

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 8 May 2006

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling) took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

CRIME AND JUSTICE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Chief Justice of South Australia, John Doyle, has rekindled the public debate about crime and sentencing. The Chief Justice is a person of integrity, with a gifted intellect. He is a person I admire and respect. His contribution to improving public understanding of the justice system is significant. I support his right to comment on matters of public policy and issues relevant to the justice system. I respect his independence and freedom to speak out. Indeed, I believe it is helpful for the Chief Justice to speak out on policy, legislation and the administration of justice. I am sure that the Chief Justice would also keenly respect my right as an elected leader to speak out on the criminal law, particularly, in advocating on behalf of victims of crime and of the need for public safety to be a paramount consideration in sentencing in bail and parole decisions. I also reserve my right, at times, to disagree publicly with the Chief Justice on criminal justice policy and administration. Such dialogue and debate can only serve the public interest.

In an address to the Australian Association of Social Workers—an address described by *The Advertiser* as ‘a public challenge to the state government’s push for heavier sentences’—the Chief Justice appears to conclude that there needs to be a shift in emphasis to rehabilitation and that longer sentences are not a particularly effective response to crime. On average, sentences are getting longer and the crime rate in South Australia is going down. I understand that the Chief Justice acknowledged this fact in his address. I am informed that the rate of offending has been declining since this government, with its tough attitude to sentencing and law and order, came to power.

The government believes that tougher sentences, particularly for violent criminals and sex offenders, are a key component of our criminal justice policy. Punishment is a significant aspect of sentences imposed for these types of offences. Sentences that do not adequately reflect the community’s expectations of appropriate punishment undermine public confidence in the administration of justice. Justice, in my view, is denied for victims and the wider community in sentences that are manifestly inadequate and do not adequately punish the offender. Cases involving the death or serious injury of the victim where suspended sentences have been imposed on the offender appear all too frequently. I have been dismayed at a number of cases where child sex offenders, who have taken advantage of their position of trust, have received suspended sentences or low non-parole periods.

I believe this soft approach sends the wrong message to the criminals, victims and the community. We are all aware of the notorious case where a guilty plea was accepted following a plea bargain and a suspended sentence imposed on a spurious factual basis, contrary to the known evidence

and contrary to the victim’s corroborated eye witness account.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Such cases do not serve to strengthen the public’s confidence and cannot be dismissed as the product of skewed reporting or the myopic view of the victim. Examples like this do not instil public confidence in the law. Whilst such cases may be seen by lawyers and the judiciary as aberrations in an otherwise properly functioning system, as an elected leader and legislator I am obliged to speak out and, where necessary, change the law to help avoid any recurrence.

I understand (and this is where I come to the nub of what has been said) that the Chief Justice told the Association of Social Workers that the sentencing process is not intended to satisfy the victim, although the victim has a real interest in the proceedings and appropriate involvement in them can help the victim and improve the quality of justice overall. With respect, I strongly disagree with the Chief Justice about tougher sentences and the role of victims in the court process. Victims are not bystanders to crimes and should not be bystanders during the court process. The victim is entitled to satisfaction. The victim is entitled to the satisfaction of knowing that the offender was sentenced on the basis of the real facts of the case. The victim is entitled to the satisfaction of expressing in his or her words, within reason, the impact of the crime upon them and their lives. The victim is entitled to the satisfaction of a sentence being imposed that reflects an appropriate level of punishment that fits the crime and the victim is also entitled to be kept informed of proceedings.

The government went to the election in March with a law and order policy to continue our program of tilting the balance in the criminal justice system in favour of victims, not criminals. The government will legislate to establish a commissioner for victims’ rights. The commissioner will be able to appoint advocates to appear in court during sentencing submissions in homicide cases or where the victims have been permanently or totally incapacitated. Victims who no longer have a voice will still be heard. A victims’ rights commissioner will also be able to consult with the DPP about victim impact statements and plea bargain arrangements and to consult with the court about its practices and procedures and their effects on victims. The sentencing law will also be changed. Courts will be required to give primary consideration to the need to protect the community from the offender’s criminal acts when imposing a sentence.

New laws will also require that the victim be properly consulted about any charge bargain process between the prosecution and the defence. In major indictable cases, involving death or total incapacity of the victim, courts will be required to set a non-parole period of 80 per cent of the head sentence. Because the minority of offenders are responsible for a disproportionately large number of offences, the government will work with the courts and other agencies to fast track proceedings against serious repeat offenders. The sooner they are dealt with the less risk they are to the community. It is vitally important that our courts remain open and that the public is well informed of the court’s work. Unfortunately, this state has until now had a greater incidence of suppression orders than other states. The government will introduce legislation to ensure that suppression orders are only granted where it can be established that it is in the interests of justice to do so.

The government is also committed to a longer term program of social inclusion that will make a significant impact on the causes of crime. A whole of government approach to homelessness, drug abuse, mental health and school retention will assist in tackling the problems and social disadvantage that contributes to criminal development. The Social Inclusion Board will also undertake a review of the juvenile justice system.

I recently met in New York with the prestigious John Jay College and will be seeking its help in these and other areas to get the balance of tough sentencing and rehabilitation right. Our child protection programs—Keeping Them Safe—will help spare the next generation of adolescents and young adults from the type of abuse that, in some cases, leads them to become antisocial or criminals.

We have already committed \$3.5 million to the Breaking the Cycle program for 16 to 20 year old repeat offenders. This is a national first, designed by the Social Inclusion Unit and the departments for families and communities and for correctional services to help young offenders to break the cycle and to give one last chance to young people who are starting to come off the rails to stop them from becoming habitual criminals. The correctional services department also offers a range of programs and services to assist in the rehabilitation of adult prisoners. This government introduced a four-year, \$5.5 million rehabilitation program. It is the first program of its kind in the state. The department also runs a number of literacy, numeracy and vocational courses. Opportunities also exist for prisoners to access higher education programs through a range of universities. The department also invests public resources in the supervision of prisoners released on parole. While prisoner rehabilitation is a necessary part of sentencing, it must be understood that the costs are high and the recidivist rate suggests that the returns are low. Our focus will remain on appropriate levels of punishment consistent with community expectations, coupled with a forward thinking social justice program.

The government welcomes debate, including with the Chief Justice, but we do not resile from our stand on sentencing or parole, nor from our interventions in the criminal law, including the appointment of a royal commission. The government sought and secured re-election with criminal justice policies that include recruiting record levels of police, national leadership in victims' rights in both the courts and prosecution processes, and introducing a greater premium on public safety in court and parole deliberations. We intend to continue with our agenda for reform.

QUESTION TIME

POLICE RESOURCES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier explain to the house whether budget constraints have resulted in police using inferior and faulty Smith & Wesson handguns and re-used ammunition? The Premier stated in his media release on 12 February 2006, 'We have the best resourced police force in South Australia's history.' Media reports indicate that over two dozen police have been injured over a three-year period due to faulty ammunition and handguns.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I will refer this question for a detailed response to my colleague the Minister for Police in another place. However, I place on the

record a number of important facts. The police in this state have never been better resourced than under this government, and never has there been a larger police force in this state than under this government. The mandate we received at the last state election but a few weeks ago was based in part upon our pledge to put 400 more police on the beat over the next four years to give us a force close to 1 000 more police than when the Liberals were in office six or seven years ago.

For the Leader of the Opposition to lead off in question time criticising this government on a matter of police resources on the issue of firearms is absolutely incorrect, given what we have done. I will seek advice from my colleague in another place to correct me if I am wrong but, in my opinion, to suggest that anything to do with firearms is a result of a lack of dollars and resources from this government is absurd and plainly wrong. I will get some advice on that.

The issue of firearms has been a point of debate within the Police Association and within the police force, and it is a matter that, as police minister, I discussed on a number of occasions with the Police Commissioner. Members of the Police Association—and I guess there are debatable points within the association—have expressed a view to me that they would like the police to have a different firearm. Do you know what I did as a minister, what I know my colleague would be doing and what any proper minister would do and, I would have thought, the member opposite who asked the question, as a former police minister, would have done? As good as politicians may be at a lot of things, when it comes to telling the police what type of firearm they should use, we are as ill-equipped to do that as anyone else.

Ms Chapman: Why don't you listen to them?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Listen to who?

Ms Chapman: The police.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition interjects and asks why I do not listen to the police. When you are a police minister you take advice and you listen to the Commissioner of Police and his senior management. Is the deputy leader saying that the way we should operate the police force in this state is to interfere, take the views of the Police Association and then direct—and have that on the public record—that the Police Commissioner should scrap Smith & Wessons and replace them with Glocks? I know what would happen if I did that: we would have the resignation of the police commissioner, as we should.

Ms Chapman: Why don't you listen to him?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Now the deputy leader is asking why I should listen to him.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, we are having silly interjections, and I apologise for responding to them, but for the deputy leader to suggest that I should not listen to the Police Commissioner is bizarre. I am not going to undermine the Police Commissioner of this state. He is an outstanding leader of our police force.

In conclusion, can I say this: yes, there have been some issues related to the Smith & Wesson, but the last time I spoke with the Police Commissioner it was his considered judgment and that of the senior people who advise him that the current firearms that they have and the program they have of replacing and maintaining those firearms is the correct policy. That is not a matter of dollars: it is a matter of the considered judgment of the Police Commissioner of this state. As long as we are in government, we will accept the con-

sidered opinion of our Police Commissioner when it comes to firearms. Silly questions, such as those the leader has just asked, should be taken as nothing more than a desperate opposition trying to whip up a storm about nothing.

STATE ECONOMY

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Will the Treasurer inform the house of the results of the latest BankSA State Monitor and, in particular, what the report found for consumer and business confidence in South Australia?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I thank the member for Norwood for her question. Of course, many small businesses operate in the electorate of Norwood, and it is only appropriate that the member would have an interest in this matter. I advise the house today that BankSA has just released its State Monitor report. It is an independent survey of business and consumer confidence in South Australia, published regularly. The latest report is very positive about South Australia. I thought it only appropriate that I share some of the comments of the report with the house. The survey uses a base of 100, so any score above 100 is positive and, obviously, the higher the result the more confident the response. If we look at the matter of consumer confidence in this report, it rose from 123.3 in February to 125.9 by May. This result is the highest consumer confidence reading in more than 12 months. It is also the third highest result since the BankSA survey began in 1997.

The report states that the reasons behind this include less concern about unemployment, greater confidence about one's household situation and an increase in people's pride in South Australia. State pride is a very important indicator of the confidence and view of South Australians about their state. Pride in our state has increased, in this latest survey, by 10 per cent to a high of 90 per cent. Contributing factors include, I am advised, the opening of the new Adelaide Airport terminal, major events during February—

An honourable member: What month is that?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In March.

An honourable member: Kevin, why is your jacket done up?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Why is my jacket done up? Because I took a stupid bet on Saturday night—not having to wear Bill Sanders' Crows tie. Contributing factors include the opening of the new airport terminal, major events during February and March, including the Fringe, the Clipsal 500, the Festival of Arts, WOMADelaide, the Tour Down Under, and maybe another event (I do not know what that one might have been). Business confidence is an extremely important indicator, and really goes to the core of understanding just how strong our business confidence is in this state. It rose from 123.1 in February to 123.6 by May. This is the second successive rise in business confidence. The report concluded that the rise in business confidence was a result of a generally up-beat mood about the business climate in this state and, as I said earlier, renewed pride in South Australia, although using the words—

Ms Chapman: Thanks to John Howard.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thanks to John Howard! Thank you, sir. The deputy leader just cannot accept the fact that, under Labor in this state, we are seeing a continual increase in business confidence, a continued increase in general state pride and, of course, the economy has never been stronger in

South Australia. With the mandate given to us by the people of South Australia we intend, over the next four years, to continue the strong, solid financial management that has given our state the highest confidence and the highest state pride in South Australia—although using the words 'pride in South Australia' in the one sentence causes me some concern! Anyway, we will leave it at that.

POLICE RESOURCES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Premier. Will the budget review currently being undertaken lock the police into continuing to use the inferior Smith & Wesson handguns and risking injury to officers—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS:—instead of upgrading to the superior Glock weapon? The budget review that is currently being undertaken is seeking a 4 per cent efficiency dividend across the board for police that could be up to \$20 million. Police officers have raised concerns that this will prevent the police upgrading to the Glock weapon, which is used by the majority of police services around Australia.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): This is a former minister of police who, for political expediency—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: You are responsible for the budget review. You are the Treasurer.

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader has had the opportunity to ask his question. The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not know why he did not ask me the question: I am the man in charge of this review. This is a reckless, silly question from the Leader of the Opposition.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I can anticipate the deputy's point of order. I encourage the Deputy Premier to go back to the question rather than commenting on it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The important issue here (and I will address the issue of the guns in a moment) is that we have been asked by a former minister of police why I do not have confidence in the Police Commissioner and why I do not, as a former minister—or the current minister—direct the Police Commissioner. Last week you undermined Monsignor Cappelletti. Now the leader is wanting to undermine the Police Commissioner. These are matters to be decided by the Police Commissioner. If the Police Commissioner—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

An honourable member: There's no money—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer is answering the question. Opposition members will listen to it in silence and cease their interjections.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Police Commissioner has a budget, which, I assume, has appropriate provision for the replacement of firearms. If the Police Commissioner arrives at a position where he does support the use of Glock firearms for his officers, he will make that decision and he will be funded to do that. To suggest that the government does not provide funding to arm our officers properly is offensive and plain wrong. Never has the police had better resources than under this government. I will take political debate over budget cuts, because that is part of my job, but a lazy question from the Leader of the Opposition—an offensive

question—cannot be left on the public record unchallenged. It is offensive to suggest that this government would not—

Ms Chapman: You won't answer it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have just answered it.

Ms Chapman: You haven't.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have just answered it.

An honourable member: You have not!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the call. The deputy leader will not interject.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Again, by her interjections, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition shows that she is simply about political muckraking. The police in this state have a budget for firearms; and, as long as we are in government, should this police force wish to upgrade its firearms and require the funding to do it that will be provided. My understanding is that the Police Department already has the appropriate funding for its firearms. We have not made any cuts to the police budget.

In fact, we are increasing the police budget to the extent of a further 400 police. To suggest that we are cutting its firearms budget is wrong. That will never happen under this government. It is simply political muckraking from a lazy opposition that cannot do the hard work and find decent questions.

ELECTRICITY

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor): Will the Minister for Families and Communities inform the house about measures the state government is taking to address the energy needs of people living in retirement villages and caravan parks, and those people living in remote South Australia generating their own electricity?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I thank the honourable member for her question, and I know that, because she has a number of caravan parks in her electorate, she has a particular interest in this issue; but, more generally, her question is about some of the more vulnerable consumers who have had to experience the electricity price hikes and how they have had to deal with them. I am delighted to inform the house that, as promised during the election campaign, the Rann government will extend the \$120 annual energy concession and the one-off \$150 energy concession bonus to a new group of South Australians, that is, those who do not receive an electricity account direct from the energy retailer, including residents of retirement villages, caravan parks and people living in remote areas using their own electricity generators.

What is more, we will encourage those people to place applications before 31 May to enable them to have that backdated until 1 January, which will mean that some people will have an extra \$450 in their pocket. We have ensured that we are communicating with those people who may be potentially eligible for this scheme by sending details to all retirement village operators, caravan park operators and others to educate people about this significant benefit. We encourage all members in this house to draw this to the attention of those people within their electorate, and we will provide information to electorate staff to assist them in that process.

