

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 1 June 2005

The SPEAKER (Hon. R.B. Such) took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

RAILWAYS (OPERATIONS AND ACCESS)
(REGULATOR) AMENDMENT BILL

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, assented to the bill.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I bring up the 21st report of the committee.

Report received.

Mr HANNA: I bring up the 22nd report of the committee. Report received and read.

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order before we commence questions. The member for Heysen, the member for Goyder and the member for Hartley should be facing west, not east.

QUESTION TIME

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): The Attorney-General is here right on cue. My question is to the Attorney-General. To clarify the Attorney-General's inconsistent and confusing answers about funding for the Office of the DPP—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, sir. That has been creeping in all week, and it is just getting worse.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is comment within the questioning. It is out of order to have comment in the question. The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: But, sir, it is inconsistent. That is three different answers.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a comment. To suggest that it is inconsistent is a commentary.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Will the Attorney-General tell the house exactly how much the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions will now receive this year, including the \$500 000 that the Premier chipped in yesterday?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I have lost track of the number of times that I have told the Opposition that the increase in funding to the Office of the DPP—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the member for Bragg ask the question, but she should be listening to the answer. The Attorney.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I have lost track of the number of times I have explained to the Opposition that the increase in funding to the Office of the DPP is \$1.2 million—

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the Attorney's microphone does not appear to be working. It. We are having difficulty hearing him make any sort of noise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members were quiet, they would be able to hear the Attorney.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: They are terribly rude, sir, terribly rude.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport will not interject, either. The Attorney-General.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: There were three components to that increase. One was an untied increase of \$300 000. We can now say that, owing to events yesterday, that increase is now \$800 000 untied. There was an increase in funding in response to a bid by the Office of the DPP for historic sex offences; that is, because there was a change of government and a move by Andrew Evans of the Family First Party, we managed to lift the bar on prosecutions for sexual offending before 1 December 1982. As I said, there is documentary evidence that the Liberal attorney-general, Robert Lawson, opposed that lifting of the immunity.

The third increase was for criminal assets confiscation, that is, reducing the burden of proof for confiscating instruments of crime or proceeds of crime to the balance of probabilities, rather than beyond reasonable doubt. That means that when a person alleged to have committed a criminal offence from which there are proceeds is not convicted, nevertheless, if it is more likely than not that the proceeds are proceeds of crime without a conviction, those assets can be confiscated. One of the reasons that Mr Pallaras makes the point that the huge increases in funding for his office may not be adequate is because previous governments, both Liberal and Labor—

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Point of order, sir. It is all very interesting but, on relevance, the question was: what is the funding for the DPP's office? We have heard about what it is for, but how much money will the DPP receive this year? It is really the question, sir; he is debating.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, I just suggest the Leader of the Opposition add it up. But to help him out I will do what I promised yesterday, that is, to have officers of my department from the finance section study what the Leader of the Opposition alleges are inconsistent estimates and reconcile those estimates to the satisfaction of the Leader of the Opposition. What I can tell the Leader of the Opposition is that the Office of the DPP got a whopping increase.

The SPEAKER: I believe that a similar question was asked yesterday and I thought the Attorney gave an undertaking yesterday to bring back a detailed answer. That should be sufficient.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I have a supplementary question, sir. The Attorney is not talking about giving us a figure. Will the Attorney undertake, by the end of question time today, to give us the budget figure for next year? He should be able to take it out of the paper. How hard is it?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader has asked the question and the Attorney cannot answer because he is rudely interrupting.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: One of the features of a governing party going into opposition is that it goes back into a comfort zone in which it forgets all the lessons of government. It is going to take some time for my officers to look at the allegations of the Leader of the Opposition regarding inconsistency to see whether there is an inconsistency and, if there is an inconsistency, to explain it to his satisfaction. It will take time. It will be done.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I have a supplementary question, sir, because this is frustrating. I ask the Attorney-General

whether the figure in Budget Paper No. 4 of \$12.9 million for 2005-2006 under the DPP's office is correct? Is it right or wrong?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will be in trouble in a minute. He asks the question and then does not give the Attorney an opportunity to respond.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether anyone is interested in the answer. It does not appear so. Does the Attorney wish to answer?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Thou sayest that there is an inconsistency: we will see whether that is right.

LEARN TO EARN PROGRAM

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. How is the government helping young people who have left school early to improve their skills and get them job ready?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I would like to thank the member for Wright for her question. Today I had the honour of announcing \$1.1 million to boost an already successful skills program, which is directly aimed at unemployed young people. It is aimed at getting them into jobs and job ready, as the member for Wright suggested. The Learn to Earn program has been piloted through the SA Works program. It has been very successful, and this is why we are adding extra funds to that program. I think that I have mentioned before in this house that the member for Napier has also been very involved in providing support for the program in his own electorate.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. S.W. KEY: And, certainly, the member for Davenport—hopefully, all members of this house will have an interest in this area. TAFE SA is involved in providing the back-up for this Learn to Earn program, as well as a number of different industries. Through the program, young people who are unemployed and at risk of not getting into the labour market will have an opportunity to be introduced to different trades and projects and are then being linked to industry. It provides personalised skills development and training for young people, and is particularly directed at young people between the age of 16 and 24 who have not finished year 12. The pilot involving 107 young people proved to be appropriate in that early school leavers had made the required transition from secondary education into training or a job.

Also, that linked up with the skills that industry was saying it needed. Eighty-three per cent of the young people who were involved last year went into jobs, including apprenticeships and traineeships, or went back to school or enrolled in further education and training. It was interesting today, talking to some of the young people involved with the project at Port Adelaide TAFE, to hear that it had dawned on a couple of them that, if they continued to operate in the way that they had been, they would never have any real future in the job market and were seriously considering going back to finish year 12.

Along with those now interested in apprenticeships, we have young people really considering going back to school. The reason why I think this is of particular interest to members in this house is that one of the things that is happening at Port Adelaide TAFE is that they are building a special bicycle to enter in the Australian International Pedal

Prix in September, and I am looking for volunteers to be in the Pedal Prix between midnight and 6 a.m. and to do a three-hour shift. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition would be interested in helping us by offering to do a shift, or some other members opposite might be interested in doing that.

There are several other projects that I would like to briefly outline. The Elizabeth students are building a sprint car and trailer and will gain welding, fabrication and automotive skills, which obviously are identified as high priorities in the north. I know that the member for Elizabeth has been very involved in trying to encourage young people to have the automotive skills necessary. I know that members from the South-East have also taken an interest in this, particularly the member for Mount Gambier, but in Mount Gambier they are undertaking a conservation land management program with industry partner Timbercorp, which will provide skills in many areas, including aquaculture, horticulture, farming and the timber industries.

In Tea Tree Gully, the Learn to Earn program is looking at community organisations, providing students with a range of multimedia, web, entertainment systems and computer refurbishment services. The partners in this project are the Electronics Industry Association and the information industry skills bodies. In O'Halloran Hill, the Hallett Cove Baptist Community Centre and Guide Dogs SA are helping young people look at training in tourism, cookery, wine studies and community services. In Gawler, the students are being mentored by local industry identities and the interest there is getting young people job-ready with skills and looking at vocational studies.

In Whyalla, the aluminium boat project will provide students with fabrication and welding skills needed for the emerging aquaculture industry in the Eyre Peninsula region. What we are trying to do with the different programs that I have noted in this house, but particularly the Learn to Earn program, is make sure that the gap between leaving school and, in most cases, leaving school before most people have achieved year 12, and getting into the work force is bridged. I would like to take this opportunity to compliment not only the members in this house who have supported the Learn to Earn project but also the workers in TAFE SA for the fabulous job they are doing in bridging that gap.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Attorney-General. Given the obvious and public pressure on the issue of funding for the Office of the DPP, why did the Attorney-General not ask the Treasurer for additional funding to assist with alleviating the pressures in the DPP's office in the budget bilateral process? The Treasurer's minute to the Attorney-General, dated 13 May 2005 and tabled in this house last night stated:

As Treasurer, I have not received any direct representations for any additional funding to cover cost pressures in the DPP's office.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I will take the question on notice and get a detailed answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The house will come to order. The member for Giles has the call.

EDUCATION, INDIGENOUS PROGRAMS

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. How is the

state government working to improve educational outcomes and employment opportunities for indigenous South Australians through the Department of Education and Children's Services?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the honourable member for her question, because I know that she is absolutely committed to good indigenous outcomes for students. She is keen to support employment in the education sector for all Aboriginal staff, particularly those in her own constituency about whom she talks to me frequently. I am very pleased to say that today we announced our strategy for the years 2005 to 2010 in not just Aboriginal education but also employment, because it is very important for young people in schools to have Aboriginal role models and mentors and for them to see their own career paths whereby they might go into teaching themselves.

The program that we have put together is important for all school children, because it will include Aboriginal educational elements for all children within our schools. Most especially, it sets hard targets for us to reach to improve the outcomes for indigenous children. We particularly aim to improve the number of Aboriginal students who gain the SACE certificate by aiming at a target of 70 per cent by the year 2010. We wish to double the number of indigenous students enrolled in school apprenticeships.

We wish to have significant improvement in school retention numbers and improve with targets the levels of literacy and numeracy attained within our schools. I am particularly proud of our elements that involve education employment. One of the issues that we have addressed is the need to have more Aboriginal employees within schools. We will improve the number of indigenous employees in pre-schools with significant numbers of Aboriginal children from one in 10 to one in eight. Also, we want to improve the number of Aboriginal employees within the Department of Education and Children's Services, and set a target of 4 per cent by the end of this program.

We recognise that it is important not only to have token employment but also to make sure that there are relative numbers of Aboriginal employees to support, mentor and improve retention rates within the system. We particularly see that the problem is to recruit Aboriginal teachers, and, in order to improve recruitment, we will select five scholarships for students who wish to do teacher training. We will recruit five trainee student teachers each year so that, over five years (and we will support them with fees, books and stipends), 25 young people will go through teacher training college who will then be able to take up jobs in our department.

In addition, we intend to recruit 10 Aboriginal early childhood workers annually to determine our strategy to bring the number up to 50 new employees. Of course, as part of that, we will have better recruitment and retention strategies to make sure that those young teachers we do recruit are supported during their employment. Also, we want to have Aboriginal leaders coming through our schools and pre-schools. We will also have leadership training as a support so that Aboriginal employees can attain the highest levels within our department, and we would expect that to occur.

During the budget announcements, we announced two schools to be built on the land. We wish to make it quite clear that those schools will have a substantial component of local training and employment opportunities for the local communities to make sure that, when we spend money on those schools, all the staff building them will not be flown in and

flown out, and that there will be meaningful employment for the local community so that those trainees will be able to maintain and support those buildings into the future and gain employment. I am proud of this strategy. I think that it will make a significant difference and show that DECS is, indeed, a leader in Aboriginal education and employment.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Attorney-General. Was the \$500 000 allocation, which the Premier decided to give yesterday to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, already in the 2005-06 Budget Paper No. 4?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I wish members of the government were so cunning but, alas, it was new money.

NURSES, ABORIGINAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister inform the house what is being done to support and encourage Aboriginal people to take up careers in nursing?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Florey for her question and her particular interest in this area. Recently, I attended a presentation of the Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards. At these awards the government honoured the contribution, hard work and dedication of our South Australian nurses and midwives.

Also at the awards we celebrated and acknowledged those incredible women who were South Australia's first Aboriginal nurses. I would like to put on record the names of these pioneers. They are: Linda Jackson, Lowitja O'Donoghue, Grace Sopar, Muriel Olsson, Faith Thomas, Margaret Lawrie and the late Nellie Nihill. Many members will recognise some of those names.

These women overcame the racial barriers of the 1950s and trained as nurses at a time when Aboriginal women were only employed as domestics in our hospitals. The perseverance and determination of these first Aboriginal nurses led to their dreams becoming reality. These women became role models for the next generations of Aboriginal women and Aboriginal nurses. The award ceremony was an important part of acknowledging and celebrating our Aboriginal nurses.

The Rann Labor government is encouraging more Aboriginal women to take up careers in the health sector. Through the South Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples' Scholarship Investment Fund the Department of Health provides specific scholarships for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. These scholarships help to support Aboriginal people through their studies. I also acknowledge the support provided through the Royal College of Nursing Australia which offers scholarships to Aboriginal people, particularly to those nurses or nursing students in rural and remote areas.

Nurses are the backbone of our health system. In this week of reconciliation, I once again honour the great example set by our first Aboriginal nurses, and this government will continue to support and encourage more Aboriginal people to take up careers in the nursing profession.

ATKINSON, Hon. M.J.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General feeling isolated, and is he reconsidering his position within the cabinet as a result of recent steps by the Premier and the Deputy Premier to usurp his responsibility in regard to the office of the DPP? Documents tabled late last night by the Attorney-General clearly show: first, that the Treasurer has been dealing directly with the DPP on funding and the Treasurer has 'told the DPP to speak to him if he has any concerns about funding'; and, second, all increased funding for the Office of the DPP for 2005-06 was initiated by the Premier and the Deputy Premier. The Premier clearly knew the contents of the Deputy Premier's ministerial statement prior to its delivery on Monday, while the Attorney-General did not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. The Attorney will take a seat until the house comes to order. I point out that the question was asking how the Attorney is faring. It is not really within standing orders. But the Attorney, if he wishes to respond, seems to be alive and well.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am sure they are genuine, but the Attorney seems to be alive and well.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Sir, it was very genuine. They were genuine concerns.

The SPEAKER: Does the Attorney wish to answer?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): If the Premier and the Treasurer want to come around to 45 Pirie Street and drop off half a million dollars recurrent for any of my agencies, they are welcome any time.

HOUSING INDUSTRY TRAINING

Mr SNELLING (Playford): My question is to the Minister for Housing. What initiatives has the government developed to provide housing industry training for young people in regional South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing): I am pleased to report to the house the success of a pilot building venture between the Housing Trust and the state government's job creation program, South Australia Works, and BoysTown in Port Pirie. The project has been a resounding success for young Port Pirie people who are gaining valuable work skills and jobs from the venture.

I thank my colleague the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. Steph Key) for her hard work in getting this successful program up and running. I know she has a true commitment to increasing employment opportunities in our regions and is as thrilled as I am to learn that the BoysTown project has already led to four formerly unemployed young people moving into full-time jobs in Port Pirie and a total of 14 undertaking paid work within the housing project.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I cannot hear the minister. There are persistent problems with that microphone.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond is correct. There is a malfunction in that part of the equipment. I ask the minister to use a different microphone.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, sir. How is that?

The SPEAKER: Beautiful.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: the idea behind this project is to boost the job prospects of long-term unemployed young people by training them in work skills while also supporting them in their personal development. I was very pleased that the Housing Trust has been able to provide a major training provider through involving young people working on the renovation of four houses in Port Pirie's Risdon Grove urban renewal project. Under BoysTown's guidance, these young people have been able to develop important work skills and, at the same time, take part in an urban regeneration project which is adding value to their local community. This program is another fine example of the government's investment in regional South Australia and demonstrates our commitment to creating quality urban environments for regional communities.

For the young participants, this housing project has provided them with training and experience in the construction of concrete borders, fencing, plumbing and establishing offices and workshop and kitchen facilities on the site. The endorsement of the project's success from BoysTown's Employment and Training General Manager, John Perry, speaks volumes on the joint venture's tremendous success, particularly in confidence building in the young people involved. Mr Perry said:

After the first couple of months, the changes were obvious, these young people developed a sense of purpose and a sense of pride. From backgrounds of educational and social disadvantage, these kids were being paid to work in real paid employment, and now four of them are working in open employment. The results are great and thanks to the dedication and understanding of officers from the Housing Trust and South Australia Works the joint project will continue to advantage Port Pirie's disadvantaged kids.

KAPUNDA ROAD ROYAL COMMISSION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): My question is to the Attorney-General. Why did the Attorney-General not act on the advice of the then director of public prosecutions, Paul Rofe QC, and introduce legislation to prevent the calling of witnesses without notice to the prosecution? On Monday 30 May the Kapunda Road Royal Commission heard from University of Adelaide Professor of Psychiatry, Robert Goldney. His evidence was in direct contrast to that of psychiatrist, Professor Alexander McFarlane, during the McGee trial. Evidence was given that the prosecution did not have the time to find an expert to challenge.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The first thing I say is that it would have been good if the member for Bragg had kept abreast of the royal commission because, today, the prosecutor, Peter Barnett, indicated broadly that, had the proposed provision been in place, he would not have taken advantage of it. That is very broadly speaking. The second point to make is that it is interesting that the member for Bragg hones in on this fragment of the rule of evidence. She does not talk about the other rules of evidence or the procedures involved in a criminal trial that make up the Martin report.

I referred all those rules of evidence and procedures of the criminal trial to what I think can genuinely be described as a high-powered committee chaired by Justice Duggan of the Supreme Court, and including Justice Sulan, Judge Rice of the District Court, that perennial favourite of the member for Bragg, Wendy Abraham QC, plus Gordon Barrett for the defence bar, who has now been elevated to the District Court. That committee went about its work patiently and methodically, and I saw Justice Duggan at the installation of Gordon

Barrett to the District Court on Friday and he told me that its report would be coming to the government soon.

Ms Chapman: Soon?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Well, in the next 10 days, I understood. What will happen is that we will have comprehensive recommendations workshopped by a representative committee so that we can get consensus in introducing changes to the rules of evidence and the procedure at criminal trials. I would have thought that is a good outcome. If the member for Bragg was so concerned about that fragment of the task, namely defence disclosure, I am wondering why she has not before raised it in the parliament nor introduced a private member's bill to make the change.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order. When replying to questions, a minister is supposed to address the substance on the question not to speculate on the motivation of the questioner.

The SPEAKER: The Attorney-General should not debate the question; he should answer it.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: There has been a range of views about defence disclosure and prosecution disclosure during the time that I have been Attorney-General. Paul Rofe had one view. Wendy Abraham had a similar view. The Solicitor-General, Chris Kourakis, had a quite different view. They were workshopped through an expert and representative committee and they are going to come up with a total solution.

BANKSIA AWARDS

Mr CAICA (Colton): Can the Minister for Environment and Conservation advise the house on South Australia's representation at this week's Banksia Awards?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I assure the honourable member that I can give him the information that he so eagerly requests. I am delighted that Adelaide is the host city for the 2005 Banksia Awards, which is the most prestigious environmental awards program in Australia. This is the first time in the history of the awards that they have been held in Adelaide and we are welcoming over 400 guests to our city over the weekend of the awards. That will be an opportunity to showcase to visitors from other states what we do in the environment. South Australia has 10 finalists in the awards this year, which demonstrates our growing achievements in the environmental area, and that is the largest number of finalists that we have had in the 17 years that the awards have been running.

This year's awards have 12 categories compared to five when it started and those categories range from environmental leadership in the community; business environmental responsibility and leadership; environmental leadership in protecting bush, land and waterways; to environmental leadership in education and training as well as media communications.

South Australia's finalists are 'Learning to love mistletoe' from the Clare Valley (which the member for that area will be fascinated to know); the Marine Team, Port Vincent Primary School; Food Forest; Dominion Mining Limited Challenger gold project; Bush for Life; the Arid Recovery Restoration Recovery Project in South Australia's Far North; the Natural Advantage of Nations, a book and training initiatives by the Natural Edge Project; Eco-Voice, the South Australian environmental newspaper; and Gurra Downs commercial date garden and nursery.

I am also pleased to see that Andrew Allanson is a finalist in the Environmentalist of the Year Award for providing leadership and information in environmental management and protection. Mr Allanson is a finalist in the Environmentalist of the Year Award for providing leadership and inspiration in environmental management and protection. In 1994, he established the Bush for Life program that protects South Australia's remnant vegetation by recruiting, training and equipping 700 community volunteers.

HOSPITALS, MOUNT GAMBIER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Health. How is the minister able to claim that all is well at the Mount Gambier Hospital when seven of the hospital's senior salaried medical officers have resigned or will resign within the next three months?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Look at the big smile on his face! He loves bad news.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): Yes; I think he does. There is no doubt that the deputy leader simply loves to throw dirt and then pull himself back from the situation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Sir, could you quieten the member for Newland? It is most off-putting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I understand that the issues in relation to the salaried medical officers at Mount Gambier Hospital relate to their positions as overseas trained doctors. Of course, the federal government needs to look at that issue in terms of making the processes simpler and easier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson will not use displays in the chamber. He knows the rules.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. The amplification system is not at its best, and it is very hard to hear.

MINISTERIAL COUNCIL ON IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Will the Minister for Multicultural Affairs inform the house about the recent Ministerial Council on Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, why it was held in this state and what the benefits were for South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will go to the deputy leader and come back to that question.

HOSPITALS, QUEEN ELIZABETH

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I was going to ask another question, as I have answered the previous one!

The SPEAKER: Order! No-one is asking the deputy leader to answer anything. He should just ask his question.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: My question is again to the Minister for Health. Why has the minister allowed bureaucratic delays within the new regional health structure to stop the installation of the new electro physiological unit at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. As a result, the lives of cardiac

patients are put at risk. A patient at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has a serious heart condition known as atrial fibrillation and urgently requires an operation called ablation. Meanwhile, he is on dangerously high levels of drugs. As the minister knows, the new equipment needed for the unit has been provided by outside funding and was due to have been operating by January or February this year. However, the new regional health bureaucracy has not given approval for its installation. The inefficiencies caused by this delay are costing the hospital \$300 000 a year.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): The regional health arrangements that have now been put in place by this government have made management processes much easier and better than they have ever been in the past. I notice that the deputy leader laughs, but of course we know that he presided over a whole range of processes and structures that were criticised by the Auditor-General. He has no credibility in this matter at all. I will look into the issue and bring back a report to the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! before calling the next question, I point out that the microphone system is not functioning properly. *Hansard* is having to rely on voice only, not direct feed, and background noise is distracting them, and everyone else. Members must speak closely to the microphone, otherwise it will not be amplified at all. We have only the ambient sound.

Mr BRINDAL: One point of order: I did not hear the answer to the question from the member for Norwood at all.

Ms Ciccarello: No; there wasn't one!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WATER INDUSTRY ALLIANCE

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is to the Minister for Administrative Services. Can the minister update the house on the achievements of the Water Industry Alliance?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): I thank member for Enfield for his question. South Australia is fortunate to have a thriving and innovative water industry. The Water Industry Alliance is recognised as one of the most successful industry clusters in South Australia, with current membership of over 170 companies. I have been advised that over the last six years the local water industry has achieved a five-fold increase in its exports, to \$350 million and employment growth of 1 500 people. The maturity and professionalism of the local water industry was apparent last Friday when I had the pleasure of attending, with Leader of the Opposition, the Second Water Industry Alliance Awards.

The awards recognise excellence and innovation by South Australian water industry companies, particularly those exporting their technology and expertise interstate and to the world. Award winners included: Philmac Proprietary Limited for export development; Optimatics Proprietary Limited and Tonkin Consulting for innovation; Sentek Sensor Technologies for marketing excellence; QED Proprietary Limited for collaborative teaming; United Water was also highly commended for collaborative teaming; and Mr Chris Stathy, Managing Director of Philmac, was given the Chairman's Award for his contribution to the water industry in this state. The innovation and entrepreneurship of our local water industry is something that we can all be proud of, and it is a great sign for the future.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members do not keep the background noise down there is no point continuing with question time, because it is impossible for *Hansard* and others to hear what is being said. If members want to suspend, that is fine by the chair. The member for Mitchell.

APY LANDS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Will the Premier correct the statement he made to this house on 5 May this year when answering a question about the APY lands, namely, that there were 'properly supported youth workers in each community'?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I will make inquiries and check. I always try to do the right thing, as I hope the member would. If you have some information that says that the information that I was given was wrong, then if you can provide the that information I will check it out and come back to the house.

MENTAL HEALTH BEDS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Does the minister think it is acceptable for a mentally ill patient to lie on a barouche in the emergency department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for five days, while the patient waited for a mental health bed to become available? Yesterday, the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service confirmed that a mental health patient was forced to lie on a bed for five days in the emergency department while waiting for a bed.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the deputy leader for the question. Of course we do not think that that is the best way for somebody to be treated. Members probably read the report in *The Advertiser* (where the deputy leader got his question from) and they will have noted that the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service was reported in *The Advertiser* this morning as saying that there has been a very unusual demand in terms of beds in the emergency department. The person was still cared for appropriately, but our preference is that they would have been able to go into a bed in Cramond House. I understand that the situation is now less busy and that Cramond House is full, but it is not overfull.

Again, I say to the house, that that is precisely why, in the budget last week, we had a \$45 million package for mental health services. As part of that \$45 million package allocated to mental health services, there will be increased funding for 'Hospital in the Home' beds which provide intensive support and medical care to people in their homes; there is money to extend the new ACIS teams, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, right across the metropolitan area—something that the deputy leader did not come near funding when he was minister; and millions of dollars will go into extra support in the community for people with a mental illness. So, we are onto it.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, the minister is debating—

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is debating. I uphold the point of order.

GAWLER HEALTH SERVICE

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Can the Minister for Health advise what progress the government has made in the

re-negotiation of the contracts of Drs Rattray and Cave to secure the provision of obstetric and gynaecological services at the Gawler Health Service? Last week I organised a public meeting which the minister attended in Gawler. The local community is most concerned about losing the obstetric and gynaecological services of the doctors at Gawler and is keen to hear from the minister as to how far negotiations have progressed.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I am pleased to answer the question but, of course, as the member knows, I talked to him about this matter last night, privately in the house, and updated him on where we are at in relation to that issue. The first thing that I want to say is that there is an absolute iron-clad guarantee from the government that obstetric services—maternity services—will continue at the Gawler Health Service. The issue that is occurring now relates to the negotiation of contracts with two obstetricians. As the member for Light knows, I have taken the negotiations out of the hands of the local Wakefield health region and asked the Chief Executive of the Department of Health to make sure that they occur as expeditiously as possible. My advice is that they have been occurring over recent days, and it is a matter of a satisfactory business arrangement being reached between the doctors and the Department of Health acting on behalf of the Wakefield region. I want to have that result as soon as possible and negotiations are proceeding.

CHILD ABUSE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. What is the process for correcting the files in his department and clearing the names of people who have had allegations of child abuse made against them that are subsequently found to have been completely without any basis? The opposition is aware of a number of instances where people who have been falsely accused of child abuse continue to be treated by CYFS staff as though the allegations were true, even after the accusations had been withdrawn or tested in a court and the person acquitted. In some cases, they have been de-registered as foster care providers.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): It is surprising to hear a question phrased in those terms from a legal practitioner. She would know more than many in this house that the standard of proof for criminal proceedings is quite different from the standard of proof that may be necessary for us to satisfy ourselves about whether someone should be a foster carer. It may be that, in some circumstances, on the balance of probabilities, we have concerns about someone for the purposes of being a foster carer but there may be insufficient evidence to establish a prosecution beyond reasonable doubt in a court. I will provide a detailed answer to the honourable member about the process for clearing a file. I presume an appropriate note is made on the relevant file.

Members would be aware that, since coming to government, we have now instituted a much more thoroughgoing regime of investigation of foster carers. The special investigations unit is an initiative of this government. There is presently a foster carer who, sadly, is before the courts facing very serious charges of abuse against children in his care and we take very seriously this process. Of course, it is a balancing act because we know that, sadly, there are false allegations made from time to time. One needs to be mindful of the fact that the children who are coming into care are children

who have been abused. Some of them understand the system and they know what an allegation of abuse can do in terms of perhaps changing their arrangements, so we have to be careful about how we treat that information.

Our recruitment processes with foster carers now make clear to them that, sadly, up to 30 per cent of them may be the subject of an allegation. Now they go into the system with their eyes open about the fact that there will be allegations. Of course, those allegations go from everything from care concerns all the way through the most serious concerns about paedophilia. Obviously, they are the most minor exception to the rule, but there is no doubt that there are a large number of allegations made against foster carers and that is because of the nature of the children and the circumstances in which they are involved. Sadly, also, there is often some competition for these children. There are grandparents and estranged parents, and it is not unknown that they are prepared to make allegations or, at least, take circumstances and elevate them to an allegation for secondary gain, that is, for them to gain custody of the child.

It is a very difficult area. Within all that we have to investigate carefully. When we do come to a conclusion that the allegations are unsubstantiated, my understanding is that that is noted on the file. There is an appeal process, and I have had recent dealings with the member for Waite who has a constituent who was the subject of an allegation that the department acted upon. His constituent appealed, the appeal process cleared her and she still has a grievance about that process. An apology has been given to her for the fact that a false allegation was acted upon, and I have now given an undertaking that I will meet with her to see if I can address her concerns directly.

It is one of the difficulties of dealing with a system of this sort. We have to take these allegations seriously. We now have a well-resourced special investigations unit and I am confident that we can be satisfied with those investigations and their outcomes.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES LEGISLATION

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Ageing advise the house whether the draft bill amending the Retirement Villages Act 1987 will be ready for debate in the parliament this year?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Ageing): It will be ready and through the house if we have the cooperation of members opposite. I have sought to truncate the process. The honourable member will be aware that I met with him and a number of other interested members who had expressed a special interest in this issue. I offered to give them an advance briefing. It was a bit of a rarity for the previous government to give an advanced briefing. Before the matter even went through the cabinet process, I anticipated that there would be a bit of a traffic jam for legislation—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, we are a big reform government. There is a lot of legislation to put through. I anticipated that there would be this difficulty, so I met with the members for Finnis, Mawson and Heysen. Also, I have distributed to all members the drafting instructions—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I have sent you the drafting instructions. They are before parliamentary counsel. Parliamentary counsel is being deluged by the amount of

reform legislation that is being put through by the government, and, indeed—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, obviously, it has caught on. Everyone wants to put through legislation. We are reforming this state in the image of the Labor Party and its principles and values. That is what we are doing. We are making this a great state. Everyone is getting on board. The federal government even loves us. It is awarding us contracts. Seriously, I share the concerns of the member for Mawson. I am very keen to promote this legislation. I will bring it to this house as soon as parliamentary counsel sends us the draft and we have taken it through the cabinet. I hope that, with bipartisan support, we will be able to race it through both houses of parliament.

