The bill applies to intoxication by drugs and other substances as well as alcohol. The use of the word is a mistake.

Ms Chapman: The word 'drunk' has died.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: In reference to the—I think catty—remarks of the member for Bragg earlier, I hardly think the title of a bill on the *Notice Paper* is a locomotive of propaganda. I just like to be colloquial rather than formal in my language. I prefer the Saxon word to the Latin word.

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Caica): Order! We will focus on the amendment, please.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I prefer the short word to the long word. The member for Bragg may condemn me for that, but on this occasion intoxication would be correct, because it applies to narcotics as well as alcohol.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 6.

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

Page 4, after line 40—

Insert:

6—Amendment of section 269—Question of intoxication must be specifically raised

Section 269 (1)—Delete ‘unless the defendant specifically asks’ and substitute:

unless the defendant or the prosecutor specifically asks

Consultation pointed out that the bill raises a problem of disputed cause. The problem can be illustrated by example: Donald was drinking at Gregory’s place and arguing about football. Donald was very drunk indeed. He began to abuse Gregory, who told him it was time for him to go home. He pushed Donald out the back door and slammed it in his face. The door struck Donald’s head, knocking him over and inflicting an injury to his left temple. After a minute or so, Donald rose to his feet, returned to the house, pulled a knife from his pocket and stabbed Gregory, inflicting a serious injury. Charged with intentionally causing serious harm, he claims that his actions were involuntary and consequential on the blow to his head, that is to say, post-traumatic automatism. The Prosecutor has an expert witness who is prepared to testify that intoxication rather than the blow to Donald’s head caused the impairment of consciousness.

The problem is that Donald can be expected to rely on expert evidence in support of a plea of post-traumatic automatism. The prosecution is now barred by section 269(1) of the act from any attempt to retaliate with the suggestion that it was alcohol, rather than the blow to the head, that impaired his state of consciousness; barred, that is to say, unless Donald specifically asks the judge to address the jury on that issue. It is highly unlikely that his counsel would take that course of action when there is an alternative explanation for the impairment. So it is necessary to amend section 269(1) to allow the prosecution to raise the issue in such cases. That is what this amendment is designed to do.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMPLAINTS BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to grant a conference as requested by the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council named the hour of 9.30 a.m. on Tuesday 8 June 2004 to receive the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly at the Plaza Room on the first floor of the Legislative Council.

MEMBER’S REMARKS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: At the completion of question time today the Deputy Premier came back with regard to the ministerial statement he made and told the house that the contents of the emails discussed made no difference to what the Police Commissioner had told the Deputy Premier. I have

found out since that the police could not locate those emails and asked the witness to reforward the emails to them. They had not seen the emails. I am not sure how the Deputy Premier was able to come in here and say that the content of the emails made no difference.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am sure that *Hansard* will confirm that when I came back I was very careful in my words. I said I had spoken to the Police Commissioner to ask him whether the reference by the Leader of the Opposition to a telephone conversation he had had with the Police Commissioner at around 12 o’clock had in any way affected or superseded his statement, or words to that effect. I do not recall saying that I specifically discussed emails, but simply the nature of the telephone conversation, to which I should not be privy and to which I am not asking to be privy. Was there anything from that conversation that superseded—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Let me finish, leader. I have something to say to embarrass you in a moment. I came back into the house and said that I had spoken to the Commissioner and he advised me that his advice to me that I read to this house stands and there was no need to change. That is what the Commissioner told me and what I said.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This is not a debate but a personal explanation, if I can be allowed to finish. I did not ask him about the emails—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The leader will listen to the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have had to endure a very difficult question time. I would like the opportunity to make a personal explanation, and I would hope to be heard.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the call: others will listen.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. The issue was: was there anything that the Police Commissioner had said to me in his advice that should be different subsequent to the phone call from the Leader of the Opposition? I did not inquire into the nature of that conversation, because that would be inappropriate. The Police Commissioner said, ‘No, there was nothing. The conversation that I had with the Leader of the Opposition, the issue of’—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Excuse me! Can I finish or not?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the call. The leader will listen.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I had to tolerate a very difficult question time, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am trying calmly to respond to this, because there is something I need to say that the house needs to be aware of. I never at any stage inquired of the Commissioner in detail about the nature of the conversation, because that really is not my interest. But I had a phone call from the Police Commissioner only 10 minutes ago. Perhaps I should seek leave to make a ministerial statement. Would that be more appropriate? I move:

