

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 29 June 2006

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

### COMMUNITY ROAD WATCH SCHEME

The **Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher)**: I move:

That this house calls on the government to introduce a community road watch scheme similar to that currently operating in New Zealand.

This is an issue which I have been pushing for a long time, and members might wonder why I am continuing to push it, given that on 2 May South Australia Police announced what it calls Traffic Watch. I will explain why I am still on this campaign trail. New Zealand Police has had a community road watch scheme for nine years. It started on 15 December 1997 and, to this point in time, it has had 92 000 reports—approximately five or 10 per day—and it has been an extremely successful program over there. For all of New Zealand, which has about three times the population of South Australia, Community Road Watch is managed by a police officer and 2½ staff, and that staffing level has not changed in the nine years that it has been operating.

I do not want to be overtly critical of SA Police, but I am puzzled as to why it has gone down the Traffic Watch path, instead of adopting the tried and tested Community Road Watch Program in New Zealand, and a similar program in Ontario run by Ontario Provincial Police called the Oro-Medonte Road Watch program, which is essentially similar to the New Zealand model and also has been operating successfully for a long period of time. In addition, Queensland Police has had a system called TRACS, a reporting system which stands for Traffic Returns Analysis and Complaints System—lovely bureaucratic language—which, in essence, means that the public can report bad drivers or people who have been seen doing things on the road which are dangerous or inappropriate.

All of those systems that I have referred to have been working well, and are working well, so I was somewhat puzzled when the police here decided to adopt a different approach. The main difference is that in New Zealand, and certainly in Canada, the complainant can not only ring a number—which is what the police have done here, using the same number as the police attendance line, which is 131 444—but they can also download from the internet a proforma, which they can carry in their car and then fill it out and either post or fax it to the police. All the required information (including their name and other details) is to be put on that pro forma and, as a result, there have been very few false reports. In fact, in 9 years, out of more than 92 000 reports made in New Zealand, there have been only four false reports in that system.

My concern with the system operating in this state is that, while it is fine to seek police attendance if, for example, someone was coming down the freeway on the wrong side (which, sadly, happened a few years ago and claimed some lives), I cannot believe that the police will come out on every single occasion for matters relating to driving behaviour. That is why I would like the police here to build on what they have started with Traffic Watch and incorporate the elements that have proven to work in New Zealand, Canada and else-

where—that is, where the pro forma is readily available and carried in your car, and you can then fax it or email it; it is all set out for you. Here, someone rang the Traffic Watch number (and I will not name the media personality who provided this information, but it was a female) to report something, and was told that they did not know what she was talking about. In fairness to the police, that was in the early days of the scheme; hopefully, the police at that number now refer calls about behaviour on the road to the appropriate section.

I urge Commissioner Mal Hyde—who is, I believe, a committed, dedicated and capable officer—and his senior people, including Assistant Commissioner Grant Stevens, to have a close look at the New Zealand model and the Ontario model, the Oro-Medonte Road Watch Program, and look at extending the reporting procedure to include a pro forma. In Ontario, Canada (where I visited recently), it is called a citizen report form, and it is similar in concept to the New Zealand form. The New Zealand form sets out things such as: ‘What did you see? Please tick one of these boxes or add (if you saw something else)’, ‘When and where did it happen?’, ‘What are the details of the offending vehicle?’, ‘What are your details (including your vehicle registration number)?’, etc. Incidentally, the New Zealand model also allows people to notify the police of good drivers and good driving behaviour. You might say that that is not our top priority, but the New Zealand model does allow people to report courteous behaviour on the roads, and we do tend to focus on negative behaviour rather than on good behaviour.

There is also one aspect of the current local situation that concerns me. I wrote to the Minister for Police, the Hon. Paul Holloway, on 23 May because a constituent had asked me whether, if you complain on that Traffic Watch number, your details are kept confidential. That is a pretty important point, because they tell me (and we have checked again) that in the New Zealand system that information is kept confidential. The situation here is as follows (and I will read it precisely as it has been given to me by the Hon. Paul Holloway):

I refer to your correspondence of 24 April 2006 to the Commissioner of Police concerning the confidentiality of information and the police traffic complaint system.

South Australia Police (SAPOL) advises that it does not, as a matter of policy or practice, release the particulars of members of the public who might complain to them about unsafe or dangerous driving behaviour. This includes any request made pursuant to provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 1991.

However—and this is the cruncher—

SAPOL cannot guarantee that a complainant’s particulars would not be released upon a successful appeal to such a refusal. Also, if the matter complained of was to proceed to court and resulted in a plea of not guilty, police would be obligated to prepare a brief of evidence and the complainant may be required to give evidence and in doing so, provision of particulars would occur.

Yours sincerely,  
Paul Holloway  
Minister for Police.

It is a difficult issue, because people have said to me that they are not going to complain or report something if the alleged offender can then come around and do them over. I have already had situations where people have been reluctant to report criminal matters to the police, because they are fearful of the consequences. In fact, in the case of someone (and I will not be too specific) who has worked for me, her husband was travelling along Greenhill Road, and he admits he inadvertently cut someone off. The character in the other vehicle pulled a gun on him; he refused to report it. I said that he should, but he would not, because he said that he was

driving his private company vehicle and it had the company identification on it. That is part of that general issue of reporting a matter to the police. I have had residents who have said to me that they are not going to report something because they do not want to be done over, that the lawyer would get hold of the details and, before you know it, the offender would be coming around to intimidate or harass you. I am sure the Attorney (and he is here) would appreciate that it is a very complex and difficult issue, that is, balancing privacy against the need to bring people to justice. I will quote from an email sent to me by Matt Fitzsimons, who is the police officer in charge of Community Road Watch in New Zealand. He says:

Dear Bob,

Thank you for your email. As a matter of routine we do not release complainant detail and no doubt you have similar privacy constraints to us. We would only... [release that information] with... [the] knowledge and permission [of the complainant].