HOSPITALS, WUDINNA

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Health advise when the outcome of the clinical review at the Wudinna Hospital will be made public? A clinical review was undertaken at the Wudinna Hospital in November 2004, with the outcome to be given to the board and the Ombudsman. The board chair stated at a public meeting that it was the board's wish that the outcome of the clinical review be made public. In a letter, the Department of Health's Executive Director of Country Division said:

I confirm that Dr David Rosenthal and Genevieve Hebert will be available to meet with the Wudinna community once the recommendations from the review have been placed before the Mid West Board.

Indeed, in a letter dated 13 January 2005, the minister said:

I hope that I will be able to visit Wudinna in the New Year to meet with you and other residents to hear your concerns. However, I need to wait for the report of the clinical review conducted at the Wudinna Hospital to be available before doing so.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Flinders for the question. Indeed, it was the one to which the Attorney was referring in terms of certain defamatory allegations made by the member for Flinders in a very scurrilous way.

An honourable member: Did she apologise?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Yes, she did apologise, but they were very uncalled for and scurrilous allegations. However, back to the subject. I do know that the board has received the report. I have not seen the report at all. That is being handled by the board of the health service concerned. I can get a report on just where they are up to; but, certainly, I have not seen the report. They will be working through the issues. Obviously, if they are doing their job conscientiously they would be doing that. I have no reason to suspect anything else of them. Yes, certainly, I have offered to go to Wudinna to talk with people about the report. I did make an offer to meet with representatives from the board when I was in Port Lincoln in January after the bushfires. I did make an offer to see them, but they were not able to make that meeting. However, I will check on where they are up to. As I say, I have not seen the report, but the board would be working through those matters.

CHILD ABUSE

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier apply the same standards as he did in relation to former archbishop Ian George by demanding the

resignation of any current public servant who was, during the periods detailed in the Mullighan interim report, employed in the administration of departments responsible for the care of wards of the state? Are you worried about taking it now, Patrick?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: No, nothing about you worries me, Mark.

The SPEAKER: Will the member finish his question?

Mr BRINDAL: Last year, the Premier demanded the resignation of the Archbishop of Adelaide, Ian George, after information on child abuse was revealed within the Anglican church by the Olsson report. He seems to have set a second standard for his own government.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I think the test of time will demonstrate that the Mullighan inquiry established by this government will make a massive contribution to the healing process for adult survivors in this state. We will also learn from that report the degree of culpability of the system of state care over the decades. There will be some sad lessons learnt, and they will be learnt not just by this government but also by government after government and minister after minister, including ministers presently in this chamber, and it will not reflect well on any of us.

The truth is that I do not think there can be any fair comparison that the honourable member seeks to draw between the remarks made at the time of the archbishop's resignation and the outcomes of this inquiry. We will have to wait for the outcomes of this inquiry to consider that. What we do know about those most contemporary events is that evidence of the most cogent kind of paedophilia was simply kept from authorities, and there is a piece of legislation that we have put before this house which will be debated within days and which will make it a mandatory requirement for members of the clergy to report such evidence when it comes into their possession. Public servants are already obliged by such a reporting arrangement, and this will extend to members of the clergy.

It was fair criticism, in my view, by the government of a range of institutions in this state that sought to ensure that that material did not come to the attention of the relevant authorities. We know that predators of this sort move from one institution to the next, and it was fair criticism to say that it was an appalling state of affairs that an institution could keep such information to itself and allow a person to go God-knows-where and continue to perpetrate their foul activities. We have acted when those opposite, who had eight years to act, chose not to.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley has a supplementary question.

Mr BRINDAL: Does either the Premier or the minister accept that they now ask us to accept a double standard in this chamber, and will the minister retract his statement if he is proved wrong?

The SPEAKER: Order! That is more an allegation than a question.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: At the start of question time, the Leader of the Opposition asked me about estimates in the budget for the Office of the DPP which he alleged were inconsistent, and he demanded of me that I get him the full answer by the end of question time.

An honourable member: Requested of you.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Well—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney will just make his statement.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The difference between the figures presented is that the budget papers—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: So there is a difference?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —yes—are program figures, \$12.9 million, which includes the DPP's portion of the total Attorney-General's Department budget, whereas the \$11.45 million, which does not include the additional \$500 000 funding given by the Premier yesterday, is the actual appropriation for the DPP. In other words, it is the real internal budget which is the money actually spent on delivering the services of the agency. This is the same treatment the budget papers give every other government program.

The 2005-06 departmental budget figure of \$11.45 million plus \$500 000 of new money equals \$11.95 million for the DPP and the program statement net cost of services of \$12.9 million for 2005-06. The difference of \$1.95 million is owing to—and I will enumerate these things—\$1.18 million overhead share of the AGD budget includes rental, computing charges, finance charges, HR minor works and other centrally provided services—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Look, finances aren't your strong suit. There is \$100 000 for IJP case track and recurrent costs, and it also includes contingencies of \$500 000 for the CPI share—CPI means consumer price index for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition—and \$120 000 for the EB share—that is enterprise bargaining, for the interest of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Goyder!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It should be mentioned that the departmental budget figure and the program statement figure are comparing two different things and not just looking at total expenses. The opposition knows (or should know) this technical difference well. It is my feeling that the opposition is just trying to misrepresent the customary format of presenting the budget papers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader is out of order. He must not display material in the house.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The minister undertook to get a reply. He was obviously reading from a sheet of paper, which has therefore been—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It's been distributed.

Mr BRINDAL: All right, that's fine.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

DEPUTY PREMIER, CENSURE MOTION

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): Mr Speaker, I give notice that on Thursday 7 July I will move:

That this house expresses its dismay at the arrogant indisposition, intemperate remarks, personal invective and abuse of the Deputy Premier directed at particular citizens such as a former ward of the state, Mr Terry Paget, who saw the vicious assault causing serious injury by Sister Gertrude of St Stanislaus on another boy at that convent; certain police officers who have responsibility for the investigations into the foregoing matter; the Director of Public Prosecutions over budget allocations and support services to his office in recent times; other public servants; other prominent citizens in their role as spokesperson for various organisations; the Leader of the Opposition and other honourable members in this place who have raised questions without notice and/or advanced arguments in support of their policy advocacy and the communities they represent; and the former speaker in his attempts to avert or prevent quarrels and other disorderly behaviour in the house—and, likewise, the current Speaker—by virtue of the Deputy Premier's Narcissus complex, resulting in him being determined to always have the last say in consequence of his bellicose, belligerent, bumptious, bad language description and persistent display of bad behaviour, and censures the Deputy Premier, calling on him to apologise to the house and the people to whom his actions have given offence.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order.

Ms Chapman: He doesn't like 'bumptious'.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: My only concern is that he hasn't included me.

Ms Chapman: He doesn't know what it is.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I would stand my vocabulary up against yours any day, member for Bragg. My point of order is that that notice of motion in fact contains a large bevy of argument which is out of order and the honourable member should be asked to redraft it into something that is merely a notice of motion.

The SPEAKER: The notice of motion did stray into debate. It was more than indicating the focus of the motion. It is not really the responsibility of the chair to rule it out of order—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: I just suggest it may be inappropriate—

Mr BRINDAL: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will not talk over the chair. The motion was getting to the point of debate but it is borderline as to whether it should be ruled out of order. We will leave it for the house to debate the matter. The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: I was merely asking for your ruling, sir, on the point of order. I believe the member for Hammond's motion to be entirely orderly. It is for a member to determine what goes into a motion, not the chair.

The SPEAKER: The chair has indicated that it is not the role of the chair to suppress debate but a notice of motion should not convey or contain the substance of the debate. It should be left to the chamber to debate that matter. The point is that the examples are for consideration during debate, not part of the motion. As I said, it is not the best way to present a motion but the house can make its own judgment in due course. The house will note grievances.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Beauty, sir! We have just witnessed one of the greatest own goals ever kicked in this parliament. I was going to get up to speak about how the Attorney was not across his portfolio and about some of the discrepancies in the last week or so over the DPP's budget. We have just seen the Attorney-General and his office trying to work out an explanation for the fact that he has been wrong all along and trying to clean it up.

I ask members to go back to the ministerial statement. He said that I did not know my finances. Train your eyes on the last two paragraphs of the ministerial statement, which state:

The 2005-06 departmental budget figure of \$11.45 million plus \$500 000 of new money equals \$11.95 million for the DPP and the program statement net cost of services figure of \$12.9 million for 2005-06.

I would like the Attorney to take his shoes off to count better. When I went to school, that difference was \$950 000. The Attorney's office has quickly cobbled together some new mathematics that has the difference at \$1.95 million. If that was only one line, that would be okay, but if we go over the page we find that the Attorney has come in here and has—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order. I wonder whether members can keep the noise down. I am trying to read my book.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. The house will come to order. The leader has the call.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The real World Cup winning own goal in this one is over the page, where he has justified the wrong figure. The mistake is \$950 000, and over the page they have tried to cobble together figures to say what the difference of \$1.95 million is, when the difference was only \$950 000.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. I point out that it will be impossible for Hansard to hear the leader's remarks if his own members keep making such noise. So, it is up to the leader whether he wants them recorded.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The Attorney says that there is a typo.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We remember typos. His office sent out 'Ron' Kerin instead of 'Rob'!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Minister for Transport!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: In this new mathematics the Attorney-General's office has now discovered, you can add up your typos. It is so creative. I wanted to cover a range of issues, but I thought it was really good when he came in with this document and tried to justify one mistake with another. In some ways, I am on the Attorney's side because, in the last few days, we have seen the Premier and the Deputy Premier trying to usurp his authority over the DPP's office. He has been totally sidelined by the Premier and the Treasurer, who have taken all the authority.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Sideline me, baby!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Sideline me!

The SPEAKER: The Attorney and the Minister for Transport are out of order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Yesterday, it was the Premier who announced new funding for the DPP's office—with the agreement of the Treasurer. The Attorney was left right out of the loop. Earlier this week, the Deputy Premier came into this place and made an outrageous attack on the DPP. The Attorney-General, as the responsible minister, was not aware that that attack would happen. The Premier and the Treasurer were usurping the authority of the Attorney-General. We also saw the DPP being told by the Treasurer, 'Don't bother going to him. If you want more money, come to me.' That is outrageous. The rift happening between the Treasurer and the Attorney-General is damaging not only the DPP but also the state, and I do not know how they can sit together in the cabinet room. The Premier has to sort out the situation—and quickly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

ROTARY CENTENARY CONCERT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Last Sunday, it was my pleasure to attend the concert at Elder Hall in aid of the tsunami and Indonesian earthquake victims. The concert was a centenary Rotary concert, hosted by the Rotary Club of Adelaide East. I say that it was my pleasure to attend this concert, because few other musical performances have given me greater enjoyment. The Band of the South Australia Police, under the baton of Doug Drysdale, gave a wonderful performance of music in various styles, demonstrating its amazing versatility and repertoire. The South Australia Police Band was augmented on the day by about a dozen students of the conservatorium and extra musicians who had returned to lend their expertise to the performance.

From favourite marches and movie themes to the absolute show stopper for me—a rendition of Toto's *Africa*—the audience was totally enthralled and thoroughly entertained. All sections of the band performed beautifully; however, it would be remiss of me not to mention the work of the percussion section. There was practically every instrument in the percussion section, including drums of all kinds, kits, snares basses, tympani, vibes and bells, as well as my favourite from schooldays, the triangle. When you have to count as many bars of music as the triangle player must before their big moment, you begin to understand their responsibility in any musical piece.

We also heard some very fine vocal work. The artistic arrangements showed the professionalism of the South Australia Police band and how lucky we are to have it. I commend the Commissioner and the Minister for Police for their continued commitment and foresight to retain the band and to fund it to its current level. Apart from the band's performances on state occasions, it is a vital component of parades, such as the Christmas Pageant and the ANZAC Day march. It provides one of the few opportunities of full-time employment for our best musicians. Music is a special part of human existence. I have long felt that school students should have the opportunity to learn both an instrument and a language while at school. To this end, I have sponsored a music prize in each school in my electorate since my election in 1997, and I look forward to doing so for many years to come.

Sunday's concert is one of several planned this year by the South Australian Police Band. Their concert series includes

an Afternoon at the Proms on Sunday 19 June, a cabaret on Saturday 10 September, and a Christmas concert on Tuesday 6 December. All details of these performances can be accessed on the band's website www.bandsapolice.com. It is reasonably priced family entertainment not to be missed. Unfortunately, Sunday's concert was not sold out, and that is sad because it was a benefit concert—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson should seek a grievance if he wishes to speak. The member for Florey.

Ms BEDFORD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is terribly rude, isn't it? There was a football match on that Sunday, so a competing recreational experience was offered to the people of Adelaide. Nevertheless, Rotary did a splendid job, and those present were grateful that the event had been organised, as is the community at large which appreciates all that Rotary does and all of its activities. As its role implies, it is a service club that does work for the greater good. Its volunteer work force is gratefully appreciated for all it does in the community, particularly for those who benefit from it directly. Rotary has many projects in each of the clubs throughout Adelaide, and it has been my honour to be associated with local Rotary clubs for many years, and I know the member for Mawson is a keen Rotary person—

Mr Brokenshire: Hear, hear!

Ms BEDFORD: —which is perhaps why he might stop speaking through the rest of my grievance. Apart from the obvious pleasure in being involved in good works, the other rewards for members include the camaraderie and friendships which last a lifetime. Every community benefits from the work of service clubs, and in this, its centenary year, I would particularly like to honour not only Adelaide East Rotary but also all the Rotary members for their work.

I particularly look forward to joining with the Rotary club members from Modbury for their next function, and ask all people in the community to consider joining a service club. I know that often it is very difficult to find time as we are running around with our various commitments, but to do that sort of work in a club atmosphere means that you are able to take on bigger projects and have better results. I commend the work of Rotary, congratulate it on its centenary, and look forward to having a lot more to do with Rotarians in the years to come.

DROUGHT

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Today in the short time available to me I want to raise a most concerning issue, that is, the prospects of a severe drought here in South Australia. As a farmer myself, I fully understand, and I rise to speak about the hardships that many farmers, not only here in South Australia but right across the country, are facing right now. There is stress and anxiety as rains fail to come. We are now in the month of June, and we have just had the driest autumn on record, that is, in over 166 years. From March to the end of May, Adelaide has recorded only 23 millimetres. The prevailing dry weather and lack of any decent opening rain is placing huge stress and pressure on farmers and their families all over Australia.

This also involves pastoralists in our Outback, grain growers and horticulturists in all our wetter regions. Many farmers in Far North and West Coast areas have faced dry season after dry season, pitfall after pitfall, and disappointing returns. After years of minimal income, expenses are still ever-increasing, and further compounded by low commodity

prices, and, to make it worse, we have a high Australian dollar. Now it is crunch time for many of our farmers in Australia. They need to make a decision to either go to the bank and stay on the farm, and hope the bad run will come to an end, or walk away from what is for some people a family tradition. Some of these farms are fourth or fifth generation farm units.

Our farmers have to make a living just like everyone else. If it does not rain, you incur the cost; you have no income. In hard times like this they need support from the federal and state government, as well as local government. I welcome the news that the South Australian Farmers Federation is forming a task force to look at hardship faced by farmers, and will be holding a farm summit involving professionals from a range of areas.

There are numerous issues facing our farmers, and whilst the drought is in front of us they continue to deal with low commodity prices and poor industry prospects. I find it rather scary, to say the least, to hear the figures which indicate that in 20 years time South Australia could be left with only a quarter of its present farming population, and that could be as low as 3 000. One can assume that there will be a flow-on effect into the local communities with devastating effects. What will happen to our export markets that we rely on? Our economy will come under increased pressure, and we heard those figures today.

The federal government is discussing financial drought relief for farmers with rumours circulating that the package could run to at least \$200 million. The drought relief package is believed to go beyond what has been previously offered, and I am pleased with that. It is great to see the federal government recognising the hard times facing our farmers, and there needs to be cooperation between state, federal and local government. What is doubly sad is that many farmers who donated hay to the Eyre Peninsula bushfire victims earlier this year are now critically short of hay themselves. In fact, they are buying it in at hugely inflated prices.

Stock have nothing to eat, especially valuable stud stock, and long-time breeding progeny has to be fed and has to be maintained. Also consider how sad it is for those affected by the Eyre Peninsula bushfires, and an early rain would have been a godsend, excellent, but what a bitter blow to these families, a double blow, as it affects the wives, the children, and also the land. The land is being totally degraded, blown away by the months and months of dry, dry weather and wind, and there is nothing there to hold it after the severe bushfire.

I urge the Rann Labor coalition government to step in and commit to some form of financial assistance to drought-affected farmers immediately. It should complement the initiatives of the federal government and help make ends meet for farmers struggling during these anxious times. Our position here in South Australia is bad enough, but we are lucky compared with some of the other states. Some farmers have had five poor seasons in a row. Many farmers have no feed, no service water, and are almost totally de-stocked. We are entering a critical period. If we do not get a major rain within two to three weeks our farmers will be totally impacted, and so will all our allied businesses in South Australia. Country business is also feeling the pinch, very much so.

Time expired.

AIR WARFARE DESTROYERS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): This afternoon I would like to congratulate the Premier and all of those involved in

delivering the good news yesterday that there will be increased skilled employment opportunities in South Australia through the warships contract. The opportunities provided by this achievement are really important, and I would like to ensure that the young people of Reynell and some of the skilled workers of Reynell are able to participate in these great opportunities that will be available, but I am quite fearful that unless things change they will not be able. This afternoon I am calling on all students, teachers and parents in Reynell to consider whether they are doing their bit to ensure that the Reynell work force is skilled and able to take advantage of these opportunities. We know that there will be a wide range of jobs—those involving both TAFE and university qualifications.

If we look at the Census figures, we would believe that residents of Reynell would be well placed to take advantage of the TAFE-based jobs. If we look at Morphett Vale which formed most of Reynell at the time of the 2001 Census, 18.8 per cent of the population had TAFE qualifications compared with 15.7 per cent for the Adelaide area overall. So, that looks pretty good. The worry there is in relation to those jobs that require a university qualification. Only 8.3 per cent of people in Morphett Vale had a university qualification compared with 18 per cent in Adelaide overall.

However, what worried me was that over the last few years I have picked up signs in my community that young people were not in fact participating in TAFE study at anything like the rate that would be required to keep up that excellent level of TAFE skills in the Reynell population. So, I asked the assistance of the library, and I must acknowledge the great work that has been done by Jenni Newton-Farrelly in helping me to better understand what is happening in Reynell with education opportunities. At the time of the 2001 census, Reynell had 806 TAFE students and 586 university students; that is, more TAFE than university students, as I had expected.

In the Adelaide Statistical Division there were 27 765 TAFE students and 45 147 university students. Reynell was not keeping up with university participation, but was it really taking advantage of TAFE to such a level that it did not matter that they were not getting the university opportunities? Unfortunately, that is not the case. Jenni Newton-Farrelly did a series of complex calculations, in conjunction with consultancy officers at the Australian Bureau of Statistics, looking at the age groups of people in Reynell compared with the Adelaide Statistical Division and their participation in higher education.

The question was asked: if people of all ages in Reynell were behaving the same as those across the Adelaide Statistical Division, would there be more or fewer people attending university and TAFE? Unfortunately, the answer is that there would be more people attending TAFE, particularly in the 15 to 29 age group, as well as more people attending university. Overall, there would be 746 additional people in Reynell studying. Most of them would be studying full time at university, if young people and older people in Reynell were able to take advantage of educational opportunities to the same level that people in the Adelaide Statistical Division overall were.

I will continue on another occasion my remarks about just how important and complex it is to address these issues, and the age groups that we have to target, but my point today is to say that Reynell is going to miss out unless people really look at the support our students need to take advantage of these great job opportunities coming up.

Time expired.

PARLIAMENT, SESQUICENTENARY

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today I wish to respond to the government's asking us as members to have ideas about the sesquicentenary of responsible government: 150 years of this place. Some members might not know that the first premier was the Hon. Boyle T. Finniss. Indeed, the member for Finniss's seat is named after the first premier. In those days, premiers did not last too long, if we look at the history. We know that South Australia started with really noble beginnings. In the proclamation of 28 December 1836, Governor George Hindmarsh said:

It is also at this time especially my duty to apprise the colonists of my resolution to take every lawful means for extending the same protection to the native population as to the rest of His Majesty's subjects, and of my firm determination to punish with exemplary severity all acts of violence or injustice which may in any manner be practised or attempted against the natives, who have to be considered as much under the safeguard of the law as the colonists themselves.

I think it is important to reflect in Reconciliation Week that we did start off well, unlike New South Wales, which they said was terra nullius, uninhabited. On Wednesday 19 July 1995 I made a grievance in reference to the tapestries in this place, although some thought that it was a bit foolish of me to refer to the tapestries.

In that contribution, I said that these tapestries do not necessarily have a place in this chamber, but that, perhaps, we should have the portrait of the first woman elected to this place. I said that on Wednesday 19 July and, as I am speaking today, I am pleased to see the portrait of Joyce Steele, who was the first woman to be elected to this place. On that day I also said that the blank window panels in this chamber should display the history of South Australia in chronological order in leadlight. I think that it would be great if we started off with our indigenous past and have the dreaming in one panel, followed by Proclamation Day, and then, for example, the first German settlement, which came to South Australia and settled at Klemzig and Felixstow, in my electorate, and, of course in the electorate of the member for Torrens. They could also display successive waves of migration. They could include something about the centenary of women getting the vote, which we celebrated in 1994. There could be a panel for that. There should be a panel for other migrants.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We could have one on Graham Gunn.

Mr SCALZI: The minister says that there should be a panel for the Hon. Graham Gunn. I am serious. This is the people's house. There should be a demonstration that this chamber belongs to the people. It would not be too much to have a panel displaying our history in chronological order. I was told that, at one stage, the Italian community wanted to do a mosaic in Centre Hall and replace the vinyl. We were told that the vinyl could not be replaced because it was heritage. I am pleased to see now that the vinyl has been covered by a decent carpet.

Next year, when we celebrate the sesquicentenary, we can celebrate our achievements. We were the first place in the world to give women the right to vote and stand for parliament. England did not do it until 1926; Italy (where I was born), until after the Second World War; and Switzerland in the 1960s. South Australia was one of the first places to give women property rights in the late 1800s when women were considered to be the property of their husbands. We

were the first place to establish the Torrens title, as well as indigenous land rights and the custody of children in the 1930s.

This parliament has a lot to be proud of. I think that if we celebrated those things in leadlight within those blank windows, it would really tell us next year that we are celebrating a great democracy. I said that on Wednesday 19 July 1995. I would like us to consider that again. It would not cost us much, and it would be a great achievement if we recognised what South Australia is made of.

AIR WARFARE DESTROYERS

Mr SNELLING (Playford): The member for Reynell somewhat stole my thunder, but I also rise to welcome the announcement of the federal government that South Australia is to be the place where the new air warfare destroyers will be built. This announcement is welcomed in my electorate, and provides a great comfort to many of my constituents that there will be good jobs for their children in South Australia well into the future. The contract, of course, is worth \$6 billion, and represents a total of 3 000 additional direct and indirect jobs in South Australia. The state will undertake the final assembly of the ships, as well as contributing to the systems integration and electronics that will be required in these new ships. As the member for Torrens says, it is a huge contract. It stands not just on its own but also, hopefully, it will be the beginning of a shipbuilding industry in this state.

The government is to be congratulated for the huge investment it has made in order to win this contract—amounting to, I understand, \$140 million. That includes: the building of a ship lift; providing 30 hectares of land for subcontractors to set up their operations on-site; a new on-site maritime skill centre (and this centre will provide a skilled work force to work on the site); \$8 million to attract people from interstate and overseas to the state with those skills that will be required; and a centre for excellence in defence industry systems capability that will be a partnership between the government, the DSTO (Defence Science and Technology Organisation) and Uni SA. This will add to our capacity to provide the complex electronics systems that will be needed for these new ships.

So, I congratulate all those involved. I thank the federal government for its show of confidence in South Australia and to all those involved in attracting the project—particularly Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce and his team, which worked so hard to bring this project into South Australia. I think it will be one of the biggest things to happen in this state probably since the start of Roxby Downs, so this is a huge coup for the state, and I congratulate all those involved.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

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

That Ms Trish White be appointed to the committee in place of Mr Snelling, resigned.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: SUPPRESSION ORDERS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I move:

That the report of the Legislative Review Committee on an Inquiry into Section 69a of the Evidence Act 1929—Suppression Orders be noted.

I am speaking in relation to a report of the Legislative Review Committee into the question of suppression orders. This relates to the broader issue of whether justice is done to those people accused of crimes by the current arrangements in relation to reporting such things. At present, it is not easy to get a suppression order unless there is a reason which goes to the very heart of our justice system. It may be that the name of children, for example, is suppressed because it is appropriate for them to grow into adulthood without having records as either victims or criminals. It is not sufficient these days to get a suppression order if one merely faces embarrassment or hardship to members of one's family. The fact is that if one is named in the press for the commission of a crime the allegation tends to stick. For an innocent person, one can appreciate that that would cause a lot of embarrassment.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: The retraction is often a lot smaller.

Mr HANNA: As the Minister for Transport interjects, if there is ever a retraction, apology or clarification relating to the innocence of such a person, it is in extremely small print and given nowhere near the same prominence. The Legislative Review Committee looked at the current situation extensively. There was an extremely fierce reaction from members of the media. They even flew in a barrister from Sydney to argue the case for greater disclosure and fewer limits on what can be printed about accused people.

At the end of the day, the Legislative Review Committee, a committee which has representatives of four different parties on it, felt that there was a very good case for greater restriction on the printing of people's names when they are accused of a crime. It is our belief that these restrictions should apply until conviction in a court, which might be due to a guilty plea or a finding of guilt by a judge or a jury, and that at that point it would be appropriate to publish the names, etc.

It must be borne in mind that there would be nothing under this regime to stop the publication of details about the crime itself, the location of the crime or perhaps even the victim of the crime, so long as the identification of the accused was not given away. Obviously, there are some grey areas at the edges, but if this is adopted by the parliament there will be much greater justice for those accused of crimes; not only the accused but also their families and those associated with them in other ways.

The Legislative Review Committee makes these recommendations to the parliament. I note that this government is not well known for its reformist approach; however, this is a matter in which justice could be done through legislative reform. On behalf of the Legislative Review Committee, I can only urge the government to take up the recommendations put forward by the committee.

Motion carried.

MARKETING OF SMALL FOOD PRODUCERS AND PROCESSORS

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): I seek leave to move my motion in an amended form by including the matters mentioned in notices of motion Nos 4 to 8.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: I move:

That this house establish a select committee to examine ways of helping small South Australian owned—

- (a) manufactures of fresh dried and other value-added (exotic and indigenous) fruit products;
- (b) producers and processors of aquacultural seafood products (both animals and vegetables);
- (c) growers and manufacturers of olives (pickled and oil) products;
- (d) manufacturers of cheese and other extended shelf-life dairy products;
- (e) manufacturers of fresh dried and other value-added fungus products; by—
 - (i) identifying existing and potential markets for such products of various styles in those countries, regions and sub-regions elsewhere in the world in which these products are presently consumed;
 - (ii) determining ways in which this industry sector can obtain the support of the three South Australian universities;
 - (iii) the application of appropriate rigor to analysis of—
 - (i) those markets;
 - (ii) their existing and potential demand for each of these products;
 - (iii) types of packaging;
 - (iv) grading; and
 - (v) pricing policies;

which will maximise penetration of these products in those markets for South Australian based manufacturers, growers and producers, whilst also ensuring and enhancing profitability.

I am cognisant of the desire of other members to debate the measures that they have on notice as well, and have agreed with them to facilitate that by truncating the amount of time spent on these motions by relying on the measure that we have all just agreed to.

In doing so, I do not want the house to think for a moment that that detracts from the importance of us as a chamber in the parliament of South Australia giving our close attention to these new industries which, collectively, will establish us not just as the place where we do smart information technology type industries and other advance technology industries in manufacturing, such as we have demonstrated our ability to do in the announcement that we won the air warfare destroyer contract, but also to provide people who wish to work outdoors and with living things and value adding to those living things the opportunity to do that with excellence, as well, and to ensure then that they can do that with confidence that they have access to world markets, which as small producers they would not have.

What we as elected representatives must do here is not just remember that we are here to listen to the submissions put to us by representatives of existing industries about how we can help those industries expand their export markets and enhance their efficiency of productivity, and so on, but also where there is no present existing industry and therefore no existing advocacy, on behalf of that industry examine the opportunities which the establishment of such an industry would provide for South Australians who like to work and do things with excellence, and in the process of so doing like also to work with living things that are the base from which they begin.

The analogy that I have often mentioned in this place in previous parliaments and in earlier sessions in this parliament is the industry of aquaculture which simply did not exist other than for a few trout in a couple of dams at Kersbrook at the time I was first elected to this place. It is now worth hundreds of millions of dollars to our economy because of my determination to make it possible to establish that industry. Of course, you always go where you are going to get the biggest critical mass in the fastest possible time, and in the case of aquaculture I chose that as a result of research I did on that in late 1973 and throughout 1974 when, by chance, I had a very lame left wing—it was in a sling most of that time being reconstructed to make it what it is today. I had plenty of time to do that research work.