This initiative will extend the eligibility for concessions for electricity potentially to another 10 000 South Australians, which means that the government will have more than 200 000 people receiving assistance in relation to their energy bills. This is the fourth specific initiative in relation to energy

concessions since this government came to office in 2002. In 2004, we increased the amount of the energy concession by \$50. We then extended it to about 15 000 self-funded retirees, and then to a large number of single people on Centrelink allowances, including students. Finally, we introduced the one-off energy concession bonus. I reiterate my thanks to the honourable member for raising this important issue. This is another way in which the Labor government is assisting some of the most vulnerable people in our community.

POLICE RESOURCES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier assure the house that the budget review currently being undertaken or the need now for police to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars more on new ammunition will not result in the police cutting training hours or, indeed, the number of rounds available for training to our police officers?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Again, the exercise being undertaken by Mr Smith and the budget review team is to look at the opportunity across government where we can identify savings options so that we can then use that money in key government spending priorities of health, education and policing. The police budget will not be compromised. The police budget will be larger but equally, for the exercise, we are looking right across government. We are looking at the police department as we are looking at the health department, to see what priority areas could be shifted from lower priority areas within those agencies to more significant priority areas.

It may be that that is an exercise that says that how the police department and the health department are spending their money is in order of the priorities that this government wants to maintain and it may be that there are no savings required from those areas. That will not stop the government from having a good look at every area of government. That is the right thing to do. The police department and the health department should be under no less scrutiny than any other government area when it comes to the efficiency of spending our dollars. That is a proper exercise of executive government to require of agencies. This government's commitment to policing is already on the public record, but the Premier just reminded me of an important point: that, whenever it has come to the equipment required by our police force, this government has never held back.

This government has allowed the police department to purchase a new aircraft so that, for the first time in our state's history, we can airlift a fully equipped contingent of STAR Force officers anywhere in the state. Under the Liberal government and for the first four years of this government, to move our STAR force I was advised, from memory, that you would often have to use two of our Cessnas and that there would be limits as to the type of equipment that could go with them. Secondly, under this government, we have on standby, under very strict protocols of use, an armoured personnel carrier, should our police ever require that. Under this government, we have given our police biological suits; we have given new equipment, new robots for our bomb squad; and we have given the great scientific and police weaponry advancements in DNA testing.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Any commonwealth funding?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Any commonwealth funding in what?

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Not that I am aware of.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: There may well have been. I said it may be: I did not say it was commonwealth funded at all, but I do not have all the details in front of me. We have equipped—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Very convenient.

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: He is such a sad sack! He was out there on his motor bike. You reckon that was not a crack at leadership? Whenever someone puts their leathers on, hops on a motor bike and gets their picture taken, they want one of your two jobs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Leadership is not an easy ride, easy rider!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: He is not even in our party. The member for Mount Gambier is not in our party and he will never lead our party. When it comes to the firearms of this state, what our police need in terms of weaponry they will get under this government. As the Premier said to me, if the police want a bazooka, he would give them a bazooka.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): My question is to the Minister for Health. How has the increased state government funding for elective surgery impacted on elective surgery lists at Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): Since 2002, the government has invested an extra \$42.6 million into elective surgery, and that has increased a number of procedures carried out in our public hospitals in South Australia. That includes a \$12 million boost late last year which took the total extra spending on elective surgery this financial year to \$16.75 million. At Flinders Medical Centre, in particular, this increased funding has allowed the hospital to introduce a long-term strategy to reduce elective surgery waiting times.

I am pleased to say that the number of people waiting longer than 12 months for non-urgent surgery at Flinders has been reduced from 525 patients to 68 patients over the last 18 months—a significant improvement. Before this strategy was introduced, the number of people waiting more than 12 months for elective surgery was growing by approximately 25 per cent each year, that is, despite the fact that we are performing more operations, there are more and more people adding themselves to the list. The funding has enabled two new elective surgery coordinator positions to be set up at Flinders to case-manage patients and to target long waiting lists.

I pay tribute to the commitment of our surgeons, particularly in areas of speciality such as plastic surgery, ear, nose and throat, and orthopaedics. I also commend the Flinders Medical Centre on its highly successful Redesigning Care Program, which has meant that elective surgery is now rarely cancelled to accommodate emergency admissions. During the election campaign, the government announced a package of initiatives to boost elective surgery again and employ even more doctors. That package includes \$55 million to increase the number of operations and \$11.7 million to go towards medical specialists to undertake elective surgery procedures.

This new four-year strategy will see an increase in elective surgery capacity to 38 500 operations annually by 2009-10.

TEACHERS, SELECTION

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Why is there no parent representation from the school governing council on the new teacher selection panel? The aim of governing councils is to get the public and communities more actively involved in discussing, deciding and guiding the future of local preschools and schools. In her press release on 1 May, the minister stated:

For the first time state schools will be able to interview and check the referees of applicants for a teaching position, and choose the best person for their school.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Morphett for his question. He, of course, knows that there is a representative of the governing council on school principal selection panels, and he knows that we have made significant reforms in the way in which teachers are selected. On that matter, I acknowledge the work done by the AEU—the teachers' union—in supporting that reform. I do not know whether the member for Morphett realises what the industrial relations record was like during the time of the previous government: how many days of strikes there were in our public schools; how much unrest there was. To read the accounts, it was like war and peace, and there was not much peace, I can tell you.

The reforms that we are introducing are very significant. It has taken a lot of negotiation, and I am very proud of the fact that we are implementing something that those opposite never attempted to introduce. They never made even a tilt at getting into place the sorts of selection processes we are introducing. This reform is one of the great steps forward we have made in having panels that check references and interview staff. In all things industrial, of course, change is incremental, and, whilst one might aspire to do many things in the future, I am very proud of the reforms that we have made, and point out that, if you do not like the reforms, are you suggesting that we go back to the system that was in place when you were in government, which included no reference checks and no interviews? We are making substantial progress, and it seems that we may well introduce those changes in the future, but with reform you take one step at a time, and do not go back to the bad old days as you left them.

AGED CARE, TRAINING

Mr KENYON (Newland): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What steps has the government taken to address the training needs of aged care workers in South Australia?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): The ability to provide quality care to our ageing population is increasingly a challenge for all governments. This is especially the case regarding the provision of appropriate care to elderly people in aged care homes. The basic standard of employment for carers in these facilities is a Certificate III in Aged Care. Many staff who have worked in the industry for many years do not have that level of qualification.

I am pleased to say that TAFE SA has been successful in securing tenders that total \$2.63 million over two years

through the commonwealth's Better Skills for Better Care program. This success underscores the quality of the program, the delivery of our TAFE institutes and the professionalism of TAFE staff. These funds will enable TAFE SA to provide accredited training to existing workers in residential aged care facilities. The funds will help workers to gain formal recognition for their skills through workplace assessment and study. TAFE SA Regional has secured over half of the state's share of funding which will enable that institute to deliver accredited training to 173 aged care workers across 30 residential facilities in regional South Australia. The training options available to carers will range from recognition of current competencies at the level of Certificate III in Aged Care and to a higher level of knowledge and skill at the level of Diploma of Nursing. Access to the diploma level will provide not only a pathway to higher education but a real pathway to employment as an enrolled nurse. As part of this program, other industry qualifications available to carers through TAFE SA will include a Certificate in Training and Assessment, a Certificate in Service Coordination and a Diploma in Front Line Management.

Workers in the aged care industry will benefit significantly from this training. As well as obtaining or upgrading their qualifications, they will increase their knowledge and understanding of nursing and aged care environments, increase the capacity to provide quality care to residents, enjoy a sense of personal achievement and experience greater confidence in their work. Aged care facilities, too, will benefit. The anticipated increase in the retention of staff will provide more stability in the facilities, and residents will receive quality care that will be enhanced by the comfort provided by familiar and well-known faces. It is especially great news for regional South Australia as the training will provide increased expertise and caring for the elderly right across the state.

SCHOOLS, LEARNER ASSESSMENT SOFTWARE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. When will the Learner Assessment software be available to schools to assist teachers in producing meaningful reports for students? The opposition has been informed that this software, which is vital for accurate student assessment, has been under development now for more than two years.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The issue of producing reports for students has been a movable feast over the past couple of years, and I suspect that we have not bedded down the programs yet because, as members would know, there have been federal requirements. The software is complex and we have been trying to make sure that any glitches have been ironed out. I know that software development is a very contentious area. At the moment we suffer from a series of impositions that have altered many of the parameters that were required two years ago. When this program was developed, we did not realise that we would have an imposition federally and much of what has come since has made it very difficult. However, on top of that, we have been implementing another program which I suppose has complicated the matter whereby we have had a unique identifier. One of the failings of our education auditing, benchmarking and management across our system has been our incapacity to track students.

As those opposite probably know, we have been a reforming government. We have been a government that has intervened and changed many processes. We have overhauled the scheme for early years education. We are moving through senior secondary reform and we are also keenly aware of the need for increased skills in the post-school sector. But the problems in having made so many reforms and spending so much money on what have initially been pilots and newly introduced programs is that one needs to have an auditing and assessment strategy. That goes from the Every Chance for Every Child period in the first few weeks of a baby's life, through kindergarten and child care, and the need to audit. So, when we put the data in now, we have a requirement for a central auditing and data collection system which has changed quite significantly over the past two years. It is a complicated answer but I am happy to get an information briefing session to the member because I know that having a scientific background, unlike so many opposite, he does like numbers and facts, and we will brief him and help him with this information.

SCHOOL RETENTION RATES

Ms FOX (Bright): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What initiatives is the state government taking to improve school retention rates and ensure that more young people are engaged in school?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the honourable member for her interest in this area, because I know she is not only well informed but also interested in school and education issues. As members know, we have had a strategy to improve retention and engagement and would aim to have children at school, in work or in training, and to this end have made our major reforms and this a priority since coming to government four years ago. We have given a commitment to senior secondary reform with a \$79.3 million package and have already begun the investment of a \$28.4 million four-year package for school retention and engagement. This has been driven by the Social Inclusion Board, which has worked with us, communities and industries to find ways of allowing children to stay at school and work in sometimes complex situations involving health, families and communities and juvenile justice, and work to find ways to engage them and put them into meaningful employment. Part of this has been a school retention action plan. We have had community mentoring programs with community mentors and an innovative community action network.

A recent program that has been particularly interesting came out of our awareness that over 1 000 young people drop out of school between Easter and August. To have reached year 12 is an achievement in anyone's life. Considering the difficulty in retaining children, it is a tragedy that they should reach so far and then teeter on the brink of completing their schooling. In the last year we implemented another program for year 12 retention and engagement that required us to target and identify children at risk of dropping out of school, both by teachers and with self-confirmation, with the young people saying they were struggling. We targeted 816 students who were identified by their teachers as being at risk, and they confirmed that they were on the verge of dropping out of school. Of these 816, 94.7 per cent were retained until the end of the year, when previously they had been identified as being absolutely likely to drop out very shortly.

Of the targeted students who did leave school and failed to complete, 50 per cent accessed employment or further education and training. This is a huge response and a very successful program, which has helped a significant number of children, with 94.7 per cent retention in this cohort of otherwise failing and inevitably going-to-drop-out children. In addition, we have worked hard to produce a 72.4 per cent rate of public school children who have achieved retention from years 8 to 12. Of those in year 8 in 2001, by 2005 72.4 per cent had reached year 12. This is a 2.4 per cent increase from 2004 and is the highest year 8 to year 12 full-time equivalent retention rate since 1995.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett has the call.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Will the minister commit to replacing state year 12 qualifications and introduce a new national year 12 assessment within the next three years? A report by the Australian Council for Educational Research recommends the establishment of a national standards body to set achievement standards graded from A to E and based on international standards.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I am not sure if the member for Morphett is yet up to speed on year 12 testing. There has been pressure for uniformity across education years. One of the fallacies that has arisen, because the federal Liberal Government has spent a lot of time criticising teachers—and that criticism falls on the private and public sector, because the year 12 assessments and programs occur both in public and private schools, so it is a blanket complaint—is that there should be a single system across all states and schools.

The fallacy of the question in implying that any program can be introduced within three years is extraordinary. Let me explain. To produce a year 12 testing regime, you do not have a group of boffins in a room writing new exam papers: you actually need to change and define the curriculum. If you change the year 12 curriculum, you have to change the year 11 curriculum, and you probably need to have a go at the year 10 curriculum. So, the idea of introducing a universal system of testing in three years is absolute nonsense; it cannot be done.

Why would you want to do that? That is an interesting idea. Most senior secondary reform around the world says that education should be locally based, it should be linked to local industries, it should be linked to VET sectors, and it should be appropriate for the jobs available. Having a universal system across Australia seems to be going in the opposite direction from the known wisdom around the world. Beyond that, what is the justification for uniform testing? The argument is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: And it is hard to really find one. The argument is that perhaps employers, TAFEs and universities are unable to select students because of the current systems, because there are different systems in each state. That just underlines the ignorance of the people who would suggest that argument. In fact, we have a tertiary ranking system that allows you to take an examination in

year 12 in any state in this country and even an IB examination and get into university. What we are suggesting is that there should be federal government control of all education systems, rather than a rational justification or a problem that needs solving.

The problem that does need solving is having proper retention and engagement strategies, and across the country we have not done this well enough. But at least in South Australia we are addressing this problem. We are developing a new, flexible SACE system, and we will introduce it because we have committed to do so, not waiting until we have been forced into doing something by the federal government that will not produce a useful outcome. All that effort to have the same examination read and marked on the same day across the whole of Australia; what is to tell us that we would have better outcomes of young people?

SMALL BUSINESS, OH&S

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. What strategy is the government employing to provide small businesses with important information on occupational health and safety requirements? There are many small businesses in Reynell, especially in Lonsdale. The Noarlunga Towards a Safer Community Industry Project team sometimes finds that small businesses have difficulty obtaining occupational health and safety information that is relevant and suitable for both employer and employee.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I want to say from the outset how concerned I am about the recent workplace deaths and, on behalf of all members, I also offer my sincere condolences to the families of those workers. Tragically, these deaths highlight just how important workplace safety is and how important it is to get up-to-date occupational health, safety and welfare information to employers, employees and the community in general.

Recently, I launched SafeWork SA's new Workplace Safety Advisory Service at Westfield Marion Shopping Centre. This advisory service provides small business employers, employees, community organisations and the general public with the opportunity to discuss health and safety issues with occupational health, safety and welfare advisers. The service will also assist more businesses in canvassing solutions specific to their workplaces. The government recognises that small businesses have a key role to play in getting the government's health and safety message out to the community, as they represent more than 70 per cent of employers in South Australia.

The advisory service will play a key role in furthering the government's commitment to educating the community about health and safety at the workplace. The advisory service will provide easy access to free advice, and it will assist small businesses to meet their occupational health, safety and welfare responsibilities. Inspectors and advisers will be available to show employers and employees how to assess their risks at the workplace and how to improve their safe work practices. The advisory service operated from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on 12 April, and it will also be operating this week on Wednesday 10 May and on Wednesday 14 June at the same times on the ground floor of the Westfield Marion Shopping Centre. After assessing the level of public interest in these services, SafeWork SA will look to extend these visits to other venues across the state. Can I recommend to interested parties, particularly small businesses and the community, to

utilise this service and to take the opportunity to continue to improve their workplace safety.