That the sitting of the house be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

CHILD ABUSE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have had a phone call from the Commissioner of Police, who has advised me that he has now obtained copies of the said emails and is preparing a briefing note for me on those emails with those emails attached. They will be in my receipt if not late today then tomorrow morning. The Leader of the Opposition shakes his head: this is the Commissioner's verbal advice to me. The Commissioner indicated to me that, when the emails are read in full context, the nature of the communication between the police officer and the person is such that, whilst investigations were conducted by police, the officer in question—and I need to get the full briefing note to give the house the full details—the Commissioner was of the view that it has been taken in part out of context, because I am advised that the police officer was assisting this person outside of his—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The leader will listen, and so will the minister for government enterprises.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Actually, I tell you what I will do: I will get a briefing note and I might just have a press conference tomorrow and release the statement in a press conference—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —and an apology!—because it might be more beneficial for me to release this outside this house where I might feel more confident that I am able to articulate my message than I am in this place. I can say that the Commissioner of Police has advised me late tonight that it is his view that matters have been taken out of context; that the officer in question was assisting this poor person outside his normal working time; and that the references to resource

allocations were indeed in reference to his ability to assist—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No. Look, why don't we have the house wait so that I can get the briefing note from the Commissioner of Police, come into this house in the next half hour or so, and read exactly what the Commissioner is saying? I have a few people in this place who need to hear the truth.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The leader is out of order. I think the house has gone beyond a ministerial statement. I think it is time to conclude.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am happy to conclude and we will put it out in the media tomorrow, where I might get a fair go outside this house.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, I think Mr Speaker is within audible distance of the chamber. If the minister, in making a ministerial statement, actually declines to make the statement to the house and says he is going to go out and do it as a press release, and that it is a matter that is germane to this house, might it not be a contempt of this house for the Deputy Premier to announce that he is not going to make a statement but that he will do it by press release?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The minister for government enterprises is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not out of order: the Deputy Premier can make a statement outside the house on matters of interest to him and the state.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.04 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 24 June at 10.30 a.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 31 May 2004

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

REVENUE, INCREASES

201. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What is the expected revenue increase derived from sewerage charge levies in 2003-04?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:

Estimated sewerage rates for 2003-04
(latest forecast) \$231.7m
Sewerage rates for 2002-03 \$219.7m
Increase \$12.0m

GRAFFITI VANDALS

227. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** For each year since 2000—

- (a) how many cases of graffiti vandalism came before the courts and in each case, what penalties were imposed?
(b) how many prosecutions were dealt with as property damage under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and how many were dealt with as graffiti offences under the Summary Offences Act 1953?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Attorney-General has provided the following information:

(a)

	Convicted	Not Convicted	Total
2000	251	39	290
2001	218	42	260
2002	239	30	269
2003	249	28	277
2004 - Part	28	2	30
Total	985	141	1126