It made it clear to me that there was a huge need emerging internationally to go away from reliance upon wild stock, in this case fisheries, but in the case of these other products that I mention in all these motions, it is not so much fisheries in the wild stock but a good many other things upon which we have been relying in either backyard-scale production or wild stock to provide us with what we have chosen to produce ourselves for our own consumption. In all these instances, every product range that I mention is currently being imported into Australia to the tune of several millions of dollars. So, there is a local market yet to be supplied.

If the select committee that I trust the house will agree to establish can identify the mechanisms suggested through the analysis that it does of each of these products in the fashion suggested in the motion, then we will come up with a bigger range of products that can be produced here and sold profitably overseas.

More importantly, by way of recommendation, we will provide for the government the means whereby it will be possible for those smaller producers to aggregate their efforts under a quality assurance program and to target them to markets properly identified in the aggregated form, using a generic South Australian label as part of the identification and badging. This is not a new idea. Over the last 25 years, we have come to understand how important that this be done more and more. The dairy industry understood it, as would the member for Mawson. Those in the industry thought about it initially but then realised the stupidity of remaining separate from each other and competing for overseas markets against each other to the detriment of the very people they were trying to help through their cooperative effort—namely, the dairy farmers themselves.

If we are to establish these industries successfully rather than simply relying upon products our forebears brought here at the time of European settlement, we need to listen to indigenous citizens, their descendants and academics with some understanding of these matters. We should also listen to what those presently engaged in small-scale production and those with expertise in the universities can tell us about the market for those products in different countries and cultures around the world. For that reason, I have put this proposition before the house.

We need to examine separately opportunities, and I refer not only to small businesses but to large corporate businesses, which are already looking after the things they can do. Over the years, they have bought out and aggregated many small producers, the products of many of which, including the manufacturing and value adding industries, have been taken interstate and away from South Australia, where the reputation for excellence was first established. I refer to canned fruit, jam, honey, cheeses, and so on. It is the South Aust-

ralian reputation that has given those brand names in their conventional markets, particularly in Europe, the high standing they enjoy. We not only produce the best wine in the world—and it is second to none—but we also could and should produce the best cheese.

Let us look at the product ranges to which I have drawn attention in motion No. 3, namely, fresh exotic and indigenous fruit (that is, fruits indigenous to Australia and already eaten by indigenous people). We do not eat persimmons, but a huge market for them exists in north-eastern China, Korea and Japan, and it is far bigger than our market for apples in Europe (which we lost) prior to the Suez Canal being blocked in 1967. We used to send something in the order of 6 million bushels of apples a year into the European market. I give the example of persimmons. The amount we could grow and sell into east Asia and into markets around the world (in high-class hotels, for example) would be well in excess of our previous market for apples. Fresh, ripe persimmons are a seasonal product, and they cannot be grown in the northern hemisphere at the same time as they are available from our orchards. Muntries are an example of an indigenous product, and there are a number of others.

I now turn to motion No. 4 and draw the house's attention to the products to which I refer—namely, aquaculture seafood products, both animal and vegetable. I refer not only to vertebrates and pelagic fish but also to invertebrates—that is, crustaceans, sea cucumbers and so on. We have the best range of species to be found anywhere in the world, and we ought not to exploit the wild stock, other than to establish the market, collect the strains and put them into aquaculture. We need research on that. The market already exists—again, in east Asia. I also refer to the sea lettuce, sea cabbage and other forms of algae used in the production of sushi and kim. Every year, we import several tonnes for consumption by our migrant communities from Japan and Korea. It is a very high value product, and we could produce it ourselves.

In motion No. 5 I refer to pickled olives and their oil. This product, too, would enable us to provide the means whereby small growers could sell their olives fresh, or crushed to produce oil, and label them with a common identifying label. Of course, the producer's name could be on the label, but it should be given the South Australian badge. As long as it complies with quality criteria established by an independent panel of judges, such as might be used in olive oil, wine or cheese tasting, the product could be given an appellation and sold according to its description.

Motion No. 6 refers to cheese and other extended shelf-life dairy products, such as yogurt. Currently, these are still not exported, even though the quality we produce would enable us to compete very successfully against France and New Zealand, if only those who take the trouble to manufacture small quantities of such very high-quality dairy products were able to aggregate the product and sell it into those markets that are buying it.

It does not have to go to Europe; it just has to go where people who eat cheese want high-quality, safe, extended shelf life dairy product that is not yet been produced with any reputation in places like China, where dairy products are being produced in greater quantity and consumed locally. They will never have enough for their own purposes in China. We can supply those markets if we set out to do so, with not the bulk but the top end of the market as far as quality goes. In motion No. 7, I have referred to seeds and other non-cereal grain products. Again, they are things like wattle seed as well as natural peppers that occur in our indigenous plants that

give us high-quality products that are second to none anywhere in the world and safe to eat. Of course, they contain very high levels of very desirable ingredients naturally occurring in them such as Omega-3 oils, and the like, in what we could be growing in, say, linseed.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Hear, hear!

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: I thank the minister for his endorsement of my concern to establish that kind of product. It will bring the price down locally with a higher quality standard by virtue of the fact that we enable greater quantities to be produced that supply both local and overseas markets. That also goes for fresh and dried value-added fungus products, that is, mushrooms and the like. Mushrooms of one kind alone are not the be all and end all. There is a great variety of fungi that people eat, and would significantly reduce the levels and incidence of cancer, not only in our population, if we were to enhance our consumption of them and give up a bit of red meat in the process of doing so, and the meals would be just as tasty, but, the rest of the world seeks this kind of product, and it can only be done by family based industries. I thank the house for its attention.

Time expired.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Sir, with your indulgence I seek a point of clarification. Motion No. 13 is worded identically to the motions that the member has just joined together, though talking about the different product. I wondered why motion No. 13 has not been incorporated with those, and possibly motion No. 12. Although the wording may be different it seeks to do the same thing.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Notwithstanding what might be seen by some as difficulties with standing orders, I thank you for allowing the member for Torrens to indulge her curiosity and me to respond to it. Motions 12 and 13 I propose to amalgamate; however, the product is different. It is a liquid, and it has separate and different expertise, in relation to the honourable members who might ultimately be elected to it, to that which would be required for all the others, and there is an existing industry in the case of the wine industry. Hence, my reason for leaving those two motions out of the proposition for which I had leave to amalgamate the six—separate committees, separate products, separate thrusts required.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I wish to speak in support of the member for Hammond's motion. Basically, he is looking to achieve—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You voted in favour of a select committee on the intersection between paedophilia and the Eugene McGee case.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Have you finished? As I was saying, I am speaking in support of the motion put forward by the member for Hammond in looking to amalgamate the those six different motions into one to form one select committee in investigating those separate areas of interest. The Liberal Party was prepared to actually support each individual motion. The Liberal Party sees a real need for the further development of market research for a number of our primary production products, particularly those mentioned. I will also read those out.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: They are: fresh dried and other value added exotic and indigenous fruit products; aquacultural seafood products (both animals and vegetables);

olives (pickled and oil); cheese and other extended shelf-life dairy products; seeds and other non-cereal grain products; and, finally, fresh dried and other value-added fungus, which I presume are mushrooms and the like. As I said, the Liberal Party certainly believes that there is a real need to further develop and research our overseas markets for these, what you could call, non-commodity primary products.

The government has certainly slipped well behind in its development in these areas, particularly at a time when our primary production represents 63 per cent of the state's GDP. Some primary producers are finding it difficult to remain viable. We are faced with some quite serious seasonal conditions, obviously, with the lack of rainfall this year. For a lot of primary producers, considering that interest rates are forecast to increase somewhere around the 9 per cent mark, it is vitally important for the state's continued prosperity that additional markets are found, particularly overseas.

I commend the member for Hammond for bringing these matters to the house. I know that the member for Hammond has a lifelong interest in the primary production pursuits of the state. He grew up on a horticultural property in the Adelaide Hills, and all his life has been involved in one way or another in agricultural, horticultural and other primary production pursuits. The member for Hammond and I initially came from the same district in the Hills, and my parents maintain links to the Lewis family.

This is an important issue. As I said, we were prepared to support each of the separate motions that the member for Hammond brought to the house. If the formation of a large number of select committees on ways to develop and promote those initiatives of the member for Hammond appear necessary, that is certainly in the absence of any real commitment from the Rann Labor government, and I know that other members on this side of the house will look to speak on that particular issue. We support the establishment of one select committee in pursuing these initiatives and, as listed on each one of these motions, by 'the application of appropriate rigour to the analysis of those markets; the existing and potential demand for each of these products; types of packaging; grading; and pricing policies, which will maximise penetration of South Australian (products) in those markets for South Australian based producers, whilst also ensuring and enhancing profitability'.

I represent an area of the state that, arguably, has the highest potential for producing primary industry products. The Adelaide Hills is one of the highest rainfall areas in the state. The majority of its parts has very good soil, and access to water is very good. It takes me to another point—and it is a related issue—that we need always to be mindful of the particular developments that take place in the Adelaide Hills, because if you allow certain developments to take place you will destroy the prosperity of the Adelaide Hills by diminishing its chances of continuing as a prime primary producing area. We are going through a current debate with the prescription of the Western Mount Lofty Water Catchment Area, and I have spoken about that issue in the house previously. If we continue with ever-increasing restrictions on water resources available to primary producers in the Hills, we will end up with the Hills producing nothing, which is certainly not in the best interests of the economic prosperity of the state. So, the member for Hammond is correct in bringing the matter to the house and we are pleased to support those initiatives.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I, too, rise to support the motions of the member for Hammond, and I am pleased that he has

sought to make this a cognate because I think it would be too unwieldy to have committee after committee meeting and, whilst many of these things are different, the aim in increasing exports is clearly there. Normally, I think the argument could be put very clearly that all these issues should be handled by a government agency, and that the government is there to do the bidding of the industries, or to assist the industries. It was certainly the case very clearly under the previous Liberal government when we set up Food for the Future and the premier's economic development forums; and we had many overseas exhibitions to help promote South Australian products and exports. What was the result of that? In simple terms, we saw our economic prosperity escalate at a phenomenal rate. In fact, exports grew rapidly from \$3 890 million in 1993-94, when we took government, to \$9 104 million in 2001-02, when we left government. So, it went from nearly \$4 million to over \$9 million in that time. It was a phenomenal increase, and we had some uncertain years during that period, too.

It was positive that the newly elected government said that it also wanted to triple exports, and we applauded that. But what has happened? The reverse has occurred. Unfortunately, exports have continued to reduce, and we have not even started to feel the effects of the drought that is now upon us. I shudder to think about what is going to happen in the next year or two because the effects of the drought will suddenly enter the equation as well.

Why has that happened? It is fairly clear: because Australia's exports have continued to go up in most cases but South Australia's have gone down. It is very clear that the government has virtually washed its hands of exports and said 'Look, that's for the private sector to undertake. We won't interfere in that.' So, the Food for the Future has gone by the bye. I guess that some people might say 'But hang on, the 13 or 14 economic development boards are there,' but most of us would appreciate that their role is not to seek to do the things that are envisaged in these motions. They are not there to seek to identify the markets. Rather, the economic development boards are there to get private companies, before they are entitled to any assistance, to assess what the markets are and to undertake business plans.

You cannot blame the economic development boards for not having done their job. It is very much a case of the government not leading but leaving it to the industry, and the industry does not have the wherewithal to undertake the work that should be done. It is a tragedy, in one sense, that as a result of the government's ineptitude this parliament is being asked by the member for Hammond to undertake the very basic job of examining ways of helping small South Australian-owned manufacturers of a variety of goods, namely: fresh, dried and other value-added (exotic and indigenous) fruit products; aquaculture seafood products; olives; cheese and other extended shelf-life dairy products; seeds and other non-cereal grain products; and fresh, dried and other value-added fungus products.

As a person who has been very upset with the lack of attention being given to his electorate, I can see this is being reflected throughout the state and we as a parliament have to take up the issue and say that, if the government is not going to do it, we have to do it. I am not on a select committee at present but I do not particularly want to serve on a select committee. There is plenty for me to do in my electorate between now and the next election, and I am sure other members may say that too. The irony is that government departments are there, public servants are there to do this job,

but they are not being given the instructions by the government. They are not being sent overseas. They are not actively liaising with the small manufacturers to help them in every way possible.

In fact, I remember about two years ago the Treasurer said that no longer will the state government be giving assistance to companies, to industries, compared to what the Liberals had been doing. He said that those days were over. I had to smile a little yesterday when the Premier announced the winning of the shipbuilding contract—which was excellent news—but apparently the government is giving assistance there, so maybe the Treasurer has been overruled: I do not know. I will let the government work that one out.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Again he was wrong, as the member for Morphett interjects. It could well be. Whatever the case, I do not see us having a choice but to support these select committees. Why the government will not take the initiative itself I do not know, particularly since it wanted to follow the same path as the previous (Liberal) government, which was well on the way to tripling exports. In fact, the figures indicate that, since we left office in the 2002-03 period, exports were down in the following year, 2003-04, by \$143 million. That is a huge fall and I believe it has got worse, although I did not have time to get the figures before this debate. Other members might be able to provide them.

Again I say that, with the drought looming, things are only going to get worse. You would think that the government would go out of its way to assist, rather than saying 'You, the parliament, can take over. You do the darn work. We don't have enough initiative to do that.' It is also rather tragic, as has been identified, that there are something like 1 800 extra public servants. What are they doing? Where are their resources being used? We certainly have the availability of man and woman power out there: it is just not being used. I, likewise, support the motions moved by the member for Hammond that have now become a cognate in the main, with the exception of the one on wineries.

I am pleased that the member for Torrens also sought clarification on that, because I was wondering why that was not incorporated. I am prepared to accept the member for Hammond's answer on that score.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In the light of the leave given in relation to the incorporation of the products that were notices of motion nos 4 to 8 into notice of motion no. 3, which has been moved and now adjourned, notices of motion 4 to 8 are now withdrawn.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES TRIBUNAL

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond):I move:

That this house establish a select committee to examine the role and function of the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Tribunal and, in particular, to—

(a) examine the statutory ambit of its responsibilities, the manner and form of its processes, and the method of its appointment;

(b) expand those responsibilities to embrace all the allowances, emoluments and salaries paid to—

- (i) judiciary;
- (ii) senior state public servants;
- (iii) members of parliament, their staff and servants;
- (iv) members of each of the local government bodies, their staff and servants;

to ensure that they are consistent with commonwealth members of parliament and their staff, and commonwealth government agencies, departments and other servants, and the provisions of the commonwealth Income Tax Act, Rules and Regulations; and

(c) determine if a method of appointment to the tribunal might be better determined by a ballot of all elected members of state parliament and local government from a list of candidates which are to be nominated (to a maximum of three candidates) by each of the following, the—

- (i) Executive Council;
- (ii) House of Assembly;
- (iii) Legislative Council; and
- (iv) Executive Committee of the South Australian Local Government Association.

The reasons for my doing that are manifold. There are just so many inadequacies at present in the methods we use for determining salaries paid to the groups of people to which I have referred in paragraph (b). But before we even get to look at that, we ought first to examine the function of the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Tribunal at present, and whether the statutory structure and responsibility determining that function is appropriate. Regardless of whether we do these other things, we need to look at that and, having looked at it, make recommendations about any change we believe might be undertaken in that role and function.

We will have done that through the framework of the responsibilities that are described for that tribunal and the manner and form of its processes—often processes which are undertaken and determined on their own motion, and I think that is wrong. I do not think that that tribunal can be expected to do the job it has been appointed to do without giving it a better understanding of what we, as the legislators, intend should be its responsibilities. At present it seems to me to be far too whimsical. Having looked at its responsibilities, we need to look at the manner and form of those processes that arise under those responsibilities as they stand at present.

Having done that, it would be ridiculous in coming to conclusions about those two elements without then addressing the method of its appointment. At the present time, it is too much a matter for the Premier to think of between when he asks for a cup of tea in the morning and when he gets that cup of tea three minutes later. There is no other time available to a Premier, yet it is the Premier, as the head of Executive Council, who really has those responsibilities at the present time. The Premier, of course, cannot go into the detail of the manner and form of the processes the committee must exercise.

The Premier delegates it to someone on his personal staff in his office to come up with what might be an analysis of how best to handle it, and I think that is wrong. It ought to be undertaken by elected representatives of the parliament, and, in turn, those are people who are accountable to the rest of the community through the ballot box. There is no better way, in my judgment, than to get ourselves as members of parliament a bit of a wriggle on, and to take up those responsibilities so that we are not told by Executive Government here in the parliament what we will or will not get and how it will be determined by an independent tribunal.

An independent tribunal that is appointed by the Premier and the executive will, of course, not do things that would be likely to offend the executive of the day. Even if they were likely to do it, it is not proper or reasonable for us to sit on our hands and expect that from the Premier. Even though the premiers in succession throughout my lifetime have had the ability they do not have the time, and it is not reasonable to expect them to give consideration to the matters that are

embodied in the work that is already undertaken by this agency of government.

We should take that responsibility ourselves, and tell that tribunal what its manner and form in process ought to be; and we, as members of the parliament (in this house at least) in our part in making the law ought to review the method of its appointment and make that clearer in the legislation than is currently the case. Having therefore dealt with paragraph (a), I look at the second part and say, 'Well, within all that framework, this committee should examine the benefits that could be derived from using that very professionally constructed and properly instructed tribunal to look at all the salaries that need to be set outside the ambit of normal Public Service salary determination.'

At present senior public servants have their salaries set by virtue of an enterprise bargain, if you like, between themselves and the minister, and what sort of a bargain is that? If you have a senior public servant and you want that person to perform and you are the minister, you are going to be very embarrassed if you tell him or her that they are not worth what they believe they are worth. You, as the person in the role of minister, will have difficulty getting that senior public servant, as the head of the department or head of the division within the department, to perform if you have already caused them some petty offence; whereas if this tribunal had that responsibility, there is no question about the fact that they could not argue with the outcome, even if they are before the tribunal that they must argue for their enterprise bargain rather than to each minister and to the executive. It is not something that we should ask our treasurers to do. It is not something that we should ask our Premier to do. It is not something that we should ask cabinet to do.

It is something we should ask a properly constructed tribunal and a properly instructed tribunal to do. We should be doing it for those categories that I have referred to—the judiciary, the senior state public servants, and members of parliament (we are already tagged to the national parliamentary salaries determinations made in Canberra, and I think that is entirely sensible and appropriate). We are people who should have no less ability and no less accountability to the electorate than they have, and our salary needs to be set accordingly. I am not in favour of seeing the states being in any sense inferior by \$1 000 or \$2 000 in the way in which members of parliament are paid. Just because the nature of the constitutional responsibilities varies does not mean that the responsibility is ultimately diminished. Just because we are part of a federation does not mean that the responsibility in some way is diminished. It is not.

I therefore look at the role of the salaries and allowances tribunal in the context of, for members of parliament, where it currently resides—that is, looking at the allowances, not the salary. The allowances for the various things, including rates of pay to select committees and the like, ought to be set by that tribunal. It should be a full-time professional tribunal, and if it is doing those things it ought to do it for the staff of members of parliament and/or servants of members of parliament.

Equally, in the fourth category, I include the members of each of the local government bodies. Go and listen to what ratepayers think. Go and listen to what the elected representatives (the members of those councils themselves) think and say, and determine, local government body by local government body, in the context of that properly constituted entity (the council), what their councillors ought to be paid and what their staff ought to be paid.

Let me say right here and now, although I know I will be castigated by the CEOs of most of the local government bodies around the state, that I think they are overpaid. There are several CEOs of local government bodies in this state who have had their rates of pay historically fixed in relation to the amount of rate revenue—who delight in increasing rates of revenue, one assumes. More particularly, they are being paid at rates greater than the amount being paid to the nation's Prime Minister, and that is outrageous and stupid. The whole system needs to be reviewed. Currently, the small number of elected representatives on those councils who come up for re-election (it has been every three years and we are just in the process of reexamining that as a parliament) do not feel competent enough in what they do, I am sure, to argue the case in making an enterprise bargain with their CEO. The whip hand is the CEO and the whip is in that hand, and it is the CEO who is driving the elected representatives rather than the other way around, all too often—although maybe not in every instance.

It is not only the CEOs about whom I am concerned because underneath the CEO is a staff structure so, whatever the CEO gets, the second and third string of middle management all the way down the line see themselves as needing to get a proportion of the same amount. That, again, is a ridiculous amount. It ought to relate to what those same people would get if they were to sell their professional skills, abilities and energies on the open market in some other sector of the economy.

So, we need to do that to ensure that there are consistencies with what is done here and what is done in the nation at the national level, and that there are consistencies between those rates of pay and the allowances and so on and the commonwealth income tax rules and regulations.

Furthermore, on careful analysis of the whole problem, we should not walk past and ignore the current method of appointment where it is all too often seen as something that could be done to give a job to someone who is a nuisance, or whatever. I do not imply that that is what all members of the tribunal are seen to be at the current time. I am just saying that that is the kind of thing that involves jobs to be dish out, and I think that is wrong. I think the executive council itself should nominate some people who can be balloted on, as should this chamber, as should the Legislative Council and as should the executive committee of the South Australian Local Government Association. Collectively, then, by ballot through the post, we receive the names and CVs of the candidates who have been nominated and elect them for the tribunal by a secret ballot. It is not at all difficult. It is very easy and very simple to do. It would not take the Electoral Commissioner more than a few hours every year to do that.

It would provide a far more satisfactory composition of the tribunal, and the tribunal would know that it is accountable to not only the parliament but also the people who have themselves been elected to office and whose decisions and activities will be affected by the way in which the tribunal does its work. Why so? Because if the tribunal fails in its duty, there will be a lack of attraction to the office for which they are determining the salaries and allowances to candidates who are appropriately qualified to fill those offices, whether they are candidates seeking election by the wider public and ratepayers for those offices or, more particularly, people who have applied for the jobs on the bench, in the Public Service at the senior level, to work with members of parliament and to work for local government, the ratepayers and the people who live in their respective localities.

It is for that reason that I commend the proposition to the house and trust that the house understands the ambit of my concern and the desire that I have to see the problem addressed through this mechanism.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member for Hammond this: in his motion when he refers to the parliamentary salaries allowances tribunal, does he mean the remuneration tribunal?

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Yes, I do.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you wish to seek leave to amend it and move it in an amended form?

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Yes, I am appropriately chastised. I seek leave accordingly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: My purpose was not to chastise you but just not to have a motion that gets up to investigate a tribunal that does not exist.

Leave granted; motion amended.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

WINERIES, SMALL

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): I seek leave to move this motion cognately and in combination with motion No. 13 next on the Notice Paper in my name, as it relates to the same industry and products.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: I move:

That this house establish a select committee to examine ways of helping small wineries which crush less than 2 000 tonnes per annum, to enter the export market and determine how to provide a cost neutral/cost recoverable Government sponsored structure which complies with ISO 9200 standards or similar, and thereby establish for them an internationally acceptable criteria for the determination of quality with terminology, which provides for standardised description of their products.

That this house establish a select committee to examine ways of helping small South Australian owned wineries which crush less than 2 000 tonnes per annum, to enter the export market by—

- (a) identifying existing and potential markets for wine of various styles in those countries, regions and sub-regions elsewhere in the world in which wine is presently consumed;
- (b) determining ways in which this industry sector can obtain the support of the three South Australian universities;
- (c) the application of appropriate rigour to analysis of—
 - (i) those markets;
 - (ii) their existing and potential demand for each of the styles and descriptions of wine;
 - (iii) types of packaging;
 - (iv) grading; and
 - (v) pricing policies;

which will maximise penetration of South Australian wine in those markets for South Australian based producers, whilst also ensuring and enhancing profitability.

Again, it is through a process of a select committee that I suggest we should examine ways of helping small wineries, which at the present time make up well over three-quarters of the number of wineries in this state, to enter the export market and determine how to provide a cost neutral or cost recoverable government-sponsored structure which would comply with the ISO 9200 standard or similar and thereby establish for those wineries internationally acceptable criteria for the determination of the quality of their products with respect to terminology which provides for a standardised description thereof.

Further, those wineries which crush less than 2 000 tonnes per annum are thereby assisted to enter the export market by identifying the existing and potential markets for wine (of various styles in those countries, regions and sub-regions

elsewhere in the world in which wine is presently consumed) and determining ways in which this industry sector can obtain the support of the three South Australian universities to assist them in entering the export market by the application of appropriate rigour and analysis of the markets themselves and of their existing and potential demand for each of the styles and descriptions of wine in those segregated markets (so identified) and the types of packaging that might best be used to get the wine to the ultimate consumers in those markets, as well as the grading (to which I referred earlier in the now amalgamated motion) and the way in which pricing policies might best be determined for the appellation of the grade within the styles of the wine which is offered for sale. Through such a mechanism we will maximise, I believe, the penetration of South Australian wine into those markets for our smaller South Australian-based producers whilst ensuring and enhancing their profitability.

I will deal with the last statement first. As it stands, the large number of small wine producers in South Australia are now facing a wipeout. A very large proportion of that large number will simply not survive what is being referred to as a glut. The glut itself is not so much of high-quality wine; rather, it is a glut of the supply of that wine (an excess of it) to the current narrow target market. That narrow target market in the main is what spontaneously rolls up on their doorstep and what they can otherwise find by jumping in the car with a few cases of wine in the back and running off to see whether they can flog it to restaurants and/or specialist bottle shops.

Why do I see this as a problem right now? There are several reasons. There is at present a great quantity of wine (much greater than ever before) coming onto the market from these small producers. There is no great increase in the number of customers for that amount of wine or the amount which they can consume if they are going to stay alive. Also, we see a rationalisation occurring in the wholesaling and retailing of that wine. Sure, they can get around the wholesaling by doing their own distribution and wholesaling it themselves, but that is not an efficient way to do it. They ought to aggregate. I do not know whether the committee would report on any such things.

Notwithstanding that, the reason they are losing their penetration is that the number of privately owned wine shops—liquor stores, if you like—is diminishing very rapidly. To survive, they have to be very much specialist wine shops in places where there is a large amount of traffic—customer traffic, not vehicular traffic. Why is that so? It is because the retailing outlets and the retailing opportunities are being taken up by large chains. Already we see supermarkets getting licences for the premises they own within shopping centres, through which they are selling far more wine than they would otherwise have been able to sell if they were not there. So, there is an increase in consumption in that respect, but those retailing outlets do not have a separate, discretionary choice of what will go on the shelves in those retail outlets. They are directed as to what wine will sit on their shelves by a single person running beer, wine and spirits or the Woolworths Liquor Stores or Sip'n Save stores.

Of course, the people occupying those positions of responsibility will select the range of wine that, administratively, gives them the simplest and easiest method of keeping their stores well stocked. They will not give a fig for somebody who has only 800 to 1 000 cases of wine to sell. They will not give a fig for somebody who has only 8 000 to 10 000 cases of wine to sell. They will barely give two

minutes to someone who has 80 000 cases of wine to sell. They want someone who can give them a range of wines that can be priced retail from cleanskin, at, say, \$45 a case, up to \$36 000 a case, at the top end—that is, in the case of dry red wine, it might be in the order of \$50 a dozen for cleanskins to \$35 000 or \$36 000 a dozen for Grange. I am sure that you understand what I am talking about, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The sad thing is that all the small wine producers, who do so much to keep up the standard and range of and interest in wine that give us the excellence we enjoy in this country, and upon which our dining habits rely, will go out of business. They will not have a place in the market. No-one will be able to cope with them. The amount of wine that the very few privately owned wine sellers that are left—such as the Melbourne Street Cellars or Redmonds on Glen Osmond Road—can sell to the public will be so small that they will not be able to take in the stock from each of those small wineries and stack it up. Their floor space forbids it, anyway. They are left with a diminishing number of retail outlets through which they, as small winery owners and producers, can sell.

At present, they do not give sufficient thought to how they can identify, through an internationally accepted system, the standard that they produce. The international market is there. Instead of going broke and going down the gurgler by trying to sell everything at \$5 or \$8 a bottle to get rid of it, their high-quality wines ought to be to a standard that is accepted internationally—that is, they say what they will do, write it down and then do what they say, with random checks and audits of what they are doing. That will be confirmed by the certifying agency. Therefore, if they say it is organic, it is organic, and if they say it is free of this, contains that, or is grown somewhere, it can be relied upon. They have a standard that is accepted internationally.

Further, this committee needs to look at how we as legislators can help and facilitate diversity in our industry and avoid a massive crash and loss of capital. We can do so by recommending to those wineries, through the report from the committee, how to obtain the help of postgraduate students in the universities and how to structure the way in which the producers might go about getting independent appellation of their product so that it can be graded in a way which everybody knows they can rely upon. The customer from overseas can then say, 'This is South Australian's appellation, and it is top line.' It will mean that it is the best gold medal standard and is above 19 points out of 20, if you like, or 95 per cent in terms of excellence, or that it is the second best, the third best, or the fourth best. However, if it is below the fourth best, of course you are on your own, and you are mad to have ever allowed yourself to produce such wine. You should have paid more careful attention to the quality and temperature of the fruit—whether it got too hot, or you exposed it to too much oxygen—and the process by which you allowed fermentation to continue. Any of those sorts of things will result in a fault in the wine, which means that it will not reach even fourth level appellation.

Therefore, I strongly recommend that, as a parliament, we do a great deal to avoid the very adverse consequences of the impending oversupply and undermarketing. It is more a problem of the latter and not the former that now confronts us. I know it will happen. Why? Because it is not in the interests of either the big retailing chains or the big corporate wineries to allow any smaller wineries to remain in existence, as they are a damn nuisance, a burr under the saddle and a worry to them. In the main, the smaller wineries are willing

to put a great deal of time and effort into carefully producing their wine and, having done so, sell it for a much lower price than the large corporations for an equivalent quality.