Maybe that is an issue the police here, and the government more particularly, need to look at, because we do not want people who break the law getting away with it simply on the basis of issues relating to privacy and follow-up threats that could arise because the complainant is identified.

In essence, what I am saying is that I commend the police here for moving on this issue. It is a step forward. I have been lobbying for a long time, and I commend the government and the police for making this first step. What I suggest to them is that they have a look at this privacy aspect in relation to complainants who ring to report bad behaviour on the road, but, equally importantly, that they look at simplifying the system so that people can carry forms in their car and can access them off the internet. A lot of the time-consuming activity, where the people on the 13 1444 number have to ask all the questions, could already be on the pro-forma. I am not saying that the police should not come out if someone is driving so dangerously they are threatening life at that time but, realistically, I do not think one would expect the police to come out every time someone rings that police attendance line.

The system in New Zealand, Canada and also Queensland requires a follow-up (warning letters and so on) and, in the case of Queensland, there has to be a response by the police to the complaint, and that is done on a local service area basis. If someone makes a complaint, they are told what is the outcome of their complaint. That is a costly procedure, but I think that in a democracy a worthwhile one.

All in all, I commend the police for the first step. I think it is appropriate when you have immediate danger. However, I do not think they have the system quite right in terms of the whole range of bad driving behaviour, which could be better and more efficiently addressed by way of a pro-forma on the internet, by fax, by letter, which people could carry in their car and fill out at the time of the offending behaviour. As I have said, I put this motion to the house not in a spirit of criticism of the local police but, I guess, with the expectation that the police might review Traffic Watch and see whether they can improve it, based on what has happened in New Zealand and Canada. I commend the motion to the house.

**Mrs GERAGHTY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### FREE RANGE FARMING

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) expresses its concern at the trend toward intensive factory farming in the context of possible cruelty to animals; and
- (b) acknowledges the ready availability of land in South Australia to support free range animal husbandry.

I do not put myself in the category of the Ralph Hahnheusers, who sometimes take protests to an extreme level, but I have thought about this issue for quite a while and, particularly, when I visited Europe on behalf of the government in 2002. We seem to have a trend here in Australia, including, obviously, South Australia, of moving towards factory farming when, ironically, we have, in my judgment—and I stand to be corrected, if someone has an alternative analysis—a lot of potential for free range farming, and that has been the traditional approach here. Whereas, in Europe, where they would love to do free range, they are forced into more intensive factory-type farming. I mentioned to some people the other day, and I may even have mentioned it in here, that my local charcoal chicken shop—and that is an unusual term because the chickens, when cooked, do not end up like charcoal—has switched totally to free range chickens. They have got rid of the caged chickens and barn chickens, and they only sell free range chickens. They put the price up and their business has increased. Their business has gone up significantly since they have switched to completely free range chickens. That suggests to me that the public, if given a choice, will opt for free range.

We have heard a lot of debate recently about egg producers and so on. It was not made clear at the time that free range egg producers are going gangbusters. It is the caged hen producers who have been suffering, along with the chooks, because they have not adapted to the new cage size, which they have until 2008 to do. Increasingly, the public is buying free range eggs and, in our household, we do not buy anything else. I do not care if we pay extra; that is what we will buy, because I do not agree with keeping laying hens in small cages, or in cages at all. The argument that the consumer will only go for the cheaper option is only partly true.

Some of the concern about intensive factory farming relates in particular to pigs. A group of which I was not aware until recently is called Voiceless—The Fund For Animals, and they have produced a lot of material to support their arguments, and they use emotive language. Their letter to me, dated 30 March, is entitled, 'From paddocks to prisons: a report on pig farming'. That is fairly emotive language and, in one sense, it might be true. I am not familiar with the precise details of the modern piggery to express a considered view. The argument put by them is that pigs are being kept in situations where they have no access to the outdoors and where they are kept in small areas and so on.

What we are seeing is more of these so-called factory farms. With chicken production, particularly eggs, as I indicated earlier, there is a move towards free range. Kangaroo Island has an advantage because it does not have foxes. However, there is a trend towards free range egg production. Ironically, at the same time as we have that trend, we seem to have this trend towards intensive production in piggeries and, to a lesser extent, with beef. I see these structures because, as members would know, many members of my family are in the farming business, some in the electorate of the member for Hammond.

I would be interested to hear the response of members, many of whom have a lot of farming experience and I am sure would classify themselves as concerned about animal welfare and the standards that apply. I would be interested to hear their response to this concern, because it is coming to me

from a lot of my constituents as well, people for whom I have high regard, who are asking why we are going down this path when we appear to have plenty of land where we could have free range activity.

Animal welfare, as we know, is an emotive issue. Sometimes it is not as clear-cut as some people would have us believe. One example is mulesing, which is not really an issue specifically related to intensive factory farming. The alternative of not mulesing is a pretty horrible death for the sheep via maggot strike. These issues need to be looked at. You cannot exclude the emotion. People are emotional, and it would be dishonest to suggest that you can look at the issue without any emotion. There would be something wrong if you did not have an element of emotion, but we need to look at this in terms of the welfare of the animals and also in terms of what consumers want.

In Australia we have a tremendous marketing opportunity in regard to being able to sell produce overseas that has been grown in a free range environment. As I said, in 2002 when I visited Europe to look at wind turbines in particular, it was apparent that people in England and Europe paid premium money for genuine free range products. We have an enormous advantage in that respect, so we should be capitalising on it. Also, there is an added bonus in respect of the flavour you get in free-range grazing. I like meat; I am a carnivore. Some people might call me other things. There is a distinct flavour difference in free range meat compared with something that is produced in an intensive environment.