HEALTH SYSTEM

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Why did the Minister for Health omit to inform the house, in his ministerial statement last Wednesday, that he had telephoned Ms Liz Curnow to discuss the health treatment of her father, Joe Chaplin? Will he also explain why he said to her, 'Now it is in the political arena, it could get nasty.'

Last Wednesday I asked the minister a question about the services provided to an 85-year old Gold Card war veteran after he had been flown by helicopter to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. After question time the minister made a ministerial statement admitting that he had received a letter from the daughter, Ms Curnow, and a covering letter from her father. The minister advised the house that he had written to Ms Curnow suggesting she meet with a patient adviser. The minister advised that no contact had since been made by Mr Chaplin or the daughter.

Ms Curnow has confirmed to me that she did receive the letter from the minister recommending as indicated but, on 10 March 2006, eight days before the election, Ms Curnow also received a telephone call from the minister. Ms Curnow informed me the minister was clearly upset that he had been contacted by *The Advertiser* about the matter and that the minister had said to her, 'Now it is in the political arena, it could get nasty.' Ms Curnow has advised me that she had intended, in fact—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN:—to go to the meeting as recommended but, after the tone of the phone call from the minister, she had decided there was no point in going further.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): So amusing, Mr Speaker. I recall the letter from the lady in question and I did ring her on two occasions. The first time was when I first saw her letter (I cannot recall the exact date) and I rang the lady to say that I had received her letter, that I was concerned about the issues, and that I had a draft letter in front of me which I was signing which recommended that the family contact the hospital and go through the issues that were of concern. I inquired, I think, about the health of her father and left it at that. I thought that was it.

Some time later I was advised that the media had found out about the issue. I rang Mrs Curnow just to find out what had happened. I was surprised that there was still an issue because, as I said, I had spoken to her and set up a process by which she could have her grievances addressed. I wanted to know what had happened and whether or not there was still a problem. She informed me that she had sent a copy of her letter to me—and this was the first time she had informed me of that—to the Leader of the Opposition, who had transferred that letter to the media. She had not done it directly herself.

I said, 'Well, if you go to the media there are certain complications that occur as a result of that.' I reject any imputation that I used a tone which was anything but respectful to Mrs Curnow and the choices she made. I was merely making a point that many people who think they can get a better result by going to the media often find out that it is pretty uncomfortable for them. A number of times last year I had conversations with people who had had their stories plastered over the media. I recall, in fact, one woman whose story was in the media and she was on the phone to me on a

regular basis crying about the intrusion on her and her family's privacy. I merely pointed that out to the family.

DISABILITY SERVICES

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is to the Minister for Disability Services. If the services now provided by the Intellectual Disability Services Council, Julia Farr Services and the Independent Living Centre will be delivered by the same staff through Disability Services SA, where is the cut to the overheads referred to in the ministerial statement, and what is its dollar value?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Disability Services): I thank the honourable member for the opportunity to explain to the house some of the benefits of this well received reform, which has been welcomed by the disability sector as a serious attempt to integrate services for the first time in the history of disability services in this state. The truth is that, over the decades, as we have gained a greater realisation about disability, the process has been that a diagnosis that puts a label on a disability has occurred and then, generally, an advocacy group—often parents or people with a disability or, in some cases, a non-government organisation—lobby for services. Often a body of parents grows up around that disability, and that is how the service begins; they lobby government. That has meant that we have been left with a very ad hoc series of services across a range of non-government and government departments that are funded.

There are two elements to the reforms. One is the quality of the service: a seamless set of services, essentially, from the moment of diagnosis until when someone is coming to the end of the time that they can be cared for by their family and are looking for supported accommodation. So, it is a qualitative reform, but there are also some quantitative advantages. For instance, across my agency there are something like 114 separate offices. One can imagine that the capacity to rationalise the number of offices could lead to savings in terms of rent, electricity and those sorts of things—obvious overheads that are available to be put back into services. As we bed down these reforms, no doubt, further cost savings will be identified, and I will be more than happy to tip them back into the services that exist for our community.

These reforms have been well received by the community: they are long overdue. They result from the government's listening to people with disabilities and their carers. As I said, I appreciate the honourable member's providing the opportunity for me to explain the benefits of these reforms to the house.

Mrs REDMOND: My question is again to the Minister for Disability Services. Will the single waiting list that the minister intends to create in the new Disability Services SA be an all-needs single list and, if so, how will placements on the single list be categorised and prioritised? In his ministerial statement last week, the minister stated:

The government will create a single waiting list for people needing specific services like accommodation or respite.

However, the ministerial statement does not explain how people's needs will be prioritised if they are all to be on one list.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There is a limit to what one can include in a ministerial statement. Perhaps—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am fascinated by disability services as is, no doubt, the honourable member, but perhaps not everyone would be. The mischief that we are seeking to remedy there is individual parents, often, who have children with disabilities and are caring for them in their own home having to negotiate a labyrinth of service providers and agencies. I will give a classic example. The other day we made an announcement of spectrum disability housing—an additional set of homes that are available for supported accommodation. A parent rang up our ministerial office and said, ‘Tell me about this; I’ve got to put my name on the waiting list.’

It is outrageous that parents or people with disabilities should have to run around trying to find out, often by accident, where these opportunities exist. Parents caring for people with disabilities and people with disabilities themselves are people in our community who have probably the least amount of spare emotional and physical resources to be running around negotiating bureaucracies. The point of having a single waiting list is that that is a proper role for government: we should be maintaining those lists. We should not have 50 lists out there with everyone having to try to put their name down on the list. It is a little like Russia circa 1955: if people see a list they join it, just in case. Obviously, they know that there is scarcity.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, that is right—or the Liberal leadership. There is scarcity in this area. Often we hear stories of people putting their names down on lists even before they are ready to be on those lists; they just want to get in the queue. First, it is about having a rational list so that we can categorise people according to need; and, secondly, it is about reducing the burden on people with disabilities and their carers. The way in which that list will operate will flow from a very important exercise that we are currently part way through, that is, a working group that we set up to analyse supported accommodation. If the honourable member has any suggestions about how this should operate, I would be more than happy to hear from her. We have some ideas about how this list will operate but, rather than just throw stones at what everyone accepts is a very good idea, we invite the honourable member to make some positive suggestions.

Mrs REDMOND: As a supplementary question: given the minister’s answer, could he please explain how the government intends to prioritise or characterise the people if they are to be on a single list?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I would have thought that it stands to logic. If you have a single list you will have a greater capacity to know who is first and who is last. If you have multiple lists, you will have a lot of difficulty working that out. So, the very concept of a single list will assist you with prioritisation. I cannot make it any clearer for the member for Heysen if she cannot work out the relationship between a single list and the greater ability to prioritise according to need.

ABORIGINAL CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Ms BREUER (Giles): Will the Minister for Consumer Affairs explain what is being done to protect Aboriginal consumers living in remote communities? Members will know that my electorate of Giles covers a large area of South Australia, and there are many Aboriginal communities in remote areas where there is often a lack of competition in

commercial activities. This remoteness also means that there is a real need for mobility, but the lack of competition makes Aboriginal people from remote communities vulnerable when it comes to the purchase of vehicles.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for Consumer Affairs): I thank the member for Giles for raising this very important issue. This government, through the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs (OCBA), is participating in a national strategy which is promoting basic consumer rights to ensure that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander consumers have equal access to consumer services. The member for Giles is right to say that the people in remote communities are often vulnerable when it comes to the purchase of vehicles in particular. I am informed by the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs that the sale of over-priced and unroad-worthy vehicles to people living in these communities is common, and that they also face problems in the use of formal credit loans.

In a recent successful outcome, the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs and the Australian Securities and Investment Commission worked together to request a large bank to restructure or write off some loan agreements with Aboriginal consumers. Most of the loans were for \$20 000 or less and were taken out to finance the purchase of second-hand vehicles. Many of the vehicles were of poor quality and in below average working order. An Adelaide-based finance broker had been involved in arranging for the purchases from certain car dealers in South Australia.

It was also found that for many of the people their incomes were limited to various types of Centrelink payments and that many borrowers were left financially over-committed. OCBA has raised a number of issues with the bank financing these transactions (including its internal procedures) to identify discrepancies in some loan applications and the eligibility criteria to assess applications from borrowers living in remote communities. I understand that the bank has responded positively to the findings of the investigation. It acknowledged that it had shortcomings in procedures and policies but emphasised that they were unintentional and that efforts had been put in place to prevent similar occurrences in the future.

The bank is now organising financial counselling for affected consumers and is committed to continuing its role in providing fair and appropriate financial services to remote communities. I have been advised by the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs that investigations continue in relation to the car dealers and the financial broker involved. This government is dedicated to ensuring that all South Australians have access to services, and this is an excellent example of how people in remote communities are being assisted through the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Mr PISONI (Unley): Will the Minister for Infrastructure give a precise time frame for the establishment of the proposed stormwater management authority? On 27 April, I asked the minister whether he supported the building of holding dams upstream on Brownhill Creek. His answer indicated that it was out of his hands and that the government would be creating a new authority to oversee stormwater management infrastructure.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): It is very hard to make a firm timetable without actually dictating to people in local government, which I am sure the

member for Unley would not like to do. Were it possible to dictate to people in local government I would think about it, but the truth is, that does not work. What we are talking about here is an authority that is recognised as being unique. We are the first state government in this state's history to tackle this issue in an organised fashion. It has been recognised—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: She just goes on and on, doesn't she? If a headache had legs, it would be the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: She reckons she heard it 10 years ago but I just made it up a few seconds ago. I am sure that she is probably right. The truth is that it is a unique and very brave thing for this government to do. We have reached agreement with local government—all bar the City of Burnside. I am told that the most recent comments from some of the Burnside councillors have in fact not been accepted by other local government members and that the discussions are going very well. A bill will be drawn up and, as always with local government, it will be the subject of quite lengthy consultation. However, it is better to get the support and get that done. It cannot work without agreement and support.

We are going to do this as quickly as possible, because it should have been done a long time ago. We started these discussions when we came to government. It was and remains a brave thing to do. It will be a historic achievement, and my own view—and I have said it to local government over and over—is that we should do it as quickly as possible. I can tell the member for Unley that it will be done as quickly as possible, but there are a large number of local governments involved and it is only appropriate that they have a say in the legislation because, at the end of the day, it will be their responsibility to manage the authority.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The SPEAKER: I draw members' attention to the presence in the gallery of Mrs Karurua Antonio, a librarian from the Parliament of the Republic of Kiribati. Mrs Antonio is here to gain experience in the operation of parliamentary libraries under a program provided by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Education Fund.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services and Government Enterprises): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: In response to a question last week by the member for MacKillop, I table a copy of the report called *Investigation into the Water Quality Incident at Summit Storage Water Treatment Plant, December 2004*.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

BROWNHILL AND KESWICK CREEKS, FLOODING

Mr PISONI (Unley): I would like to make it clear to this house just how frustrated the residents of Unley are by the threat of flood. The Brownhill Creek and Keswick Creek systems also include the Parklands and Glen Osmond Creek, and it affects 5 000 homes in and around my electorate of Unley. In November last year, the government released an information update. This brochure described how a number of flood mitigation components had been developed and how they can combine to reduce the risk of flood damage in and around my seat of Unley. The study team was described as broad and included the Patawalonga Catchment Water Management Board. The study found that up to 5 000 properties in the catchments could be affected by a one in 100-year flood. This, incidentally, does not necessarily mean that you will have a flood only every 100 years. I think we have had at least two of those in the last 20 years, and more than 1 300 properties could flood above floor level.

This study set about finding ways to reduce the impact of large catchment-wide floods. A total of 12 recommendations have been circulated to the affected property owners. It is not suggested that any single recommendation will work in isolation but that the best results will be achieved by combining the recommendations. The total cost to implement a combination of these measures has been estimated to be \$55 million. The good news is that the flood damage savings and multi-purpose benefits to the affected properties would exceed \$80 million. On top of the tangible economic benefit, it has been estimated that extensive social benefits would be achieved by reducing disruption, personal and community distress and health issues, including the loss of life. Although it is still further to be investigated, it is estimated that some areas will be protected from a one in 100-year flood, and that the rest of Unley will be protected from a one in 50-year flood.

The measures have been costed and rank in order of effectiveness. At a cost of \$3 million, the study has recommended raising community awareness and flood preparedness. This would consist of community awareness, as some effective actions to reduce flood risk are non-structural. Assessments conducted as part of the study estimate that up to 20 per cent of potential flood damage could be avoided through raising community awareness and flood preparedness. Personally, I believe that this recommendation on its own is simply a stalling tactic and should only be implemented in the final stages of the mitigation program. The big ticket items and most effective measures would be to spend \$12 million upstream on Brownhill Creek, building two flood control dams. These would be earth dams vegetated with native grasses and ground covers, and a rock-lined spillway may also be included. These dams would have a pipe near the base and would be empty most of the time. This would allow the water to pool behind the earth walls and have the effect of slowing the flow of water down the built-up areas in and around Unley; a bit like a hole in a bucket, holding the bulk of the water back by releasing a small amount at a time until the bucket is empty.

I believe that these works are urgent and will have an immediate effect on reducing the flood risk if used in conjunction with a series of temporary flood storage areas in

the South Parklands between Fullarton and Peacock Roads, at Ridge Park in Myrtle Bank, and the Wayville Showgrounds. These measures would manage the flow from the Parklands and Glen Osmond Creek also, at a cost of \$21 million, and would benefit those living in the north of my seat of Unley. I urge the minister to direct the new Storm Water Management Authority to put plans in place to introduce these recommendations without delay. I am surprised that the Labor members who hold the seats to the west of my seat of Unley are not being vocal and pushing the minister for the implementation of these recommendations to protect their constituents from flooding.

The study also describes the following projects as having a high level of effectiveness: the Anzac Highway diversion, estimated to cost between \$7 million and \$17 million; and bridge upgrades for Darley Street, Fisher Street, Hampton Street and Cross Road are costed at between \$10 million and \$14 million. Finally, we can help to minimise the run-off into our streets by slowing the growth of urban infill in Unley and by forcing new developments to contain their own water run-off. When a housing block is cleared and three homes replace a single house, there is, obviously, less soil and vegetation to absorb the run-off from the expanded area and from roof and concrete.

Time expired.

BANGLADESHI COMMUNITY

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): I rise today to pay tribute to a growing community group in our state. The South Australian Bangladeshi Community Association is a fairly new and emerging group. I was pleased to represent the Premier at the Bangla New Year celebrations a couple of weeks ago. I congratulate the community on a fantastic exhibition of handicrafts, artworks, souvenirs and the most beautifully embroidered saris and other clothing. We were also treated to graceful performances of song and dance by the adults and children. This included visiting professional performers from Bangladesh who were a valuable role model to the young performers. The whole event was both colourful and entertaining.