We as a society will be the poorer, not just because we will miss out on the wide range of interesting, high-quality wines we can enjoy but, more especially, because those producers, when their winery goes broke, will lose their life savings and the means by which they can earn income for themselves and their family. The communities in which they are established will lose the benefit of those families and the incomes they spend at the present time. The wine producing regions will experience a profit transfer away from the families in the regions in which the wine is grown and produced and into the pockets of the people who have the lion's share of the ownership and who live on the north shore of Sydney, in Vaucluse, and so on.

The extremely wealthy in the national community will be those who benefit, as they will receive the profits from the large wine corporations. Sure, some of those profits will go into the managed funds that provide us all with superannuation. Sure, they will find their way into the community in pathways that are different from those at present. But I am saying that, if the regions are to retain their character and value, we must have this mechanism examined. And we must do it: nobody else has the power or authority to call for people and papers and provide the kind of information and feedback to the small wine producers, and the growers who depend on them, in any better form, indeed, nowhere near as well as the parliament can. I thank the house for its attention to my concern and trust that we will avert the disaster that will otherwise overtake us.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PASSENGER TRANSPORT (PROOF OF ENTITLEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Passenger Transport Act 1984. Read a first time.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Over the past 12 months, I have had a number of constituents contact my office about problems with faulty concession stickers on their student ID cards. This is not a huge issue—and I will not take the full 15 minutes to talk about it—unless you are one of the students who gets pinged for a faulty ID card. The problem is, as we should all be aware, that students at TAFE colleges and universities are issued with an identification card for the current year of study. These cards are used not only to show who the students are but nowadays as swipe cards to get into many facilities and buildings. These cards are used frequently and every day by students who are studying in South Australia.

They should not have to worry about the integrity of the cards. They should be able to concentrate on their studies, because they are under enough pressure as it is. But, the problem is that the little silver sticker which is issued by the Office of Public Transport and which is attached to the student ID cards is not as durable as it should be. If students use public transport—and we want students to use public transport: we are spending millions of dollars on new trams, and we have a great bus and train service—if the little silver sticker is faulty in that you cannot read the ink or, worse still, the adhesive has not been doing its job and the sticker has

fallen off, and if the students are approached by an inspector—and we are not encouraging fines evasion in any way shape or form—the inspector looks at the ID card, as is their right and, if it is faulty, the inspector gives students an expiation notice straightaway.

This is the problem. The students do not have any time, not one second: they do not get 24 hours to produce ID proof. But they get an infringement notice straightaway. The infringement notice is initially about \$170 but, under the Invalid Tickets Passenger Transport (Regular Passenger Services; Conduct of Passengers) Regulations 1997, regulation 9, the fine can be up to \$1 250. Some students might have been rorting the system, but this bill is not going to assist them in any way, shape or form. It is aimed at giving students the same rights as the drivers of motor vehicles. Under section 96 of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, the driver of a motor vehicle can produce his or her licence or learner's permit 'within 48 hours after the making of the request at a police station conveniently located for the driver, specified by the member of the police force at the time of making the request'.

I have proposed an amendment that I hope the government will take up. This bill amends the act to allow students using public transport 48 hours to verify their proof of concession. It also makes it reasonable and legally consistent to permit students travelling on public transport the same allowance as is granted to drivers. That is all we ask. We ask no more, no less. I wrote to the then minister for transport, the Hon. Trish White, in November last year, and after a few weeks the wait became very frustrating. It was not that minister's problem: it is just the way bureaucracies work. After a number of weeks we got back a letter stating the following:

Currently the Department of Transport and Urban Planning (Office of Public Transport) produces full-time student concession stickers and supplies them to universities and colleges throughout Adelaide.

There is no argument about that. It continues:

The stickers are silver in colour, available only to full-time students, and are designed to disintegrate when removed from the card to which they are affixed.

There is no problem about that either, because we are not encouraging students to rort the system. We certainly do not want any fraudulent use of the stickers. We just want good, honest, decent South Australian students, as 99.9 per cent of them are, to be given an opportunity for a fair go. Nothing more and nothing less: just a fair go. The minister's the letter continues:

The Office of Public Transport has not received any complaints regarding the stickers dislodging from the cards.

I do not know who is getting the complaints, but I am certainly getting them. I would encourage anyone who reads my speech in *Hansard* or hears about this issue in the media to contact my office, because the complaints that have come to my office have certainly been genuine. This may not be a huge issue, but I do not see why any student should not be given the opportunity to prove their innocence. In the cases that have been brought to me, people were not trying to rort the system: they just want a fair go.

I do not think there is anybody in this place—not one member on either side of the chamber—who does not want people to have a fair go. We have all come into this place to try to make South Australia a better place for people to live their lives. And it is a great place. Look at that fantastic announcement yesterday. South Australia is good; it could be better.

A very small move like this could make life a lot better, and a bit easier for full-time students attending universities and colleges throughout Adelaide. I was contacted initially by a young lady who is studying full-time. She has no money, and she is struggling and working part-time. The sticker was on her ID card. She brought it and showed it to me and, with a bit of detective work, we worked out that the sticker was well and truly valid at the time but that you could not read it because the ink had worn off. The sticker was still there, and there was no problem with the fact that the lady was a full-time student. It did not take much detective work to see that the expiry date was current: it was in February 2005. These cards are used by students not only to identify themselves but they are also used through all the swiping facilities in the university to gain access to facilities within their places of study, and the cards are vital to the students.

I was particularly alarmed when not only was the student given an infringement on allegedly having a faulty ID when it was not—and any sharp eyed inspector would have seen that—but then also to be contacted by another constituent who said that some of the inspectors on trains are targeting and unnecessarily harassing students on the Belair line. This is an allegation that is unproven, but if the students are being harassed by the inspectors these inspectors need to realise that they are there to check on passengers paying their fares, and that those who are eligible for concessions should get them. They are not there to harass, or in any way stand over passengers, and I certainly hope that that is not the case, and that is not a problem that I have had brought to me in the past.

This particular student needed his ID card at uni, he needed it to access various buildings, to access the library facilities, to get into some other laboratories, and some of the other places of study, but what happened? This inspector really stepped over the mark this time. Not only did he issue an infringement notice but he took away the guy's ID card because the silver validity sticker supplied by the office of public transport was on there but, once again, the ink had worn off because they get used frequently. As this constituent said to me, 'It is a very stressful situation, particularly at the time of year when students are doing exams,' which was when this chap came to see me on 12 November last year. I guarantee that inspectors should not be confiscating these ID cards. I would like to see regulations that say that they are allowed to confiscate ID cards. It is bad enough that students are being pinged with fines of anything between \$170 and \$1 250—potentially, if there was a challenge and it went through the court system—and, I suppose, if they were recalcitrant offenders and it was proven then that fine may be a suitable deterrent.

All we want is for students to have a fair go. We want the students to be able to provide some identity—and they have that in the first place, they already have the card—so the inspector can take down the student ID number and the place where they are studying, and this is clearly shown on the ID cards. The one I have here clearly shows that the University of Adelaide issued this card, it has the student ID number on it, it has the student's name on it, and a photograph, so there is no doubt that the student is who they are. These are not being issued fraudulently, and I think that they are fairly difficult to duplicate or manufacture in a full-time manner.

So, there is no doubt about that, and I do not see why it is such a difficult issue to allow students who are under pressure, working part-time in many cases to get themselves through university, having to face exams, having to face the pressures of life that many young people have these days and,

through no fault of their own, either the sticker that is supplied by the office of public transport to the university and put on these ID cards, falls off because of frequent use, or the ink is not up to the wear and tear that it is exposed to. That is all I ask. I ask no more and no less. So far, all I have had is knock-backs from the government. I would have thought that the government that professes to be on the side of the struggling poor would look at this and say, 'This is a crazy situation.' All they want is 48 hours, the same as motor vehicle drivers get to produce their proof of concession, to validate the faulty sticker issued by the office of public transport.

I was very disappointed that the previous transport minister knocked me back on that request, and that is why I have had to introduce this private member's bill. It is going to take a while to get through this place, like everything else—a bit like getting letters back from ministers—they take a while, but I am learning to live with those frustrations. Probably the most frustrating part of this job is the time that things take to get through this place. So, I put the bill before the house. I am not expecting many people to speak on it.

I would like to see the government's view on this. I hope that they view it sympathetically because I do not see why students should be put under this unfair pressure. It is not their fault. If they were doing it fraudulently then that would be picked up because the other details that are on their identification card would soon be verified. Give them the 48 hours as is allowed in the Motor Vehicles Act—nothing more, nothing less—and then everybody could rest easily, and students would not be out of pocket for between \$170 and, possibly, \$1 250. It is an absolutely crazy situation, and I should not have to be sitting up here using 15 minutes of parliamentary time talking about this. It could be fixed with one stroke of the minister's pen by introducing a regulation allowing this. I hope the minister looks at this and sees some sense in this very sensible concession.

Ms BREUER secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LOWER MURRAY RECLAIMED IRRIGATION AREA

Mr RAU (Enfield): I move:

That the second report of the committee on rehabilitation and restructuring of the Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area be noted.

In 2004, the committee travelled extensively along the River Murray in order to familiarise itself with the numerous issues and government programs along the river. It also gave the committee the opportunity to personally meet with those communities directly affected by the river's current state of health and by the programs being implemented to rectify these issues. The Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation's Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area Restructure and Rehabilitation Program is one such government initiative that was raised with the committee on its visits to the region. The committee resolved to examine the program and to consider its impacts on the environment, the irrigators and the communities of the area.

It is consistent with one of the Natural Resources Committee's principal statutory obligations, which is to take an interest and keep under review the protection, improvement and enhancement of the natural resources of the state. By way of background, the Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area refers to approximately 5 200 hectares of flood-irrigated

farms on the River Murray floodplain between Mannum and Wellington. Most of this land is used for dairy farming and the area is a significant producer of milk for the state. Irrigation in the Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area is predominantly in the form of flood irrigation; that is, the opening of sluice gates in levy banks to allow the flow of water from the River Murray into supply channels.

Once the supply channels are filled, the water is allowed to flow across sloping paddocks. The remaining water is then collected in a back drain, the contents of which are discharged back into the river. This form of irrigation in this particular area is not metered. Approximately two-thirds of the study area is government districts, where the land comprising drains and channels is government owned whilst the areas under irrigation are privately owned. Broadly, the department's restructure and rehabilitation program is concerned with reduction in the pollution of the river to meet the Environment Protection Authority requirement of no return of irrigation run-off to the river by the year 2008; more efficient use of water taken out of the river; maintenance of a sound, sustainable, regional economy; and devolving responsibility for the government-owned areas and infrastructure to the irrigators.

This program is funded under the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality Improvement, with some \$22 million being provided for the program. It is estimated that the irrigators will contribute approximately \$2.5 million to the rehabilitation phase of the program. The restructure and rehabilitation program comprises four distinct stages. The first stage consisted of an information program to irrigators, advising them of water allocations, environmental requirements that have to be met, and the terms of any government financial assistance for restructuring, exit or rehabilitation.

The second stage facilitated a period of water trade and restructuring, so that those who wanted to exit could exit and those who saw a future and wanted to expand could buy up their neighbours. As part of this process, the department did not identify those areas that were to be retired. Rather, the decision was left with individual irrigators. As a result, up to 40 irrigators have exited, resulting in 1 500 hectares of land having been released by irrigators wishing to exit the industry. Of that, 500 hectares have been taken up by other irrigators in the area. It has also allowed for 18.6 gigalitres of the area's overall allocation of 67.3 gigalitres to be sold.

The third stage of the program was for the preparation of agreements for rehabilitation work for those irrigators wishing to stay involved in the land. These agreements have now been completed by the irrigators, and the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation is currently in the process of drawing up rehabilitation funding deeds. The final stage of the program will be implementing rehabilitation works agreed to in the rehabilitation funding agreements. The installation of meters, laser levelling and realignment of irrigation channels are some of the capital works that will be required to achieve the key targets, such as water use efficiency of no less than 65 per cent by 30 June 2007 and no return of irrigation run-off to the river by June 2008.

The committee supports the objectives of the restructure and rehabilitation program. Having visited the area twice for the purposes of this inquiry, the committee witnessed at first hand the current state of irrigation infrastructure and fully supports its upgrade to allow for more efficient use of water allocations. The committee is aware of the various water quality issues in the Lower Murray and also fully supports efforts to prevent polluted discharge into the river from those

areas that remain under irrigation. Having established the rationale for the program, the committee was very interested to hear from the irrigators themselves to determine the impacts this program will have on them. Whilst there was an acknowledgment from the irrigators that irrigation practices should be improved, a number of concerns were expressed to the committee.

The irrigators expressed some disappointment regarding the method by which the restructuring program had been communicated to them, with many feeling as though they had not been adequately informed about the process and the expectations on them. Whilst the committee is aware of the consultation program conducted by the department, it acknowledges that consultation from government agencies can make assumptions about the community understanding of government policy and processes and neglect to adequately explain all steps involved. This report therefore recommends that officers from the department liaise closely with irrigators throughout the rehabilitation works phase of the process, including regular attendance at meetings such as those convened by the South Australian Murray Irrigators and Lower Murray Irrigators associations.

The committee also recommends that the department ensure that the community is consulted and kept informed in a transparent, timely and efficient manner in any future dealings throughout this restructure and rehabilitation program or any other programs that necessitate community consultation, and that the community's concerns are addressed appropriately. A major concern to irrigators is the financial impact of this program upon them. Whilst the government funding will cover up to 83 per cent of rehabilitation works on the irrigated properties, the remaining 17 per cent of rehabilitation costs will be contributed by irrigators.

This equates to approximately \$630 per hectare and, to many farmers, it is another expense on the back of a very difficult time for the industry. Notwithstanding its support for efforts to achieve more efficient use of water and to prevent return of drainage to the river, the committee is aware of the financial impact this program will have on landholders who choose to remain in the industry. The committee also believes that the lack of a strategy in relation to which land is or is not retired has further contributed to the remaining irrigators being severely financially disadvantaged.

This report therefore recommends further consideration by the department into additional assistance or financial options being provided to those irrigators unable to meet their share of rehabilitation expenses. Also of concern, both to irrigators and the committee, was the lack of a strategy in relation to which land would be retired and which would remain in active agricultural use. The committee both saw and heard evidence that the retirement of some farms has resulted in patches of disused land interspersed with irrigated land.

The committee is concerned that a lack of consideration appears to be given to the ongoing management and maintenance of land and infrastructure that has been retired as a part of the program. Specifically, the committee is concerned that, without ongoing application of water, some of the retired land may suffer from significant salinity and other degradation problems. The report makes two recommendations in relation to this issue: first, the committee recommends that the department investigate the likelihood of degradation on retired land in the Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area and, if necessary, investigate the sourcing of environmental

water for that land and develop an appropriate management plan for its application.

Secondly, the committee recommends that the department resolve issues relating to the cost of maintaining shared irrigation infrastructure passing by both disused land and irrigated land. The final concern raised by irrigators is ongoing access to the Environmental Land Management Allocation, or ELMA water. ELMA is an allocation of water held by the Minister for Environment and Conservation and is used for land management purposes by irrigators, in particular for the minimisation of the effects of rising saline underground water. The amount of water able to be used per hectare in each of the irrigation districts in the area is determined by the Water Allocation Plan for the River Murray Prescribed Water Course.

The committee recognises the concerns of irrigators regarding the maintenance of current levels of ELMA water. This allocation will be maintained for the life of the current Water Allocation Plan. The committee recognises that key stakeholders, such as irrigators, will be closely involved in all stages of the preparation of the next Water Allocation Plan.

In conclusion, the findings and recommendations of this report have been arrived at in a bipartisan fashion, with each member of the committee recognising the importance of more efficient use of water in the area and less polluted discharge back into the river. Accordingly, the committee supports the objectives of the Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area Program of restructuring and rehabilitation. However, the committee also recognises the importance of the dairy industry in the Lower Murray area to both the regional and state economy. It is mindful of the fact that other industries rely on a vibrant dairy industry. Whilst acknowledging the needs for reforms in irrigation practices in the region, the committee does not wish this to be at the expense of the individual irrigators and small businesses in the region.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those people who contributed to the inquiry. I thank those who made the effort to prepare submissions or to appear before the committee, and the many people who met the committee on its travels and extended it considerable hospitality. I extend my thanks to the members of the committee: Mr Paul Caica, who acted as chair of the committee for some time in an exemplary fashion; yourself, Madam Acting Speaker (Ms Ciccarello); Mr Mitch Williams; and from the other place the Hon. Sandra Kanck, the Hon. Caroline Schaefer and the Hon. Bob Sneath. I also acknowledge the work of the former chair, the Hon. Karlene Maywald, who did an excellent job. Finally, I would like to extend my thanks to the members of the staff of the committee for their assistance. I commend this report to the house.

Mr CAICA (Colton): I will be brief in my comments. I cannot add much more to what has been relayed to the house by our outstanding chair of this committee other than the fact that it is a joy to work on this committee. It is interesting to look at the scope of issues that the committee has tackled to date and intends to tackle into the future. One of the benefits of this committee is getting out to those areas that are the subject of our report and meeting the people who work the land, who have an involvement with the land or who, indeed, are affected by how well that land is managed. A broad range of people are involved.

The simple point I wish to make more than anything else is that the Chairman spoke to the house about the degradation

of that land that has been retired, and he made a very valid point. I believe that one issue has not been properly explored, and the people living within that region have not been provided the opportunity of getting expert advice as to alternatives that may be viable for the use of that land. There is certainly a focus and a perception that it can be returned to its former natural state, as best as possible. Obviously, that will require some water. If this land does not get water it will be further degraded.

Other alternatives for the use of that land that are outside the scope of a particular focus on dairying need to be explored a little more. I am no expert in that area, but, obviously, it is very fertile land and it may be of some benefit to the community in terms of replacing some of the loss to the economy that has occurred through the restructuring of the dairy industry. The point was made by the Chairman that the dairy industry is very important to that region.

Of course, it is an industry that is extremely important to South Australia as a whole. I think that there is the potential there to explore other alternative uses for that land and to look at produce that may be viable. As I said, I do not know what this might be but, surely, there are alternatives which ought to be explored and which can be of benefit not only to the local community but also to the broader South Australian population through an effective use of that land. That is not to say that there are not other sections that ought to be returned to a more natural state, because that is the case. The fact is that water needs to go on there sooner rather than later to ensure one of two things—that is, that we keep that land viable into the future for a proper return to its natural state, or the possibility of its being available for other forms of agricultural or horticultural use.

I also highlight the collaborative approach that has been taken by the committee on this issue and other issues that we have dealt with, and it is a very bipartisan approach to addressing the particular issues before us. I think the committee needs to be congratulated in that regard, because we are all working towards a collective outcome that orientates towards what is in the best interests of South Australians based on the information with which we are being provided.

I conclude by again congratulating our Chairman, who has not been the chair for very long and has not been on the committee for very long but who in that short space of time, as I know the committee would expect from the member for Enfield, has been able to grapple with those issues and get his head around them in a very timely fashion. I commend the report to the house.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I can speak first-hand about what can happen to such land if you do not look after it. I congratulate the committee on its work and findings and note that it was done in a bipartisan way, although I have not yet spoken to my colleagues on the committee about the report. A number of years ago my family and I owned 170 acres of what was I think the only private swamp on the Lower Murray at Wellington. Before we bought that property the previous owner had sold off the licences, and when we took over the property it was in an absolutely disgusting state. This very fragile country was actually below sea level; that is how low it was. On the northern end it was just over one metre below sea level, and on the southern end (and it stretched along the river for about half a kilometre or a bit more) it was 1.7 metres below sea level, so huge amounts of seepage came onto this land. The top third, if not closer to

one half, was very saline and very degraded beyond what you would have thought was a recoverable state. The bottom third to a half was covered in reeds six feet high, thistles and samphire.

The bottom line is that you cannot allow this country to just sit there, and I am glad that the report acknowledges that and that the government is willing to assist farmers in managing this land. It is very fragile country. We were able to recover it for use in dry land farming. We were also able to cut some hay off the bottom end of the block because of the seepage that was coming through, and we grew very good meadow hay without irrigation. So, it certainly can be managed.

Also, it can be grazed. We initially got control of it by turning in nearly 200 head of steers. They were pretty wild steers and they just disappeared into the swamp for a start, and we thought we lost them all and they were on their way to Goolwa. But they ended up coming back and, after a number of months, the fences between the 10 paddocks and the channels started opening up. We had a fellow come in and clean out the channels so that the paddocks would drain, and that certainly helped a lot. In the end, we were able to put in some salt tolerant crops (oats) on the higher paddocks and bring them back to a semblance of a productive state. They were never as productive as they may have been had they been under irrigation for dairying. However, it is very true that there are opportunities on those swamps for other crops and ventures, and the government needs to be careful about how these swamps are managed. It is good to see it is taking a positive attitude towards the management of the Lower Murray swamps.

I understand that 11 dairies have moved out of the swamps, and that has certainly put a bit of pressure on the cheese factory at Jervois. I understand they are now trucking in milk from the South-East. But the Jervois, Woods Point and Wellington communities are terrific communities and need all the support they can possibly get—and I guarantee that the member for Hammond will be able to say a lot more about this than I can.

The report is a positive one. I congratulate the committee on the work it has done in recognising the serious issues that are involved. I understand there were some issues about changes in funding after the present government came to office. Whether or not they have been sorted out I do not know, but I trust the members on the committee—they are fine, upstanding people—and I am sure that the government will manage these swamps in the way they need to be managed, and that is very carefully.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): It was my wish to allow this matter to pass by way of adjournment, but I fear that if I do so the opportunity for me to contribute in this session will never arise. For that reason, I rise now to make some remarks. I commend the committee on what it has done, and I also commend the people who serve the committee for ensuring that the appropriate measure of factual information was put in front of it.

In the first instance, I commend the committee for what it has done, because it has listened to people and it has heard and reported the concerns which they have expressed, such as to be found on page 8 of its report, where it is stated that the committee both saw and heard evidence that the retirement of some farms has resulted in patches of disused land interspersed with currently irrigated land.

The committee is concerned (and I agree, and it is justifiably concerned) that there appears to be—and I can tell the committee that there damned well is—a lack of consideration given to the ongoing management and maintenance of land and infrastructure that has been retired as part of the program. The committee was specifically concerned that, without ongoing application of water, some of the retired land may suffer from significant salinity and other degradation problems.

I can tell the house that there is one other problem, and it is this: where the land is retired in part of the sandwich arrangement that has arisen in consequence of the higgledy-piggledy way in which this has occurred through lack of aptitude on the part of those in government who are responsible for it, the poor beggars who are left to irrigate have to put on far more water than would otherwise be the case, because the water runs out through the cracks onto the unirrigated land immediately adjacent to their bays. And as they go into a metered supply, they will find that the amount of water they have to supply if they use flood irrigation is far and away in excess of what they would be using if everybody was still irrigating cheek by jowl.

It is just not fair. No thought has been given to that by those people who have been in charge of the job of rehabilitation. Why would they bother? Unless a committee like this stirs them up, gives them a good shake-up, they do nothing. They sit down and get their salary every week. That does not mean that the problems suffered by the poor people who live there will go away, because they will not. I am very apprehensive and anxious about the consequences for those folk who live in my electorate. It is very sad that we did not go down the path of doing some of the research that is necessary to determine the most efficient way of using that water to maintain, perhaps, the provision of fodder for dairy cows.

One thing I want to say to every member of the committee is this: at present, it is not necessary to put that water on pasture. You would get just as much feed out of it if you did as I did in two years of research (1966 and 1967) when I buried several lycimeters in what is now known as the Toora swamp in the downstream end of the Mypolonga swamp. I planted vegetable crops there and put in low pressure reticulation spray heads close to the ground, and put the water on about the same rate as it would if it were flooded. It did not end up with any access running off the toe of the swamp into the toe drain to be reused somewhere else on high ground or come back into the river.

This enabled me to understand that, at the right times of the year when there is a greater shortage of fodder than you would get if you were growing lucerne on high ground (in other words, in the wintertime), those swamps should be planted with bulbous vegetable crops: carrots, beetroot, turnips, swedes and radishes. They could be densely sown so that they could be harvested at a small diameter, very early in their growing cycle, while they are tender and full of flavour, and then graded. The perfect ones would be blanched, frozen and sold around the world very profitably and cheaply. Any vegetable that had any imperfection in it at all (whether it be beetroot or carrot) would go straight into a flail type masher (a hammer mill) and turned into fodder for the cows along with the foliage.

There would be a large amount of offtake that you would get after you crushed the carrots and the beetroot for juice for human consumption and left the residue to dry. Beetroot is higher in antioxidants and vitamin C than blackcurrant juice. You would not only get a very high value first phase product

that you could sell for human consumption, but you would be left with as much feed as you would need to feed the same number of cows as you would if you were just growing grass and letting them graze on it. However, they did not do that trial, they could not wait, and I could not get any support from anywhere to do it.

A trial would have examined the mechanism by which we distribute the water through line ahead lateral irrigators on wider bays with, therefore, longer lines that run down the length of the swamp instead of the narrow bays that you need for flood irrigation. Instead, they spent money on putting a laser level top on the soil—which ends up all too often cutting the good soil off the very poor producing soil underneath it on the high rise in the swamp—and putting that good soil over saline soil in the lower areas, which is then contaminated anyway. So you still do not have an adequate root zone, and you are worse off than you would have been if you had left it the same and put the line ahead lateral irrigators on it with the low pressure, high-volume delivery spray heads hanging under that line to irrigate the pasture. So, instead of irrigating pasture, irrigate the vegetable crops of which I speak.

You could use the same technology in the summer to grow pumpkins. In Europe, they feed the cows on pumpkins during the winter. They grow pumpkin in the spring and summer and harvest them throughout the summer to late autumn for cows and pigs, as well as mangels (which are exactly the same as radishes, carrots and beetroot) and sweetcorn. I have grown sweetcorn on those swamps, and it was the most valuable crop at that time. You simply strip off the perfect cobs for human consumption and forage harvest the rest, flail it and turn it into ensilage and feed it to the cows. The bulk of the vegetable material you would get with the quantity of water it contains and the amount of nutrients in it would be greater than you could get from the pasture that is otherwise grown on it.

If we had done that demonstration trial—I have been trying to get it done for nearly 20 years—these problems would not have arisen, and we would still have had a dairy industry in place plus that enormously valuable vegetable industry of which I speak and even more jobs. We would have had around the year production of vegetables augmented in the summer time by lucerne on the high ground, if necessary. I do not know that it would be, but we would have had another benefit for the dairy industry that you cannot get in the South-East or in the hills.

During the winter months the temperature of the soil and the atmosphere is so low in those locations that there is no pasture or forage crop that you can grow which would enable cows on the same area to produce the same amount of milk. It is just too damn cold, whereas out on the Murray swamps it is not. You get level production pretty much throughout the year, and the volume of milk that can be taken off from the cows that graze on the forage which is produced in those ameliorated temperatures in the soils and atmosphere is greater per hectare—and thus the production per cow.

Remember: the withholding and standing costs of a cow are the same, whether you have it on the top of the hills at Mount Barker, or out in the frozen flats at OB Flat south of Mount Gambier, or somewhere like that, as it is at Jerois. Jerois and, indeed, the Lower Murray swamps have always produced more milk from the same animal in the same area as can be obtained from any other dairy farm anywhere else in this country. That would have continued.

That is the way it has to go if we are going to make good use of this soil. We cannot allow it to dry out. It would be a disaster ecologically for the river (the way it is at the present time) to allow that saline groundwater to rise up through the dry ground and not only damage the swamps with salt scold but also ruin it. It will get into the river and ruin the achieved level of salinity that we have tried to get reduced below Morgan by all the good work that has been done by successive governments and to which the current minister in the chamber now is committed along with the minister for the Murray—and I commend them for that.

My final remark is this: it is a pity that we did not understand the necessity to do this kind of thing before the inevitable was upon us. It is our responsibility as legislators to discover the way forward so that we can enable the people on those government settlements (the way they were) to come into the 21st century, to retain their pride and dignity, and not end up, as has tragically happened in more than one instance, injuring themselves. Indeed, some have suicided. That is the worst part of not doing what we could have done and receiving the benefits that would otherwise have come to us had we had the wit to have done it while we had the opportunity. I commend the committee for its work.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: MENINGIE AND NARRUNG LAKES IRRIGATORS

Mr RAU (Enfield): I bring up the third report of the committee on an inquiry into the Meningie and Narrung lakes irrigators and move:

That the report be noted.

The Narrung Peninsula is situated at the south of Lake Alexandrina, to the west of Lake Albert and along the northernmost stretch of the Coorong. Agriculture in the area, which covers more than 4 000 hectares, consists of irrigated lucerne and cash crops with an annual gross value exceeding \$20 million. The value of livestock in the area also exceeds \$20 million and contributes about 11 per cent of the state's milk production. Capital infrastructure in the area is in excess of \$65 million and, on current market value, the licensed water there is worth more than \$5 million.

The committee resolved to examine the issues the irrigators brought to our attention on the first of our trips to the region. On the second trip, a formal hearing was held at the offices of the Rural City of Murray Bridge. The committee took evidence from irrigators and their representative association, the Meningie and Narrung Lakes Irrigators Association. We heard that irrigators in the area see themselves as isolated from the rural irrigation industry along the Murray and felt that, when agencies made decisions regarding water restrictions, they were among the last to be informed. They recognise that agencies managing the state's water resource can, during extended dry periods leading to low flow, have limited control over the quality and quantity. Nevertheless, they remain convinced that information on sufficient water flow and quality is available to these agencies for them to make some early observations, if not management decisions.