The member for Schubert would know that lamb raised on saltbush or bluebush is different in flavour to lamb produced in the South-East. In fact, I think saltbush lamb is the most beautiful flavoured meat you can get. It is not easy to get down here, and I think the member for Schubert ought to be trying to promote the sale of saltbush lamb in the city. I guess we are limited in terms of the areas where lambs can be grazed. Years ago I had the privilege of attending many barbecues on the Nicholson properties near Whyalla, where lambs would be killed and barbecued using the frame of an iron bed. We had the most magnificent barbecued chops; you would not get anything better anywhere. That was saltbush lamb.

Getting back to the key aspects of my motion, I think we need to look at this issue. I would be particularly interested in what the Minister for Agriculture has to say, if he chooses to participate. I would be interested in what the industry response would be. The industry may say that it is driven by economics or it is driven by health considerations, but I think it is important to have the debate to clarify why we seem to be going down this intensive factory-farming approach given that, as I said, it would appear we have plenty of land to have a free-range approach.

I put this motion forward in the spirit of having a good debate, and I look forward to hearing from those in here who are farmers, some of whom may have shed-type production. It is not an issue that we can pretend is going away, or will go away. This organisation, Voiceless (and I am not saying I agree with everything it has to say), is obviously backed by a large amount of money. You only have to look at the quality of its publications to see that someone is putting a lot of money into this. We are going to be hearing more and more about this issue, so it is appropriate that we debate it, consider all the aspects, and are able to make meaningful decisions about the future of this particular aspect of agricultural production in South Australia. I commend the motion to the house.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss):** I feel drawn to say a few words on this issue because I cannot in any way, shape or form support some of the statements made by the member for Fisher. I do not believe that there should be any concern over the trend towards, as he puts it, intensive animal factory farming, or factory farming.

The second point the member made was to acknowledge the ready availability of land in South Australia. We happen to live in the driest state in the driest country in the world. That is even more relevant at the moment as we are going through an extremely hard time in relation to rainfall over South Australia but, more to the point, over Western Australia, Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. Blind Freddy should be able to see that we are in for an appalling run if we do not get rain very shortly. This state's economy is critically supported by agriculture and primary industries, and the potential for a disastrous crop failure across the state this year is well and truly staring us right in the face. What that will do the state government Treasury coffers, heaven alone knows.

I live in a high rainfall district and we have had no rain to speak of since March. People have stopped putting crops in the ground; paddock feed has stopped; the mice are running rampant; there are frosts, day after day. I live in an area on Kangaroo Island where we usually never have frosts, but we have had 10 in a row. We are in an alarming situation, and to even suggest that we try and change the trend towards more intensive farming I believe is erroneous. To even suggest that we have plenty of land to support widespread agriculture and animal husbandry is erroneous as well.

Quite frankly, the country is running at a maximum now, according to the rainfall. Goyder's Line was put in place well over 100 years ago and is still most relevant. Even with climate change and global warming, Goyder's Line has proven to be quite appropriate, and will increasingly be so. I am afraid that there is a small group of people running around Australia (and there is a small group running around the world) who think they are God's gift to the world in answer to animal husbandry and looking after farming animals.

You only have to look at today's paper to see that one of the scions of Animal Liberation has been taken to court over the treatment of a dog. I do not know whether members have read that or not, but—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Animal Liberation. An office holder, public officer.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Yes, thank you. The Attorney-General is quite right. These are the same people who are running around rodeos (which have been the backbone of country life in Australia forever and a day), taking photos and occasionally getting ducked in water ponds, and doing good, honest, country people a disservice. The PETA organisation, which is trying to ban mulesing, has absolutely no understanding of how to run sheep, cattle, or anything else.

I have run a few sheep over the years (and I am sure there are other members in here who have done so, as well) and there is nothing worse than having sheep running around flyblown, wrinkly, chasing them around a paddock and watching them die in agony. Any attempt to even try and stop this sort of practice, or any other practice, makes me shake my head in wonder and disbelief at the short-sighted attitude of people who come up with these ideas.

As I said before, the reliance on agriculture in this state is paramount. It is only a minority of producers who ill treat animals, and let me place well and truly on the record that I

have absolutely no time for them. Anyone who does a disservice or is cruel to animals I would kindly take out the back and speak to fairly severely. I have run a litany of animals—pigs, sheep, cattle, dogs and horses. I can supply anyone with horses if they would like some, as I need to get rid of them. Those of us who have been in animal production for a long time know that you look after them properly and do not ill treat them. If you have intensive animal production, whether in a feed lot for cattle, sheep or whatever, you look after them. Pigs thrive in a controlled environment in a shed with a roof over their head and three square meals a day—they absolutely love it. I am not saying that there are not people around who do not look after them either.

With the production of chicken meat, it is not done in cages but rather in barn-like sheds. The battery hen legislation has changed. The cages have been made bigger and there have been a host of legislative changes to that way of producing eggs. I like to see chickens running around and laying eggs in the open. I have been to the Kangaroo Island farm of one of the largest free range egg producers in South Australia—Tom and Fiona Fryer. Graham and Kathy Barrett are also egg producers over there. It works exceptionally well, but one size does not fit all. If you go to the Mid and Lower North of the state you will see egg producing properties around Murray Bridge and will find that 99 per cent are run extremely well and comply with the legislation, and the animals are well looked after. If there was any suggestion of ill treatment of those animals, I would be the first one to stand up in this place and give them a good crack around the ears.

I cannot support the motion put up by the member for Fisher, as it shows a lack of understanding. I invite the member to come with me on a tour at any time to look around some of these places, or come and live in the back paddock for about 30 years, like some of us here have done, and learn a bit about animal production, so that he understands that we do care for our animals. I urge the house, when this motion is before it again, to reject it.