Penalties for Graffiti Offences from January 2000 to December 2003

2000	Custodial Sentence Suspended	Custodial Sentence Not Suspended	Community Service Orders in Hours	Defendants	Fines Variances	Defendants	Total Penalties
1-3 months	1	2	1 to 10	6	\$1 to \$100	1	10
3-6 months	2	3	11 to 20	13	\$101 to \$500	54	72
6 months-1 year	1	1	21 to 50	24	\$501 to \$1,000	4	30
1-2 years	0	0	51 to 100	20			20
	0	0	101 to 200	6			6
Total	4	6		69		59	138
2001	Custodial Sentence Suspended	Custodial Sentence Not Suspended	Community Service Orders in Hours	Defendants	Variances	Defendants	Total Penalties
<1 month	2	0	1 to 10	16	\$1 to \$100	1	19
1-3 months	4	2	11 to 20	5	\$101 to \$500	39	50
3-6 months	2	0	21 to 50	21	\$501 to \$1,000	9	32
6 months-1 year	1	1	51 to 100	7			9
1-2 years	0	1	101 to 200	7			8
			>300	2			2
Total	9	4		58		49	120
2002	Custodial Sentence Suspended	Custodial Sentence Not Suspended	Community Service Order Hours	Defendants	Fines	Defendants	Total Penalties
<1 month	1	0	1 to 10	5	\$1 to \$100	2	8
1-3 months	2	4	11 to 20	7	\$101 to \$500	47	60
3-6 months	0	2	21 to 50	14	\$501 to \$1,000	5	21
6 months-1 year	0	0	51 to 100	19			19
1-2 years	0	0	101 to 200	8			8
2-5 years	0	0					0
Total	3	6		53		54	116
2003	Custodial Sentence Suspended	Custodial Sentence Not Suspended	Community Service Order Hours	Defendants	Fines	Defendants	Total Penalties
<1 month	0	2	1 to 10	11	\$1 to \$100	1	14

1-3 months	1	0	11 to 20	7	\$101 to \$500	54	62
3-6 months	2	0	21 to 50	24	\$501 to \$1,000	4	30
6 months-1 year	0	1	51 to 100	12			13
1-2 years	1	0	101 to 200	2			3
2-5 years	0	1	>300	2			3
Total	4	4		58		59	125
2004 - Part	Custodial Sentence Suspended	Custodial Sentence Not Suspended	Community Service Order Hours	Defendants	Fines	Defendants	Total Penalties
<1 month	2	2	1 to 10	5	\$1 to \$100	0	9
1-3 months			11 to 20	0	\$101 to \$500	7	7
3-6 months			21 to 50	2	\$501 to \$1,000	2	4
6 months-1 year			51 to 100	2			2
1-2 years			101 to 200	1			1
2-5 years							0
Total	2	2		10		9	23

(b)

Offence Act, Section, Description and Number of Defendants from January 2000 to December 2003				
	Act Name	Section	Description	Def
2000	Passenger Transport (Regular Passenger Services; Conduct of Passengers) Regs	35	Write, Draw, Paint or Affix Word or Poster on a Passenger Vehicle, Prescribed Premises or Thing Situated at Prescribed Premises	3
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(1)(B)	Mark Graffiti	198
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(4)(A)	Carry a Graffiti Implement with Intent To Mark Graffiti	40
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(4)(B)	Carry a Graffiti Implement in a Public Place or a place on which The Person is Trespassing or has Entered Without Invitation	49
2000			Total	290
2001	Passenger Transport (Regular Passenger Services: Conduct of Passengers) Regs	35	Write, Draw, Paint or Affix Word or Poster on a Passenger Vehicle, Prescribed Premises or Thing Situated at Prescribed Premises	1
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(1)(B)	Mark Graffiti	164
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(4)(A)	Carry a Graffiti Implement with Intent to Mark Graffiti	35
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(4)(B)	Carry a Graffiti Implement in a Public Place or a Place on which the Person is Trespassing or has Entered Without Invitation	60
2001			Total	260
2002	Graffiti Control Act 2001	10(1)(A)	Carry a Graffiti Implement with Intent to Mark Graffiti	23
	Graffiti Control Act 2001	10(1)(B)	Carry a Prescribed Graffiti Implement in a Public Place or a Place on which the Person is Trespassing or has Entered Without Invitation	19
	Graffiti Control Act 2001	9(1)	Mark Graffiti	79
	Passenger Transport (Regular Passenger Services; Conduct of Passengers) Regs	35	Write, Draw, Paint or Affix Word or Post on a Passenger Vehicle, Prescribed Premises or Thing situated at Prescribed Premises	1
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(1)(B)	Mark Graffiti	106
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(4)(A)	Carry a Graffiti Implement with Intent to Mark Graffiti	13
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(4)(B)	Carry a Graffiti Implement in a Public Place or a Place on which the Person is Trespassing or has Entered Without Invitation	28
2002			Total	269
2003	Graffiti Control Act 2001	10(1)(A)	Carry a Graffiti Implement with Intent to Mark Graffiti	54