It is important to note that Bangladesh has only existed as an independent state since 1971 even though its national character dates to an ancient past. We may well have had immigrants from this area dating back many years, as it is suggested by the community that some of the original cameleers were Bangladeshi and not Afghan. It is actually ignorance on behalf of South Australians to have called all these cameleers Afghans regardless of the region of the subcontinent they came from. The first immigrants from Bangladesh came to South Australia to escape the civil war between east and west Pakistan in 1971. My interest in this is personal as I was born in Karachi in what was West Pakistan nearly 20 years before, and I have always held a keen interest in the politics of the area for that reason. These early migrants were only able to come to Adelaide because of the relaxing of the despicable White Australia policy in 1967. Thankfully, this policy was abolished six years later in 1973. Family and friends later joined these original settlers. The 2001 ABS Census shows that 120 children were born in South Australia at that time and that 197 people said that they spoke Bangali.

Through their hardworking and greatly respected chairman, Dr Abdul Hossain, the community members tell me that there has been a steady flow of new skilled migrants to South

Australia in recent years and that, currently, about 45 families live here. In addition, we now have quite a number of Bangladeshi students studying in South Australia as overseas students. The government recognises the important contribution that migrants from Bangladesh make to the economic and cultural development of this state. It will be interesting to note the growth of those registered as Bangali speakers in this year's census, given the successful establishment of the Bangladeshi Community School as part of the Goodwood Primary School in 2004. This school works hard to ensure that the Bangladeshi children develop an appreciation of and intimate tie with their tradition, language, culture and lifestyle. They certainly add another colourful dimension to the cultural diversity of this state. The performance of the children at the Bangla New Year celebrations reflected well on their school, teachers and community. I congratulate them on a wonderful event.

MORPHETT ELECTORATE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Last New Year's Eve about 70 000 people gathered at Glenelg. For those members who were not at the Bay on New Year's Eve, I suggest they come down in the future because it is a fantastic event. New Year's Eve at Glenelg is a tradition, and I think that it should be listed as a state icon because, over the years, millions of people have come down to the Bay to welcome in the new year. This last New Year's Eve celebration was no different. The weather was kind this time and we were able to have the fireworks and other displays including the dancing and bands. It was fantastic, although the problem we had related to the sheer numbers in attendance, and, for example, they all want to use the toilets. They all want to have a good time and they really enjoy themselves, but we need to make sure that they are in a safe environment with all the necessary facilities available to them. You have to make sure that people will not flout the law.

While the area is a dry zone during the New Year's Eve celebrations, it needs to be enforced. To do that the South Australia Police come down and do an absolutely fantastic job there on New Year's Eve, as they do at all times at the Bay, under what can be sometimes difficult circumstances with over 3 million visitors a year. On New Year's Eve there are thousands of people there. The City of Holdfast Bay employs a private security company and I believe it spends nearly \$250 000 a year on private security down at the Bay, but on New Year's Eve it is a significant part of their budget for the night, which is what I am getting to: the budget to pay for New Year's Eve. The cost of putting on the fireworks, providing toilets, getting bands down there, providing security, liaising with the police, St Johns (the South Australian Ambulance do a fantastic job) the fire department, MFS and the SES: the logistics of organising it is immense and so is the budget.

To continue to hold New Year's Eve at Glenelg at Moseley Square and out on the jetty is an expensive exercise and is becoming more expensive. I would expect the state government to recognise this event as it is almost an iconic event and put its hand in its pocket more deeply than it has before. The Treasurer has short arms and deep pockets, and I expect the government to take over funding this event from the City of Holdfast Bay. I do not believe that the 30 000 residents in the City of Holdfast Bay should be funding the entertainment for New Year's Eve at Glenelg. It is a state event, one that is enjoyed by families, all South Australians

and many visitors from interstate and overseas. It needs to be run properly, be well and truly financed, and it needs more and more money. It is a state event and we need state money. I ask the state government to support the City of Holdfast Bay in continuing the event. The police are very concerned that if it is not an organised event it will become an absolute riot, as we saw in 1982 and 1984 when the riots were terrible. The police can be really tested under those circumstances. We do not want that but want to retain the reputation of being a fantastic family event. New Year's Eve celebrations should be a time when everyone in South Australia can come down and be a part of it.

The Holdfast Shores development, after 10 years of being a building site, will be finished, and I invite the Premier to come down with me on the water slide for two and we can try it out! There is the little one the kids go on, one for individuals and one two people can go on. I am happy to be down there with the Premier, slip sliding down. It would be quite a splash when he and I hit the bottom!

The police do a fantastic job down at the Bay, and Superintendent Paul Dickson, who has been in charge of Sturt LSA for a number of years, is being promoted and moved into crime. I publicly thank Paul. I have stretched our relationship a little when I have come out on issues down there and made him go more grey than he would have been under normal circumstances. However, Paul Dickson has been another fine example of what we have in the South Australian police force—dedicated officers. They are ambitious and want to go through the ranks, but in the process they do a fantastic job and, in leading Sturt LSA and the police in the Morphett area, Paul has done a terrific job and I wish him well in future.

CLEANERS

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): Today I will discuss some of the quiet achievers in our community—people who work as cleaners. Having been one myself for paid work, I am particularly sensitive to some of the issues cleaners have to face. I was very impressed in seeing that the Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union in Australia and the Service and Food Workers Union in New Zealand have kicked off a campaign called the Clean Start. This is where unions point out that the property services industry in Australia and New Zealand is in crisis. Incomes for cleaners and security officers is now so low that the industry is incapable of attracting and retaining a stable work force.

This campaign comes at a critical time for cleaners as the basic wages are under threat by the evil federal work choices legislation. We are finding that workloads are intensifying, with the Australian benchmark now at 1 000 square metres an hour, compared with the North American standard of 300 to 400 square metres per hour. In comparing ourselves with the US, it is very unusual that we are expecting workers in Australia to work doubly as hard per hour as do our counterparts in the US.

Under the Clean Start plan, instead of directly targeting employers, who are mostly contractors, the unions are seeking an agreement on minimum awards for the entire industry. I know that the Miscellaneous Workers Union, particularly, has been trying for some time to make sure also that there is continuity of entitlements and services, such as long service leave, within the industry, and I hope this campaign will achieve that aim. Quite often, people work on a part-time basis. Cleaning jobs are usually precarious, with

60 to 70 per cent of workers being employed on a casual or part-time basis. Workers are forced to hold down a number of cleaning jobs, each with very little security, working shifts which are two hours to four hours in length and which can start at any time of the day or night.

The Building Service Contractors Association estimates average hours of work to be 15 hours per week, but the reality is that many cleaners get even fewer jobs. When you consider that the average annual income for cleaners is \$8 200 and that the poverty level for an individual is \$15 288, that is very serious. I understand that the poverty level for a family is now considered to be \$32 864. As well as poor pay, cleaners face a range of occupational health and safety problems, and they are frequently exposed to chemical risks, electrical hazards from faulty machinery, and heavy lifting. This campaign includes the aim of getting the top end of town, particularly the commercial property owners and also some of the award contractors, to ensure that they are paying basic wages and that their health and safety standards are being observed, as well as supporting the right of workers to organise.

Certainly I know that, through the TAFE sector and some of the private training areas, many cleaners are availing themselves of training to ensure that they know the proper manual techniques and also that they understand the seriousness of using some of the chemicals they potentially use in their work. Cleaners in Australia are telling us that at the moment they really cannot earn enough in these jobs to raise a family, and they call on the citizens of Australia to be aware of their plight and to support the Clean Start Campaign: A fair deal for cleaners.

I commend the workers who have come out in the cleaning and security area for making this something about which we can all be educated. They are asking for help, and many religious and ethnic communities and politicians have already pledged their support. Many tenants and office workers have also said that they will support cleaners in getting a fair go.

SOUTHERN BLUEFIN TUNA

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): At last, the bluefin tuna's place on the international list of threatened species is being reviewed. Brian Jeffries, the Chairman of the Tuna Boat Owners Association, has welcomed the review, stating on ABC radio today:

We actually have asked 13 times in writing to the group who run that list, exactly for any documents which could justify the listing. As of this stage, they haven't produced one document. Now what they're doing to their credit is now reviewing the whole situation as to whether that should've been listed or not.

The Australian southern bluefin tuna industry is estimated to be worth about \$1 billion, almost all of which is in South Australia. The industry has had many ups and downs in the almost 50 years of its operation. That led to tuna farming and a rebirth of the fishing industry in a new direction.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Why did the tuna barons back Hank?

Mrs PENFOLD: Hagan, I think, not industry. The majority of southern bluefin tuna caught in Australian waters is caught off the South Australian coast. The fish are transferred to cages to fatten and grow, then sold on the lucrative Japanese sashimi market. While southern bluefin tuna are not the only fish used for sashimi, they are considered among the best for this purpose.

For many decades some of those in the industry have experimented to find ways to close the tuna cycle. This has been recognised by other nations that fish for southern bluefin tuna, principally Japan, as a necessary factor if the fishery is to continue and expand in the future. Some of that research and experimentation is being done here in South Australia and on Eyre Peninsula by the Stehr group at Arno Bay.

The leaders in the Australian section of this worldwide fishery have been concerned for decades about the future of their industry. They were among the first—if not the first—to push for quotas and a reduction of effort. Australia has consistently obeyed the restrictions. It is ironic that, while Australian fishers obey the rules, some other nations that fish for southern bluefin tuna do not necessarily see quotas as a constraint to be observed.

An increase in the effort required to catch the same tonnage of fish in the wild as in past years was noted decades ago, when leaders began to push for limitations. They were concerned about the sustainability long before sustainability became a catchword trotted out on almost every occasion by a certain group of people in relation to anything and almost everything.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Why did you lose two of the three Port Lincoln booths?

Mrs PENFOLD: I didn't.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You did.

Mrs PENFOLD: Labor lost 3.3 per cent of its vote on the Eyre Peninsula. Those both inside and outside the industry who are genuinely concerned about sustainability worked together for solutions. The formation of a worldwide body that included all countries that fish for southern bluefin tuna was a major step forward in the introduction of quotas that were eventually accepted by participating nations.

The ones who have the most to lose if the fishery collapses are those involved in it, or depending on it for their livelihood. Conversely, they are the ones to gain most by ensuring that the fishery is stable and recovering in the wild so that any suggestion that southern bluefin tuna is an endangered species is removed. When tuna fishing, as an industry, took off in Port Lincoln in the 1950s there was also a thriving tuna industry operating out of Eden in New South Wales. That base and cannery have long since gone. While the Port Lincoln cannery is thriving, the tuna species is no longer the valuable southern bluefin tuna.

Longliners have been credited with seriously depleting southern bluefin tuna boats. Local boats preferred poling and later purse seining. In poling a line with a barbless hook on the end was attached to a pole about three metres in length. The hook was flung into the school of tuna and the fish were flipped aboard, when caught. It was extremely physical and tiring work. Purse seining is a method where a long net is run around a school of fish and then pulled in at the bottom so the fish cannot escape.

The fish are often caught in the Great Australian Bight and are carefully pulled to Port Lincoln, where they are artificially fed until they reach their optimum weight for the Japanese market, when they are humanely killed and flown chilled or frozen and shipped to the lucrative Asian markets. The value to this state of the employment and associated industries that live off the tuna industry is probably, in its own right, worth much more than a billion dollars. There are boats and crews, shipyards and slips that build and maintain the boats and the staff employed.

Time expired.

DUNSTAN, Mrs G., DEATH

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): On Friday I attended the funeral service of Gretel Dunstan, dearly loved mother of Bronwen and Rodney, Andrew and Melanie, Paul and Margaret, and grandmother of Tom, Katherine and Corey. One of Gretel's oldest friends, who had known her since her arrival in Adelaide, said that her passing marked the end of a very significant and important life. Gretel Elsasser was born to Jewish parents in 1930 in Mannheim, Germany, where she spent the first seven years of her life. At the time, of course, Germany was in political turmoil with the rise of Nazism and life was extremely difficult for her Jewish family. She remembered feeling different from other children, and when she was about four she got herself into enormous trouble with her parents because she drew a large swastika on a sheet and draped it over the balcony of their apartment in an effort not to be singled out.

In 1937 the family was forced to leave Germany in a great hurry because the Gestapo was after her father, Robert, who was a teacher in a hastily established Jewish school, having been dismissed from his former position in Oberrealschule, an upper secondary school, because of his race. One can only imagine his outrage at this situation after having served in the German army in the First World War and being awarded the Iron Cross, both first and second class. Fortunately, Gretel and her parents and sister found a temporary haven in Switzerland with her mother's family but were unable to stay there because her mother had lost her Swiss citizenship when she married a German national. Gretel was aware of the grave danger in which the family found themselves and often spoke about being dragged from office to office while her parents frantically tried to find some way of reaching safety. However, she also remembered wonderful times spent with loving grandparents, and she would talk about the beauty of Geneva and the nearby Alps as well as the ice-cream and baked cheesecakes that her grandmother made. Bronwen regrets that, as much as we would have liked to do so, she was never able to make a cheesecake like those she remembered from her childhood.

Eventually, and most fortunately, Australia granted the Elsassers a visa and they began the long journey, arriving in Sydney one week before the declaration of war in 1939. The Elsassers tried to look for work as teachers and had an interview with Miss West and Miss Bryant, the headmistresses at Frensham School, an exclusive girls' boarding school in the Blue Mountains. Although there was no position available for Robert and his wife Marcelle, the school most generously offered to take Gretel and her sister Charlotte for a term, which was subsequently extended for another year free of charge. So, the two girls, neither of whom could speak English, were separated from their parents, who travelled to Melbourne in search of work.

It was a very difficult time for two very European children who, although safe from Hitler, were in an extremely alien environment. Gretel was blessed with an amazing brain and a wicked sense of humour, both of which she used to help her adjust to the situation. Finally, in 1940, a position of school librarian was offered to Robert, and he and Marcelle moved to Canary Cottage in the beautiful school grounds. Gretel and Charlotte continued to board, but spent the school holidays with their parents in the cosy cottage. Marcelle described this time as idyllic, and she also became a teacher of French and Latin at Frensham. Gretel was highly amused recently to read accounts of the eccentricities of her family in a Frensham

publication, and she loved the bit that said, 'Mind you, Gretel was no angel.' At the end of last year, at the request of the school, she wrote a memoir of her time there, and this is now in the school archives.

After four peaceful years at Frensham, Charlotte was ready to start university, so the family moved to Adelaide, where Robert had been offered a position at Prince Alfred College. They lived in the back of a house in Edward Street at Norwood, and Gretel attended Walford House School, as it was known in those days. She was an outstanding student and became dux of the school. She won numerous prizes, including the Tennyson Medal for the top student in Leaving Honours English in 1947, which was an amazing feat, given that she had spoken no English until she was nine. Gretel loved her time at Walford and she loved some of her teachers, especially the legendary English teacher, Miss Swift (or 'Swifty', as she was called by the girls). She also, typically, played lots of pranks on teachers and loved to tell stories about things such as making stink bombs in chemistry and letting them off in another teacher's class.

When her grand-daughter Katherine started at Walford in year 7, Gretel asked if she was happy that Bronwen had chosen to send her to 'our school', as she had also attended Walford in the 1960s. Gretel was delighted when Katherine came home and told her how she had located Gretel's name on the honours boards that hang in the foyer of school hall, and even more delighted when her grand-daughter's name was added for prizes in both English and French, two of the subjects in which she herself had excelled. I hope to continue my remarks tomorrow.