**Mrs GERAGHTY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### SATELLITE CITY

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I move:

That this house requests the state government to re-evaluate the concept and merit of a Monarto or similar style satellite city development.

I am not saying that we need a satellite city at Monarto, or anywhere else in particular. Whilst the government is looking at options, I encourage it to look at the possibility of a properly planned and considered development that will help deal with the issue of our largely fixed urban metropolitan area boundary and the consequence of infill development that arises from that and the clear effect it has on land prices. Someone suggested to me, after they saw the TV program, that I wanted to build a satellite city at Monarto. I am not suggesting that, but we should consider the concept of a satellite city. The gentleman who spoke to me in the shopping centre said, 'Why don't you just add on to Murray Bridge?' Murray Bridge is a great town and I have a lot of relatives up around that way. I am not sure who they voted for—maybe Adrian—but the issue is not simply tacking on more houses somewhere else, which has been part of the problem.

What we are seeing at the moment is housing development on high rainfall land, particularly around Mount Barker where there is relatively good agricultural land. It was put to me

years ago that we built in the wrong place in Adelaide. We should have built on the hills face zone and left the plains (the fertile areas) for horticulture. In the Torrens Valley we have built on the best soil. We are building houses in Underdale because the University of South Australia sold that land. I think that was a mistake. It also tried to get rid of Linear Park, but the government has retrieved that. When soil tests were done on the Underdale land (where the Lewis family had grown celery for a long time), they did not actually hit the bottom of that alluvial soil—that's how good it is. It will now be used to grow lawn and rosebushes and probably not any native plants, which is another sad thing.

We are now experiencing pressure in the metropolitan area which has resulted from a diminishing land supply for housing. Some people say that we could live like they do in Hong Kong or Singapore. If you want to live like that, you're welcome to it, because I don't, and I don't think many South Australians would either. Who would want to live in the equivalent of a chook cage with no land of your own to do anything in? Given that, in effect, the government controls land supply in the metropolitan area, according to the latest information there will be enough building blocks for the next 15 to 25 years. That seems like a long time, but it is not. There will probably be about 50 000 to 60 000 potential allotments available for subdivision in the metropolitan area, and that land will be eaten up fairly quickly.

So, I come back to the point: do we want to go high rise; do we want to go infill, where people do not have a backyard to kick around a football or play cricket? We have already moved down that path. Do we want to have a situation where you cannot have a decent sized tree or shrub; do we want to be able to look into our neighbour's backyard or, in some cases, their house? Do we want to live like that? I am trying to get people to look at some of these aspects.

Back in the 1970s, Don Dunstan was a visionary. He suggested (along with others) the possibility of having a satellite city at Monarto. That did not come to pass because it was probably too soon to initiate that idea. As members would be aware, the original name proposed for Monarto was Murray New Town. When Don Dunstan introduced the second reading of the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Act in 1972, he said:

Australia is one of the world's most highly urbanised countries, and our major cities continue to grow larger.

He went on to say:

The government is determined that the future city dwellers of the State should not be condemned to living in a metropolitan area characterised by congestion, noise and smog, with the tiring long journeys to and from work and those are the evils that are so readily apparent in large cities throughout the world.

Don Dunstan was a very smart person, and I think he deserves the accolade of being called a visionary. The development of the freeway has, in a way, helped to awaken the development of this concept. No doubt, it has given rise to expansion in the area close to Mount Barker, because people can access the city very quickly now from that area. When I was in Murray Bridge a couple of weeks ago, I found it quicker to get from Murray Bridge to my home at Coromandel Valley than to get from my home to the city. That is an indication of the effectiveness of the freeway.

Part of the concept of Murray New Town—and I do not know whether members realise this—was a tunnel, approximately from Clapham just above Mitcham, to go straight through the Adelaide Hills and provide a speedier rail service to serve Murray New Town or Monarto. It is the sort of thing

that some people are suggesting now because of problems with freight train noise and so on going through the Belair area, and the member for Davenport is well aware of that. One would imagine that the cost of that tunnel in today's terms would have been enormous. Nevertheless, in the early seventies, as a result of that vision of Don Dunstan, there was at least a consideration and awareness that we cannot keep on doing what we have been doing for years in the metropolitan area, cramming more and more people into a fixed area, without having consequences in terms of travel time and quality of life.

I am often intrigued when I hear people saying, 'We need more people in South Australia. If we don't have more people, it will be the end of the world.' I do not agree with that; I think that that is a fallacious argument. What we need to be doing was articulated by people including John Stuart Mill a long time ago. The concept of the steady state economy does not mean that you do not do anything: it means that you seek to improve the quality of your society rather than expand simply by means of quantity. I think that that should be our focus in South Australia: improving the quality of life, not simply having more and more people. I cannot see the logic of having more people simply for the sake of it, particularly when you do not look after your own people adequately—certainly not all of them at the present time.

Even with a steady state economy, we are still locked in to some additional urban growth. Do the people of South Australia want to live in an increasingly intensively developed area or a satellite city—maybe not Monarto; it could be out North, or it could be somewhere else. We need to be discussing and looking at these options. At the moment, members would be aware that the Land Management Corporation—which is a branch of the government; it came from the old MFP—in effect, controls land supply and, therefore, land pricing in the metropolitan area. When we talk about the possibility of a satellite city, wherever it might be, we can build from scratch a city which has the most modern energy saving approaches, which uses solar energy and which has cycle ways so that the Attorney-General can ride in safety—and we would all want the Attorney to ride in safety in this satellite city.