	Graffiti Control Act 2001	10(1)(B)	Carry a Prescribed Graffiti Implement in a Public Place or a Place on which the Person is Trespassing or has Entered without Invitation	42
	Graffiti Control Act 2001	9(1)	Mark Graffiti	169
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(1)(B)	Mark Graffiti	11
	Summary Offences Act, 1953	48(4)(A)	Carry a Graffiti Implement with Intent to Mark Graffiti	1
2003			Total	277
2004	Graffiti Control Act 2001	10(1)(A)	Carry a Graffiti Implement with Intent to Mark Graffiti	7
	Graffiti Control Act 2001	10(1)(B)	Carry a Prescribed Graffiti Implement in a Public Place or a place on which the Person is Trespassing or has Entered Without Invitation	7
	Graffiti Control Act 2001	9(1)	Mark Graffiti	16
2004			Total	30

MILLIPEDES

286. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What action has the government taken to control millipede infestations in Mount Gambier and the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: Between 1985 and 1988, the South Australian Government funded a large research project on millipede control. Studies were conducted in Europe to identify any potential biological control agents that might be used in Australia against millipedes and this work led to the introduction and release of a parasitic fly. Unfortunately this fly failed to establish under Australian conditions and currently it is considered that there are no further promising candidates in Europe for introduction into Australia as biological control agents for millipedes. In this same research project, studies conducted in South Australia identified a native nematode as a good control agent for black Portuguese millipedes. This work resulted in the description of a new species of nematode and subsequently a local company has successfully marketed this nematode as a control agent for millipede infestations. Over the last ten or so years, the feedback from householders suggests that this nematode has been highly successful in reducing millipede numbers in many problem areas to much lower and more tolerable levels. The same research project also fine-tuned the techniques for using both chemical and physical barriers for millipede management.

A fact sheet containing information on the biology and behaviour of millipedes, the use of nematodes (including details of where to purchase nematodes) and physical and chemical barriers is available on the SARDI website www.sardi.sa.gov.au under Entomology/Urban Pests.

HOSPITALS, REPATRIATION GENERAL

295. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What impact will the regionalisation of the Repatriation General Hospital have on veterans in the Waite electorate?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: On 1 April 2004 I announced that the Repatriation General Hospital will retain its own board and although the hospital sits within the Southern Region it will not be part of the Southern Adelaide Health Service.

I expect that the Repatriation General Hospital will work closely with the Southern Adelaide Health Service and in particular continue its close association with the Flinders Medical Centre.

Services received by veterans in the Waite Electorate will continue to be provided as they have been in the past.

PUBLIC SERVANTS, NUMBER

305. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

1. What is the current total number of State public servants and of these, how many have permanent full time, permanent part time, casual and contract, status respectively?

2. How many public servants are employed on a temporary, 1 year, 2 year and 3 year contract basis, respectively, and how many will have to apply for their positions at the end of their contract?

3. Are contract public servants entitled to the same leave entitlements as permanent employees and if not, how do they differ?

4. How many consultants are employed to undertake roles previously undertaken by public servants?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have been advised by the Office of Commissioner for Public Employment that:

1. At June 2003, there were 85,576 State public sector employees. Of these, 17,628 were employed as public servants under the Public Sector Management (PSM) Act. Based on the position in which those public servants were employed at that time:

- 11,598 were permanent full time employees;
- 1,402 were permanent part time employees;
- 3,958 were contract employees; and
- 670 were casual employees.