It is during these periods, which may eventually lead to unfavourable irrigation conditions or water restrictions, that irrigators need to make critical management decisions. They will need to make decisions on issues such as the culling or movement of stock and whether stock feed can be grown or

needs to be brought in. Obviously, early advice to the Meningie and Narrung lakes irrigators on the potential for low flows and salinity increases would assist them in making more timely management decisions on forward provisions for irrigation or importing stock feed and stock movement. The committee supports and encourages any initiative that can be implemented by the department and the South Australian Murray Darling Basin Natural Resource Management Board that could provide much earlier advice than currently is the case. The committee supports this view, and one of our recommendations reflects this position.

The committee heard that below average rainfall in recent years has contributed to lower than normal water levels in the lakes and a reduction in the natural flushing-out of the system. We were advised that contributing factors to these lower levels might be due to some inefficient use upstream and possible poaching of water. This only exacerbates the difficulties faced by the Meningie and Narrung Lakes irrigators.

Debate adjourned.

DOG FENCE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Dog Fence Act 1946. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

It is with great pleasure that I introduce the Dog Fence (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2005.

As many Members will appreciate, the Dog Fence in this State is essential for protecting the sheep industry from the predation by dingoes. What Members may not realise is that the fence also provides a boundary outside of which the dingo is recognised as a legitimate wildlife species.

The Dog Fence in South Australia is two thousand, one hundred and seventy eight kilometres long, and is a part of a continuous fence that starts on the cliffs overlooking the Great Australian Bight, winding its way for more than five thousand, four hundred kilometres across South Australia, New South Wales and Queensland.

In this State, the Dog Fence consists of not only the traditional netting fence but also of five hundred kilometres of solar and/or solar-wind powered electric fence. This approved electric Dog Fence is an outcome of research carried out by the Board that tested various types of solar-powered electric fencing and demonstrated the efficacy of a 1200mm high 10-wire electric fence. Electric fences, because of their lower height, provide for easier migration of large native herbivores.

The Dog Fence today is owned and maintained by both Local Dog Fence Boards and private owners. Landowners on whose land the fence is situated may elect to form a local dog fence board, which owns and manages that designated section of the fence, or may elect to individually retain full ownership and management.

There are six Local Dog Fence Boards consisting of Fowlers Bay, Penong, Pureba, Central, Marree and Frome. Four station owners have decided to still own and maintain their sections of the fence. The State Dog Fence Board is constituted under the Act to ensure that the Fence is properly maintained and is kept in dog-proof condition, and that wild dogs in the vicinity of the fence are controlled. The entire fence is inspected at least every second week by patrolmen employed by the local boards or by the station owners themselves.

The South Australian Dog Fence is maintained by the State Dog Fence Board with an annual budget of \$800 000 for the 2 180 kilometres of fence (\$367 per kilometre). This compares favourably with the Fences in the other two states where the New South Wales Dog Fence of 584 kilometres has a budget of \$2 055 per kilometre,

and Queensland's Fence of 2 600 kilometres has a budget of \$596 per kilometre.

As I have previously reported to this House, I had the privilege of joining the State Dog Fence Board and local dog fence board members recently for an inspection of some 342 kilometres of the dog fence stretching from Fowlers Bay through to Pureba. I was very impressed by the state of the fence and the work being done by the various dog fence boards and the community.

This Bill is the culmination of a review of the *Dog Fence Act 1946*, and advice was sought from stakeholders and the broader community on which, if any, sections of the Act should be replaced or rewritten to better reflect today's thinking, and whether any new provisions should be included.

Community consultation occurred through regional meetings, which were convened in Keith, Mannahill, Ceduna, Port Augusta and Adelaide. These well attended meetings helped shape the proposed amendments I am introducing today.

Landowner support and involvement is essential to maintain a dog-proof fence. The provisions of the *Dog Fence Act* must remain flexible enough to retain landowner participation given trying conditions for many on the land while still ensuring that the fences remain dog-proof.

The current provisions of the *Dog Fence Act* restrict activities to maintaining a dog fence in the northern areas of the State. The Bill will broaden the scope of the Dog Fence Board to enable it to maintain dog fences in other parts of the State. Landowners in some areas of the State have long been seeking the capacity for the Dog Fence Board to be involved in maintaining fences other than in the northern areas of the State, such as to keep wild dogs inside park areas.

Many of the amendments in the Bill are consequential to this.

The Bill will update the definition of a wild dog to include a dog that is any cross of a dingo or a feral dog.

The Bill will revise the term of appointment of Board members to be up to 4 years in lieu of the current fixed four-year term. This change will allow for the staggering of members' terms so that not all of the terms of office expire at the same time.

Although the Dog Fence Board has been consulting with stakeholders before moving or rebuilding a fence, the Act does not require the Board to consult at all. The Bill will now require the board to consult with the occupier of the land, or the owner of the fence, before making any changes to the fence.

To properly maintain a dog fence, the Bill will allow the Board or an authorised person, for the purposes of the Act, to remain on the land where a dog fence is situated. To provide further support to members and staff, the Bill will indemnify members of the board, a member of a local board or an authorised person when acting in good faith under the Act.

Where a local dog fence board is formed, the ownership of that part of the dog fence is vested in that local board. However, some landowners adjacent to the fence consider it more desirable that they manage their section of fence. The Bill will allow the local board to vest ownership of the fence back to the adjoining landowner with the agreement of that landowner. This amendment is in response to the specific request of some pastoralists.

The Dog Fence Board funds its operations, including the maintenance of the Dog Fence, from rates on land and this amount is matched dollar for dollar by Treasury. This scheme will continue but the Bill will update key aspects of the scheme. The maximum amount that the Dog Fence Board can pay to a fence owner to maintain a kilometre of fence will increase from the current \$225 to \$250. Where the Dog Fence Board imposes rates on land, the maximum amount will increase from \$1 to \$1.20 per square kilometre.

For a number of years the Dog Fence Board has adopted a policy of aggregating certain parcels of land into a single holding for rating purposes. The Bill will formalise this arrangement and provide that a holding will include parcels of land that are farmed as a single enterprise.

In recovering rates, there has been no mechanism that allows the Dog Fence Board to take into account extenuating circumstances for the payment of those rates by the occupier of that land. The Bill will provide the Board with the authority to extend the time for payment as it sees fit.

Consultation with local boards, the South Australian Farmers Federation and interested communities including indigenous groups has resulted in a Bill that retains community involvement and the commitment to maintaining dog-proof fences.

I commend the Bill to the House.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Dog Fence Act 1946*

4—Substitution of long title

This clause amends the long title of the principal Act to reflect changes made by this Bill.

5—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends or adds definitions of certain terms used in the provisions amended by this Bill. In particular the concept of primary and secondary dog fences is explained.

6—Amendment of section 6—Members of board

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 6 of the principal Act to reflect the existence of primary and secondary dog fences.

7—Amendment of section 7—Term of office

This clause amends the term of office of a member of the board so that a term does not exceed 4 years rather than be 4 years.

8—Amendment of heading to Part 3

This clause is consequential.

9—Substitution of sections 18 and 19

This clause provides for the substitution of sections 18 and 19 of the principal Act, and allows for the creation of secondary dog fences to further restrict the movements of wild dogs within the area inside existing dog fence, which becomes the primary dog fence.

10—Amendment of section 20—Construction of fence to complete dog fences

This clause makes a consequential amendment and also requires that the board consult with owners or occupiers of land prior to issuing a notice under section 20 of the principal Act.

11—Amendment of section 21—Replacement of parts of dog fences

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

12—Amendment of section 22—Duty of owner to maintain dog fence and destroy wild dogs

This clause makes consequential amendments.

13—Amendment of section 23—Powers and duties of board as to dog fences

This clause amends section 23 of the principal Act to empower the board, or a person authorised by the board, to enter and remain on land on which a dog fence is situated in order to exercise the powers and functions referred to in the section. The clause also makes a number of consequential amendments.

14—Amendment of section 23A—Dog fences on Crown land

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

15—Amendment of section 24—Payments to owners of dog fences

This clause increases the amount payable to owners of the dog fence to \$250 per kilometre of fence, and makes a number of consequential amendments.

16—Amendment of section 24A—Provisions as to ownership of dog fences

This clause amends section 24A of the principal Act to enable the Governor to vest (on the recommendation of the board and with the agreement of the owner) part of the fence in the owner of the land on which the fence is situated. The fence may also be vested in a local board, with the consent of the board. The clause also makes a number of consequential amendments.

17—Amendment of section 25—Imposition of rates on ratable land

This clause increases the rate payable by owners of certain land to \$1.20 per square kilometre, defines *holding* for the purposes of the section and makes a consequential amendment.

18—Amendment of section 27—Payment and recovery of rates and special rates

This clause enables the board to extend the time for payment of rates.

19—Amendment of section 27A—Contribution by councils as alternative to rating by board

This clause amends an obsolete reference.

20—Amendment of section 28—Charge to be payable by occupiers of land outside dog fence

This clause makes a number of consequential amendments.

21—Amendment of section 35A—Local dog fence boards

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

22—Amendment of section 37—Inspection of dog fences by Government employees

This clause makes a consequential amendment, and enables a government employee to enter and remain on premises for the purposes of the section.

23—Insertion of section 38

This clause inserts a provision shifting personal liability from the board, a member of a local board, and certain other people to the board (in the case of a member of the board, or a person acting at the direction of the board) or, in any other case, to the Crown.

24—Amendment of section 43—Penalty for damaging or removing a dog fence

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

25—Amendment of section 44—Employer liable for damage done by employee

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

26—Amendment of section 44A—Gate or ramp is part of a dog fence

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

27—Amendment of section 45—Penalty for leaving gate open

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances.

(Continued from 31 May. Page 2881.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I continue my remarks (from page 2881 of *Hansard*) which I made last evening, when I talked about the Deputy Premier launching his attack on the Director of Public Prosecutions to cover his back when he learnt that the DPP intended to mention the abuse and intimidating call from the Deputy Premier in his annual report. In his tirade on Monday, the Deputy Premier said that, in the conversation, he and the DPP had agreed to avoid 'playing political football'. Having heard of the complaint of the Attorney-General made by the Director of Public Prosecutions, of course the Deputy Premier reneged on that undertaking, came into the house and started his tirade.

The Deputy Premier said in his contribution on Monday that he did not go into matters of law or matters of the DPP's work. He said, 'I only talked to him about budget matters.' Of course, he also omitted to tell the house that he and the Premier are running this agenda as a tag team. The Premier talks about legal matters. The Premier talks about the role of the DPP, and where that is failing and how the Premier is such a hero in law and order matters, but the Treasurer only tackles him on financial matters, and he thinks he can get away with it. The Premier and the Deputy Premier are both in this up to their necks.

This is typical of the way this government operates. This is the modus operandi of this government—standover thuggery, bullying and intimidation. The ministers do it, certainly we know that the Deputy Premier does it, and I know that the media officers employed by this government do it. I have no less than three instances that have occurred in my electorate where minister's media officers have rung up and abused and intimidated and acted like thugs to media people in my electorate way down there in the South-East. It

is not as though it is the daily newspaper or a mainstream television station. They are tackling minor news outlets in country electorates with their stand-over tactics and thuggery. Time expired.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): In the time available to me this evening, I rise to briefly focus on the issue of infrastructure and the way in which it has been approached in the recent state budget. In April this year, I raised publicly the fact that the government's rhetoric did not, in fact, match its expenditure. Unfortunately, we have seen the same problem repeated in this recent budget. In April, I raised the fact that the government's capital works budget was not exactly as it would have us believe, and that we were facing a government that was claiming that it then had the capital works expenditure of some \$950 million.

I pointed out to the public that that actually involved the pea and thimble trick, because, of course, what has occurred in recent times is that the government no longer leases the government motor vehicle fleet. Under the previous Liberal government, the motor vehicle fleet was leased from the Commonwealth Bank. The Commonwealth Bank purchased our motor vehicle fleet, and that freed moneys to be used for other state purposes. What has actually occurred is that this government has bought back the fleet and it has included the cost of recapitalising the fleet on an annual basis within its budget. So, in April of this year I pointed out that, in fact, the \$950 million of infrastructure spending had actually been inflated by \$111 million.

Naturally, when the budget was handed down this time, I examined what had happened with the motor vehicle fleet. This time the Premier tells us that we have an infrastructure budget of in excess of \$1 billion. In fact, it is \$1 040 million of expenditure. By interesting coincidence, I should say that that figure is the same as was handed down by the last Liberal government in 2001-02. That is the first point to make. The infrastructure budget handed down in this parliament is the same as the one handed down by the Liberal government for the 2001-02 budget, but there is a reduction that has to come off the state government's budget figure. For, in actual fact, \$118 million of its infrastructure budget is again for the government motor vehicle fleet, for public servants and ministerial motor vehicles.

In actual fact, after all the rhetoric, after all the public claims, after all the statements by the Premier and after all the statements by his Minister for Infrastructure, the provable reality is that Labor's infrastructure budget for 2005-06 is \$118 million less than the infrastructure budget that was handed down by the Liberal government for 2001-02. That is the great infrastructure strategy that this state has before it. Is it any little wonder that, when after three years of appalling government, it finally hands down an infrastructure plan that is very scant in detail. South Australians are left with a Labor government that, despite its rhetoric, the best it is able to deliver for South Australians in the way of new infrastructure projects is an extension of a tramline, by some one kilometre, a couple of tunnels under some busy road intersections, and also a railway station movement near Westfield Marion Shopping Centre.

It is interesting to reflect on those four main projects that the government has announced. In fact, the Liberal Party announced an assessment of the tramline when it was in government, and elected not to continue with that project as it saw other things that better met the state's needs at that time. The Liberal government actually announced the work

on the moving of the train station near the Marion Shopping Centre, but a lot more with it. For, in fact, our announcement was a complete package: a new swimming centre for the state adjacent Westfield Marion; reconfiguring the roads; redeveloping government-owned property in the vicinity, particularly the Housing Trust properties around that area; moving the railway station; reconfiguring transport through Westfield Marion Shopping Centre; and, importantly, an interchange that was going to be located on the corner of South Road and Sturt Road to service the southern suburbs to get people into the city faster, and to get people to Westfield Marion faster, recognising that there are two major centres that people in the southern suburbs wish to go to: the city of Adelaide for employment purposes and for shopping purposes, and, importantly, Westfield Marion, which is the biggest retailing centre in the state.

What we have seen from that grand plan is Labor grab just a piece of it after public servants responded to Labor government panic that it did not have any decent announcements for its infrastructure plan. The public servants within transport have been quite open in their discussions with the Marion Council and the Liberal Party and have said that they pulled something out of the old plan that was three years old that had been put on ice by this government, and they tried to make become it a reality. That is the appalling form of the government we have today and its approach to infrastructure.

What do we have at the end of it? We have a budget that is smaller for infrastructure than was handed down for the 2001-02 budget by the Liberal Party, and we have a government that has no plan for infrastructure of significance and, certainly, no plan that is appropriately funded. We only have to look over the border at other governments to see what they have done.

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

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I am making a contribution in my capacity as the member for Kaurana, and I do so to respond to some of the inaccurate, inflammatory, foolish and childish remarks made by the member for Mawson in his contribution yesterday or the day before. He made a number of comments. It is clear that over the last three years, the member for Mawson has largely ignored the south, and largely ignored his electorate. We are coming up for an election, so he has decided to flex what puny political muscles he has. He is using the age old tactic in the southern suburbs to say that the South has been forgotten, and he is trying to drum up support that he is going to do something about it.

Mr Venning: The south will rise again!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: As the member says, 'The south will rise again.' One of the silliest of his claims was the claim that under this budget there are no new roadworks for the south. That is what he said. That is just plain wrong: it is foolish, and it is wrong. He should have looked at the budget papers. For the benefit of the record, I felt it incumbent on me to let the house and the public know in fine detail exactly what is being spent on the roads in the south.

In 2005-06, the government plans to spend \$3 million on overtaking lanes in the outer south, on the Noarlunga to Cape Jervis road, where there will be two new lanes, and we will extend an existing lane on the Noarlunga to Victor Harbor Road. The same budget announcements also include \$1.65 million in road section improvements along Black Road, Flagstaff Hill, and I am sure that the Speaker will be

pleased about that. It also includes a further \$90 000 for junction improvements at Flagstaff Road, Flagstaff Hill; a \$420 000 commitment to road safety improvements along the Southern Expressway; a \$300 000 intersection improvement at the junction of Main South, Iverene, and Malpas Roads, Aldinga; a road section improvement at Penneys Hill Road, McLaren Vale, valued at \$150 000; cutting and embankment works along the rail line near Noarlunga Centre worth \$2 million in the 2005-06 year; and a further \$500 000 to upgrade a bridge at Grand Central Avenue, Hallett Cove, over the Adelaide-Noarlunga line.

In addition to that, the 2005-06 budget represents the first year of a \$22 million, three-year commitment to Long Life Roads. This initiative is likely to include works within the southern suburbs; however, these works are yet to be specified at the moment. In addition to the specific announcements of the recent state budget, there is a significant effort put into 'Business as Usual' works, with some \$68.3 million to be spent on road maintenance across the state next financial year, which will also include, undoubtedly, roads in the southern suburbs. More broadly on the issue of transport spending, it is worth noting that the state government will spend \$191 million on transport investments, that is capital projects in South Australia, in the next financial year. That compares more than favourably with the \$129 million on transport investment—\$142 million in current dollars—that the former government spent in its last year in office—effectively 35 per cent less than was allocated by this government for the coming year.

So, to say that there is no money spent on roads in the southern suburbs is just plain wrong. Will we have the member for Mawson come in here to apologise and correct his error? No, don't bet on it, he won't do it, because that is not his style. In the southern suburbs he goes around saying that he is a consensus politician, he wants to work with the government, he wants to get a good deal for the south, we are good friends, we will work together, but then he comes in here and he is totally different in his attitude. He plays the game and he needs to be made accountable, and that is what I am very pleased to be doing today.

In addition to the expenditure on roads in the southern suburbs, I am pleased to say that there is \$1.855 million to upgrade the D.V. Fleming bridge, and this upgrade will strengthen the bridges located on Main South Road, spanning the Onkaparinga River, Noarlunga, to support heavy vehicles.

In addition to these expenditures there are other things that will assist the southern suburbs, and I will go through those for the house. Policing in the South will get a significant boost with \$9 million budgeted for police stations, particularly at Christies Beach with that complex being upgraded, and Aldinga will also get a share of that expenditure for a 24-hour new police station in the Aldinga area. That is in addition to the 17 new police officers who will be provided to the southern area, and five of those will be at the Aldinga station. Health will also receive improved funding with a \$6.7 million funding increase for the Southern Adelaide Health Service, and that money will help to improve services at Noarlunga Community Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre. The Repatriation Hospital will also receive help with \$18.7 million extra cover over the next five years, and that is evidence of the government's commitment to the South and to our health system.

The government has also committed \$2 million for an upgrade of the Christies Beach waste water treatment plant to expand capacity to cater for population growth. The project

will include evaluation and consideration of alternative technologies to enable the removal of the sludge lagoons adjacent to the Onkaparinga River, with community consultation. That is something I would have thought some of the member for Mawson's electors in the Noarlunga Downs area would be welcoming very strongly. There will also be \$150 000 for the Southern Success Business Enterprise Centre at Morphett Vale, and that centre is focused on assisting small business in the southern suburbs.

There will be \$4 million-odd over four years to redevelop the Marion Interchange, an important development that will improve transport facilities for the southern suburbs by relocating and upgrading the Oaklands station to include park and ride facilities to better improve the Marion regional centre. Also, \$2.2 million will be spent to redevelop the McLaren Flat Primary School, in the member for Mawson's electorate, something that he omitted to tell the house when he went through his diatribe the other day. In fact, most of his comment related to my electorate, strangely enough—very little to his own electorate—possibly he does not spend enough time there to understand what is going on, and what the issues are.

The member for Mawson made comment about coastal works, and said that nothing had been done in that area. I can inform him that that is not true. The government spent a considerable sum of money fixing up the coast along Whitton Bluff, and we have also witnessed the City Council of Onkaparinga invest a considerable sum of money investigating the points along the coast where work is needed. Some work has commenced and money has been allocated to do a lot of that work, so a great deal has been done. We have also invested in the surf lifesaving centres, and the Christies Beach Surf Lifesaving Centre, which is now one of the best surf lifesaving club venues in the state, was recently opened by the former minister for urban development and planning, the Hon. Trish White. That leaves me a minute or two to talk about a couple of issues.

The member for Mawson also attacked, I suppose, the planning process in relation to the Aldinga area and criticised the government for what it had done or not done. In fact, this government is dealing with that issue by putting in a planning process and committing to infrastructure in that area, including the police station, which I have mentioned. We are also working to have a health centre and helping the Catholic schools system to put a school in that place. It is a difficult issue. It was neglected by governments of both persuasions for a long time, but we are now actually dealing with it and getting on top of it. Part of that has been to double the amount of public transport available in that area through extra funding for bus services.

The final matter I raise is the extension of the Noarlunga railway to Seaford. As soon as that was announced, did the member for Mawson say that this was a good idea? Of course not. He said that it is not happening soon enough and it should go further, and he questioned the cost. The member for Mawson is obviously an expert on anything he turns his mind to without any need for study or investigation. Clearly, it is important before a government builds a railway line that it works out where it should go, who will use it and how much it will cost. That is what we are committed to doing. I am very confident that that railway line will be extended. It is certainly my commitment to my community to work as hard as I can to achieve that outcome.

It does not help at all for the confidence and welfare of the southern suburbs to have one of their members sniping and

criticising the south and running it down as the member for Mawson has done in his contribution, and as he is doing more frequently through the local media. He may think it achieves votes for himself but he does it at a price, and that price is a lowering of self esteem and confidence in a community that has experienced some difficulties because of the closure of Mitsubishi and the Mobil plant. Fortunately, the community has been able to respond very well to those setbacks, but not with the help of the member for Mawson.

The SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Morphett, earlier today the member for Hammond gave notice of a motion. I draw members' attention to standing order 94. The point I was trying to make at the time was that it is not the wish of the chair to stifle debate, certainly not to gag debate, but motions should not involve debate or pre-empt debate and they should not include language that is unbecoming according to the standing order. Accordingly, on advice, the motion will have removed from it those expressions that are deemed to be unbecoming or would pre-empt debate, so that there is no misunderstanding when the *Notice Paper* is printed for tomorrow.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): When I was elected as member for Morphett I truly was blessed with a great electorate, from Glenelg North down to Warradale and from Somerton Park across to Glengowrie and all points in between. It is only 12.8 square kilometres of electorate, but it is a very popular area for all South Australia, Australia and, I should say, overseas. It is a well-known fact, and I have said it in this house a number of times but I will repeat it because it is a very pleasant fact, that nearly three million visitors a year come down the Bay. They are South Australians, they are Australians and they are from overseas. Even Andy Thomas, when he was on TV the other day speaking to the Premier, said he cannot wait to come back to our great beaches, and I know that he would have meant the beaches down at the Bay.

The three million visitors come to savour the delights of the Bay, with the 106 restaurants and cafes we have there—which might even be a bit more now as the development is continuing—and they wander round Moseley Square. This is where I start to talk about some of the issues we have with the budget and with my electorate. The government has the money to be able to assist the City of Holdfast Bay and my electors in Morphett to achieve some of their wishes. The upgrade of Moseley Square, which has been mooted for a number of years now, is finally due to start next month. The cost is over \$3 million: almost a dollar for every visitor who comes down the Bay each year. This should be a state project. You cannot expect the 31 000 ratepayers of the City of Holdfast Bay to keep putting their hands in their pockets to upgrade local projects like this.

The Bay is a state icon, so the state government should be putting its hand in its pocket to assist the local government in a big way. There are some funds coming in, but we need a lot more money. The big event we have each year is the New Year's Eve event. The talk last year was that it would be the last New Year's Eve fireworks show and family event down the Bay. This cannot be allowed to happen. I have already had discussions with the mayor, the CEO and the senior police at Sturt LSA, who are doing a fantastic job under difficult circumstances. We all agree that the New Year's Eve event at Glenelg, at Holdfast Bay, around Moseley Square on the foreshore, with the fantastic fireworks

display off the end of the jetty at midnight, must not be allowed to fold.

Up to 70 000 people come to this event and, once again, this event should be funded by the state government, not just by the ratepayers of Morphett and the City of Holdfast Bay. I ask the government to look at its priorities, look at what is going on here. We do have the money and we need to make sure that those two projects do not fade and that the upgrade of Moseley Square is completed to its best. That includes a \$70 000 grant I have asked for to assist with the installation of closed circuit security cameras. It is a very small request from the Premier and police minister. I have written to them both.

There is one infrastructure project that I would love to see completed down there. I had problems this morning just riding my pushbike over the walkway at the Patawalonga gates. It is impossible to get past on your bike if there is a pedestrian going past or someone with a pram. That was planned to be double the width that it is now. It is less than a metre wide now and it should be about two metres or 2½ metres wide. It could happen. Once again, it is used by people from all over the state, as well as all visitors. It needs to be a state project.

I will quote an article from the *City Messenger* (published today) about the upgrade of the Adelaide Aquatic Centre. I note that the government has put in \$500 000 to upgrade the area over the next three years. That is good. I congratulate the minister. The Hon. Michael Wright, the Minister for Sport and Recreation, is quoted in the Messenger as saying:

This agreement with the council also ensures Adelaide ratepayers are not burdened with the upkeep of a facility that is used by people from all across South Australia.

Here is an example of where the state is putting its hand in its pocket to help ratepayers. Let us hope that it does it with the Moseley Square upgrade and the New Year's Eve celebrations, as well as the Patawalonga gates. The other big problem we have at the bay, obviously, is policing. There are never enough police on the roads. That is no fault of the police; they are under huge pressure. The most common problem being made known to my office is complaints about hoon driving and anti-social behaviour. We do need to have more police on the beat. We need a visible police presence. Superintendent Paul Dickson, the new officer-in-charge of the Sturt LSA, and I have had a number of discussions. He is very keen and enthusiastic. He will carry on the great job that Superintendent Paul Schramm did when he was there.

The good things in the budget that are happening down at Morphett include the Paringa Park Primary School. It is still in the budget for the \$2.5 million upgrade. Some plans have started. The disappointing part, though, is that the hall that needs to be built to complement the refurbishment of the 50-year old Bristol buildings that are going (they were second hand 50 years ago) will cost an extra \$800 000. This very small school community cannot afford to put its hand in its pocket to pay for that hall. The government should be putting its hand in its pocket. It has plenty of money, so let us see it do something.

The Marion interchange is a good project. It is a very good start to what could be a terrific upgrade of the passenger transport systems in South Australia and, certainly, the effect on Dunrobin Road, though, will not be any different from what we have been looking for for four years. Dunrobin Road is just north of the railway line. It comes onto Diagonal Road. It is an awful bottleneck, and it causes all sorts of problems.

There is some good news. There is more money for sand management. Since 1836 when white people landed here and began interfering with the coastal ecosystems, the sand has been moving and is in need of management. The funding is there, and it is good news. I am pleased to say that my electors in Morphett will appreciate that. I will not back away from the fact that, for three years in this place, I have been supporting light rail in South Australia, and supporting the extension of light rail out to North Adelaide. I would like it to go right up to North Adelaide, through the parklands and down North Terrace. I have been saying that for over three years in this place. I will not back away from that, not for one second. I was nick-named the member for trams at one stage. I hope that, when I do eventually leave, I am not remembered just for my urging to upgrade and increase the light rail in Adelaide, but I am very keen on seeing that project developed and enhanced.

What I have a real problem with is the government plans and the upgrades that have been announced. A lot of them are just lines on a piece of paper. The figures have been pulled out of the air. The Premier was in Portland, Oregon, hanging from a tram strap making an announcement about trams going to North Adelaide. It is very difficult to believe that it has been studied properly. Evidence was given to the Public Works Committee about the extension of North Terrace and it was said that there would be some significant problems with the relocation of the water and sewerage mains and other infrastructure. Certainly, there was some concern about traffic flows.

Light rail is really the way to go for public transport. Adelaide is the perfect size and geography for a light rail system, but it must be done properly. Light rail is efficient. People will use the new trams. We are getting nine new Bombardier Flexity Classic trams. They are 70 per cent low floor trams. They are not the 100 per cent low floor trams that we would have liked. They are also 30 per cent narrower than the old H class trams that we have now. We are keeping some of those for the tourists on weekends. They will be a good tram, but I am disappointed that we did not go for a 100 per cent low floor and wider-bodied tram. The only other place that has these trams is Frankfurt, Germany. Let us hope that we do not have to keep piggy-backing orders from Frankfurt to get more trams on the lines here. The fact that Adelaide had a fantastic light rail system is well and truly acknowledged.

In fact, I was in London 18 months ago looking at the Croydon trams. I saw a photograph of the tracks being laid in 1927. They were pulled up in 1957 and relaid in exactly the same spot in 1997. I will not withdraw from urging an upgrading of the light rail, but I do have a real problem with the way in which the government has planned it and the way in which the figures have been pulled out of the air. Certainly, I really do stick by the fact that we need to do this. I do realise that there are 75 000 kilometres of local roads in South Australia, and those roads do need maintaining now.