Many people in the future would be working from home, so we do not necessarily have to think of people commuting to the city, although that would be a consideration. Increasingly, there will be a lot of people who work from home using high speed internet, which is gradually occurring via Telstra and other providers. We can design community facilities that are multi-purpose, and that has been happening in the last 15 to 20 years. We see now libraries often integrated with schools, and we often see, for example, shared facilities between Catholic schools, government schools and Protestant schools. If you plan from scratch you can do that sort of thing properly, adequately, and comprehensively.

I am aware from correspondence with the former minister for planning, Hon. Jay Weatherill—whom I regard as a very capable minister, although he does not have that portfolio now—that both he and the Premier in letters to me have indicated that the concept of a satellite city was something that they did not dismiss out of hand. This is a letter from Hon. Jay Weatherill, then minister for urban development and planning, on 6 December 2003, which states:

The development of a 'Monarto' style satellite city is one type of option available (amongst others) that will be considered in planning for long-term growth and management of Metropolitan

Adelaide. Depending on population requirements, other options may also include continued growth of regional centres.

He then talks about the revision of planning provisions at the moment. Likewise the Premier, the Hon. Mike Rann, in a response, essentially indicated a similar sentiment. So they did not dismiss the concept of a satellite city out of hand; I think they took the sensible approach that it was one option, and that we should have a comprehensive and thorough look at all the options to see what we could do if we were innovative and creative. Members would also be well aware that the Premier is pushing hard on issues such as dealing with global warming and so on, and we need to bear those considerations in mind when we actually do our planning.

There are people who happily support infill, and I guess the issue is how it is done. Is it done in a way that is thoughtful, a way that allows people to have access to open space, and does it provide for people to have an area to enjoy gardening and to plant some tall trees; or are we going to end up like some cities around the world which are, basically, concrete and brick endlessly juxtaposed against each other and stretching into the distance?

Once again, this is a discussion point. I emphasise that I am not saying that it has to be Monarto; Monarto may not be feasible now or may be inappropriate because of things that have happened there. However, we are talking about thinking outside the square, thinking about whether we continue with the fixed metropolitan boundary concept and the consequential urban infill approach or whether we go towards the concept of a satellite city. We are already sprawling out, as I mentioned earlier. Drive along the freeway and look at Mount Barker and you will see that the broccoli and the brussels sprouts (which we are told are good for us) are gradually being overrun by quarter-acre blocks. Obviously, people want that option, but it is at a price. It is in our high rainfall areas (which has consequences for our water catchment areas) and it is also, often, some of our better agricultural or horticultural land.

The choice is ours. We need to plan ahead, and I am trying to think not just of tomorrow or of the day when the 50 000 or 60 000 blocks in the metropolitan area run out. We need to have a strategy or a plan to deal with urban development so that, once again, we lead the world in terms of innovation and creative thinking—energy saving and innovation, work-at-home options and all those sorts of things. We can be a world leader in those terms. We can also acknowledge Don Dunstan as someone who was a thinker and innovator, someone who was prepared to challenge the status quo.

**Mrs GERAGHTY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## YOUTH SERVICES

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I move:

That this house requests the state government to undertake a comprehensive review of services and facilities for young people with a view of ensuring that young people are treated equitably.

I believe the Minister for Youth, the Hon. Paul Caica, is probably keen that this motion be somewhat modified, and I do not have a problem with that. However, in my contribution today I want to start by saying that I do not believe our community values young people in the way that they should be valued. That is not to say that we should not be critical if some young people do the wrong thing. But most of our young people are fantastic: about 6 per cent, or thereabouts, get into trouble with the law, but most do not. Overall, they

are fantastic. I do not refer to them as a resource, because I think that tries to put a price tag or economic label on them.

Young people are important as young people. As I say repeatedly, if you are 15, you are just as important as someone who is 35 or 95. Sadly, many of our young people are treated as if they are lepers, and I have used that term before. I have seen it in shopping centres, where people walk around them and ignore them, rather than talk to them and engage with them. Some shopping centres discourage them and do not want them to be there. The modern shopping centre is really the equivalent of the old village common or green, therefore it is natural that young people would want to congregate there—and they have every right to be there, providing they obey the law and so on.

The first point to make is that young people—and I am talking here particularly about teenagers—tend to be disregarded in our community in a way that I think is unfortunate. We are quite positive to very young children, and so we should be. They get facilities and resources by way of playgrounds and things like that, and that is good. Senior citizens are well looked after, because they vote. They get senior citizen clubs and other resources, and so they should. However, particularly younger teenagers, who have no political clout whatsoever, tend to be ignored.

I asked my staff to find out what councils are doing in terms of young people, and I believe we contacted every council in the metropolitan area. In relation to the City of Onkaparinga, there are no dedicated youth centres in my electorate. There are five youth centres in the entire council area. They are not drop-in centres, which is a term which has gone out of favour. The Adelaide Hills Council does not have any dedicated youth centre, nor does West Torrens, the City of Burnside, the City of Prospect, the Adelaide City Council or the City of Mitcham. The City of Marion has some youth services, but it does not have a dedicated youth facility.

The City of Campbelltown does not have a dedicated youth centre. The City of Holdfast Bay runs a youth centre in Partridge Street. The City of Salisbury, the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters, the City of Playford, the City of Walkerville and the Unley council have no dedicated youth centre. Tea Tree Gully has a Tea Tree Gully youth club that provides sporting facilities. Port Adelaide Enfield has two youth drop-in programs, and the Parks Community Centre has a youth drop-in centre. The Town of Gawler has no dedicated youth centre; Charles Sturt does not have a specific youth centre; likewise, Barossa does not; and Mount Barker and Murray Bridge do not.