2. As at June 2003, there were 2,807 short term (up to one year) and 1,151 long term (one to five year) contract employees employed under the PSM Act.

PSM Act employees employed on short term contracts cannot be extended beyond a maximum period of two years in the same position. The maximum period for a long term contract is usually 5 years.

Contract employees may be converted to on-going employment without further advertising of the position in some circumstances—usually where the need for the position on an on-going basis now exists and when there has been a previous merit based selection process.

The number of current contract employees who could be converted on that basis is not known.

3. All PSM Act employees, except for those employed on a casual basis, are entitled to the same leave entitlements whether employed on a contract or ongoing basis. However, contract employees can only have leave granted within the period of the contract.

In addition, the Cabinet Office has advised that:

4. As part of their normal human resource planning, agencies consider using consultants to supplement the work of public servants in appropriate circumstances, for example: where specific expertise is required for a short period or where an independent assessment of public sector operations is necessary. Direct replacement of public servants by consultants as a form of outsourcing is against the policy of this government.

URRBRAE HOUSE

317. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**

1. What is the status of the salt damp and other restorative work at Urrbrae House and what has been the financial impact due to the delay?

2. How much has been and how much will be spent by the Adelaide University and the Government, respectively, on salt damp treatment and other restorative work at the site?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The University of Adelaide has committed \$840,000 to arrest the effect of rising salt damp on the fabric of Urrbrae House. Funding for this project has been sourced solely from the university's finances.

Stage 1 of the works was completed in May 2003 at a cost of \$320,000.

Stage 2 was documented and tendered in October 2003. The lowest (and preferred) tender exceeded the available funding of \$520,000.

A revised phasing of Stage 2 of the works has been developed to suit current budget planning, commencing in the summer of 2004-05 at a cost of \$520,000.

To allow for the completion of Stage 2, Urrbrae House has been closed since late 2003, and the estimated cost of the closure to the end of May is \$10,000.

SABRENet PROJECT

318. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** With respect to the proposed SABRENet project—

- (a) how much funding has the State Government provided towards the project;
- (b) from which Budget line will the project be funded and will funding be drawn elsewhere from within the existing Budget;
- (c) what are the details of external funding; and

Funding	Source
\$3.8m	Australian Research and Education Network (Commonwealth)
\$2.0m	Capital Development Pool (Commonwealth)
\$2.0m (approx)	Combination of cash and in-kind contributions from project partners including the State's three universities, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) and Defence Science and Technology Organisation (DSTO).

(d) The initiative to develop high performance computing capabilities in South Australia, including a connection to the national research broadband network (what is now SABRENet) was first proposed by the South Australian Partnership for Advanced Computing, an unincorporated joint venture of the three South Australian Universities and subsequently endorsed by the Premier's Science and Research Council.

MINISTER'S YOUTH COUNCIL

324. **Mr BRINDAL:** What is the selection criterion for membership to the Minister's Youth Council and how many members are also members of registered political organisations?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The Minister's Youth Council is a formal, Cabinet endorsed ministerial advisory committee. Vacancies on the Council are filled in one of two ways.

As with any ministerial advisory committee, the Minister to whom the Council advises can appoint members as the Minister feels appropriate.

Alternatively, the Government calls for expressions of interest from young people to fill vacancies on the Council. The call for expressions of interest are publicly advertised in the press and on the Government's youth website, The Maze. As with other ministerial advisory committees, the names of nominees for the Council are provided to Cabinet for noting, in this case by the Minister for Youth.