Time expired.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 4 May. Page 149.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition):

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and congratulations on your elevation to that role. The Economics and Finance Committee will no doubt miss you, or are you still a member? No, you are not.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Tell us why you almost lost Bedford Park?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I can explain that to the Attorney.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And Eden Hills.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Look, I probably would have lost Bedford Park had the Attorney not visited. When the Attorney started doorknocking I had a flood of votes back in. The poll reflected it. We could track the Attorney's activities in Davenport by the way my votes were lifting in the various booths.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I never entered the leader's electorate.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: In debating the Address in Reply, I will not unduly delay the house, but I do want to place on record my congratulations to Her Excellency the Governor not only for the way in which she delivered her speech but also for the excellent role she has played as Governor. She is a fine example to South Australia. I was delighted when the Premier rang the morning of the announcement to advise me

that the government was going to extend her Excellency's term for another nine months or so. I think that the Governor does an excellent job for South Australia.

Also, I congratulate the Speaker on his elevation to that position. As the house knows, I nominated him for Deputy Speaker in the last parliament. It is good to see the house put the member for Playford into that role, and I am sure that he will perform that role to the best of his ability. I take this opportunity to congratulate new members from both sides of the chamber on their maiden speech; it is always a tortuous task to work out what you are going to say and how you are going to say it. Congratulations to all members on all sides and, indeed, both houses on their maiden speeches. I think that there might be one more maiden speech in the upper house this week. I think that Stephen Wade's maiden speech is yet to be delivered. Also, I place on record my thanks and congratulations to all past members of the Liberal Party who did not make it through the election process or who chose to resign at this election. The Liberal Party is certainly grateful for their contribution over many years. I know that they will all go on to other activities. We will have a function to thank them in due course but, as part of this contribution, I do want to thank the past members of the Liberal Party for their contributions not only to the party but also to the parliament and to the state.

I want to mention a number of issues very briefly that have been raised since the election. It was interesting that the member for Napier let the cat out of the bag in relation to the position of Governor during his Address in Reply contribution and that, in his view, the position of Governor should be abolished and that those functions, apparently, could be undertaken by officers of the Office of the Premier. Just imagine all the various ceremonial functions that the Governor attends and the response from the South Australian public if we had someone from the Office of the Premier performing those particular roles. I could just imagine how enthusiastic the members of the public would be if they saw an officer from the Office of the Premier undertaking a function. I think that the member for Napier has let the cat out of the bag to this extent; that is, ultimately, if the Labor Party is successful in its long-held view that the upper house should go, it will be interesting to see exactly what doors that opens for the Labor Party (or, indeed, future governments) then to deliver on whatever agenda it wants. Clearly, one agenda of the Labor Party is to abolish the position of Governor. Obviously, that is the cat out of the bag by the member for Napier.

Other than that it is old fashioned, I am not quite sure what argument the member for Napier puts forward. It will be interesting to see how the member for Napier manages that debate during the four years of the government as we lead up to discussion about the future of the upper house. The government has announced that it will have a referendum on the future of the upper house. If the government has its way, that will be a matter for the South Australian public come the 2010 election.

It was rather humorous of the Premier to stand up and say in a recent conference that the upper house was holding back the mining industry in South Australia. When we asked him the very simple question as to whether he could give us one example in the history of South Australia where the upper house has held up a mine, the only one of any relevance that anyone could think of was when the Labor Party was holding up the Roxby Downs development. Ultimately, a Labor Party member (Normie Foster) saw the light, voted for the legisla-

tion and, therefore, was ultimately out of the Labor Party. The Premier is great at making these claims but, when you ask him to substantiate them, the claims actually fall over.

It will be interesting to see how the Premier is going to run the debate about reducing the quotas in the upper house. Many academics believe that if you go, say, to four-year terms, maintaining 22 members, then reduce the quota, that will favour the minor parties, which the Premier would accuse of being anti-mining and anti-development. It will be interesting to see ultimately where that debate goes. It will be interesting to see what South Australia makes of the upper house. I did note that at this election the Hon. Nick Xenophon received a significant vote in the upper house, which would indicate—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He got more votes in every Croydon booth than the Liberal Party.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: But it is interesting that South Australia voted in the upper house for Nick Xenophon. It will be interesting to see what South Australia thinks of a government that wishes to get rid of the upper house and how that argument plays out. The government will have to prove its case as to why the upper house is such a bad thing and what is wrong with it. When I was sitting on the government benches and we were trying to sell ETSA, from memory the legislation was held up for 500 days and not one of the Labor Party members rushed out in front of the TV cameras and said, 'This is outrageous: the upper house is blocking government legislation; let's get rid of it.'

All the government got rid of, of course, was the two Labor members who voted for it, Terry Cameron and Trevor Crothers. It will be interesting to see exactly what argument the government puts up in relation to getting rid of the upper house. If you look federally, you see that the leader for the time being, Mr Beazley, is running around Australia saying how outrageous it is that the Howard government controls the Senate, because it gives the government total power. There is, at least, an argument to say that getting rid of the upper house would have a similar effect here in South Australia. The Governor's speech, which outlines the government's program over the next four years, is as interesting for what is there as for what is not—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, the other way round. What you are trying to say is that it is notable for what is not there, not for what is there.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Members can understand why the Attorney, when he visits Bedford Park, upsets people and turns votes our way. You can just imagine him doorknocking Bedford Park on his bike and giving them English lessons. Good luck to him! Of course, the Attorney has visited functions in Davenport. He has actually caught trains up to the Blackwood station and ridden to a Davenport fundraiser for the Liberal Party. He paid his \$15, which was duly receipted, and he spoke at the function, as I recall.

The electors of Davenport well remember that. I do note that, since the Attorney's visit to that booth, I have not lost it. I keep on letterboxing saying, 'If you don't vote me back in, I'll bring him back.' However, it is interesting to see what is not in the speech. In my previous portfolio area of environment, for instance, there was a long-held commitment that the government was going to bring in a new coastal protection act, but nothing happened during the last four years and it is not in the Governor's speech. The government was going to bring in a biodiversity act—nothing happened for four years—and it fell out of the Governor's speech.

The Hon. P.L. White interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Taylor says that you would not put that in the Governor's speech. Go back and have a look at the previous speeches by the Governor; that is what you padded it out with. The government was going to bring in animal welfare reforms. A discussion paper was put out and, ultimately, nothing happened. It was going to do something about cats—nothing happened. It was going to bring in legislation regarding contaminated land—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: How come Vickie is not here listening to your speech?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Because there is no requirement for that. It was going to bring in contaminated land legislation and, I think, when government members were briefed on their own contaminated land legislation, they suddenly realised what they were doing, and that has also now disappeared into the ether. So, there is a whole range of questions now about what the government is going to do in relation to those areas, and a whole range of other areas.

I have raised some questions in relation to the announcement by the government that it is to have a Commissioner for Social Inclusion. The questions are not that difficult because, one would assume, if you are going to have a commissioner, the commissioner would have more powers or new powers to undertake a role. That is all that we have been asking: what powers will Commissioner Cappelletti have as commissioner that the mental health minister does not have or, indeed, that the cabinet do not have, because the cabinet can access any information they wish; the minister can access any information she wishes; Monsignor Cappelletti—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: 'It' wishes: cabinet is a collective, it is singular.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Is it? There you go. Ultimately, Commissioner Cappelletti or, as he was then, Monsignor Cappelletti, as a member of the Executive Committee of Cabinet, would have access to any information that the commissioner required. Any information that Monsignor Cappelletti required, he would have had access to, and no one believes that the Executive Committee of Cabinet would not have had access to that information. I know that every time I raise a question about the Commissioner for Social Inclusion, the Premier accuses me of attacking Christian leaders. That is wrong: I am simply asking questions about the issue, and will continue to ask questions about the issue because, now that Commissioner Cappelletti is on the public payroll, he should be available for public questioning and public criticism as part of the public debate.

I understand that Tim Flannery has resigned today. I note that the timing of that was only some days after Tim Flannery expressed a more supportive view of nuclear energy in Australia than he had previously. All my briefings from Mr Flannery on that issue have been in the negative until the article on the weekend when, all of a sudden, there was a slightly different view on that, so, it will be interesting to see where government takes the issue of climate change. I note that the day after the Liberal Party committed to the greenhouse targets, the Premier matched some of our targets, and now is going to legislate for the state to have greenhouse targets.

I find legislating for greenhouse targets intriguing. How is it going to be enforceable? It is a state greenhouse target. How is the government going to bring in legislation that is actually enforceable? It will be interesting to see how the legislation deals with that issue because, some people, Madam Deputy Speaker, have expressed the cynical view publicly—and I know that you will be very surprised at this—

that you cannot have an enforceable target for 2050 when we are only in 2006. How does the state penalise itself? If the state does not achieve the reduction as proposed by the legislation, who is penalised?

So, if it is about setting a target for the sake of setting a target, I refer the government to the State Strategic Plan which has targets everywhere, none of them legislated, and few of them achieved. So, the issue with the greenhouse legislation is: setting the target is fine, but how is it actually going to be enforced? That is what I will be interested in with respect to that particular piece of legislation. I hope that it is not like the dolphin sanctuary legislation, which was all about running around South Australia saying, 'We have introduced legislation; the first in Australia to have a dolphin sanctuary.'

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No? Really?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, it might surprise the Attorney. You must have missed the press release. Ultimately, when you refer to the bill and ask the minister if any more powers exist in this bill than under any current legislation, the answer is no. So, it is purely a marketing exercise. I guess that a lot of the environment groups are now looking to this climate change legislation, hoping that it is not just another marketing exercise. I note that Kim Beazley, the current leader of the federal Labor Party, is talking a lot about industrial relations.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He'll still be in office after you've gone.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Well, I'm not so sure about that. I note that Mr Beazley says a lot about industrial relations but—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He'll be prime minister when you disappear.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes; the Australian government does have a policy for people to work after 70 years of age. Mr Beazley talks about industrial relations and I have one question for the federal Leader of the Opposition. Is it the federal Leader of the Opposition's policy that, regardless of the High Court outcome, he will hand industrial relations back to the states? That is the simple question. He is running around Australia saying how outrageous the industrial relations legislation is and that he supports the state Labor governments' around Australia taking it to the High Court. So, regardless of the High Court outcome, will a Beazley government hand the powers back to the states?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What does Nick Minchin think of it?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Nick Minchin thinks you're an idiot. That is Nick's view. Ultimately, the view is—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You keep interjecting. I am only going to take five more minutes.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Nick Minchin likes me.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: He only says that to your face. Nick has cousins at Bedford Park. The issue for Mr Beazley federally is whether he will hand it back to the states. He is running around Australia saying how bad the federal legislation is but, of course, he was part of the Keating cabinet that used the corporations powers to bring in the unfair dismissal laws in the first place. They would have gone to the equivalent of the crown solicitor federally and—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The Australian Government Solicitor.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We'll call it the Australian Government Solicitor, if that keeps the Attorney quiet for another 30 seconds. They would have asked the Australian

Government Solicitor, 'Do we have the legal power to do this?' The answer would have been yes. Did the unions run around saying that it was outrageous to use the corporations power? Did they take it to the High Court? The answer is no; they did not. What precedent will the commonwealth use when they go to the High Court in relation to industrial relations matters? They will say, 'Here is a precedent, that is not even by our government, of a former Labor government using the corporations powers to bring in industrial-type legislation.'

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Did unfair dismissal come before the High Court?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No; no-one took it to the High Court.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Then it is not a precedent, is it?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It will be because they will use it as evidence.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You don't understand, do you?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I do understand.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, you don't.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Go and read Justice Kirby in *The Australian* and see what he said. Get your nose out of the Form Guide and read what Justice Kirby said in *The Australian* and you will see that was the exact discussion.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I think you'll find Justice Kirby won't be at *The Australian* when I ring. I think you'll find he's on the High Court.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, but he was quoted in *The Australian*. Ultimately, I think that Kim Beazley has a question to answer to the Australian people. Simply, will he hand it back to—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You don't really understand how courts work, do you?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I do actually. Will they hand it back to the Australian people? Let me explain it to the Attorney in very simple terms because I know that he is qualified as a lawyer but has he actually been in the courtroom as a lawyer? Regardless of what—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I'm down at the District Court regularly.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: For a cup of tea. Regardless of what the High Court says about industrial relations, if a future Beazley government wants to hand it back—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Well, they can.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: They can, exactly. Thank you for that interjection, Attorney.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: They can.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: They can. That is the question that I put to Mr Beazley. Given that he does have the power to hand it back, will he? I suspect that the whole agenda is that he will not hand it back. I suspect that he has absolutely no intention of handing it back and that the High Court challenge by the respective state governments around Australia is really doing the unions' work and saving the unions' money.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Yes, but the unfair dismissal law is not a precedent because it didn't go to the High Court, according to you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There has been sufficient debate across the chamber.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Let me explain it to you. It is a precedent—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There has been sufficient debate across the chamber. I have been very liberal. I think it is time it concluded. The leader should continue.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker; it is good to see that you have been very liberal in your early days as Deputy Speaker. That will surprise some people. Let me explain it to the house as follows. My use of the word 'precedent' is that it is not the first time that the corporations powers have been used by the commonwealth government to bring in industrial relations legislation that affects the states.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Yes, but it could be invalid.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I didn't ask that question; I am just saying that it is a precedent for the use of the power. We have on record the agreement with me of the highest law officer in the land that Mr Beazley has a choice. He can hand it back to the states or not. That is the question for Mr Beazley. That is the question for the Labor Party.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: After he's elected, he'll deal with that question.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No; the Attorney says that at the next federal election, he will deal with that matter. But even if Mr Beazley wins the next election—

Ms Fox: When.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: When is a good question. When will Beazley ever win a federal election? It is a very good question from the member for Bright, as she interjects out of her seat. The issue is that, even after the election, if Mr Beazley happens to be the prime minister, the question for him as prime minister is that he can still hand it back. That is the question for Mr Beazley.

The other issue of industrial relations is more local. That is the issue of the sports and coaches award that is currently before the Industrial Relations Commission. This is a direct result of the Fair Work Bill brought in by the government. It came up as an issue during the election and it will regulate our sports industry so that any sporting group that pays a player, coach, trainer or administrator could be under the auspices of this award. So, we will watch with interest what happens with that award.

I raise another issue. I hope the parliament has something planned, and I think that South Australia should have something planned, to celebrate the sesquicentennial of the bicameral parliament system in South Australia.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Sesquicentenary.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: There you go. We hope the parliament has something organised. Certainly we have not been advised that something has been organised, but no doubt the government will run around celebrating our bicameral system saying that it should be abolished, which is essentially where we are with this government.

Another issue I raise is that of cost shifting. There is no doubt that this is an issue to watch over the next six months while we wait for the budget. There will be at least two areas in which the government will seek to cost shift: one is local government and the other is levies. Watch the natural resource management levy: there will be a huge shift from current departmental expenditure onto the natural resource management levy. The government went to the last election with an expanded definition of what could be caught and funded under the levy. We sought to make various amendments. Ultimately the legislation is through and there is pressure on the budgets of agencies everywhere throughout

government. The government will try to duck shove everything into the levies—there is no doubt about that.

I want to comment on the electorate of Davenport, which is centred around Blackwood and which includes Bedford Park. There are issues I will continue to work through in relation to Davenport, one being the traffic congestion. There have been public meetings and a number of meetings with ministers concerned. The government has a problem with the traffic congestion along the main street of Blackwood. I suspect we will be close to having traffic from Blythwood Road roundabout through to the Blackwood roundabout as one continual traffic jam. While that may not sound serious to the house, in the event of a fire or freight train going through at the wrong time, there will be a major issue for that community. I have asked a number of departmental officers to travel with me in a car to show them the problem. I have made the offer to ministers' chief of staff and to ministers, and so far I have had a knock-back at every level, but I will continue to raise it, because it will be an issue for that district.