Those councils have provided information which suggests they provide sporting facilities and so on, so I am not saying they do not have any facilities young people can use: that would be wrong. However, the general situation is that councils and the state government do not provide specific facilities or centres for young people. As I said earlier, you can argue that the drop-in centre, where young people, in their words, can 'hang out' and play pool, socialise and so on, has gone out of favour. Those younger teenagers cannot access licensed premises in the same way those over 18 can. I think that could be looked at, with certain safeguards, because those younger teenagers often want to access the music, not necessarily the alcohol. But, in terms of services for young people, we have what is really a mish-mash of services. We have some good services through, for example, Second Story-type But, generally, what is available to young people, in my view, is far less than what they should get and, certainly, far less in comparison to what older members of the

community get. The rationale or the reason, I believe, is because young people have no political clout. That is an issue which I am seeking to address through another measure.provision.

Young people make a very positive contribution to our community. As I said before, they are not only the future, they are the present as well. Often, when young people get resources provided, they are for particular categories, and I do not have any problem with assisting young people who have a disability or a mental health issue; but the vast majority of young people get very little in the way of direct services from the federal government, state government or local government. I am not picking on the present government, because it has been a problem for a long time. When I was minister for youth affairs, I sought to have a one-stop shop where young people in the city could go to get information about apprenticeships, health and all those things. We did not quite achieve that, and I hope that the current Minister for Youth might be able to bring about a simple one-stop shop where people could find out about TAFE and what it offers, health and all sorts of things, because they do not normally have the resources to travel around town like older members of the community. We need to ensure that young people feel welcome in public areas like shopping centres; when I was minister for youth affairs, I floated the idea of youth friendly zones. However, as I said, it is a two-way process; you have to require of those young people a commitment to proper behaviour, respect for others and respect for property—the same rules that should apply to anyone else.

Youth support services have gone backwards in some areas. When I became member for Fisher, when it was in the City of Happy Valley, it had youth workers available 24 hours a day. Now, within the City of Onkaparinga, which is many times larger, they do not have that service. They have contracted out services to Mission Australia, which offers a very limited service and, whilst I am not saying that it is not a good service, it is limited. The previous Happy Valley council offered 24-hour, on-the-ground youth workers who could talk to young people and who could find them if they were in a park at night or they had been drinking too much, or whatever. They could find out what the problems were at home. I have argued for a long time that, within the police force, there should be specially trained youth workers who can get onto issues before they get out of hand in order to deal with the problems and underlying reasons for the anti-social and criminal behaviour. They need to visit the home.

That used to be done years ago by a police officer called Senior Sergeant John Wallace, who was recognised some years back for his good work as a police officer. He used to visit the homes of the young people he was aware of who were in danger of going off the rails, and he would visit them at home to see if they were doing their homework, helping mum and all that sort of stuff. He was a great police officer. He was in charge of the Hindley Street police station for some time. He had this approach of not seeing young people as the enemy, and he would argue that there are many ways to deal with an issue. Some in the police force did not like that because they said their role was not to be youth workers. He would often get the street kids together to talk to them and sit around with hot chips, or something, and that was an expression of his approach which I know, from personal experience, actually saved many of those young people from probably an early death or getting into serious trouble.

What I would like the Minister for Youth to do—and I am willing to provide the information that we have; we do not

have the resources that the government has. But I think it is time we had a comprehensive look at what services young people need, what is provided, what facilities are needed and what could be provided. We do not have police youth clubs in South Australia. New South Wales does. I think it is a very good concept, where the police can get to know young people in an area, and I have been arguing this for a long time without success. You could start off with one in the north and one in the south and have dedicated police officers specially trained to work with young people. It does not have to be the old style, the learn-how-to-box type approach; more comprehensive than that. If they work with young people, they can get an understanding of the police and not see them necessarily as the enemy. That is just one thing. There are 101 things that we could be doing to engage young people—which is the current term for dealing with young people.

As I indicated earlier, time and space will not allow me to include all the information we have gleaned from the various councils. Many of the councils are consulting widely. In fact, yesterday I received in the post the Youth Development Strategy and Policy from the City of Playford, with a detailed message from the Mayor of the City of Playford, Marilyn Baker. Some councils view youth issues and the role of youth as very important. Sadly, some are not doing anything at all and, I think, prefer to believe that there aren't any young people out there or that you can ignore them.

So, I would be willing to provide to any member, and certainly to the minister, this comprehensive list that was prepared this month within my office, with limited resources, asking all the councils in the metropolitan area—and near metropolitan area—what they do in terms of facilities and services for young people. It is a mixed bag: some are doing things and others are not doing much at all. I believe that it does not matter whether you are young or old; whatever your situation, you are entitled to be treated equitably and fairly in our community.

A young lass named Claire Hardwick, who worked in my office earlier this month, wrote a report, 'What Young People Want'. She points out:

There is very little for young people to do around Happy Valley and Aberfoyle Park. When young people from around here—meaning the Happy Valley area—

want to get together, they often congregate at the Westfield Marion Shopping Centre to go to the movies or just shop. If they want to go to a swimming pool, they must travel to Noarlunga, Marion or even the Adelaide Aquatic Centre, in the city. A centre where youths could just go and congregate would be very popular and beneficial. When young people have nowhere to go, it is possible that they will find other, not so appealing pastimes, such as graffiti or vandalism, which are becoming big problems in the area. The lack of services for youths in the area is recognised by many people, especially the youths themselves.

Then she refers to a youth needs survey that was done in 1995. In her words, to conclude:

More facilities for young people need to be built, things that young people actually want, such as a recreation centre where youths can just turn up and hang out. Until then, young people continue to make their own fun—

and sometimes antisocial activities—

such as graffiti and vandalism.

So, there is a plea from one of the young people in my area saying that young people are not getting the consideration they deserve. I commend this motion to the house and trust that the minister—who I know is committed to young people—will pick up the suggestion and have a look at what

young people are getting or not getting in the way of services and facilities.