The specific selection criteria are:

Essential Characteristics

Minister's Youth Council members will demonstrate the following characteristics:

1. Be aged between 12 and 25 years of age.
2. Have a knowledge of youth affairs and issues at a local, state and/or national level.
3. Have an ability to communicate effectively.
4. Have an understanding of, and respect for, the need for diversity of representation, including young people from different socio-economic backgrounds, occupations, geographical regions, gender and minority groups such as; people from who identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders, disabled people, or people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.
5. Be able to maintain high levels of confidentiality in respect to issues the Minister's Youth Council considers.
6. Be able to attend monthly meetings and from time to time, other meetings or functions.

Desirable Characteristics

The following types of experience and skills will be considered favourably:

1. Experience in working with young people.
2. Experience in volunteer work.
3. Involvement in youth and/or community groups.
4. Involvement in extracurricular school activities.
5. Experience in meeting procedures.
6. Knowledge of government procedures.
7. Knowledge of culturally diverse groups.
8. Knowledge of issues pertaining to minority groups.

(d) who initially raised the proposal?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE:

- (a) The State Government has allocated \$1.47m towards the SABRENet project.
- (b) The State Government's contribution to the project will be funded principally from the budget line allocated to High Performance Computing announced in the 2003-04 State Budget (\$1.4m), and from the 2003-04 Science, Technology and Innovation base budget within the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (\$0.07m).
- (c) External funding towards the SABRENet project is as follows:

Members of the Council are selected on their ability to represent the views of their peers to the Government. The Minister's Youth Council needs young people who are passionate about issues that affect them and are able to communicate those issues and those of other young people.

The Council's membership is broadly representative of the diversity of young South Australians therefore the Council will seek to balance age, gender, employment and education experience, cultural background and geographic location.

The question of political affiliation is not asked during the selection process. The Office for Youth, which provides executive support to the Council, advises that it does not enquire as to whether members of the Minister's Youth Council are members of any political parties.

SA WATER

333. **Mr BRINDAL:** Why is information on the power consumed and corresponding greenhouse emissions produced from pumping water from the River Murray to Adelaide not made publicly available by SA Water?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Information about the power consumed and the corresponding greenhouse emissions produced from pumping water from the River Murray to Adelaide is made publicly available by SA Water through its Sustainability Report that is available on the internet at the following address: <http://www.sawater.com.au/annualreportcentre/Sustainability.pdf>

WATERPROOFING ADELAIDE

334. **Mr BRINDAL:** With respect to the publication "Water Proofing Adelaide—

1. Why do some sectors of the Water Industry consider the paper "too limited in its vision" and "greatly biased towards the business case of SA Water" and how will these concerns be addressed?
2. Why is the interaction between on site rainwater storage and run off flows generated in street drainage networks not mentioned?
3. Why is the possible target for annual grey water re-use given at 0.6GL when the potential is at least 50GL?
4. What will be the potential reduction in water consumption arising from the gradual conversion of Adelaide's lawns and gardens to native and drought tolerant vegetation and why is this not highlighted in the paper?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

1. I am advised that Water Proofing Adelaide has not received formal comments along those lines from any sector of the water industry.

The Water Proofing Adelaide document is a discussion paper only which aims to provide the community with a comprehensive overview of the facts surrounding Adelaide's water resource, supply and management issues. The aim is to promote community discussion. The document has no intentional bias toward the "business case of SA Water" or any other vested interest. Water Proofing Adelaide has aimed to take a holistic approach to water resources and has not focussed specifically on mains water. The paper was prepared under the guidance of senior executives of a number of government agencies and in full consultation with the

Water Proofing Adelaide Strategy Advisory Committee. The Strategy Advisory Committee comprises representatives from key stakeholder groups including the Council for Social Services, the Conservation Council, the Farmers Federation, Business SA, Catchment Water Management Boards, the Water Resources Council, the Australian Water Association, the Cooperative Research Centre for Water Quality and Treatment, and the Cooperative Research Centre for Freshwater Ecology.