The Flagstaff Hill Primary School requires an upgrade, and we will continue to lobby with that. I note that the Bellevue Heights Primary School is getting an upgrade. I cannot work out this government. To my knowledge there have been only two projects in the state's history where a school has been upgraded and the money put in has been commonwealth money only. The last four years of this government saw a \$2 million commitment for Coromandel Valley Primary School, which was the previous Liberal government's commitment. The current government came in, got out \$800 000, and it was left with a \$1.2 million upgrade—all federal money. Lo and behold: the Bellevue Heights Primary School has been lobbying for an upgrade and has been successful. It is an \$800 000 upgrade and, guess what? There is not one cent of state government money in it. The state government runs around saying that it runs education, and how outrageous it is for the federal government to put its imprimatur on education, when in my electorate in particular there are two examples of projects going ahead with not one cent of state government money in it, which is very unfortunate.

We will keep lobbying on behalf of schools. The Hawthorndene Primary School needs a sports hall. We will be working with them. The Eden Hills community is concerned about a lack of parking around the station, which I have raised with the government and I will continue to do so. With those few words, I support the Address in Reply.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): It gives me great pleasure to join this debate, and I will support the motion for the Address in Reply. I take the opportunity to congratulate you, Madam Deputy Speaker, on your elevation to the office of Chairman of Committees. I congratulate the Speaker, in his absence, on his elevation to that high office. I also congratulate our Governor for the fine work she does, not only in delivering her speech to the opening of this fifty-first session of the South Australian parliament but also for the work she does around the state. I also am delighted that she has indicated that she is willing to extend her term in office. She has been a popular Governor all over the state, and the opportunities I have had to be with the Governor when she has been in the South-East in my electorate have been greatly appreciated by me and by my community, and they look forward to her returning on every occasion.

I am deeply honoured to have been returned to this place for the third time. It was with great awe that I walked into this

place the first time as a member of parliament, but to be returned on this the third occasion is just as humbling and I am proud to represent the people of the MacKillop—a large area of the South-East of the state. My return is in no small measure due to the efforts of a large number of people, and I put on the record my thanks and appreciation to those people, particularly Liberal Party members and supporters in the South-East—and there are a large number of them. I will not name them, as I am sure to miss some out. I say a big thank you to my staff, who play a fantastic role in assisting me and the people of my electorate. I refer to my staff both in the parliamentary building and in my office in Naracoorte. They do a fantastic job, and I am proud and pleased to have them working for me and for the people of MacKillop, and I have no doubt that they have played no small part in my return here.

I also take the opportunity to thank my wife, Leonie, who also is incredibly supportive of me and my role.

Mr Venning: They vote for her, not you.

Mr WILLIAMS: I suspect my colleague the member for Schubert speaks with some knowledge when he suggests that my electors are voting for my wife and not me. I get a thrill when I am often introduced at various functions around the electorate often as ‘the member for MacKillop, Mitch and Leonie’, so he is right.

The electorate of MacKillop is large and diverse. It contains a large number of communities and a large number of pursuits, ranging from fishing and forestry to general and all sorts of farming to the wine industry. Again I mention the member for Schubert who, in his Address in Reply speech, talked about the wonderful wines that come out of his area and also talked about the Barossa Valley. I can say without any fear of any contradiction that the most recognisable name from South Australia on the international scene is Coonawarra, and I am absolutely delighted that my electorate contains not only Coonawarra but also many other fine wine growing districts. We have, of course, a large range of value-adding industries across that electorate as well, and I might mention some more about that as I go on.

I also offer my congratulations to all new members of this place. As I have said, I have found it to be an honour to be here, and I am sure that all members feel the same way. In spite of the way in which we are often treated, particularly in the media, it is a job that takes a fair bit of skill and a fair bit of hard work, effort and dedication. I congratulate all those who come to this place, and I particularly congratulate and welcome the four new members on this side of the house. I am also pleased that among the new members who have come to this place there is a considerable amount of experience from the local government area as well. One of the things I have lamented over my time in this place, having had a background in local government some years ago, is that more of the members do not have a similar background. I think the relationship between this level of government and local government is not as good as it should be. I suspect that there is a level of mistrust of this level of government by the local government sector, and I am sure that the more people we have in here with experience in local government the better we will be able to make that relationship.

He is not here, but I particularly want to congratulate the member for Stuart. He has been returned to this place for the twelfth consecutive parliament, which is a fantastic record. I want to congratulate the member for Stuart, because he has fought a battle to be returned here that no member should have to fight. He has fought a battle against someone who

was on the government payroll and who campaigned against him in his electorate for over three years. It is an absolute disgrace that the government had Justin Jarvis on the government payroll doing virtually nothing but campaigning for the seat of Stuart. I think it has done a great deal of good for democracy in South Australia to have the member for Stuart overcome that work against him and be returned to this place. I not only congratulate him on that count but also acknowledge his record. I think he is the longest serving parliamentarian in the history of this nation. Obviously, he is not sent back here year after year without being a very effective member.

I want to spend a little time talking about parliamentary reform. I think we will be hearing a fair bit about parliamentary reform over the next couple of years and, if we are going to go down this path, we need to bring some intellectual rigour to the debate, which is something I have noticed a serious lack of. There has been no intellectual rigour and there has been no debate on what we have, what we might want and what deficiencies there may be in the current system. I suspect that this debate, like a lot of the political debate in this state over very recent years, will be dumbed down to the lowest common denominator, and that is a concern. We as members of this parliament have a duty to uphold the institution and to be very public in our support for the institution because of what it delivers to our communities. I think we have failed to do that far too often, and that is why the debate gets dumbed down.

There has even been discussion in the local media about the Address in Reply debate, with people saying that it is unnecessary. I am not too sure that it is unnecessary. I do not really see the problem with a newly elected government expressing what is its agenda for the next few years; in fact, I think it is absolutely essential that the government should express in the parliament what is its agenda for the next few years. I think it is just as essential that other members have the opportunity to debate and to talk about those aspirations and also to talk about their own aspirations for their own communities. That is why we are sent here, and that is what the Address in Reply debate is about. Unless we stand up in this place and out in the communities and defend that, we will lose the argument in the public arena and people will question why we have the Address in Reply. Once they start questioning that, they will question why we do everything else in this place.

We saw questioning in the local media last week about the processes we went through to install new members in casual vacancies, both in our upper house and in the senate. I think it is very important that we go through a formal process to appoint these people. They have been appointed to very high office and have very great responsibilities in representing the people of South Australia, and I do not have problem with our spending what after all is only a few minutes—15 or 20 minutes—on that process. Some of the processes may seem quaint and indeed outdated, but it is important that we stick to the process and that, at the end of the day, we can say that we have gone through the correct process, bearing in mind that these processes have been built up over hundreds of years. Today, it is very easy for us and people in our community, with all the freedoms and liberties we enjoy in this country, to say how unimportant these things are. The reality is that hundreds—if not millions—of gallons of blood have been spilt to achieve those freedoms and liberties.

I have been in plenty of places where you walk down the streets in major capital cities in other countries and there are

police officers or soldiers standing on street corners with machine guns. We happen to live in a society where we do not need people standing on street corners with machine guns to maintain law and order. We have to ask ourselves: why is that? Is that by some sort of accident? I would argue that it is not by some sort of accident. It is, in fact, because we have institutions which we have faith in. We have openness and accountability and where everybody is treated the same before the eyes of the law. That is why we do not have to have soldiers or police officers on street corners with machine guns to maintain law and order; because we have a system which we all trust and believe in.

The institutions of the parliament are an important part of the glue that holds all that together. I would argue that before we start tearing down the institutions that have been built up over many hundreds of years, that we ask ourselves why would we want to do that, and what would we want to achieve. It is the old axiom: if it ain't broke don't fix it.

The first question I ask myself when I think about parliamentary reform is: is it broke? What are the problems? The Premier is running around the state saying that he wants to make South Australia business friendly, he wants it to be a place of action where things get done. He is suggesting that the upper house of our parliament is part of the problem. I suggest that all members go and read the contribution of Rob Lucas in the other place last week on this particular matter, where he detailed the amount of legislation which does not get passed by the upper house. It is around about 2 per cent or less; 2 per cent or less of the legislation does not get passed. In the last parliament where it was right on that figure—2 per cent—one of the pieces of legislation that did not get passed was the sustainability development bill. The Premier again is blaming the upper house because that did not get through. The reality is that the government did not want it to get through in that parliament. There was a huge public backlash against that particular piece of legislation and the government was not game to have it passed so close to the election. It had nothing to do with the upper house. It had a fair bit to do with the government's image in the electorate.

After questioning what are the problems with the upper house and why would we want to get rid of it, I then ask: what are the things we might lose, the good things about the upper house that we might lose if we happen to get rid of it? It does provide the checks and balances; it does give us another tier of accountability of the executive government. There is very little accountability for the executive government in the lower house because, by definition, the executive government controls the numbers in the lower house. We know through our standing committees how ineffective they have become. Madam Deputy Speaker, you and I both had the experience (enjoyable or otherwise) of serving on the Public Works Committee in the days when Peter Lewis, as an Independent, was the chairman of that committee.

The Hon. M.J. Wright: How was it?

Mr WILLIAMS: How was it? It was interesting to say the least. Can I say to the minister, it was a very effective committee in keeping the government of the day accountable. Nothing like that will occur on any of our standing committees today; nothing will. That is why we need the upper house, because it does form committees of inquiry from time to time and that is where some of the most important work of the parliament—in my opinion—is carried out.

One of the things that really fascinates me is that we have an example here in Australia of what happens if you do not have an upper house, and that is the example from Queens-

land. I think everybody in this place, even some of the younger members, would remember the Fitzgerald inquiry and what happened in Queensland because of the lack of those checks and balances, the lack of accountability of the executive government. Some people argue an upper house costs too much money and my understanding is that it probably costs something like \$5 million a year. In Queensland, as a result of the Fitzgerald inquiry, and the problems they had there as a direct result of having only one house, they now have the ICACC (Independent Commission Against Crime and Corruption). Members may be surprised to learn that it costs the Queensland taxpayer something like \$32 million a year. \$32 million a year to perform a function which we have performed by our upper house. I think that is one of the things we should really look at in the debate.

I note that the leader talked about the Hon. Nick Xenophon in another place and how well he performed in the most recent election. I note he made an immediate call for the Premier to bring on the debate and to bring on a referendum about the upper house. I agree with Nick Xenophon's sentiments. I think we should bring it on. If we are going to have an intelligent debate and we are going to apply some intellectual rigour to the debate, bring it on and have it now. I am absolutely certain that is not what will happen. Why am I certain of that? Because this has nothing to do with this parliament; it has nothing to do with the effectiveness of this parliament. It is all about a distraction, a distraction at the next election when it will serve the Premier's desires and needs at that election. I have grave concerns about the talk of abolition of the upper house and I would argue very strongly along the lines that the Hon. Nick Xenophon does; that if we are going to have the debate, if we are going to have a referendum, bring it on and have it, so that it will be debated on its merits rather than used as a smokescreen.

Getting back to some other matters that were raised in the Governor's speech, it is interesting that the state's strategic plan was highlighted. The Governor said that she is pleased that the plan has engendered growing community support. That is an interesting comment. I do not know how much support there is out there in the community. I know the government is spending a fair bit of taxpayers' money on a roadshow which is running around the state seeking input from the community. Can I say to the house that my experience is that at least half the people who have been going along to these events are bureaucrats. At least half of them are bureaucrats; they are on the government payroll and they are going along talking to themselves, basically.

The State Strategic Plan is neither a plan nor is it strategic. I do not have a problem with the strategic plan. Having been a businessman and having run a business for most of my working life, I know that to run anything successfully one has to have a plan and one has to be strategic. I lament the fact that government does not necessarily work that way, because of the electoral cycles and imperatives. So, I do not have a problem with the idea of having a strategic plan. Let us have a plan that sets out where we want to be but also, more importantly, how we will get there. Let us have some strategies in it. Let us not, for example, say that we want a population of 2 million people in South Australia by 2050. That may, indeed, be something that we want. However, if one is to have a strategic plan one might ask: where will we put those people, where will we house them, how will we house them and what will they do? How will we provide the essential services to them—in particular, water but also

schools and hospitals? How will we provide that sort of infrastructure?

I keep arguing in my electorate that there are two types of infrastructure that we need, particularly in regional South Australia. We need the physical infrastructure—roads, rail, schools and hospitals—but we also need the social infrastructure, and we keep falling down in providing that social infrastructure; that glue that holds our communities together. We keep failing the people of South Australia. If we are to have a strategic plan, why does it not talk about some of those things? Why does the Strategic Plan not address the issue of whether the city of Adelaide will be home to most of those 2 million people (if we ever reach that figure) by 2050, or whether we will have a strategy that the cost of putting another 500 000 people in metropolitan Adelaide is too great and we would be a lot better off by placing them in other parts of the state?

An honourable member: Monarto.

Mr WILLIAMS: That's one of the few good ideas that man had, and he dropped it very quickly. However, I suspect that he had that idea for the wrong reason. I would like the strategic plan to reflect its title. Mineral resources is my area of responsibility on this side of the house, and I note that the Governor said:

My government will work with BHP to establish Australia's biggest desalination plant in the Upper Spencer Gulf.

I am not too sure what the government's input into that will be. The government, of course, will provide some licences and approvals and those sorts of things but, apart from that, I do not know what the government's input will be. However, I would have thought that, if we had a strategic plan and we had some strategies, the government would be in there boots and all for a desalination plant, particularly in that part of the world, and that it would already have made a commitment to take water from that plant to provide water for the Eyre Peninsula and the Upper Spencer Gulf area—for those cities of Port Pirie, Whyalla and Port Augusta—and even as far as the Mid North and Yorke Peninsula, where we have huge problems with water infrastructure, and reduce our requirement to take more and more water out of the River Murray.

Instead of doing that, this government has announced that it will take another 1½ gegalitres of water out of the River Murray to provide a water supply to Eyre Peninsula. The environmental arguments that the government keeps putting forward are that it will increase environmental flows into the River Murray. However, on the other hand, it is taking water out, when there is an opportunity; there could be a partner in that project.

The show stopper me for in the Governor's speech was the statement that the government will free up business by eliminating 25 per cent of red tape by July 2008. I would love to know how the government quantifies 'red tape'. Does it measure the length of it, or does it weigh it? Maybe one can weigh it, because it is an incredibly heavy burden on business. However, I do not think that this government will ever reduce any red tape whilst it continues down the path of spending the windfall billions of dollars it is receiving in tax revenues on more bureaucrats. The government has employed over 8 000 more bureaucrats in the last four years, and it has the temerity to suggest that it will reduce red tape. I would argue that this government, in fact, is heading in the opposite direction.

My leader spoke a few minutes ago about the government's suggestion that it will introduce a bill to reduce the

state's greenhouse gas emissions by 60 per cent by 2050. Like him, I am a little amazed by that statement, because I do not know what impact or effect any legislation might have. The government does not have any strategy about that in its strategic plan. It was most interesting to read the contribution of the new member for Newland on this matter, because he is a long way out in front of the government—in fact, he is a long way in front of the leaders of this government—with regard to uranium.