**Mrs GERAGHTY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTING

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I move:

That this house requests that the Auditor-General, when reporting to the parliament, report with an increased emphasis on ways agencies and departments can enhance their service delivery through improved efficiency and effectiveness, and also provide greater detail on how staff resources are allocated to meet agency objectives.

This is a hobbyhorse of mine that I have been riding for a while. I have spoken to Ken McPherson, the Auditor-General, on several occasions about this. I have great respect for Ken McPherson. I think he is a very dedicated and committed Auditor-General. He tells me that he has the power to do this, that he can report on efficiency and effectiveness. What tends to happen over time (given that the Auditor-General's Department has to contract out some of its evaluation services because it does not have all those people in-house), is that the emphasis is on asking, 'Has someone spent the money according to law? Have they put the money in the right account?'

Members may recall the debate about the issue of moneys in the Attorney-General's Department, where there was an allegation relating to whether or not money had been hidden. That discovery, and highlighting that type of activity, is an important role for the Auditor-General. But it is also important for the auditors to report that things could be done more efficiently and effectively, if they become aware of that when performing their auditing role. Ultimately, the decision is up to the government, for the ministers to say, 'Look, the auditor has highlighted the fact that we could do this a lot more cheaply by doing it a different way. We could save a lot of money by doing it in a better way.' I believe the public would welcome that and would want that.

One of the things that is very difficult, when you are a member of parliament, is to actually know what is happening in government, and I use that term in the general sense, in terms of the Public Service. How many police are there actually doing frontline policing? How many are involved in paperwork? The Auditor-General, or the auditors, could inform us that X number of police are doing patrol duties and X percentage are tied up in paperwork at head office. They could tell us how many people are actually nursing in the front line and how many are involved in administration. You could work out some of this from the departmental reports, but you would need to be accompanied by a sniffer dog and Sherlock Holmes to work it out, because it is usually tucked away in part of the overall reporting of a department.

When the Treasurer was introducing a bill in the last session, he indicated that he was sympathetic to this proposal, and so was the Auditor-General. I was going to move an amendment to that bill but, sadly, that bill was never finally dealt with. I stand to be corrected on that but, as far as I am aware, the bill relating to the Auditor-General's powers was not finalised in the way that the Treasurer was hoping or indicating that it would be. If it can be done through legislation, as a requirement, then I am happy about that. The Auditor-General tells me he has the power, but the practice in the past has been to focus more on bookkeeping than on efficiency and effectiveness, and I do not want to use this in a negative sense. Some auditors-general, particularly in New

South Wales, put a lot of effort into determining whether a government agency is operating effectively and efficiently.

The motion is fairly self-explanatory. Let us have the talents of the Auditor-General and his contracted auditors having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the department—is it meeting the objectives that are set for that department or agency—and comment on them. Then the government of the day or the minister could say, ‘Look, he’s raised a very good point. We could do this more cheaply by going about it in a different way,’ or ‘We’ve got too many people doing this particular task when they could actually be doing something else.’

I think it is a commonsense measure, and I trust that whether it be through legislation from the Treasurer, or through this motion, that we can achieve what I think is a worthwhile objective. I commend the motion to the house.

**Mrs GERAGHTY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### MATERNITY LEAVE

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I move:

That this house calls on the state and federal governments, and the private sector, to improve the provision of paid maternity leave.

The minister, Hon. Michael Wright, indicated that it would be preferable, rather than having a locked-in time frame, to have a more general indication to improve the provision of paid maternity leave, so I have amended my original motion. This issue across Australia is a mixed bag. As a nation we do not have a general paid maternity leave provision. Only two OECD countries are in that category: Australia and the United States. More than 120 countries around the world have paid maternity leave and it varies considerably. The most generous—some would say enlightened—is Sweden, which provides 15 months maternity leave at 75 per cent of salary. I understand they also have a provision for paternity leave. One could make a case that the father should have some time off to spend with the new mother and baby as well.

The focus of this motion is specifically in relation to women having access to paid maternity leave. The estimate—and I say ‘estimate’ because it is hard to be dogmatic about it—is that about 38 per cent of all Australian working women have access to some paid maternity leave, but it varies considerably. In the retail sector only about 1 per cent have access to paid maternity leave, about 3 per cent of women in the hospitality sector, but 77 per cent of women in the finance and the insurance sector have access to paid maternity leave. For those women who have access to paid maternity leave, the average across Australia seems to be of the order of about six weeks paid leave. It is very important, particularly in those early stages of motherhood, that a mother be able to spend time with the baby and be able to do so without financial worries or concerns.

In the previous session of parliament the then minister, Hon. Lea Stevens, introduced a provision whereby new mothers were visited in the first year of the life of their baby, and that was a fantastic thing to do. I have argued for not only that to occur, which the then minister instigated, but that it be replicated later whether the child is two, three or four years old. Babies are often seen as cute and cuddly, but once they become more independent some suffer badly in terms of the way they are treated. It is not surprising that we have people who are affected as a result of inappropriate, poor or even aggressive parenting.

So, I think that first visit in the first stage of a newborn’s life is excellent and should be repeated prior to the child going to school when it is, say, two or three years old, because when a child goes to school, as members know, there is a mandatory reporting requirement if there is any evidence of abuse. At present, there is a gap between the birth of the child and the visit by the nurse and when the child goes to preschool when we do not know what is happening to the child sometimes, through either neglect or wilful abuse, the child suffers greatly.

I often think that there are some very important things for which we do not provide or allow in our society. Surely, there cannot be anything more important than the relationship between a mother and a child in its early days, weeks and years. All the evidence suggests that that bonding (that time together) sets the child up for the rest of their life. We do not choose our parents, and those of us who have been fortunate to have a caring, dedicated mother benefit from that throughout our life. This is only possible if a mother is enabled financially to spend time with her baby.