2. The impacts of onsite rainwater storage on flood potential (and, by implication, on the street drainage network) are referred to briefly on page 45 of the discussion paper. On site rainwater storage can have a benefit in reducing the impact of minor flood events of up to one in five year recurrence interval. Beyond this the impact lessens and it is unlikely that conventional on site storage mechanisms such as rainwater tanks will have a significant impact on the design, construction and performance of street drainage networks designed to accommodate larger storm events. Other forms of localised stormwater capture and storage are given prominence in the document. For example, page 21 is dedicated to discussion and representation of the Parfitt Square project.

3. The term grey water is used in the context of the discussion paper to refer to water, mainly from showers and laundries, that has not come into contact with black water (toilet waste). Although much cleaner than black water, the Department of Human Services advises that there are still significant health risks associated with the use of grey water. Approval of the Department of Human Services must be obtained before systems for reclaimed water reuse are installed. This includes grey water systems. The costs to homeowners of establishing appropriate reuse systems are high and householders need to be very diligent in the maintenance and operation of the systems. The figure of 0.6 GL per annum of localised grey water reuse is not a Government target but rather represents Water Proofing Adelaide's best estimate of the likely maximum voluntary take up of such schemes given the cost and difficulties involved.

4. Conversion of Adelaide's lawns and gardens to native and drought tolerant vegetation is mentioned in the discussion paper on page 37. It is estimated that water consumption could be reduced by up to 30GL per annum through progressive replacement of current gardens with natives or other drought tolerant species. The discussion paper also poses the question of the extent to which it is reasonable for the community to move in this direction. Gardening is an important recreational and economic activity in our community, providing many social and wellbeing benefits. The growing of vegetables and fruit is a part of the culture of many groups within the community and many residents take great pride and satisfaction in their gardens.

SHAPING THE FUTURE PROJECT

373. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** With respect to the Ten Performance Targets mentioned in the "Shaping the Future—STI10" document, what indicative data sources will be used to measure each of the following indices—

- (a) public sector R&D performance;
- (b) business R&D performance;
- (c) precinct innovation performance;
- (d) collaboration;
- (e) commercialization;
- (f) investment;
- (g) people and skills development;
- (h) intellectual property;
- (i) state government infrastructure and support;
- (j) community outreach and innovation awareness;

and exactly how and where can these sources be accessed?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The indicative data sources that will be used to measure the Performance Targets within the "Shaping the Future—STI10" document are set out within the document on pages 30 and 31 and are as follows:

Performance Index	Indicative data sources
Public sector R&D performance	Primarily University and Commonwealth data sources.
Business R&D performance	ABS surveys, AusIndustry, Commonwealth, and International eg OECD data.
Precinct innovation performance	State and Commonwealth data eg Jobs growth, export contribution, company formation. Plus industry sources eg Fast 50 studies.
Collaboration	Primarily University and State data.
Commercialisation	Institutional, enterprise, and State data, plus business data sources.
Investment	Australian Venture Capital Association Ltd, other State and financial data sources.
Intellectual Property	Primarily IP Australia National 'Score board' data sources.
People and skills development	Commonwealth and State data.
Community outreach and innovation awareness	Qualitative and quantitative STI and innovation market perception surveys.
State Government infrastructure and support	State data and Interstate data plus Commonwealth data.

As stated these are indicative data sources. Much of this data is already available to the public and accessible via the internet or other public reports eg those provided by the Australian Bureau of Statistics on public sector and business R&D performance.

Some of the data is held by specific organisations eg universities and later made public in codified form by Commonwealth agencies such as the Department of Education, Science and Training.

Other data is developed by independent or commercial sources such as the Deloitte Technology Fast 50 program, SA Great Awards and other recognition programs.

There may be some instances where data may be commercial in confidence and only available in aggregate form eg venture capital funding. In such instances, the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology will negotiate with the source organisations for the release of aggregated data.

Some data sources, particularly for Performance Targets 4, 8, 9 and 10, will be assembled from across State Government agencies.

Data sources that prove most informative over the long term will be tracked so as to measure progress against the performance targets for the 10 Year Vision for Science, Technology and Innovation.