The poor old tram may have to keep going for a little longer; and, certainly, the tracks may need to wait that little bit longer. There is plenty of money in the budget. There is some money in there for the people of Morphett; and, certainly, the opening of the Paringa Park Primary School is something I hope to witness in December.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Dr McFETRIDGE: This budget has been a challenge to spend all the money.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The chair takes the view that, if an honourable member is finishing a sentence, it is acceptable to go over time but not to go beyond that. The member for Mitchell.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): The River Murray is the lifeblood of South Australia. It is 2 530 kilometres long from the Snowy to the Murray Mouth in South Australia. The flow in the Murray is very low by world standards. Its annual average flow would pass through the Amazon in less than a day. Also, the Murray has a highly variable flow, which means that it is subject to huge variations of rainfall and drought. Indeed, part of the problem that we have at the moment is not only that the flow is so low but also that our interference with the natural rhythm of the river over the last 150 years has meant that there is less of the wetting and drying cycle in the ecosystems surrounding the river, and that is part of the problem that the environment around the Murray faces today.

Flood plains are a vital part of the river's ecosystem. They are nature's water treatment works, removing vast quantities of pollutants from inland river waters. They also act as a buffer zone and a nursery, and are the major centres of biological life in the river's ecosystem. Many flood plains are threatened within the Murray-Darling Basin as they have been developed for agriculture, recreation and industrial purposes, thus dividing them from the river. Flood plains also flood less frequently, and this has brought about changes in flora and fauna species that once thrived.

Some of the biggest wetlands in Australia—the Coorong, the Riverland wetlands and the Chowilla flood plain system—completely depend on the Murray for their continuing existence. The Coorong, particularly, relies on a decent flow of water from the river to counteract the flood tide delta that builds up from the sea. The estuarine environment depends on the ebb and flow of clean sea water to survive. In turn, fish and migratory birds rely on the Coorong wetlands for their survival, and we need to keep this holistic perspective in mind when dealing with these complex issues.

There is evidence that the River Murray is in trouble. Poor water quality, loss of native plants, animals, fish, forests and wetlands and an increase in pests such as carp all point to a river and a landscape in decline. Scientific advice indicates that if we do nothing the river's health will inevitably get worse. This will affect our native plants and animals, our city and our communities.

One of the main causes of the decline is the large amount of water we take from the rivers of the basin for irrigation and other uses. Of course, I am not referring only to South Australians here but also to our fellow communities in New South Wales and Victoria, particularly. Some of the crops and industries do not belong on the river: for example, rice and cotton are inappropriate crops for Australia. They disproportionately use far too much water.

During the past 150 years, settlement and resource use within the Murray-Darling catchment have been managed in a fragmentary, localised and uncoordinated manner. Little regard has been shown for the need to manage the system as a whole, and the long-term environmental, economic and social consequences of most developments have been ignored. This has resulted in conflicting resource uses and demands and serious declines in environmental quality, leading in particular to increased soil and water salinities.

The Murray River water has effectively been privatised—that is, water has been virtually given away for a song

through years of ignorant management practice—and I mean ignorant government management practices. Licences to draw water have been granted without any concern for the health of the river or the health of the Murray Mouth and the surrounding areas. These licences are effectively being subsidised by mortgaging off the future wellbeing of the river and all the ecosystems that depend on the river for survival. It is a resource that should be kept in trust for Australian people and particularly the people of South Australia.

At the very least, we should be using something closer to a market rate for water extracted from the river. If something closer to the market rate was applied, it would be a market in which the government could and should buy water that is necessary for the environmental flow, and it would also mean that some people growing high water use crops would effectively go out of the market. This would be good for those who are left, and it would be good for the environment where those industries are currently operating.

Some would say that a time of drought is the worst possible time to think about reducing people's entitlement but, in an economic sense, it is probably the best time because those who are borderline operations will be able to retire from their agricultural operations with dignity if their water entitlements are paid out at this time by a government, and that would be a reclaiming of what used to be a commonwealth resource; and, it could be used then for the health of the river itself.

Many allocations of water from the Murray-Darling system are at prices which do not reflect the full costs associated with delivering the water. Under-pricing of water leads to excessive use. Efficient allocation of our water and our financial resources requires that users pay closer to the full economic costs associated with the use of these resources. Those economic costs need to take account of what economists call externalities—in other words, the consequent impacts of taking out water upstream, and those impacts include the degradation of the environment further downstream.

The government's 2005-06 budget on the River Murray is vague on this issue. The stated budget target simply says that the government will return water to the River Murray through the Living Murray initiative. Of course, the details can be explored in questioning of the minister, but South Australia needs to be clearer about what our targets are. Whatever the government is doing in this budget will not be enough to save many stands of red gum forests and it may not be enough to save the Coorong unless we can turn around conditions in the whole system, and it will not be enough to save Adelaide from becoming another Alice Springs in terms of its water resources.

The Greens have argued that 3 000 gegalitres of water need to be returned to the Murray for environmental flows to give a high probability of restoring its health. That is the figure we say should be the target. The federal government, in conjunction with states, has essentially set a target of 500 gegalitres, and that will not be enough to turn around the environmental degradation going on right now.

I am particularly critical of the New South Wales and Victorian governments, because they really are holding a gun to our heads. Our brothers and sisters in New South Wales and Victoria have the option of essentially forcing South Australians to die of thirst. The New South Wales and Victorian governments, it seems, would rather ask us to drink our own urine than contribute more to the health of the river. It is essential to have their cooperation because of the very

nature of our political entity, our federation. Unfortunately, South Australians do not control the river, yet we rely on it more than anyone else. The Coorong and the viability of South Australian agriculture, as well as many towns, and even Adelaide itself, depend on the goodwill of the New South Wales and Victorian governments. They are leaving us for dead with their current attitude on the River Murray.

South Australia should be going into the market now and buying water for environmental flows. Engineering tricks are not the answer to restoring flows to the River Murray. There is absolutely no substitute for getting more flows—flows which we can control through the locks and lake systems, so that we can have periodic flooding which suits the ecosystems surrounding the river. We need to get into the market to do that. Now is the time to do it even though there is a drought. Many people in New South Wales and Victoria would like to sell their water entitlements and get out of their business altogether after this many long years of drought.

If the New South Wales and Victorian governments are obstructing this sort of measure by the South Australian government, they ought to be forced to drink their own urine, because that is essentially what is being forced on South Australians through the continued lack of cooperation from the New South Wales and Victorian governments. It is an absolute national disgrace.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart is going to be very shy and reticent.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: If the minister for agriculture would be patient, I am sure I will not put his blood pressure up too high. All I want to do in this brief 10 minutes is talk about one or two important issues in my electorate. Before I do that, I was interested in the minister for the environment's contribution, because he was somewhat uncharitable towards the member for Mawson. A nicer and more gentlemanly member you would not be able to find. When I was listening to the minister's speech I wondered whether perhaps the comments of the member for Mawson were having a considerable effect on the minister and somewhat riling him because he would have to answer the appropriate questions that the member for Mawson was raising in relation to the activities of this government.

This budget does a number of interesting things. I commend the government for buying a new police aircraft. I think this is long overdue. The need for the police to be able to quickly and effectively move around South Australia in all types of weather is important. I have advocated for a long time that there ought to be a large single-engine aeroplane stationed at Marla so that when there are difficulties on the Pitjantjatjara lands the police can fly out there very quickly from Marla instead of putting in hours and hours in a motor vehicle.

There would be lots of young police officers (male and female) who would only be too pleased to learn to fly 207s and 206 aircraft and take five or six people out there. They have good airstrips out there, and you can get there in minutes where it takes hours by car. You have police aides in every centre, and I think this is something that should take place. National Parks have had one of those aeroplanes for years. This would be a very good investment. I am pleased the government is going to buy a decent turboprop aeroplane. Perhaps they might even buy two. You never know.

I am disappointed that there was nothing in the budget relating to a number of important roads in the north of South Australia. The road between Lyndhurst and Marree should now be sealed. One of the most important—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You were one of those who voted to stop it. We will remind everyone up there of your involvement—you and the SDA: they are the ones who stopped it. I am happy to take on the Attorney-General any time he wants to, but let me say to him now: you set up this government-sponsored Labor Party office in Port Augusta which is a quite—

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

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General has a point of order.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You can hand it out, but you can't take it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart should not talk over the chair. He should know that.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I took it from the former speaker, the member for Stuart, for four years. Of course I can take it.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Stuart is using the second person 'you' with reference to members of the government, and I ask him to speak—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, that's the second person plural.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney has made his point. The member for Stuart would know that he should use other terminology than the word 'you'.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Of course, Mr Speaker. The Attorney-General is very thin-skinned and unwise on many occasions. I was indicating that the most important road on which the government is not spending enough money is the road between Lyndhurst and Moomba. That particular road is one of the lifelines of South Australia, and the need to commence upgrading and sealing some sections of that road is long overdue. I call upon the government to put those plans in place because of the amount of traffic that travels on that road on a regular basis every day. We know what happens when you have a major dislocation at Moomba.

Ms Breuer: Which road?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Between Moomba and Lyndhurst. It is very important. We know what happens when you have a major dislocation up there. We are waiting with bated breath to see whether the government is going to give financial assistance to the regional cities for their bus services. The government is subsidising the metropolitan bus service by some \$160 000. I expect that the government will come to the party because, politically, it has no alternative. It knows that to stop the buses in those regional cities would be politically unacceptable. I also say to the government: as you have received from the GST twice as much money as expected, there is a need to assist some of the small operators who provide services in the Far North. Currently, one operator wishes to extend a small bus service as far as Arkaroola. It is an expensive undertaking, but there is a demand. To get people to use the service, first you must provide it and then build up the clientele. I suggest that there is a need for the government to financially support those types of operations.

There is no longer a regular air service to Leigh Creek, and many people in the Far North do not have the ability to transport themselves to Port Augusta or to Adelaide. Therefore, in a decent society, I believe that we have a responsibility to help these people. It will not take many thousands of dollars to ensure such a project. Once it is off the ground, it can be maintained and will assist not only the locals but also the tourism industry. I call on the minister to provide some extra funds—and I am not talking about massive amounts of money. We are talking about providing a service that is long overdue. Therefore, I hope that, in the next few months, the government will look favourably upon this suggestion, as people in all parts of the state are entitled to a fair slice of the government's cake.

Another ongoing issue in the northern part of the state is the need to extend the water services. SA Water needs to be in a position to provide water not only to Kimba, as will occur with the new project, but also to places such as Terowie, which has been making representations for years to have these services extended. A number of other places, such as Marree, Hawker and Oodnadatta have very poor quality water. The unfortunate thing is that these long-suffering people are required to pay the River Murray levy. They should not have to pay it; it is an imposition. The sort of slug it tried to put on some of the small progress associations—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What they need is a dynamic young member.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: They have a dynamic young member—an experienced member with a good track record! The honourable member and his mates from the SDA can spend as much as they like, but this time they will be under attack. The SDA will need to come to the aid of the member for Giles and one or two others who will have a vigorous campaign waged against them. We will see whether she will stick up for those people who want to freehold their perpetual leases, or whether she will let the bureaucrats from the Department of the Environment get their way. She has a clear choice: stick up for the people in her electorate or support the bureaucrats. I am calling on her to support her electorate and give it what is just, fair and reasonable and brush aside the Sir Humphreys who have been getting their way for too long.

I throw down that challenge to the member for Giles and others, and I look forward to the next three months, during which we will raise a number of issues affecting the people of South Australia. I am sincerely looking forward to the challenge next year.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): When preparing these remarks, and after listening to some of the contributions made by members opposite, I began to think of the importance of this debate in getting out the real message about the state budget each year and how important it is to separate the reality from the rhetoric, how important it is to let the residents of Florey know about the impact of the state budget on them and how much work goes into it. Florey residents understand this, because they know how much work they put into their own household budgets. They want to know what their share of the state revenue will be and how the budget will directly benefit them. They understand the truth of simple maxims, such as, 'You can't spend what you don't have,' 'You have to cut your coat according to your cloth,' and 'No pain, no gain.'

This government has been working hard on the essentials in order to ensure our future. Our Treasurer has shown great restraint and has achieved a AAA credit rating for the state.

In achieving this fiscal goal, he has proved the government's economic credentials, namely, that we have sound foundations on which to build prosperity. Yesterday's announcement of South Australia's share in the defence industry contract—the right to build air warfare destroyers at the ASC in the Osborne marine precinct—is yet another step towards the security of the state. Thousands of direct and indirect jobs mean that South Australian families will have a secure future. Throughout the next decade, and longer, we will enjoy the effects of this major economic boost. As we know, the spin-offs, and the potential for growth in other industries that underpin our economy, including small to medium enterprises, will be significant.

Everyone involved in the bid to win the contract deserves great commendation and our thanks. The announcement and this great success could come only through cooperation. South Australian business and union leaders have ensured that the atmosphere for harmonious relationships into the future will last long beyond yesterday's most welcome announcement from the Premier. It is his leadership we have to acknowledge in winning this and the many other projects in which the people of Florey will share.

My community will enjoy the prosperity created by the government in many ways. We will share in the employment boom that will deliver to the families of Florey the opportunity to raise their children in their own home. We have all seen the benefits of the building boom that the state has enjoyed in the past few years. It will mean that the commitment to quality education, which has been a hallmark of this government, particularly in the early childhood years, can be built upon. The government has worked hard to ensure that our children receive the best possible education from the valued, highly committed and dedicated educators in our public education system.

At the Modbury Primary School we have already benefited greatly from the investment in the refurbishment of the buildings and play areas. Further, in cooperation with the City of Tea Tree Gully, I look forward to shortly hearing about an agreement regarding community use of the surplus school building that will house, among other groups, the University of the Third Age, an outstanding initiative providing educational opportunities for seniors over a very wide range of topics—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: Well, that's a senior. It provides a range of topics at a reasonable cost.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Unley!

Ms BEDFORD: They tell me I can join. We have also seen in Florey funding made available to improve the environment through the creation of wetlands to enhance our amenity by promotion of biodiversity and conservation, not to mention encouraging passive recreation like walking to improve health, fitness and wellbeing derived from exercise. There will also soon be a new police station in our area, and we are already benefiting in Florey from the brand new \$3.8 million state of the art fire station, which services our region.

In the not too distant future, those Florey electors lucky enough to be travelling long distances will benefit from the fantastic new air terminal at the Adelaide International Airport. We have all waited many years for a modern airport, and it took this Premier and this government to deliver that dream. Health services remain a major focus for everyone, and I remind the house that the Modbury Public Hospital had its management outsourced in a contract that has never been

replicated. That is because it did not provide a good model for health care. Our area has had to pay dearly for that mistake made by the Liberals.

The Generational Health Review is about to deliver better working relationships that will see a revolution in the way acute and community health services are delivered, and it will be through negotiation and cooperation that we see change for the better. The health staff at the Modbury Public Hospital and in every other area in the state, world leaders in many areas, will continue to look after us in the same professional way they always have. The Modbury Health Service will also receive a boost with 25 more adult acute beds and a \$700 000 upgrade to Woodleigh House, with a further major development planned there soon. Other mental health initiatives include a share of the \$1 million going to beyondblue program, and part of the \$1.5 million increase for ACIS staffing.

Some of the measures that Florey families have accessed recently include the new universal home visits for newborns, part of the Every Chance for Every Child program, and money is going into general practice partnerships—\$3.25 million being made available through the Division of General Practice—and the work of the Adelaide North-East Division is well recognised and deserves the fine reputation it enjoys.

There is also a share of money for disability programs, and I will continue to lobby for improvements in this particular area. The HACC packages will also maintain a high priority so that older people can stay in their homes longer, enjoying a good quality of life in familiar surroundings for as long as possible. This is just a snapshot of some of the benefits from this budget. There is much more, of course, that I have not time to mention, and there is much more to be done. Happily, many other good projects are in the pipeline.

In closing, because of the hard work that this government has put in over the past three years, we have before us a period of growth and prosperity that will bring benefit in some way or another to every family in Florey. We have shown that we can make the adjustments to live within our means, and through that work we can look forward to gains. If we continue to work together, our families can enjoy being part of this exciting period for the South Australian community.

As we saw by winning the defence contract yesterday, when we all work together we can successfully tackle challenges. We can be winners and we can be a very best that this nation can be. Our greatest strength is our people, and in South Australia we have much to offer in every walk of life. The history and heritage of this state will continue to defy the odds through innovation and world's best practice in so many areas. This is particularly so in the country, where our people are doing it tough. They are constantly in our thoughts. They have had another very tough year facing the devastation of fires, especially on the Eyre Peninsula, and drought almost everywhere else. On behalf of the people of Florey, I know we all hope that they will soon recover from the hardships they face and have the good rains that we all long for them to have. I commend the budget and the bill.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much chat. The Minister for Administrative Services might like to go and do a bit of administering; the member for Wright might like to take her seat; and we might be able to hear the member for Hartley. The member for Hartley.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): In this 10 minute griever, I would like to concentrate on the electorate of Hartley, which I have had the privilege to represent. Indeed, it is an honour and privilege to represent an electorate in which I was brought up since I was eight years old. We can really discuss the figures of the budget. The reality is that this government has really underestimated its revenue income by about \$600 million per annum for the past few years. There is no question that this government is flush with funds from GST, stamp duty, property taxes, and so on. We can argue about the statistics, but someone told me that a politician uses statistics like a drunk uses a lamp post—not for illumination, but for support. There has been little bit of intoxication with the government's own rhetoric when it comes to this budget. To put it in perspective, I would like to read a letter that was sent me straight after the budget from an angry Hartley constituent. That sums it up, stating as it does:

Dear Joe, I understand that the government has in its 2005 budget reduced or abolished the stamp duty on home loan mortgages. Whilst this may appear a very generous outcome, it is in my view a publicity stunt as the stamp duty on mortgages is probably the least of the costs in acquiring a house. For example, my daughter and her fiancé are currently contracting for a house in Paradise and they have agreed to a sale price of \$277 500. They are first home buyers and are seeking a substantial loan to gain the property.

I was staggered to learn that the fees associated with this transaction were just under \$20 000, making the total cost of the property in the order of \$297 000 or 7 per cent on the cost. On further investigation, the largest component of those costs was not the mortgage duty, it was the property transfer duty going to the state government. This amounted to over \$9 000 and constituted nearly 50 per cent of the fees. It is quite obnoxious that such a duty is imposed on young starters. While the federal government relieves some of that burden with a \$7 000 first home buyers grant, that \$7 000 plus some more is just diverted to the state Treasury. In respect to young people starting out in purchasing a home, little wonder they find it difficult with the 'Foley/Treasury electronic \$\$\$\$ siphon' working to suck and divert millions to state Treasury for doing basically an administrative function in the government's LOTS system.

If the 'Foley smoke and mirror act' thinks that our family and friends will be fooled by this tokenism, he had better think again. Accordingly, if politicians want to make a real difference to young families starting out, there better be a more equitable and considered view of whom they help. I also understand that the government did have the opportunity to reduce property transfer duty but took the soft option. In my view this is a very underhanded approach to assisting young people in a buoyant and in an inflated property market. All this threatens to further erode the ability for young home buyers to purchase a reasonable property!

Angry Hartley constituent

I thought I would read that letter because that sums up the difficulty that young people have, and the reality is that there have been some changes in taxes, but they have been forced upon this government by Treasurer Costello, and so it has responded. But the reality is that they are still taking more in property taxes, and they are still taking more in gambling taxes, and people will not be fooled by this Clayton's relief budget, because that is what it is. People are still hurting out there.

Hartley has an ageing population, and the \$150 one-off for power is welcome, but the reality is increased valuation and property prices—what about all those other increasing costs? What is this government doing to help those—very little—because they will not be bought off with the \$150 handout. Welcome as it is, it is only a short term measure. Looking at some of the local projects: we all know about Lochiel Park, and the government was going to have 100 per cent open space. What has happened to that 100 per cent space? The 100 per cent became 70 per cent, and I visited that area of

Lochiel Park recently and there is nothing there: vandalism, a lot of talk, no action. I am told that the Campbelltown council still does not know how much land it can have around Lochend. Lochend, a heritage building, was the house of the founder of Campbelltown, Charles Campbell, and it requires some certainty. They spent \$600 000-700 000 on this house but there is a fence around it, and it cannot be utilised because of the indecision of this government.

Regarding the former Hectorville school site: I know that some decisions have been made but the vandalism continues. I still get constituents telling me of the problems that exist in that area. It is time that this government made a decision on the materials and services charge. That affects all constituents who have children attending schools. There is uncertainty year in, year out. This government has asked again for an extension until September to work out what to do with the materials and services charge. It is not good enough. I am sure that if the member for Taylor were still minister she would have made the decision. She was well on the way to making the decision. This government has not made the decision, and having uncertainty at the beginning of the school year is not a good thing.

We know how difficult it is with mental health in the community, and I understand that the government has increased the health budget, but it is still under-resourced. If one in five suffers from a mental illness, as the minister rightly said this morning on talk-back, logic will tell you that young people are also suffering from that problem. You imagine trying to teach in a classroom when it is an emotional hothouse, and I have talked to teachers and they tell me that it is very difficult to teach these days because we are putting unrealistic demands on our teaching force without putting the appropriate resources to deal with health problems, and mental health problems. I was on the report that looked into ADHD. The number of young people who suffer from that illness is increasing, as are other areas. We must have a comprehensive look at this.

We know that the government is flush with funds, and this is a time when we should have invested in the future. In good times, even if you look at the Bible, the seven years, the fat cows, and the seven years that followed of the skinny cows, it makes sense to do something—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: That was in Joseph's dream. Well, this Joseph's dream is that the government does something to address these real issues—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: And the Attorney protests too much. He is more interested in passing bills in the upper house because he cannot face them in the lower house. The government has the majority here but it pushes a bill which is unpalatable to the public in the upper house. Face it here where you have a government majority—or, shall I say, with the help of the members for Mount Gambier and Chaffey. This is the time when we should have put some money aside for the future to have some development. I have been told that the Public Works Committee has hardly any references before it.

Mr Brindal: We are getting more now.

Mr SCALZI: I am glad that the member for Unley tells me that they are getting more now.

Time expired.

Ms WHITE (Taylor): I rise to commend the Treasurer and, in fact, all cabinet ministers for their formulation of a very good, well balanced state budget. At this time we have

an historically high rate of employment and economic growth, low rates of unemployment and a particularly strong balance sheet. We are satisfying the ratings agency, which brings the obvious benefits to all citizens of South Australia.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is out of order and out of her seat.

Ms WHITE: We have projections of future budget operating surpluses and we have seen land tax relief. In fact, we have seen tax relief for households and for businesses and, importantly in this budget, the foundations have been set for our future in the \$1 billion infrastructure outlay. Particularly important in that infrastructure outlay is the \$140 million that formed part of our bid for the air warfare destroyer, a \$6 billion contract that brings to the state the promise of secure jobs for future South Australians as well as for our current population. Some 3 000 direct and indirect jobs are predicted to flow from that major boost to our economy. Osborne, of course, will become the centre of a twenty-first century shipbuilding industry, the centre point in Australia for that activity.

Many modules will be produced here: the final assembly of the ships, the infrastructure in the ship lift and the Maritime Skills Centre that will come with that. Particularly interesting to me is the construction, upgrade and maintenance work that will flow from that contract and the impact that will have, not only for the defence industries. As someone who comes out of the defence electronics and communications industries, I know what an impact that will have on South Australia, a state where a lot of our small to medium enterprises struggled considerably in recent years due to delays and negative policy decisions by the federal government when it came to awarding defence contracts. This is a real opportunity for South Australia to promote its small to medium enterprise network as well as the flow-ons to all sorts of industries.

Particularly important in that is the Centre for Excellence in Defence Industry Systems that is being established here, the joint partnership between the South Australian government, the University of South Australia and the Defence Science and Technology Organisation. Through my role as a recent minister for science and information economy and my association with the defence industry generally, I know that that project was being particularly promoted by Dr Nanda Gopal and Dr Neil Bryans, who lead the Defence Science and Technology Organisation. That is a particularly important new development in South Australia because it really targets a systems integration need we have in terms of skills in a lot of industries in South Australia and globally.

It will mean that the expertise we gather through the work on those particular contracts will flow out to industries such as our car industry, our advanced manufacturing industries and even our food processing industries, because those are the very skills that you need in so many modern industries. That will give us a real boost. I was very glad to note the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education's announcement today that we have (according to the NCVER, at least) passed the mark where we now have the most apprentices and traineeships in this state that we have ever had. In fact, we have had a 10 per cent increase in the number of people doing traditional apprenticeships in this state, so that is very welcome news.

A very large part of the infrastructure outlay allocated in this budget is going towards the state's transport network, much of which was announced a couple of months ago. In my

previous role as minister for transport when this was approved by cabinet, I was very pleased to note the impact that that will have on our economy and on both private and public transport networks. In fact, the projects that are being funded in this budget are the very ones that the peak organisations in South Australia came to me and nominated as their top priorities. They are people such as the RAA, the South Australian Freight Council and the South Australian Road Transport Association (SARTA).

The \$122 million that will be spent on construction of the South Road tunnel at Port and Grange Roads, including going under the Outer Harbor rail line, is particularly important. That is one of the major bottlenecks in terms of freight transport in this state, not only for metropolitan Adelaide residents but also for freight operators all over the state. They nominate that as a bottleneck. The \$65 million underpass under South Road and Anzac Highway is something that the RAA was particularly keen to see funded in the Transport Plan and in this budget. Also very pleasing is the \$51 million extension to our tram line network; and \$21 million of that is to link the tram line that ends at Victoria Square with the railway station. In a sense, that is the first step towards a truly rapid transport network and system in metropolitan Adelaide.

Of course, the precursor to that was something that was started by the former transport minister, the Hon. Michael Wright, namely, the purchase of modern light rail vehicles which really will transform our system and link up our train and tram systems with our heavy rail network. It offers much potential for future transport into the future. It will include, of course, improved traffic management in the city, something which has not been talked about very much, and a less congested city than we could otherwise expect. The \$7 million bus and train interchange at the Marion Shopping Centre will make a huge difference to the people of the south.

The upgrade to facilities on the Eyre Peninsula was something I was particularly pleased to see because that will have a big impact. This budget, in terms of delivering for the people of Taylor, delivers much, particularly to the state's 250 000 pensioners, self-funded retirees and low-income earners with \$150 cash in their pockets towards their ETSA bills. The \$92 million extra funding budget for disabilities and the \$45 million extra input for mental health will make a huge difference to those people most needy in our community, and many of those people reside in my electorate.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I feel deeply sorry for those backbenchers opposite who valiantly through the debate and through this grievance debate have tried to defend the indefensible. My colleague the member for Hartley spoke about dreams. There is a line in *Joseph and His Technicolour Dreamcoat*: any dream will do. It might be nice if there was at least one dream in this budget, but I could find none. It is pedestrian, it is second rate and it is a poor attempt at pork-barrelling. I feel sorry—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Attorney-General will come to order.

Mr BRINDAL: Well, I can add up in my head, which is more than the Attorney can do, and I can be—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Another 10 minutes of a stream of consciousness.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley should focus on the substance of the bill.

Mr BRINDAL: I will, sir, but I will make the note, because I think that you, sir, if ever you set up a Dorothy Dix

question as the minister, will at least be there to answer it, as I was. It reaches an extremely low point when a minister, having asked someone to ask a question, is not there to give the answer that he so desperately desired to give this house, especially when they are questions without notice. I do digress, and I will take your wise advice, sir, and get back to the subject at hand, which I am prompted to do because the member for West Torrens said the other night that I did not say a word about Unley.

I am not in the habit, in 16 years of standing up here, and saying that—is the member for West Torrens blessing the people or is he just giving some sort of benevolent wave to the Speaker? The point I was making is that I am not given, in any budget, to passing gratuitous advice about how my electors will benefit from the additional money going into mental health, this that or something else.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No, my electors, generally speaking, in the last 12 years that I have represented Unley, have got nothing from any government at any time of any particular note. My electors have been—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: My electors have been—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Attorney.

Mr BRINDAL:—very poorly served by a succession of governments if pork-barrelling was their aim.

Mr Koutsantonis: That's going in my newsletter.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for West Torrens says, 'That's going in my newsletter.' My electors are intelligent enough to realise that I am elected here to do my best on their behalf for all the people of South Australia, and the people in Unley (often having more than most people in South Australia) are more than happy not to have their hands out when every budget comes around, but to see—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney has been warned. He will be named in a minute.

Mr BRINDAL:—some people, like those whom the member for Enfield represents, for instance, getting a little more than they get. It is actually called social justice. I would think that the people in Unley know a lot more about social justice than most of the members sitting opposite. In fact, I will be encouraging many of my electors to run for Labor seats, because they would do a better job representing people who need justice than those who sit opposite but who espouse words and say nothing.

To return to my theme, *Joseph and His Technicolour Dreamcoat* had a line in it: any dream will do. Well, there was no dream in this budget. The opposition, I think, believes that if this government had any dream at all it would be better than what it is putting forward—a lot better than what it is putting forward. On matters pertaining to Unley, there are a couple of matters which I do not save for the budget but which I will raise again in the context of the budget. However, they are not solely Unley matters: they are matters pertaining to the Adelaide Plains in the metropolitan area, and the foremost of those is the inefficiency of our stormwater system and the likelihood of severe flooding causing danger to property, and possibly even to life—a problem estimated last week to the Public Works Committee to be conservatively well in excess of \$200 million.

Mr Williams: This is the opening bridges?

Mr BRINDAL: No, the opening bridges are another saga. We will be told about the opening bridges. The member for

Hammond will not mind my saying that he made a meal of a couple of projects undertaken by the Liberal government which he considered not to be a wise investment of public money. I only wish, and I am sincere in this, that the member for Hammond had been on the Public Works Committee this morning because, if he thought, as he did, there was something wrong with the perfect fit (that there might have been something wrong with Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium, and certainly he was not all that fussed about the wine centre—and if he had been given the story we were given on the opening bridges), I do not think I would have been responsible for his comments—not that anyone was responsible for the member for Hammond's comments other than the member for Hammond. So, flooding is a problem. The other thing that is a problem, again—

The Hon. I.P. Lewis: I thought we were on the bridges.