He has not reached the point where he is suggesting that the only way we can eliminate 60 per cent of our emissions of CO₂ greenhouse gas emissions may well be by some other technology, which we are too afraid to even talk about, let alone embrace, at this stage. However, he does make some good points, and one of them is that the policies of his colleagues and Labor governments with regard to uranium mining are ridiculous. With respect to the safety aspects, I was delighted that he detailed the number of deaths that occur in China due to coal mining and the number of people throughout the world who are dying from respiratory diseases. He also pointed out that burning coal produces thousands of tonnes of uranium, which is expelled into the atmosphere all around the world through chimney stacks and coal-fired power stations all the time on a daily basis. Yet the nuclear power industry is so regulated that there is virtually no radioactive fallout at all.

I want to cover briefly a couple of other issues. My leader talked about the cost shifting business that this government is in the process of doing. I issue a word of warning about the NRM boards. We talk about parliamentary reform but let us talk about governance reform, because what we have done with the NRM legislation in South Australia is to create another tier of government. We have now four levels of government in South Australia: local, state and federal, and we also have our environmental government—the NRM boards, because we have given them decision-making powers and, more importantly, taxing powers.

They are another level of government. I believe that South Australia will rue the day that it went down that path, and the quicker we get to redressing that the better. Again, that is all about allowing ministers of the Crown to hide behind boards and committees and to say, 'The decision was not taken by me.' Whether it be some decision affecting the community or a decision on the taxing powers, they can hide and say, 'No, that is at arm's length from me.'

Well, for goodness sake, if we are going to reform government, let us get back to the point where responsible government is what it says: where the ministers are responsible to the people through the parliament, because that is what we are lacking. If we are going to debate parliamentary reform that is what we should be debating. We talk about what we may be using for fuel and energy in the not too distant future. A businessman in my electorate is currently running a small business. He has a number of commercial vehicles, and he is running them today on pure canola oil.

He puts it in the fuel tank, but he has made an apparatus because the canola oil needs to be heated up a little before it is injected into the engine. He is running diesel engines on pure canola oil. He must start them on diesel, and a heat exchanger is connected through the exhaust system to heat up the canola oil. He tells me that they are running very well. He has been running them for sometime, but probably not long enough to be able to say categorically that they are not having any adverse impact on the engine itself. However, he believes that they are not. I believe that there is an opportunity for us

in the not too distant future to change much of our fleet—and, potentially, a lot of our farming fleet which uses a lot of energy—to a renewable energy source.

I would like to canvass a number of issues relevant to my electorate, and I might run through them briefly. I have written to the minister about the disused railway yards in Naracoorte. The disused railway land, as members will recall when the parliament went down to Mount Gambier, was handed back to the local community through the council. I would like that to happen in Naracoorte, Millicent and where the rail line traverses communities in my electorate.

I raise the issue of country speed limits. A couple of roads in my electorate have a 100 km/h speed limit for no scientific reason. In fact, the best part of the Dukes Highway between Adelaide and Melbourne has just been rebuilt the other side of Bordertown, which has a 100 km/h speed limit. The rest of the road has a limit of 110 km/h. We need a new hospital at Naracoorte or a very significant upgrade. I would argue that we need a new hospital. My communities want a greater police presence, particularly on weekends and late on Friday and Saturday nights.

We need real incentives for country teachers so that we can get the same quality of teachers keen to go to country areas. There is a major new development (and I know that the government is aware of this and working with the developers) to build another pulp mill in my electorate, which would be great news for my electorate. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para): Before I get into the meat of my speech, I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on ascending to your position. I also give my congratulations to the member for Reynell who is the Deputy Speaker and, I believe, the first woman to hold that position in the House of Assembly in South Australia. I place on record my respect and admiration for the Governor of South Australia, Marjorie Jackson-Nelson. I thank her for her speech, but, more broadly, for all the very good work that she does for South Australia. The following congratulations are to the Rann government and to the Premier himself on a magnificent campaign and victory, which sets up the government with the numbers it needs to get its agenda through, and I look forward to being a part of that government.

I congratulate especially all the new members who have joined us in the parliament, and particularly the new members on the government side—the members for Light, Hartley, Mawson, Bright, Newland and Morialta. I think that I have got them all. I wish them well in their careers, and I look forward to working with them. In terms of my own electorate, I was very pleased with the result because I had been away and out of commission for some months. There was some concern by those who did not know my people that there could be some sort of backlash against me because of my absence due to illness, but my constituents voted otherwise.

Certainly, they embraced me with great warmth and they followed through with their votes. There was a primary swing of about 11 per cent to me in the election, and I was very pleased about that. I thank very sincerely my campaign team led by Lee Odenwalder and backed up by Tash Truscott, Chantelle Keeris, Chris and all my volunteers and supporters who worked very hard to get a very good result. It is good to be back in the house. One negative aspect of taking sick leave last year was not being able to finish the year and to finish the ministry of health for which I had responsibility for nearly four years.

It was a great honour to serve as Minister for Health for South Australia. It was a great opportunity to be in a position to initiate very wide reform in health service delivery here in South Australia, and I am really proud to have been the minister who championed the Generational Health Review, the most significant review of health services for 30 years, and to actually start the underpinnings of the work that needs to be done over the next 20 years. I did not do this on my own, of course—no-one ever does—and I would like to pay tribute to a number of people on my ministerial staff: to Geof Loveday, who worked with me for about 10 years over the time I was shadow minister and as minister, and to Danny Broderick, who became chief of staff after Geof Loveday retired, just for the last year or so and who also worked with both Geof and me before the election of the government in putting together the policy in working out the structures of the Generational Health Review and the directions that we would take in terms of health system reform.

To Vaia Proios, Brigid Mahoney and Teresa Forest, who were ministerial advisers, thank you for your very great efforts. I thank all the other staff, the public servants and media advisers who worked with us. We had a fast and furious time: it is always like that in health. I thank Jim Birch, who was the chief executive in health, and an outstanding chief executive. Jim Birch was in the pipeline as we took government in 2002, so he was ready to start on the agenda straight away. He has done a remarkable job. I would also like to pay tribute to the fantastic workers in the health system. Part of the good times as minister was to know that you were working with the thousands of people who work in the health system, in our hospitals and health services across this state, people who really put their heart and soul into everything they did: nurses, doctors and other health professionals, administrators, clerks, ambulance workers—the whole lot working together in very challenging circumstances for a lot of the time.

I worked with those people, knowing that they came on side, they came on board with the government to try to do things differently, to try to make a better health system, to introduce reforms that would increase the quality and quantity of patient care. In the final analysis, it is for others to judge the extent and significance of the work that was achieved in health as a result of the Generational Health Review, but I can say that reform has begun right across the system. Most significantly, we have seen the move to primary health care and the shift of resources to the preventative end of the scale; the work to bring a fragmented system together to provide an integrated approach; and the work on elective surgery that the current minister remarked upon in question time today.

Not only was over \$40 million put into elective surgery to undertake more operations, but the whole way elective surgery was organised and run has been upgraded so that we are producing more and doing better with the money that we have. I congratulate the health regions in the metropolitan area but also the country health regions, because they have cooperated to bring this about. Work has also been done in the emergency departments through Redesigning Care, another thing that the minister mentioned today in question time. This work was done by people who actually got on board and believed that, as well as doing their job, they would work towards a better system, and it was fantastic to be able to lead that.

The key to these reforms has been the integration of our hospital system, and the primary tool for this integration was the change in governance that was achieved in the metropoli-

tan area. That change of governance was a direct result of the Generational Health Review, where John Menadue said that governance was the key to any reform. That change of governance in the metropolitan area saw 13 or 14 boards collapse down voluntarily into three boards and meant that no longer did health units work in isolation. That was one of the problems in the past: that each health unit was an island on its own. They competed rather than cooperate with each other.

Duplication of service was occurring, and the competition meant that things could have been done a lot better if they could have been done differently. That governance change has enabled that to occur. One of the really important things is that the other areas of reform which have just been started need to be continued. In particular, I am talking about the establishment of clinical networks, because one of the other things that John Menadue said so clearly was that, because we had separate units all doing their own thing, often very expensive services were duplicated when they did not need to be. You could provide a better service by changing that arrangement, so that you could then use money that went into that duplication to provide other services.

These are the hard things that require a term of government, and a solid majority for the government to actually put them in place. They are the things that need to happen now to ensure that the changes that have commenced are carried through. I hope that the minister will do this—I am sure that he will—he has indicated that the directions of reform will be carried through, and I am certainly hoping that the governance changes that are in place now—which enable that further work to be done—stay there. I also hope that the government now starts to address the other issues of clinical networks, and better arrangements of different specialties, because it is there that we will generate the resources that we require to build further the primary health care services and the mental health care services that we still need. That being said, I conclude my remarks, and I look forward to this term in government.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I commence by congratulating the Governor on her outstanding speech—a speech that put forward the blueprint for her government over the next four years—and congratulate the Governor on the way in which she carries herself in discharging her responsibilities. She is extremely popular with the South Australian people, and I know from all the street corner meetings that there is a high degree of respect for her. I also congratulate you, Mr Speaker, and, through you, congratulate the new Deputy Speaker on her rise to the position. She is the first woman Deputy Speaker in the history of the South Australian parliament. I also congratulate the new members to this chamber, firstly on being elected and, secondly—and I know how nervous I was when I made my Address in Reply—on their outstanding first contributions. Mr Speaker, as you would know, as well as anyone else, no member of this parliament—

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, that was collective. That was to all the new members, congratulating each and every one of you on your contributions.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: With Leon I was just watching my back, that was all. As every member of this house knows, you cannot get here without the help of others, and anyone who

thinks that they do it alone is either not going to last very long or, indeed, will not go very far. As with my first election, my re-election as the member for Colton was achieved with the help of so many people, and we know the duties and responsibilities that those people freely participate in, whether it be letterboxing, enveloping, folding, setting up corflutes or handing out how to vote cards. Like all successful campaigns, if these responsibilities are not done well, you simply reduce your chance of doing well. My people were outstanding in this regard. There are far too many people to mention but I am not going to allow this brief Address in Reply to pass without at least acknowledging a few of the very many.

I begin by mentioning my family, Annabel, James and Simon. As a member of parliament, it is very difficult for our families. We have our ups and downs like all families, and they handle it very well, and they remain the most important people to me. I know for a fact that I would not have been re-elected without their support, and that includes my extended family, my mother, and Annabel's parents as well.

I briefly mention a few others. My sub-branch worked tirelessly over the four-year period and particularly during the election campaign to make sure that my campaign went very smoothly. In particular, I highlight the efforts of Jim Fitzpatrick and his wife Christine. If you have three Jim Fitzpatricks in your sub-branch, you do not need too many other people because he does not stop working. My office staff went beyond any reasonable call of duty and I thank and congratulate Bridie, Matt, George and Cristina for the efforts that they put in, not only during the election campaign but also over the four years, and in such a way that my electorate office is certainly a connection that the people of Colton have with their elected member, through those workers in the office.

There are a lot of others as well. I thank Andy Dennard, who doorknocked with me on numerous occasions and did an outstanding job, and on election night said, 'Imagine what we would have got if you had not been so lazy as not to doorknock the last three days, Paul.' He did a very good job and was always willing to come out doorknocking with me. The Hon. John Gazzola and the Hon. Bob Sneath (Mr President) helped at the office on occasion. In fact, I left one morning to go and do some work, and all of a sudden those two had the office organised in such a way that a shop steward had been elected. When I came back, I said, 'What are you guys up to?' They replied, 'You are not to speak to the workers here; you are management. Go down to the shop and get us all something to eat,' which I duly did. They had elected Tommy Byrne as a shop steward, and had a deputy shop steward as well in Marilyn.

The firefighters have been a great help to me throughout the years, Mick Tagell and Dave Martini, in particular, who can deliver up to 1 200 pamphlets in under an hour. They keep telling me they will get that time down. There are far too many people to mention. I have mentioned just a few. I offer my thanks to the people of the electorate of Colton. I regard myself, without big-noting myself, as a grassroots campaigner, and I meet with the people of the electorate of Colton as often as I can, whether that be through doorknocking or street corner meetings. I believe that we have made a connection, that is, that I have made a connection with the people of Colton, whom I represent, and they have made a clear connection with me. On election night, and since, I have been humbled, but mostly proud and privileged to be re-elected as their representative, and I do not underestimate the enormous

responsibility that I have, given the faith that they have shown in me, and I will not lose sight of that responsibility.

Finally, in this round of thank yous and congratulations, the Premier needs to be congratulated on the efforts that he put in over the last four years. He is always available to any candidate—whether they are running for a first or second time—to be there, to meet with the people of the electorates of each of the elected members. He makes himself readily available, and for that I thank him. The party office has been mentioned by other speakers. It did an outstanding job from those who headed the campaign down to the workers who provided the support in the office. They were outstanding and provided great support to those running for a second or third time and, indeed, those running for a first time.

I want to reflect on something that was said by the member for Hartley in her outstanding first speech. I will paraphrase it and if I get it wrong I am sure that the member for Hartley will correct me. She talked about the future being now, and that is so true. As a newly re-elected member with a new job, I do not underestimate the tasks at hand with respect to my portfolio responsibilities. I conclude by turning to one aspect of Her Excellency's speech which relates to my new responsibilities in the area of training and employment. We are all aware that South Australia is confronted by a skills shortage, and that is no different from the rest of Australia. We have an ageing population and an ageing work force, and that needs to be taken into account when looking at the current and future industry needs. As a government, we have done an outstanding job in attracting investment to this state, whether it be through the air warfare destroyer contract or the Roxby Downs expansion. With all that coming together, it is more critical than ever for us to link the training and education of young South Australians to targeted vocational outcomes, which means jobs.

To this end, we require the active participation of industry. In fact, industry is not simply an employer. It is vital that industry, in partnership, plays its role in identifying its employment needs, assists in translating those needs into training and educational requirements and understands that these employment needs can be met only by industry assisting in providing components of this training. As the minister, I have an expectation of an increased industry contribution to the state training effort, and we require that to be successful. I refer back to the member for Hartley's words: the future is here and now. As a government, we need to lock in the gains that have been made over the past four years, and we can do that only by making sure that we treat the here and now as the future, because that is what it is. I thank members for their time. I look forward to working with all members of this 51st parliament in our collective work of advancing the interests and welfare of our great state.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): In referring to the election, I also take the opportunity to thank the many people who helped me to achieve an outstanding result in Norwood. I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on being elevated to the position of Speaker, and I congratulate the member for Reynell on her appointment to the position of Deputy Speaker. I also congratulate Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson. It is pleasing to see that she has agreed to extend her term until next year, as she has been a very popular Governor. The outcome in Norwood was fantastic, and I need to thank many people, including my sub-branch members, who helped us to run the campaign. In Norwood, we do not wait until an election is called to run a campaign:

we start running our campaign the day after the election because, Norwood having been the most marginal seat for a number of years, we know that there is a lot of work to be done. We held dozens of street corner meetings; in fact, in the last 12 months we had 36 street corner meetings. I thank the Premier and all the ministers who gave generously of their time to come to the electorate to meet the hundreds of people who came out to speak to them. I think we had a record in St Peters where, at one of our street corner meetings, more than 100 people came out to speak to the Premier.

To my staff, Teresa Lane, Paola Mavrogiannis and my trainee, Alex Baker, I give enormous thanks, because they really have been rocks of Gibraltar for me. Over the past 12 months, in particular, Norwood has been under a lot of pressure and scrutiny, because we had the high profile former Crows player who had been parachuted into Norwood as the best bet, according to the Liberal Party, to beat me. I am glad to say that my local community recognised the work that we had been doing over the years and supported me in the campaign. We have gone from having a margin of just under 100 votes to now having a buffer of almost 1 700—

The Hon. M.J. Wright: A safe seat.

Ms CICCARELLO: A safe seat; Norwood is no longer the most marginal seat in the state.

I thank the various people from interstate who also came down to help with my campaign. In fact, in the office it seemed that we had more people from Queensland at one stage than South Australians working on the campaign. The electorate of Norwood is recognised around the country, and many people who had been down to help in my previous campaigns wanted to come down this time, because they realised that Norwood was very crucial in the election. They are Lorna Patterson, David Nelson—whom I christened 'squirrel' without a Q and who is a special young man—George Houssos and Courtney Roche from Sydney. I was quite confident throughout the 12 months of the campaign and, in fact, the polls in *The Advertiser* said that I was well ahead of the high profile candidate. Mostly the polls were 55 or 45 in my favour.

The only time I became a little concerned was when Centrebet—and this just shows how little I know about racing and betting—attracted bets for Norwood—the only seat, in fact. They had me at \$1.10 and my opponent at \$8. My heart sank, because I thought it was very bad. Fortunately, the Hon. Michael Wright, the minister for recreation and sport, and Hollywood Syd were able to convince me that I was a winner. The fact that there was less money wagered on me meant I was a good bet, so I need to take some lessons about racing. I thank my family—my brother and, in particular, my sister. We choose to be in this place and are prepared for the many barbs thrown at us, but it is very difficult when your family has to constantly read negative comments about you in the paper. My sister, who lives three doors down the road, was a constant source of encouragement for me, and I thank her enormously for what she did and for her support. I also thank my dear friend Michelangelo Rucci. I thank everyone for the confidence they have in me, and I assure them that for the next four years I will be working very hard to repay their trust in me and reap the benefits for Norwood.

I thank a couple of unions who also supported me, not that I am aligned to any of these people. I was supported by Don Farrell and John Camillo and their respective unions. I can say that I was supported by both the left and the right, but I have learnt recently that one of these unions which was in the left has now joined the right, but I am thankful for the

support. I thank David Feeney, Nick Champion and Michael Brown from our party office. I also thank Daryl and John Platten, who provided very great support.

Mr Pengilly: Don Farrell?

Ms CICCARELLO: I have mentioned Don. Daryl and John Platten have a printing business in Norwood—The Printing Hub—and they were very supportive in being able to ensure that my printing was done in time. I thank all the people who had confidence in me. The member for West Torrens has also been very supportive of me. From the time my opponent was preselected, Tom sent a message to me and said, ‘Baby, don’t worry, you’re going to kick his arse’. He was very confident right through the campaign that I would have no trouble in retaining the seat of Norwood. My thanks to everyone and I look forward to four years in this place achieving the best I possibly can for the people of Norwood.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I move:

That the house do now adjourn.

ROADS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Mr Speaker, as I did in my Address in Reply contribution the other day when you were not in the chair, I congratulate you on attaining high office. I raise again the issue of the condition of our roads. There was no mention in the Governor’s speech about the condition of our roads. Mention was made of bike tracks, but there was nothing about roads. I want to know whether that was intentional or whether the government has some ongoing capital works programs in relation to roads. If that is any indication, it causes me great concern. We have a serious problem. Will the government accept that it has a problem and, if not, it must make earnest efforts to address it?

As I drove along Highway 1 in coming here today, I was appalled at the condition of this main road, particularly in wet weather. The roads, which are rutted where the heavy vehicles are driving, fill up with water and trucks splash about. Cars go past these trucks with no visibility at all. No wonder people are killed and hurt! They take their lives in their own hands when passing. When road conditions are poor it becomes obvious when it is wet. The new roads with a proper camber on them are safe, no matter what the conditions—dry or wet—as there is no water on them because it runs off. However, there are problems when they are deeply grooved and rutted, as is Highway 1 and many others, particularly between Merriton and Red Hill, which is a disgusting road. I knew that I would have to raise the issue again as it concerns me very much, particularly with respect to trucks.

Some of the trucks, particularly B-doubles, are not the problem as they are fitted with mesh under the mud guards and the water does not come swirling out. With small trucks the water comes off the wheels like a fog and there is no visibility from the cars going down, particularly where the roads are so rutted that there is an inch and a half of water on those roads. The trucks pick it up and it is dangerous. Many city drivers are not aware that coming the other way they are in a passing lane in which cars can be travelling the other way. You are able to overtake if the lane is free. They really are taking their lives in their hands.

The government needs to build more double highways. I gave the previous Bannon government accolades for building the Adelaide to Port Wakefield dual highway. That highway has saved many lives. It is still a good highway, although it is getting rutted and needs attention. We need to extend it past Port Wakefield, and I note that the member for Goyder is here. We need to get over the politics of Port Wakefield and extend it to at least the Ardrossan turn off. We saw what happened on the Easter weekend. It is important to make the Sturt Highway a dual carriageway out past Nuriootpa to at least Berringer Blass, and even to Truro. It is important because the record on this piece of road—the accidents and tragic deaths—is unacceptable. We had more accidents this morning. It is really serious and the cost of building another road is such that I cannot see why we are not doing it. We have the wide road corridors, and the government at least in the next four-year program ought to come out and say that it will do it and give us a time frame.

Now that we have the beautiful roadworks from the Port Adelaide highway extension, we now have to address the problem further up the road because, hopefully, within the next four or five years we will see some action in the new road extending from Two Wells across to Angle Vale and Gawler. That is the new dual highway which I think will solve many problems, because we have to get the traffic out of Salisbury and Elizabeth. It is ridiculous to have all the traffic converging on one point, with two lanes going away from these major highways. All these roads converge into the city and, as you travel down near Parafield, there are two lanes, and that is ridiculous. Why they do not put in at least a third lane beggars belief, and I do not know why they do not do that.

Also, the Gawler to Clare road is certainly in need of a massive upgrade. Over the years I have been harping about some of these roads, and I will say that some of the minor roads have been done in the north—not much, thanks to the government, but some—and thanks mainly to local government, particularly for the Nantawarra to Whitwater road, which is a small road only about 11 kilometres long. It is now sealed, which is absolutely marvellous. I thank the council in the area for that, and the member for Goyder will tell me which council is up near Balaklava.

Mr Griffiths: Wakefield.

Mr VENNING: It is Wakefield Regional Council. I congratulate them on that, because I drove on it the other day and thought it was wonderful. It is a very vital connector road. It gives people the option to get off the main road and travel a different route. I refer also to the Kapunda to Marrabel road, which is dead straight, with a 100 km/h speed limit on it because it is extremely rough and narrow. Why do they not upgrade that road? A speed limit of 100 km/h is ridiculous on such a straight road.

That leads me to the point I want to make. I am extremely annoyed that we are continually decreasing speed limits on all these roads. As the roads deteriorate we do not fix them, we just reduce the speed limit, and that really gets up my nose. You drive along and come around a corner and, sure as eggs, there is a yellow sign under the speed limit saying ‘speed limit change’. I think to myself, ‘Not another one!’ All it does is flag that the road is dangerous and the government will not fix it and is saying, ‘You have to drive more slowly because this road is not safe.’

I noticed this morning, coming past the airport, that the speed limit on that road also has been reduced. It was an 80 km/h speed zone and was reduced to 70 km/h, and now is

60 km/h. How are people supposed to keep up with this? How can you fine people and take away their driving licences when you alter speed limits like this? It is unbelievable. I really am getting a little cross with the police. I expect that the Police Commissioner, or someone else, should come out and comment on this matter. I do not think it is fair. It is okay if a person runs a red light to throw the book at them but, when you are continually changing speed limits and people living in the area have not noticed the change, not only do they pay the fine but they can also lose their licence. So I get very concerned about that.

Finally, I was very incensed to see the new Ikea development. As a member of the ERD Committee (which had its first meeting today) and as a previous chair, I wonder how a developer can get approval to put a thing like that there.

Ms Ciccarello: The federal government!

Mr VENNING: The member for Norwood raises a point about the federal government. Yes, I understand it is on commonwealth ground but, surely, everyone has to get some approval to erect a building. Why would you erect a building like that right alongside the second-busiest intersection in the state? It has been put there and now there is congestion at the main intersection to the airport and people are missing aeroplanes. I do not know why they put it there. Surely, something is wrong when the state government has no control over what the federal government does. Is there a federal government planning body? Can we go to a federal government planning body and seek input? If not, we should be able to.

To top it off, there is that absolutely hideous sign stuck up there. Talk about a blot on the landscape! As you come from the sea to the city, all you see is this huge sign up there which I think is a disgrace. I do not blame this government for that, but something is wrong with the rules that do not allow us some control over a building like that. In relation to the car park, as the member for Norwood knows, as a previous member of the Public Works Committee, if that had been a state development, we would have ensured that they had some sort of water retention program. But not that development!

It drops the water straight into the stormwater, over the side, and that has had to be upgraded. Who does that? It certainly would be the state government that would have to pay for that. I am rather annoyed that various bodies can get through the system by building on commonwealth ground. It should have been built beside the Harbour Town development, not there. It is a serious problem. What to do. I think that is the main reason they have altered the speed limit along there. The congestion now on that corner is unbelievable. Realising that it was going to be a very popular business—and it is—I ask: why did they choose to put it there? I despair that the government should have some control over all lands. Surely, if it does come under commonwealth control, we should at least have some input. I am concerned that it is there and, if that sign fell down, I would be very pleased.

Time expired.

DUNSTAN, Mrs G., DEATH

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I want to continue the comments I started during a grievance debate earlier about Gretel Dunstan, who died last week. In 1948, Gretel began an arts degree at Adelaide University. However, this was interrupted when she married Don Dunstan in 1949 and went to live in Fiji, where their first child, Bronwen, was born. The

family returned to South Australia in 1951 and, to help ends meet, they took in boarders, for whom Gretel cooked, cleaned and washed, with no hot water system in the house and no washing machine. Bronwen remembers her mother baking jam tarts and other desserts each day for the Chinese boarders who lived with them.

In 1953, Gretel found herself in the role of a politician's wife, when Don was first elected as member for Norwood, and she worked tirelessly for the political causes they believed in. Andrew was born in 1954, and Paul was born in 1957. During this period of her life, Gretel also helped look after and house elderly relatives on the Dunstan side of the family, as well as caring for three young children and helping out in the electorate.

However, Gretel felt that she needed to be more than a mother and housewife, and she decided to return to university to complete her degree. This sort of behaviour was most unusual for a woman in her day, and even her parents, who placed great emphasis on education, expressed their concern. In typical Gretel fashion, she was determined and undeterred. So, she returned to university and somehow managed to juggle the demands of motherhood, marriage, political life and study. She was also a member of the Equal Pay Committee, and she supported the RDNS (for whom she sold badges regularly) and, through her association with Doris Taylor, Meals on Wheels.

In 1960, she graduated with an honours degree, majoring in economics. Gretel then began working part time as a tutor in the economics department, where she was a valued colleague until her retirement. Following her graduation, she embarked on research for a master's degree. However, the other demands on her time prevented her from completing the thesis. As the years went by, she was made a permanent member of staff and became a lecturer in the department.

By 1976, she had fewer demands on her time, so she was able to take sabbatical leave and spent a year at London University, where she completed a masters degree. She made many friends at Adelaide University and served on the Staff Association Committee for a number of years. The year she spent in London was a memorable one for her, and she enjoyed some wonderful times with Adelaide friends who were also living in London and Paris. Unfortunately, she suffered a stroke, which caused her some physical disability.

However, on her return to Adelaide, she overcame these problems and returned to work at the university. Eventually, she became a senior lecturer and especially enjoyed her maths class, in which she instilled in her students her love of that subject. Her son Andrew and grandson Tom inherited her talents in this area, and she was proud of their achievements when they won maths prizes at their respective secondary schools.

Gretel also had problems with her heart and her back, as well as suffering another stroke in 1992. So, in 1993, she reluctantly retired. This was a huge change for a woman who had led such an active life. However, she developed an interest in her beautiful garden, which was lovingly maintained for her by her gardener, Mario. She kept her mind active by reading complex books about mathematics, science, philosophy, politics and other challenging topics. Bridge had been a talent and a passion for her, and she won *The Advertiser Shield* for bridge on two occasions. She enjoyed playing until the pain in her back made sitting at the bridge table impossible. Gretel was always to be found doing crosswords, sudoku and other brain stretching pursuits. Even though she

spent a lot of time alone, she said that time never hung heavily on her hands.

Gretel's house at St Peters was a hub of family life where they celebrated birthdays, weddings and Christmases in the garden, and later, when she was unable to go outside easily, in her family room. She also enjoyed entertaining her friends, assisted by a number of special people who worked for her and ensured that she was able to remain at home until about six weeks ago. The family would like to thank Mario, Mary and Heather in particular. Some of those who had worked for her also became special friends and continued to keep in touch with her because they enjoyed her company and her friendship.

Bronwen remarked that, in talking with Gretel's friends on Tuesday evening, so many of them remarked on her witty sense of humour, the fact that she did not suffer fools gladly and cheerfully burst people's balloons when she thought they were being pompous. Many of them had been on the receiving end of her barbed witticisms and they shared stories and laughter. One famous occasion that sprang to mind was when Don and Gretel were hosting a party during an Adelaide festival. Some of the invited guests included Rudolph Nureyev and Robert Helpmann. During the evening, Maggie Tabberer, who had not been invited, arrived wearing an amazing stole made of small creatures joined mouth to tail around her neck and along her ample bosom. Gretel greeted her warmly, with the comment, 'Oh, hello Maggie! I see we have an animal lover among us!'

In the last couple of years, Gretel was able to make some significant connections with her past. She renewed her

friendship with her friend Milton, who encouraged her to listen to the classical music she had always loved and also turned her into an avid Crows fan! Last year she learned about a letter which had been written by her father to Dr Janzow, a Lutheran pastor in Adelaide who was helping Jews to escape from Europe. She was enormously proud that this letter was included in an exhibition at the Migration Museum and in a publication by Peter Monteath. Following this, she began to translate a diary written by her father about his time in Melbourne as a hawker before he was able to join his children at Frensham. Unfortunately, she died before she was able to complete this work, but a number of people have generously agreed to help with the task.

Gretel was overwhelmingly grateful to Australia for providing her and her family with a safe haven when they needed it most, and Australia was fortunate indeed to have been able to number her as one of its citizens. It was her passionate desire to see the same opportunities offered to other people in need of asylum, and she would want all of us to keep working for social justice especially in today's political climate. Gretel Dunstan was certainly a remarkable individual who contributed greatly to South Australia. I remember the early years in Norwood when she worked very hard with her husband, Don Dunstan, to improve the lot of the less fortunate people in South Australia and my condolences go to her family.

Ms Bedford: Hear! Hear!

Motion carried.

At 5.28 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 9 May at 2 p.m.