Mr BRINDAL: No, we were back on flooding. The member for Croydon described it as a stream of consciousness: it actually has some theme. Flooding, as I said, is a problem, and again a problem not only relevant to Unley but also to the electorates of Adelaide, Norwood, Mitcham and such other of the inner city electorates that may have this problem. This is a problem of planning controls and the lack of controls over demolition. Adelaide has—and I think we can be proud of it—a unique character, a character that has come from the way that this city developed, and a character that I hope, in world terms, is rather elegant and unique.

It is probably mostly influenced by the existence of quarter acre blocks and large blocks in very close proximity to the city. But, because a succession of governments has had urban consolidation policies, each of those governments, in fairness to this chamber, has had policies saying very clearly that urban consolidation can and should take place where it is relevant and where it fits the needs of the infrastructure and some of the characteristics of the area. Unfortunately, in their greedy grabs for increasing ratepayer revenue, many councils have taken that as *carte blanche* to demolish character homes willy-nilly, put up Tuscan monstrosities and basically turn what were beautiful areas into something less. Every member of this house that represents—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: A lot of people live in those in Adelaide.

Mr BRINDAL: I know a lot of people live in those, but I cannot help their poor taste. If they live in those and do not vote for me, I will be quite grateful, because I like to think I have a better type of thinking person who votes for me.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Look, members opposite can laugh as much as they like but, sir, would you remind them that to take excerpts from *Hansard* and report them in a way calculated to be prejudicial to another member is, in fact, a serious contempt of this house?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That is not right: that is wrong.

Mr BRINDAL: It is not wrong.

Mr Koutsantonis: See you in court.

Mr BRINDAL: Well, we will see, and we may well see after the next election because, if members opposite think they will get away with the tawdry little tricks they tried to pull on my ex-colleague Sam Bass and others, they might get a rude shock this time because the people of South Australia are waking up to tricks and foul play generally. They actually do not like thuggery and standover tactics, and the ALP, in so far as it continues to exercise those sorts of tactics, wants to realise that it is 50 years out of date and we are living in a civilised South Australia where people are a lot more

intelligent than they are given credit for by members opposite. There is a belief opposite that people are idiots and do not know the difference between taking a comment out of context and the value of someone's work. Well, I will stand on my record for the value of my work in this place and let the members for West Torrens and Croydon do their worst. I will be here: they will not.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: And have the guts to run for a marginal seat yourself.

Time expired.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has finished. The member for Napier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley and the Attorney are on dangerous ground. The member for Napier.

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): On Monday of this week in question time the Leader of the Opposition asked the Treasurer the following:

Will the Treasurer concede that he has changed the accounting method used so as to hide the fact that the Labor government expects to deliver what would have been a budget deficit in three of the next four years?

That was a clear interference that we were basically trying to disguise budget outcome. What the Leader of the Opposition was alluding to (although I am not sure that he had a clear grasp of the accounting principles) was a move from net lending outcomes to net operating balance. Last year—and I cannot take credit for the move—I suggested that we make this move to expressing final budget outcome in terms of net operating balance. I said last year that, as a reader of profit and loss statements, I find the GFS (government finance statistics) net operating balance the most useful indicator, subtracting, as it does, expenses, including depreciation, from revenue. I said further:

The GFS net lending outcome figures, I believe—

these are the figures that the Leader of the Opposition would like us to continue to use—

understate the financial health of the state, deducting (as they do) all purchases of non-financial assets from the net operating balance, while loading back in depreciation. This seems to be a hybrid accrual and cash flow measure which expenses capital acquisitions.

I went on to explain this by saying:

The construction of a hospital wing, for argument's sake, cannot be equated with expenses such as wages or office consumables. The consumables are consumed, but the hospital wing remains.

Perhaps I could explain this a little more simply. If we look at the man in the street trying to work out his financial position at the end of the financial year. The Liberal Party is asking us to look at the amount of wages that this individual has received during the course of the year, deduct taxes and all other expenses and, if that individual has bought a home during the course of the year, deduct that also.

If this individual earned, say, \$50 000 a year, after the deduction of taxation and all other expenses, he would end up with \$15 000 in the bank and then, if he happened to buy a house for \$300 000, under the Liberal Party that person's financial position at the end of the year would be down the gurgler to the extent of \$15 000 minus \$300 000 for the purchase of a home. It does not make sense. What the Treasurer has done makes a lot of solid financial sense. It is not a distortion of the final budget outcome; the net operating balance is clear. The Leader of the Opposition wants to

continue to lay upon us the net lending outcome. That is a complete and utter distortion of the projected final budget outcome.

I refer to the uniform presentation framework, which was agreed by the Australian Loan Council in March 1997. It was based on a review undertaken by the heads of Treasury. They wanted to move to the net operating balance, away from this net lending outcome which the Leader of the Opposition seems to defend and which he wants to retain. I think the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party at some stage will have to come into this house and tell us how they would frame their budgets. What the uniform presentation framework (agreed by the Loan Council) says in respect of the operating balance is as follows:

The operating balance provides a measure of government saving that encompasses the full costs of providing government services (including all accruing costs) and hence indicates whether the existing level of services can be sustained.

It states:

In measuring changes in the government's fiscal position the underlying deficit and operating balance [which we have moved to] are considered the most relevant for assessing fiscal soundness.

That is what the Loan Council said on this recommendation from the heads of Treasury. The Liberal Party wants to go back to a measure that it was recommended we move away from in 1997. That is a move backwards. I do not think members opposite have a grip on the way that the finances of this state are worked out.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

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

Mr O'BRIEN: I refer now to the guidelines for the presentation of the federal budget which say in respect of the measure that the Leader of the Opposition wants us to use:

As such it approximates the contribution of the Australian general government sector to the balance of the current account and the balance of payments.

What relevance does that have for the South Australian community? It might be great at the federal level to work out where your balance of payments is sitting, but it has absolutely no relevance to the South Australian parliament or the South Australian community. On Monday, the Leader of the Opposition said that we should use this particular measure. The Leader of the Opposition stood up in this place on Monday and asked a question; I think he should come in here and give us some answers.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): The contribution of the member for Napier was quite interesting. He has improved his contributions since moving from the backbench up a level. The point that the member for MacKillop was making was about comparing apples with apples. The opposition is saying that we should look at the figures for this year in the same way as the figures which were presented last year. We are not arguing whether or not this is a better way to do it; it is just a matter of comparing apples with apples.

I refer to the figures that presented by the minister for education in terms of school retention. I well remember during my four years as minister that we were roundly criticised about retention figures. The then shadow minister (the member for Taylor) criticised our school retention figures. We consistently came back with the fact that part-time students were not included in the retention figures and that South Australia had some 27 per cent of year 12 students undertaking part-time study whereas the highest number in

any other state (from memory) was Western Australia with about 10 per cent. Those figures not being included affected our school retention figures.

I remember that the leader of the opposition at that time (now Premier) ignored that fact completely. So now, when the retention figures are not reacting in the way in which the Minister for Education would like, what do they do? They change the counting and the way the figures are produced. No longer does the government use the official ABS figures: it has its own formula to do the work. That is hypocritical when you then produce figures that may appear favourable but do not compare apples with apples, and that is what is being said tonight about the presentation of this budget.

I said the other day that there are a number of disappointing things about the budget, but I did not mention the roads in the South-East. The budget contains nothing for those roads. Anybody who has travelled to the South-East will have seen the thousands of hectares planted to blue gum eucalypts—trees that, not too far down the track, will mature. Where is the infrastructure to ensure that those blue gum logs can be moved by road or rail? Nothing is happening. It will be a huge problem for this government or our government in the next term of office, and it will need to be addressed. The roads are not up to the standard to take the heavy traffic that will travel on them.

The Committee for Adelaide Roads issued a press release about the budget, entitled 'Budget: a mixed blessing'. It states that, over the next 10 years, some \$1.5 billion of expenditure will be needed to cope with the anticipated growth in traffic and freight to keep South Australia competitive. What do we see? Nowhere near that figure. As I said the other night, the RAA indicates that some \$200 million is required for the backlog of road maintenance; however, only \$22 million has been allocated in this budget. Sir, every other country member and I will tell you that more money is desperately needed, particularly when the government is considering the extension of the tramline from North Terrace to North Adelaide.

This morning, a constituent came to see me and told me of her despair about a friend who has long-term mental health problems. Her friend had been abandoned as a child and had spent her youth in the orphanage at Goodwood. She suffered from anorexia in her late teenage years. She got married and had a child, after which she suffered postnatal depression. Subsequently, she had another child but, by that time, the department took her child away because, mentally, she could not cope. She does not recognise her first child. Her husband is trying to cope with this almost impossible situation. She is only 22 years old and now suffers from dementia. Some support is available for her in the system, but it is nowhere near enough. I am not criticising the government about this issue, as it has built up over a number of years.

Having talked with this person today, she indicated that some friends in England had told her that the English system places people with mental illness back into the community. However, some 60 per cent of those people end up in gaol, as many commit crimes either because they are not taking their drugs or because they become involved in drug trafficking. As a result, I am told that the British government is now reassessing that policy and looking at re-establishing the institutions of the early 1960s and 1970s to ensure that these people get their medication on a regular basis and are kept where they are safe and where their families know they are safe.

As much as we do not want to institutionalise people, my constituent told me that sometimes these people just go off the rails and do not receive adequate care. She told me that she just had to talk to someone, as her friend was in a desperate state. I told her that I would write to the minister and outline the situation to see what more could be done. When you see spending on certain projects in this budget, and then you are told a story such as this, you ask: where are the priorities of this government?

I would say that this is the highest taxing government I have seen since I have been in this place. The amount of revenue it will collect—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The second highest taxing government.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: That is exactly right—this one, the one last year and the one before. As to payroll tax for small businesses in South Australia, the threshold for 2005-06 is \$504 000. It is the lowest threshold of any state in Australia, and small businesses are looking for relief. This is a regressive tax, and any relief that can be given will be an advantage for small business. This government will collect some \$3.4 billion worth of GST revenue. I think back to when we were in government: we actually had to pay the federal government \$38 million in the first few years of the GST. I remember having to find an amount—and I am pretty sure it was \$11 million—in the education budget to pay back to the commonwealth. There was no such windfall gain as this government is seeing. The emergency services levy collection this year is up by 6 per cent. When the Liberal Party was in power, we fixed that amount of income collected.

Time expired.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): I am very pleased to be able to contribute to the debate on the Labor government's fourth budget. I want to pick up again on areas that are causing concern, particularly to many of my constituents, who are asking questions about why money that they believe should be spent in certain areas is not being spent. One of the major questions that is being asked by my electorate at the moment relates to the \$22 million promise by the Labor government that it will fix the roads and the roads infrastructure throughout South Australia. Unfortunately, it was not until a couple of days after the budget was brought down that many of them understood that the \$22 million, as small an amount as it is, stretches over three years. So we are looking at a pretty paltry \$7.3 million a year for the road infrastructure, which is in very bad repair throughout the whole of this state.

That amount of \$7.3 million is certainly not going to even touch the edges in terms of the majority of our roads, let alone cover maintenance or redoing many of the roads. Not only will many roads be stretched to capacity but they will also deteriorate over the next few years if that is the amount of money that this government intends to spend. This represents a very serious and distinct lack of management of the state road system by the Labor government when we consider that, at this point in time, we are talking about anything between \$160 million and \$200 million of backlog maintenance to bring the roads up to scratch, let alone renewing roads and placing new roads on our landscape.

The other very surprising aspect that people were questioning me about was the fact that the transport minister, minister Conlon, pledged some \$35 million in another area of spending, that is, the purchase of some 48 new red-light

cameras. That only confirmed their view that the Labor government certainly has an obsession with revenue raising. That \$35 million pledge to purchase new red-light cameras has only confirmed my constituents' belief that the Labor government as a whole is not really interested in road safety factors, which are extremely important to all of us right across this state. If, in fact, that money was directed into construction of roads and maintenance over the next few years to address the backlog of \$200 million, it would take this government something like 27 years just to repair the roads that are damaged at this time.

As I pointed out earlier, it is quite surprising that the budget continues some of the sequences and the precedents seen in past budgets whereby it allocates dollars and makes announcements in terms of tens of millions of dollars when, in many aspects, only very small amounts of dollars will be spent under this budget. We can see that this government, in terms of insignificant funding—about which many people are complaining at present—is bulking up allocations into three or four year figures. I am sure that we are all convinced that it is doing that just to provide a rather impressive headline.

People in this state also remember the Bakewell Bridge issue. Quite a fuss was made by the Labor government about the replacement of the Bakewell Bridge, an announcement being made that the government would arrange for some \$30 million to be available for replacement. What it did not tell the people of the state was that there was no money in the budget for that project. But the announcement sounded good. There was to be \$30 million of expenditure and the Bakewell Bridge was to be replaced. But, when we looked in the budget papers, we saw no amount of money to cover replacement of any part of that bridge.

Mr Venning: They were not doing their job.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order! I warn the member for Schubert.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: It is likewise with country roads.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order!

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: We have had an empty promise of some \$5.8 million to fix accident black spots. Again, when we looked, there was no money in the 2004-05 budget. The Labor Party in opposition made quite a deal of the issue of black spots, because that is where tragedies occur; that is where lives are lost. They are the most dangerous areas in the state. The roads contributed to the danger and people were dying. Now we have in power a Labor government which has forgotten its own arguments about black spots, which is showing that it does not give a damn about road safety and which, in fact, has cut funding to black spot areas right across this state. Now that is a tragedy, and it is a tragedy of massive proportions. If we continue to have the tragedy of deaths in these areas then it will come back to haunt this Labor government that has so absolutely, inanely, removed the type of funding that is necessary to correct some of the problems in black spot areas.

I think that many South Australians would also be shocked to learn that the Rann government takes some \$800 million a year from motorists through registration, third party, and GST on petrol but, in return, spends the least amount of money on road safety and traffic management in Australia.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: How much is that? Can you tell us how much that is?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I can tell you, Mr Attorney—and thank you for asking—that the national figures show that

South Australia has the lowest expenditure per person on road safety.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What is the expenditure in dollars?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Just listen and I shall tell you. The 2005 Productivity Commission report on government services reveals that the South Australian government spends just \$9 a person on road safety and traffic management issues compared to \$29 a person nationally, and up to \$46 a person in the state of Western Australia. What is South Australia—\$9 per person on road safety and traffic management, and yet \$800 million is taken out of the hip pockets—again in the areas that are part of the road safety contribution—but I am afraid that only a very small portion goes back. I think that we can all agree that safe travel on our roads is a joint responsibility of motorists and government.

Road safety, though, is not just up to individual motorists. The government must also play a role by ensuring that our roads are safe to drive on. Keeping road safety as a top priority among road users, and looking at things like education campaigns and, particularly, extra police on our roads, is all part of what this government should be doing, and looking at, at this point in time. However, as I have said, under this government, according to the national Productivity Commission, South Australia spends less per person on road safety than any other state or territory. In its 3½ years in office, this government has failed to address that \$200 million road maintenance backlog as well as it has failed to assign extra traffic police to increase police visibility as a traffic calming measure.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Why are we so far in front of you in the polls?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: We are starting to catch up; don't get too cocky about that. Other areas of this budget have had shortfalls and, unfortunately, that will have to wait until another time.

Time expired.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Last Thursday in this house after question time, the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries asked me my opinion on the current situation with the Barley Marketing Act. Did I favour the implementation of a GLA or what was my position? Since then, the minister has written to me, so I use this opportunity tonight to put my views officially on the record, and I also wrote back to the minister today in the same vein. Not many members of this house understand the mechanism of orderly collective marketing of grain, commonly called single desk. The member for Enfield understands, and I commend him for his support on this matter. I will spell out in very clear terms what value it brings to growers and the South Australian economy generally. Of course, I again declare my interest as a barley and wheat grower.

While the world grain market remains essentially corrupt with subsidies and tariff protections given by most other countries to their growers, the Australian farmer operates a business, growing grain efficiently with no help from government. They developed the single desk to give them collective bargaining power and to maximise grower returns, develop markets, develop varieties, and also to do their own research and development. One thing stands in the way of the continued success of exporting barley in South Australia by this method, and that is the prospect of this government—or any government for that matter—repealing the Barley Marketing Act 1993.

I have discussed this issue before, and, since the minister approached me on the floor of the house, I have discussed it again with members of the South Australian Farmers Federation, because the minister was concerned that the Farmers Federation was not quite sure of its position and was beginning to wobble. So, I spent the weekend on the phone, and I am meeting quite a few of them, and I am much assured tonight as I deliver this speech. SAFF Grains Council, in consultation with the industry, has recommended changes to barley marketing whilst retaining the single desk. I support that, no ifs, no buts. Growers have deliberated and moved forward but the minister has made no announcement on where he is going. I am urging him to leave it in place. He has not said anything, he has not encouraged anybody to do anything, and I think that the minister has been quite derelict in his duty. He is supposed to lead, he is supposed to get out there and do the honey bee, pick up the nectar, and then come into this place and reflect what the industry wants. He has not given the industry much leadership at all, or indication of what he is thinking, or what he is going to do.

The question is: will he support the changes recommended by SAFF and the industry, or, as he said to me, 'Just abolish the Barley Marketing Act altogether.'? Recent press reports saying that single desk is only about pricing of grain is a false representation. These come from a small group of disgruntled growers, mainly from the Mallee, who are being supported anonymously by international grain trading companies. These growers number less than 20, and are having a rough ride at the moment, but they are chipping away. When they encounter difficulties or come under pressure from their peers, many fall away, but really they are a declining group. Some of the letters appearing on our desks—and many other members would have received them because I have—have been written by Brooks Brothers, but we know that some of them have come from a public relations company, Glencore.

Mr Leighton Huxtable, who is well known to me and others, is a very strong advocate of getting rid of the single desk, because he is a trader. At least he is being consistent in that. All they want to do is get rid of the single desk. They do not see the risk we put ourselves in if we do that. Let us be very clear about what is at stake here. It is not only about the barley single desk in South Australia: the multinational grain traders are after the big target, which is not barley but wheat. They want to get rid of the single desk for wheat even more than they do for barley.

The Grain Licensing Authority (GLA) in Western Australia has proved a failure in the past year, with cash prices being outperformed because of the single desk pooling system. As I said to the minister the other night on the floor of the house, South Australian growers do not want a GLA. Deregulating the grain industry will only transfer a large percentage of profit from the industry to overseas multinational corporations. If that was not the case, why would they want to be in it? They want a larger grab. We have seen what multinationals do via Woolworths, Coles and others, in profit making from the source products, which get squeezed down to nothing, and they rip off the profits.

We have seen the successful wine industry over the years. Most production is now owned by overseas interests, and I have no problem with the French owning Orlando, the Americans at Berenger Blass and Southcorp, or the Swiss at Lehmann; and the list goes on. The stakes are incredibly high. It is not only about price: it is about retaining companies and their business in this state or at least in Australia. Doctor

Tony O'Malley of Viva SA, in an article in last week's *Stock Journal*, stated:

The wine industry is not going to grow as it did in the past decade. The major brands have no offices in South Australia. That is also what the Foster's takeover of Southcorp means.

Let us look at what SAFF and the industry propose. They want third party access to pools for other companies purchasing barley, and I support that. They want improved accountability and transparency of the single desk. I agree, even if it means creating an office of an independent regulator or auditor. They want separation of the Australian Barley Board export pools from its other business activities and an audited report on pool performance once they are finalised. SAFF also proposes to benchmark the other services being provided by the Australian Barley Board that are charged to growers, and that is also fair enough. The barley industry in South Australia has set the pace in Australia since 1920, when a group of growers from Yorke Peninsula formed a cooperative to market their barley overseas.

Subsequently, the barley industry has grown to be larger in South Australia than in any other state. In fact, South Australia markets 25 per cent of the world's traded barley. This state's industry has set the pace in maximising prices for growers for over 80 years. Grain analyst Malcolm Bartholomaeus has determined that ABB's pool prices outperform harvest cash prices in the majority of years. Coming from him I would believe it, because he also tends to be a bit of a deregulator, although I take it from Malcolm. The ABB also provides services in financing payments, risk management of currency, and shipping and transport, all adding value to the growers' grain. I remind members that this value is returned to growers who supply the grain.

Brooks Grain actively purchases barley from growers in Australia for domestic and overseas clients. Unlike ABB, which is a South Australian company owned by Australians, Brooks is a wholly-owned subsidiary of international commodity trader Glencore. ABB's profits are taxed in Australia; Glencore accumulates profits in Zug, Switzerland, where it pays no tax at all. Brooks is engaged by Glencore and Brooks is the name on all the lobby correspondence that we have been receiving—straight from Glencore's PR office, as I said earlier. If this minister repeals the Barley Marketing Act to install a GLA like Western Australia's or to totally deregulate, I will never support that happening. I will push for the installation of an independent regulator/auditor similar to the Australian Wheat Board.

If it is good enough for the Wheat Board, why can we not keep it for barley? Mr Rob Reese, whom I have known for many years, is active in PIRSA, and it is people like him and others close to the minister who are hell bent on deregulation. I have no problem with Mr Reese: he is a good fellow who knows his job. He has consistently, for years and years, wanted to deregulate the market. After all, that is his job: he is a grain marketer and adviser. If that is where the minister is getting his advice from, I suggest he listens to others as well. New information is that the pools in Western Australia are returning better prices than the GLA. I know that Mr Andy Crane, the chairman of the grain pool, is working up a position paper on this.

The Grain Growers Association is a dissident group pushing for deregulation. Rumour has it that it had its AGM in a phone box the other day and people were complaining about empty seats! Seriously, everybody is entitled to a point of view. It is up to others to ensure that they do not get snowed by outside interests. I will continue to support the

retention of a single desk for barley and wheat in Australia. It has served our farmers and economy well, and I hope that it will long into the future.

Time expired.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Just as the Premier intervened and allocated additional resources to the DPP, so too do I ask that he intervene to resolve my concerns regarding the staffing levels in the Flinders electorate offices. The Flinders electorate is entitled to only 2.1 full-time equivalent staff members and I pay an extra 1.2 staff members out of my own pocket. Because of the sheer size of the electorate of Flinders, which is roughly the size of Tasmania, I have to run two offices: one full time at Port Lincoln and another two days a week at Ceduna, four hours drive away.

The bushfire has brought to a head the urgent need in my office for more staff, something I have been asking the Treasurer for since May last year. Since that time I have sent the Treasurer four letters asking for additional funding for staff, together with faxes and telephone calls, and he did not have the courtesy to acknowledge even a single one of them until recently when, on 5 April, some 11 months after my initial letter, he sent me a three-line response rejecting the request without explanation.

I understand that the electorates of Stuart and Giles are staffed at a rate of around 2.5 FTE; and, although Flinders is not geographically quite as large as either of these electorates, I do serve about the same number of people at 32 558, according to the most recent census. However, in Flinders they are spread more evenly throughout the electorate.

I have to respond to concerns about 10 hospitals (which equates to 12 per cent of the state's hospitals), two health centres, 72 education institutions and 10 local councils (14.7 per cent of South Australia's local governments) and to the dire needs for better access to the most basic services, such as mains water, telecommunications, public transport and safe roads, in relation to myriad other inquiries that are the bread and butter of an active electorate office in this huge and diverse electorate.

Due to the geographic and demographic layout of the Flinders electorate, I run two offices rather than one central office—as occurs in Stuart and Giles—to better serve my constituents and to address the vast array of issues, but this puts considerable strain on the resources available to me. The Port Lincoln office operates full time, Monday to Friday, 8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m., in line with other electorate offices throughout the state. However, while other full-time electorate offices are staffed at a rate of two FTE, my office has to manage with 1.7 FTE.

This is particularly difficult when I take one staff person out of the Port Lincoln office to accompany me either to Adelaide during the four-day sittings to assist in maintaining contact with my offices or to assist with the driving requirements to travel around the electorate to meet constituents if it were not supplemented with the staff I pay myself. The travel required is an occupational health and safety issue that is never taken into consideration when considering staffing. For example, two weeks ago a staff member had to assist me with driving as I visited Ceduna and Streaky Bay (an eight-hour trip).

Last week, after several late nights attending parliament, I needed a staff person to help drive to Kimba, a five hour round trip in the opposite direction. A DECS employee attending the same meeting hit three kangaroos on the way up to Kimba from Port Lincoln and had to be rescued.

Fortunately, he was not injured. My Ceduna office is open for two days a week with .4 FTE, and will be even more critical when, after the next election, we will officially be responsible right across to the border with Western Australia. I would not be happy but would stop complaining if the Premier would at least consider allocating an additional .3 FTE staff, which would make the number of staff working in the Port Lincoln electorate office on a par with the rest of the state's electorate offices.

Soon after Labor came into government, most electorate offices in the state had their electorate staff doubled, largely for occupational health and safety reasons. However, Flinders did not receive any additional staffing entitlement, despite having to manage without other members of parliament—either state or federal, upper or lower house—nearby to carry out some of the load, such as the much appreciated and well-used justice of the peace service, unlike metropolitan offices. At this point, I reminded the Premier that the recent ministerial portfolio reshuffle (brought about by the resignation of the member for Taylor) resulted in an additional 16 new ministerial staff.

There are 15 ministers in the government, yet one resignation and reappointment created a reshuffle which suddenly created 16 new positions. In addition, I note that in this budget there are 1 842 more public servants than were budgeted for last time. I find this a bitter pill to swallow, when my staff and I in our huge electorate, with the extra load of the bushfire and the distinct possibility of impending drought, cannot be allocated a mere .3 of a position, which would be on top of the 1.2 staff that I already pay for the sake of our mental health safety and wellbeing.

The recent tragic bushfires on Eyre Peninsula may have faded from the headlines now, but the recovery process will take much longer. We are now in the dangerous phase after a traumatic event when the accumulated mental and emotional stress can manifest itself in depression, anxiety and post traumatic stress disorders, as highlighted in the speech I gave in Mount Gambier. My staff and I have been at the forefront of working for bushfire victims. The additional workload has not been recognised by this government. I am gravely concerned, too, for many of my farming and rural families, some of whom are facing yet another year without income.

I am sure that I do not have to remind the Premier that my electorate has huge potential, and if this state is to triple its exports (as he set in his goals) much of this export will have to come from the Flinders electorate. Already nearly 40 per cent of the state's grain and 65 per cent of the state's seafood comes from the Eyre Peninsula, and the mining potential may be the proverbial Aladdin's cave. The region already contributes \$1 billion to the state's economy each year, and I am working hard to boost that further by helping to facilitate new projects and investments to bring about more wealth and prosperity for the future, not only for my constituents but for the whole state.

I need more staff hours and I think that I have a very strong case. I call on the Premier urgently to meet my request and ask him to be generous. In days gone by a region such as mine might have had two members and staff, but now it is supposed to be one vote one value. This could only be the case if I am provided with more staff. In the time left, I will quote a few paragraphs from my letter to the Treasurer of 29 April this year in response to his rejection letter. It does not surprise me that the Treasurer has neither acknowledged nor responded to this correspondence to date. My letter states:

Dear Kevin,

The workload in my office has not abated since I wrote to you about this subject. In fact, it reached crisis point in the aftermath of the devastating bushfire here on Eyre Peninsula on January 11. As well as the direct impact on residents who tragically lost family members and had their homes and properties destroyed, the bushfire has had a ripple effect on the entire community that cannot be underestimated. I take this opportunity to congratulate the state government on its response to helping victims by setting up a single one-stop shop for advice and referrals.

However, my office is one of those agencies at the front line of helping bushfire victims, both in the days immediately following the fire and in ongoing recovery progress and also needs urgent assistance. Demand for help has been such that, in addition to the many people who contacted the Bushfire Recovery Centre, my staff and I have been contacted by hundreds of bushfire victims and others who have sought our help on issues as diverse as feed and transport for surviving livestock where the stamp duty could be waived on replacement homes and vehicles and referrals for counselling.

Many of these constituents have contacted us multiple times, and the queries are still coming in. We have also taken a lot of calls from people in other parts of the state, and interstate, from people wanting to help. Some bushfire victims simply wanted to talk to a sympathetic listener, and we had traumatised people break down in our office. People who come to us for help in these circumstances cannot be fobbed off quickly with a phone number or a pamphlet. My staff have done their best to respond with sensitivity and to help in any way they can, but the sudden increase in work load for an office that was already over-stretched has taken its toll on all of us.

For example, one Friday recently my full-time assistant was alone in the office for most of the day as a trainee and the person I personally pay for were both away sick and I was in Adelaide. During the morning, my assistant had a stressful emotional interview that took almost an hour, while juggling five phone calls and another three people coming into the office. We need at least one more full-time person. However, I would be happy if we could get funding for even 0.3 FTE staff. This would take the number of staff working in the Port Lincoln Flinders electorate office that are paid for by the state government to two FTE, on par with most full-time electorate offices in the state.

Time expired.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to grieve about the issue of bullying and intimidation, particularly within the health system, although it is pretty endemic throughout this government, as we have seen in the last week, because it goes right up to the Deputy Premier and the way he tried to deal with the DPP of the state.

I want to start firstly with Mount Gambier, because clear evidence has been presented to this parliament that at Mount Gambier one doctor has had to go on extended stress leave because of bullying and intimidation at the Mount Gambier Hospital. I pointed out when parliament sat in Mount Gambier that five doctors currently work at or have previously worked at the hospital who are in the process of taking legal action against the hospital over bullying and intimidation there. We know that some of the doctors have gone interstate because of bullying and intimidation.

We know that the two mental health nurses at the hospital left the hospital and resigned because of bullying and intimidation, and I raised the issue of the former director of nursing also resigning because of bullying and intimidation within the hospital. I was absolutely astounded then, immediately after cabinet had sat in Mount Gambier, to find a letter to the editor from the Chairperson of the Mount Gambier District Health Service Board, Mr Peter Whitehead. The letter is dated Tuesday 10 May, just after the parliament had met in Mount Gambier and had heard of a number of problems with bullying and intimidation in the administration of the hospital. The chair of the board writes:

On behalf of the (Mount Gambier and District Hospital Board), I respond to your editorial on 6 May 2005 and advise you that there are no complaints of harassment and bullying lodged with the board, and therefore there is nothing to report to the community on this subject.

That is an outrageous statement because we know evidence was presented to the select committee of the upper house on that subject and letters have been sent to the chair of the board and the hospital. I will read to the house a letter sent from one of the doctors to the Editor of *The Border Watch*, Dr Kevin Johnston, specialist anaesthetist, in which he said:

Of more concern, Mr Peter Whitehead has stated that there are no complaints of harassment or bullying lodged with the board. Clearly, the chairman has forgotten that he received just such a formal complaint from me, lodged with him personally on 23 November 2004. While checking his files he might find copies of the subsequent letters of 12 December, 17 December and 29 December 2004 relating to the same matter. With luck he might even be able to find a copy of his reply of 20 December 2004, in which he confirmed his receipt of the original formal complaint.

Since that matter has not been investigated at the hospital, it remains lodged with the board. How can the community be confident that other similar complaints have not been forgotten in the system? The other issue is that other similar issues have been raised and five doctors are taking legal action against the hospital. I have copies of a number of those letters, including the letter from Dr Johnston to Peter Whitehead as chair of the board, lodged on 12 December 2004 and that letter is very clear concerning harassment, intimidation and misuse of authority within the hospital.

It horrifies me that the chair of the hospital board at Mount Gambier is willing to come out and make a statement that is plainly untrue. There can be no denying that because, first, I raised in question time in Mount Gambier the previous week at least three different cases concerning harassment and intimidation at the hospital. I understand the matter was raised with the minister when she met with the board (or she said she would raise it with the board of the hospital), yet we have this outrageous statement made:

I advise you that there are no complaints of harassment and bullying lodged with the board and therefore there is nothing to report to the community on this subject.

Frankly, someone who misrepresents the truth to such an extent is not fit to be chair of that board.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Is that right?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That's right. Someone who misrepresents the truth, when you have black and white statements—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Say it out there.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: A doctor has written a letter to the editor saying exactly that. The facts are there: there are a series of letters and claims made in parliament which outline that fact. The trouble is that the Attorney-General has not bothered—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Read out the letter.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have read part of the letter already. In a hospital where serious issues have arisen concerning the resignation of doctors, doctors taking stress leave, two mental health nurses leaving and the director of nursing leaving also, I am horrified that it appears that the chair of the hospital board is so deaf to the complaints and so blind to the letters that have been sent to him that he cannot even acknowledge that a complaint has been lodged (either with him as the chair of the board or with the board). This is astounding, and it is bad for Mount Gambier, extremely bad, but there are also situations in other hospitals such as

Wudinna where there have been ongoing allegations about bullying and intimidation of nursing staff. So bad are these issues that the regional board initiated—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —a clinical review of the issues raised, because a doctor had to go to the Ombudsman and the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity concerning threats and intimidation made against him. I have heard the tapes. That is why the Ombudsman used a rare power and put a stay of action on the hospital board at Wudinna. Despite that clinical review, which took place more than six months ago, we have heard nothing, even though serious issues of intimidation and bullying have been raised. I have received numerous complaints about bullying and intimidation, and I have raised them with the Ombudsman, who has found in favour of those complaints at hospitals such as Glenside. I have raised complaints within government in terms of mental health services in the northern suburbs, and I have raised complaints in relation to major hospitals.

The minister was on talkback radio this morning and a nurse called in. This nurse had achieved excellent results in her nursing degree. She worked within the hospital system for (I think she said) six to eight months before leaving because of bullying and intimidation. The select committee has heard complaints about bullying and intimidation within the hospital system. When you look at the large number of reports and the extent to which it all gets swept under the carpet, you start to appreciate that it is endemic amongst a significant part of senior management. In fact, I would argue that it goes right up to ministerial officers and the way ministerial staff deal with the press in this state. We know that government press secretaries ring the media and bully, intimidate and threaten them. The media have complained about it, and of course we have seen examples—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Could you give one single example of that?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: If you want an example, look at the most recent example where the Deputy Premier rang and obviously intimidated and bullied the DPP. That has been outlined clearly. I am concerned because the bullying and intimidation that is endemic within the health system is counterproductive to having a high-quality system where people can report malpractice and inappropriate behaviour. This bullying and intimidation is also rife in Queensland where they had Dr Death. I want to make sure that we do not have that situation here in South Australia.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I have great pleasure in contributing to the debate on the bringing down of the budget. I would like to continue the remarks that I was making yesterday evening concerning some specific issues involving the electorate of Kavel, particularly road safety.

What has become clearly evident to me is that this government is more focused on continuing to raise revenue by punitive actions in terms of increasing fines and measures of that nature, instead of looking to spend more money on providing ways of improving road safety. The government continues to ramp up punitive measures such as fines,

increasing demerit points and things of that nature, instead of spending money on initiatives to assist motorists and also to improve the condition of our roads.

There are a couple of quite glaring examples of this in my electorate. I have raised this issue on a number of occasions both in the house and by letters to the minister; that is, the intersection of the Woodside Road and Princess Highway in the township of Nairne. I have to say that I am reaching the point where I cannot understand the stance of the minister, the parliamentary secretary and the department on this matter. We have a T-junction intersection and a school crossing immediately adjacent to that intersection, with the actual primary school being situated on another road which runs off the main road and which is very close to that T-junction. In the morning and in the evening, when children are either dropped off or picked up, there is significant congestion at that intersection.

I have visited the site on a number of occasions. I have stood at the school crossing at the end of the school day and witnessed cars being held up in a queue for at least 12 minutes. The road is called Saleyard Road. After picking their children up from school, it takes people 12 minutes to travel from the end of that road (which is not that long—it is probably 150 metres, if that) and turn onto the main road. I do not know what you think, Mr Deputy Speaker, but I think a 12-minute wait on a side road in a rural town, after picking up children from a local primary school, is excessive. Parents are subjected to this problem every school day, both morning and night.

Another issue is the traffic congestion on the Woodside Road, as a result of the significant residential development on either side of the road in the township of Nairne. If anyone wished to drive along that main road tomorrow, they would see new roads, new services and new infrastructure being built to cater for the new housing development that is taking place. With the increased demand on the Woodside road, there is traffic congestion at the T-junction. Combined with the congestion on the Saleyard Road, created by the primary school traffic, it has become an intolerable situation. Transport SA is not coming up with any long-term solution. All I ask for is a set of traffic lights at that intersection, and I do not think it is out of the question. The school crossing could be abolished, but where the children need to cross the road could be incorporated with a set of traffic lights. You do not have to be a genius to work that out.

The last letter I received was from the parliamentary secretary, but it was only a regurgitation of the advice received from Transport SA. We get the standard response, 'No; there is not enough traffic. It is not high on the list of priorities, so you're not getting a set of traffic lights.' I think that is pretty short-sighted, because I believe there is a real need, as does the local community and the school community. It is a strong argument. It would not be too costly, as electricity has already been laid a few metres away from the intersection—and the school crossing is only a few metres away. I do not know the price of a set of traffic lights—perhaps \$100 000—but a considerable component of the cost would be running the power to the site. The power is already there, so all that needs to be done is to install the poles and the lights, and the problem will be solved for many years.

However, we do not get a positive response, just the same old, same old—namely, a total refusal to acknowledge the problem. What it will take is an accident to occur, and I really dread a serious incident involving a child. By then, unfortunately, it will be too late. If a child is hurt or injured, or if

something even more serious happens, I will say that I asked them to do something, but nothing was done, so the responsibility lies fairly and squarely at the feet of Transport SA and the minister. I think I have said enough about that issue.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And, indeed, generally.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I will tell the Attorney exactly what I will do: until I get some proper action, I will keep raising this issue.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No; you won't be telling me; as a matter of fact, you won't be telling me at all!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I will keep raising this issue until something sensible is done.

Time expired.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Tonight, I want to highlight another success story in my electorate, namely, the creation of Wallaroo Blue. Until recently, Wallaroo Blue was known as Flinders Seafoods. I first met with some of the people about three years ago when they indicated they wanted to introduce mussel farming off Wallaroo in Spencer Gulf. I was most interested to hear what they wanted to do, etc., and to identify the specific area. It was fantastic that, for the recent Cornish Festival, the Kernewek Lowender, they were able to harvest something like 15 000 mussels (which is about one tonne). They were able to be cooked on site, and the locals were able to taste them. From all the reports I have received, they came across excellently and certainly appealed to the appetite of those who love seafood. In fact, several people to whom I spoke at the Fisherman's Wharf at Wallaroo indicated that they had come specially because of the magnificent seafood available.

In the past year, Wallaroo Blue has doubled its Northern Wallaroo site from five hectares to 10 hectares, and it has doubled the number of backbones upon which the mussels grow. Two years of trialing has confirmed that the tide direction and strength are just right. So, it is really good news for South Australia and certainly for Northern Yorke Peninsula. I was pleased to have a chat with the Director, Bruce Koller, who is from New Zealand, and a couple of his brothers. In fact, there was a fair New Zealand contingent, and they are very positive about the future. They indicated that recent capital investment has included the purchase of a socking/seeding machine, a 30-foot aluminium boat, a tractor and a soon to be delivered locally designed and manufactured 'declumping' machine, which cleans the mussels.

The positive thing is that local businesses have also benefited. A local engineering firm, Pearce's, has made the anchors; Shmik Engineering designed and made the innovative 'declumping' machine; and Davies Transport has undertaken much of the freight requirements. In the next four years, Wallaroo Blue plans to be at full capacity and hopes that its 200 off-shore hectares will be fully developed and producing something like 2 000 tonnes of shellfish per year. If members are wondering how much is 2 000 tonnes of mussels, they should remember that the total amount of mussels produced in Australia is 3 000 tonnes. So, within the next four years, Wallaroo should be producing 2 000 tonnes, and we will be the major mussel producer in Australia.

I am delighted that this is happening in my electorate, and I want to, first of all, compliment Wallaroo Blue for taking the name of Wallaroo as part of its selling logo and to thank the New Zealand-based company Flinders Seafoods for having the confidence to invest here in the way it has. I want to thank the Yorke Regional Development Board, which had a lot to do with bringing the company to the area, and also the

District Council of the Copper Coast, which has been exceptionally helpful in recent times and has helped ensure that Flinders Seafood, through the logo Wallaroo Blue, has gone from strength to strength.

Members might recall that last week I asked the Minister for Transport a question in this house about the construction of the last section of road to be upgraded between Port Wakefield and Kulpara. The minister indicated that he did not have the information available off the top of his head and said that he would seek information. Members may also recall that, when I spoke about the budget yesterday, I said that I could not find any money allocated for the upgrade in the budget. However, I was pleased to note when reading my local paper, *The Yorke Peninsula Country Times*, that it had a summary of the regional component of South Australia's Strategic Infrastructure Plan, which was released in Mount Gambier. From memory, I think we members were told that we would be getting a copy in our pigeonholes. Something must have happened to mine because, unless my office has not let me know (it usually does), I have not received it, so I have not read it. I would have to make inquiries about that.

However, there is one bit of good news—only one bit of good news. As the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* states, the peninsula's only mention is that it gets \$2.9 million in roadworks to be shared between Kulpara and Port Wakefield and between Auburn and Tarlee. This announcement is good news, but people should bear in mind that almost all of this road reconstruction was undertaken by the previous Liberal government. The money had actually been allocated by the previous Liberal government. Now it is three and a bit years since we lost office, and, finally, it looks as though this last section, which is about 5.2 kilometres, will be reconstructed.

I have written to all the transport ministers. There have been three of them, namely, the initial minister, the Hon. Michael Wright, the next minister, the Hon. Trish White, and the current minister, the Hon. Patrick Conlon. I have asked and pushed and persuaded, and I have been very, very disappointed and disheartened, but it looks as though it will be done before I retire from this place. At least I will be able to hold my head up a little higher than I have been in the past three years.

The other thing that apparently is in the strategic infrastructure plan is an announcement that the augmentation of water supplies on Yorke Peninsula will continue to support residential development. I find that almost an insult. Do you know what augmentation is, Mr Deputy Speaker? Augmentation is payment of a significant sum of money by a person who buys a block of land in northern Yorke Peninsula. By a significant amount of money I mean that the cheapest is \$6 000, and that is in northern Yorke Peninsula, and we go up to \$14 000 in the Ardrossan area. If you think that that is a great government initiative, I say please stop augmentation; allow water to be provided as it has been. Surely, with something like \$2 200 million more in revenue than the last Liberal government had when it left office there is a large amount of money available for water upgrading, and there is no need to hit country people with an added tax that is very, very discriminatory and, by logic, therefore unfair.

It is interesting to see the *Country Times* headlines with the budget announcement as the South Australian Farmers Federation stated, 'Rural SA—invisible.' They probably sum it up best, because there is virtually little for the rural sector in this budget. I do not think that time will permit me to highlight some of the things that the Farmers Federation says, but it is certainly unimpressed with the budget. As the Local

Government Association says: it is not enough. Certainly, it appears that this budget is not going to help rural South Australia as it should.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): There are a number of matters of considerable disturbance to me to which I wish to draw attention in this grievance debate. They relate to a journey which began with the unfortunate mention on Christmas Day 2001 and the consequence of that a week later when I met one Terry Stephens. It strikes me as quaint that he is now out of prison in Western Australia but there are charges pending against him for which he has been bailed, I think; I am not sure. However, no attempt is being made to extradite him for the crimes that he has committed here in South Australia. He goes free for several months. The only charge that has been laid against him thus far, even though a number of other charges could be laid against him subsequent to his being properly interviewed by South Australian police officers, is the one of creating a false belief, when he went publicly on air to say that he had delivered 20 tonnes of guns to the boot of my Falcon, or some other stupid, ridiculous proposition, which of course has now been proved by Channel 7's investigations and the discovery of the guns (which I never saw) in some other place.

Why the man still goes free is beyond me. He sought and conspired with people to have me removed from public office and to overturn the government. Yet, clearly, it suits the government and the police to allow him to continue to be free. There is no reason at all why he could not be extradited right away. I am told that the funds are there. He is a terrible man, having been convicted of fraud, of armed robbery—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He was a great friend of the Liberal Party a few years ago.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: He seemed to be. He had a great number of Liberal Party members constantly talking to him on the telephone and Liberal staffers doing likewise, and I understand that the endorsed candidate for Unley was a close fellow traveller of his throughout those early months of this government's term in office. In any event, I am distressed and disturbed by the indifference of the government and the police to allow a man who has done what he has done (he is a paedophile as well) and, worse—or better—he is a close confrère of McGee and conspired with McGee and van Kryssen to defraud Liddy's victims of any access to Liddy's assets. I do not know why the government of the day chose to call this royal commission the Kapunda Road Royal Commission when there are far more serious questions that ought to be asked and far more serious investigations made of matters to unravel the criminal behaviour of people associated with McGee, and probably McGee himself, in all that. He ought to be investigated and charged.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: For what?

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: He ought to be investigated for what he did in preventing the victims of Liddy and Liddy's associates from gaining any access to compensation from Liddy's assets. McGee was central to that. He is very well connected, and that is coming out daily in the evidence before the royal commission, which I will not debate here because it would not be appropriate to do so. It is quite unfortunate, however, that the government does not see the circles in which McGee moves, and those who are associated with him, as being significant to the way in which he was able to avoid investigation—just because the police sergeant who was supposed to have investigated those matters did not, it does not mean that that man as a police officer could not have been

approached by others known to McGee. Those questions are not being asked.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Sir, I rise on a point of order.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Anyway, I want to move on from that now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: I want to move on to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The Attorney-General is on his feet.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: a royal commission has the status of a proceeding before a court, and the member for Hammond's canvassing of the issues in the Kapunda Road Royal Commission is a violation of the sub judice rule of the house.

The Hon. I.P. Lewis: No, I am not. Those matters are in the public domain.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond can hold his fire for a moment.

The Hon. I.P. Lewis: That's bullshit. You are taking up my time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The clock is stopped. I do not uphold the point of order. The member for Hammond would only be out of order if his comments were attempting to affect the outcome of the royal commission. I do not think that there is anything that he has said so far that could be construed as that. In any case, I doubt the royal commissioner is likely to be affected by what the member for Hammond might say in the course of his speech.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I want now to turn to matters which are in some measure connected, and that is because of the involvement of paedophilia. I want to know, for instance, as it relates to the preparation of a class action, which is still in the hands of the solicitors doing it on behalf of the wards of the state, who were the victims of paedophiles using them as takeaway kids during the time that they were in state institutional care. I want to go to those matters which need explanation to the public of South Australia by asking at what level, for instance, Ms Michelle Holthouse is employed in the Premier's department, and what is her role and function, and what specific parts of her job and person specification enable her to work on issues surrounding that class action, and the claims being brought against the Crown by wards who were victimised by paedophiles whilst they were wards, to discover if she is addressing those matters during the couple of months or so in recent times.

That happens to be the same lawyers as are acting for the minister in the government who is alleged—not by me—to have been a paedophile, and that strikes me as a quaint conflict of interest, because the solicitor acting for the wards is Mr Peter Humphries. The amount of money for those 60-odd wards, who are preparing that claim through Mr Humphries, is over \$60 million to my certain knowledge, from what some of them have said to me about it.

I would like to know on how many occasions the Premier's staff, and the staff of any other minister, discussed the question of how to deal with the former speaker—that is, me—and when to remove him from office and, if so, how they ought to go about doing that before they did it, because that discussion itself is a crime. It should have been brought on by debate here. When was that subject first discussed by the Premier with any other minister, and I would like to know from the Attorney-General, who was briefed to ask the Clerk

of the chamber here for advice about how to remove the former speaker—me—and to whom did that person report after speaking to the Clerk about how to go about.

Is it true that the lawyers representing the minister who is the subject of the allegation of being a paedophile the same as the lawyers who are representing wards of the state? I know the answer to that; it is true. Yet, the government thinks it is funny that Mr Humphries (a former ALP candidate) will probably get a fee of several million dollars out of that when the wards of the state get their damages. It strikes me that it will never go to court or, if it does, it will be a sham, and the Crown will back off and pay. There should be some compensation paid to them for what they have suffered, but I am not sure that the level of the amount that is being developed is reasonable.

One of the other quaint things is that Ms Michelle Holthouse lives at the same address in the Premier's electorate at Brahma Lodge as does Paul Kiley, who is the spokesperson from the wards of the state group in dealing with that firm of solicitors. I worry about those things because it looks to me as though it is a put up job. The other regrettable accident, if that is what it is, is that Mr Paul Kiley is a member of that same group.

Time expired.

Motion carried.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Earlier today in a ministerial statement shortly after question time I provided the house with information about the budget of the Office of the DPP in response to questions from the Leader of the Opposition yesterday and today. In the statement I inadvertently provided incorrect information that I now wish to correct. The program figure, including the additional \$500 000 announced by the Premier yesterday, is \$13.4 million. The actual appropriation, including the additional \$500 000 announced by the Premier yesterday, is \$11.95 million. The difference between the program budget and the appropriation—that is, \$1.45 million—represents the cost of overheads such as accommodation rental, computer costs, minor works and contingencies, etc. that are provided by the Attorney-General's Department. The additional \$500 000 announced by the Premier yesterday is not included in the budget papers that were published before the Premier's decision.

RIVERSIDE GOLF CLUB

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I lay on the table a ministerial statement concerning the Riverside Golf Club coronial findings made by the Hon. Paul Holloway in the other place.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Thursday 23 June 2005, in accordance with the timetables as follows:

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

WEDNESDAY 15 JUNE AT 11 AM

Premier

Minister for Economic Development

Minister for Social Inclusion

Minister for Volunteers

Minister for Arts

Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts

Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
State Governor's Establishment
Arts SA
Auditor-General's Department
Administered Items for the Auditor-General's Department
Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
House of Assembly
Joint Parliamentary Services
Legislative Council

THURSDAY 16 JUNE AT 11 AM

Minister for Transport

Minister for Infrastructure

Minister for Energy

Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure
Administered Items for the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure
TransAdelaide

FRIDAY 18 JUNE AT 9.30 AM

Minister for Health

Minister Assisting in Mental Health

Department of Health
Administered Items for the Department of Health

Minister for Emergency Services

Administered Items for Police and Emergency Services (part)

MONDAY 20 JUNE AT 11 AM

Minister for Police

Minister Assisting the Premier in Economic Development

South Australia Police
Administered Items for Police and Emergency Services (part)
Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
Office of the Venture Capital Board

Minister Families and Communities

Minister for Housing

Minister for Ageing

Minister for Disability

Department for Families and Communities (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Families and Communities (part)

TUESDAY 21 JUNE AT 11 AM

Minister for Environment and Conservation

Minister for the Southern Suburbs

Department for Environment and Heritage
Administered Items for the Department for Environment and Heritage
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Environment Protection Authority
Offices for Sustainable Social, Environmental and Economic Development (part)

WEDNESDAY 22 JUNE AT 11 AM

Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation

Minister for Correctional Services

Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Department for Correctional Services

Minister for Industry and Trade

Minister for Mineral Resources Development

Minister for Urban Development and Planning

Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Planning SA
Administered Items for Planning SA

Offices for Sustainable Social, Environmental and Economic Development (part)

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

WEDNESDAY 15 JUNE AT 11 AM

Treasurer

Minister for State/Federal Relations

Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

THURSDAY 16 JUNE AT 9.30 AM

Attorney-General

Minister for Justice

Minister for Multicultural Affairs

Attorney-General's Department (part)
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
Courts Administration Authority
State Electoral Office

Minister for Youth

Minister for Status of Women

Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education

Department for Families and Communities (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Families and Communities (part)
Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (part)

FRIDAY 17 JUNE AT 9.30 AM

Minister for Education and Children's Services

Minister for Tourism

South Australian Tourism Commission
Minister for Tourism
Department of Education and Children's Services
Administered Items for the Department of Education and Children's Services

MONDAY 20 JUNE AT 11 AM

Minister for the River Murray

Minister for Regional Development

Minister for Small Business

Minister for Consumer Affairs

Minister for Science and Information Economy

Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (part)
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Attorney-General's Department (part)
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)

TUESDAY 21 JUNE AT 11 AM

Minister for Administrative Services

Minister for Industrial Relations

Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing

Minister for Gambling

Department for Administrative and Information Services (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Administrative and Information Services (part)
Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Independent Gambling Authority

WEDNESDAY 22 JUNE AT 11 AM

Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries

Minister for State/Local Government Relations

Minister for Forests

Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
South Australian Local Government Grants Commission
Office of Local Government
Administered Items for the Office of Local Government
Outback Areas Community Development Trust
Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Ms Bedford, Messrs Buckby and Caica, Ms Ciccarello and Messrs Kerin, Snelling and Venning.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Messrs Evans and Goldsworthy, Mrs Hall, Messrs Koutsantonis and Rau, Ms Thompson and Ms White.

Motion carried.

RECREATIONAL SERVICES (LIMITATION OF LIABILITY) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 24 May. Page 2642.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I will not hold the house long, as the opposition has given its support to the bill. It is a disappointment that the bill has to be brought to the house, although I certainly will not be casting any aspersions on the Minister for Consumer Affairs as it is not her fault in any way, shape or form. Her predecessor has got her into more strife with this and putting her into coalition with the Labor Party. This bill reinstates the use of liability waivers for recreational service providers. It clarifies the definition of recreational services so that it is beyond question that not-for-profit bodies are covered by the legislation, and it allows a minor amendment not affecting substance to be made to a registered safety code without the need for process or public consultation and laying before both houses of parliament.

This bill is necessary because, when the Treasurer introduced the original Recreational Services (Limitation of Liability) Bill, the ability to use waivers to limit your public liability insurance or liability in any form was removed from the bill to be replaced by the use of safety codes, which had to be registered with the office of Business and Consumer Affairs and listed on the web site. The big problem is that not one safety code has been registered in three years. I understand that there is a safety code for swimming with dolphins on the way and a couple of others have been talked about.

I have previously raised the issue of the need to have these safety codes in place, and I am very disappointed, having attended a seminar for recreational service providers at the Entertainment Centre nearly three years ago, not long after the introduction of this bill, to explain the obligations of recreational service providers. They went away to try to get their codes together but they were not given any assistance whatsoever, as I understand. If they were, I would love to hear about it. The Department of Recreation and Sport should have done more: it could have done more but it did not. Most of these recreational service providers are volunteers, and they were not given any legal assistance. They are not the legal eagles that we have in the Attorney-General and others. They do try their very best but they need some help.

We had the obstacle of having to construct these codes without legal advice and then, when you had your code constructed and it was examined by the Office of Business and Consumer Affairs and was going to be registered, you were hit with a \$1 200 bill. If you wanted to register to use that code, you were then hit with another \$250. That fee is being waived. I was very pleased to hear the Premier's parliamentary secretary at the volunteers morning announce that that fee is going to be waived for the registration of

codes, and I will hold the government to that. The need to pay that in the first place was something I found most questionable when we should be encouraging the volunteers, who are providing most of the services for recreational services and sporting bodies, to do the right thing, do their job, enjoy their sport and provide the backup required.

We have not seen one single code, not even a principal code that could be used to build on for other sports. It is just beyond belief, and very disappointing. The Treasurer in his initial brouhaha said that this was all going to be very easy. It sounded good, it was a great idea at the time, but we have seen not one code. The need to introduce the bill is because the Australian Masters Games are coming up in South Australia in a few months' time. They would have had to spend over \$60 000 in developing codes of conduct. They would not have been able to get them developed and registered in time so we have had to go back to the use of waivers. On the plus side, I spoke to the Insurance Council of Australia about the waivers and it is more confident in the current use of waivers. The waivers we used to use have been discarded.

The current use of waivers is looked upon far more favourably; they are a much more significant clause in a contract for recreational service providers. So, the two-year sunset clause that is in here may not be necessary—and I will be interested to see if it is—because insurance companies say to leave the waivers in there, and if you can get codes of conduct then that may help as well.

I will not get in the way of the government changing its legislation back to what it was. It is disappointing. It is not the fault of the Office of Business and Consumer Affairs—they work their butts off. The Commissioner, Mark Bodycoat, is a hardworking man and runs a very tight ship up there. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the Office of Recreation and Sport, because they should have had at least one or two codes developed by now. The bill needs to be passed and it needs to be passed quickly, so I commend it to the house.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I will make a very brief contribution to this, in particular in relation to the waiver of fees for the lodgment of codes under this legislation. Quite contrary to the member for Morphett's contribution, this has not been introduced because not one code has been registered. That is absolute nonsense. This piece of legislation has been introduced because our Minister for Consumer Affairs has actually taken the time to listen to people from the not-for-profit sector, and it has happened because our Premier made a commitment to our volunteer community that they would be consulted in relation to legislation that impacts on them.

When this was initially introduced they were not considered to be the target of this legislation; this was aimed at commercial recreation activities, not for normal sporting and recreation activities; and it is acknowledged that \$1 200 is a huge impost on a not-for-profit organisation. This issue, in fact, was brought to the Premier's Volunteer Ministerial Advisory Group by Recreation SA, and I want to particularly commend Peter Vandeppeer, who made an enormous effort in putting a case to the advisory group and spent a lot of time in speaking with me and the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, Mark Bodycoat.

As a result of their efforts, and consideration given by the minister, this amendment has been brought to this house for consideration, and I strongly recommend that all members support it. This really is an example of the Premier's

Volunteer Ministerial Advisory Group taking a strong voice to the government and the government actually listening to what those organisations had to say and acting on their concerns.

I also want to pay tribute to Judy Hughes, in particular, who made an enormous effort in relation to this, both in consulting with those people in the advisory group and working through her office in the Office of Consumer Affairs. So, I commend this bill to the house and thank all those who have worked so hard to have this brought forward.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for Consumer Affairs): I thank honourable members for their support. In particular, I would like to thank the member for Morphett for providing the opposition's support for this bill in the fashion that he has. I would also like to mention the member for Wright and the enormous amount of work and effort that she has put into supporting the volunteer groups in ensuring that they get a fair and reasonable deal from this legislation. I would also like to mention Judy Hughes and the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs for the effort they have made in supporting me as minister and also the development of this legislation.

The main thrust of this bill is to amend the Recreational Services (Limitation of Liability) Act 2002 to allow recreational service providers to use waivers while safety codes are developed. The immediate benefit of this is to ensure that the Masters Games can proceed as planned, as this will have a significant effect for those organising and participating in this worthy event.

The transitional measure will allow recreational service providers to be protected while they develop their safety

codes. Once the safety code is registered, there will be no need for waivers, and a sunset clause of two years applies to this provision. I do take note of the comments made by the member for Morphett in relation to the delays that have occurred since the introduction of this legislation. I give a commitment that we are endeavouring to work our way through the issues that have prevented more expeditious resolution of safety codes.

While it is the case that no safety codes have been registered at this point, the government is also actively working with recreational service providers to assist them in completing appropriate codes. Further amendments in this bill which will assist recreational service providers relate to amendments to codes of practice and a clarification of the definition of recreational services. I commend this bill to the house.

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

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.37 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 2 June at 10.30 a.m.