Under our current system, some mothers do get the benefit of paid maternity leave, but most do not—and that is iniquitous. We have a class system where some mothers are paid maternity leave but most are not. Ironically, if you look closely at those sectors that are paid maternity leave, you will see that the ones who need it the most do not get it. As a general rule, children who are born into more affluent families would probably gain an advantage anyway in respect of assistance from family members and in terms of medical care, etc. We are actually disadvantaging even further babies who are born to the poorer women in our community, especially shop assistants and those who work in hospitality.

My mother-in-law, who sadly passed away this week, back in the 1950s as a single mother had to look after two small children (my wife and her sister) while she scrubbed floors in a manager’s house in Sydney. While she cleaned the house, she had to keep an eye on her little tackers and make sure that they did not fall out of a window of this multistorey mansion in Pont Piper.

As a society we are more affluent and richer (collectively) than we have ever been, yet we have this paradox where we do not provide for maternal care, which is so important. We pay a lot for footballers—that’s fine—but we don’t want to pay for someone to look after a child so that the child can grow up in a secure and loving environment and be given the affection and time that they need. Any mother will tell you that there are times when they suffer guilt because they are trying to look after a family and earn money at the same time. For many, there is no choice. Some families have an option and the wife and mother does not have to work, but many do not have that choice.

I was talking to a woman in the workplace the other day—she already works in the aged care sector, and was operating a checkout in Woolworths—and she said, ‘I will get a couple of nights off this week, and I will actually be able to cook a meal for my children.’ That is the reality for a lot of people out there. They do not have the luxury of staying at home to look after their baby or child—they have to work—and many of them have more than one job. For this woman with whom I spoke at Woolworths, her great wish during the week was to actually have some time at home and cook a meal for her kids. So, I do not believe that anyone on the grounds of fairness and equity can argue against paid maternity leave, and I would argue that it should not be a burden on the employer to provide it. I think it is a community responsi-

bility: we as a community should pick up the cost of paid maternity leave. It should not be imposed on small business or big business. I do not think that that is fair or reasonable. It is a cost which should come out of the community taxation pool, and I think it is unfair to expect business to carry the cost of what society wants. I think that that is avoiding the responsibility of the whole community. So, I am not suggesting that the private sector must pick up the cost, and I do not think that we should always express it as a cost: we should express it as a benefit, as an investment if you like, in the quality of life not only for the mother but also, importantly, for the baby, who is the most vulnerable in that relationship.

I have a lot of information here and I do not have time to include it all. I have research from around the world, and details of the average commitments people have in regard to paying for food, bills, school fees and so on. The reality is that there are many women in the community who cannot and do not access paid maternity leave. It is not available to them, and they cannot afford to take time out without pay to look after their newborn. As a community I think we pay a big price, and so do those individuals, where the mother is forced to put their child in child care—and there is nothing wrong with child care properly done. I think children can actually benefit from it. I have a little grand-daughter who loves going to child care, and I think the interaction is great, but I think that that early period after someone is born is a time when the mother should be able to spend quality time (which is the phrase) with that baby. Sure; have child care later on, but we seem to be in a hurry now: we get rid of mothers with newborns as quickly as we can from hospital, and no sooner have they had the baby than they are in a taxi on the way home. One thing that we do not do well enough is to look after the newborn and allow it to have time with the mother so that the mother can actually focus on the child without having to worry about whether she can pay for the electricity bill.

I commend this measure to the house. I have amended it, and I accept the point that to set down a specific time period is prescriptive and unreasonable. So, the motion, as amended, seeks to improve the provision of paid maternity leave and now deletes that aspect which provided that it should be 12 months. I think the amended motion is an improvement, and I commend it to the house.

**Mrs GERAGHTY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### ROADS, SOUTH-EAST

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) condemns the state government for its inaction on South-Eastern road infrastructure;
- (b) notes that there appears to be no long-term plan or funding from the government to meet the road infrastructure needs of the South-East going forward; and
- (c) calls upon the state government to reinvest more of the revenue received from motorist and fuel taxation into road maintenance, and to the construction of new and improved roads in the South-East.

I draw the attention of the house to this most serious motion, which points to the fact that the government has not done enough for South-East roads and infrastructure. There is no long-term plan for funding and there is no long-term plan to rebuild the existing roads or to build new roads. Not only that, but the government is also awash with cash, and we know that they are reaping millions from motorists. To give

an example, we know that for every cent of GST on fuel (and at about \$1.40 per litre there is about 14¢) the state government is receiving \$26 million in revenue straight into Treasury coffers. We also know that it is taking nearly \$400 million from motorists in licence fees and other charges and that it is reaping about \$96 million to \$98 million in infringement notices—and a new round of increases in taxes and charges on motorists has just been announced by the government to further add to the burden of revenue taken from them. Is it being put back into roads? No; it is not. Is any of it, or enough of it, being spent on South-East roads? The answer is simply, no.

My motion draws this to the attention of the house and seeks action, and I hope the minister will come down and participate in this most important debate and tell us what the government is planning.

*The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I hear the member for Mount Gambier crying out that this is just a stunt. He believes that this motion is unnecessary, that it is a spurious motion. I note that the member for Mount Gambier, in *The Border Watch*, dismissed the motion, saying that it was not needed—

*The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** —and suggested that there was no need to invest in South-East roads. We will get back to that in a moment.

**The Hon. R.J. McEwen:** Where's Mitch?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** If that is the position of the member for Mount Gambier, a minister in the Labor government, if he is not arguing for the money around the cabinet table, who is? We will come back to that in a moment.

South-East roads are a mess. I have been down there—I spent three days on the back of a motor cycle, probably the least safe option for travelling those roads—and have looked at the potholes and the dents, and at the roadworks required, and I was not in a chauffeur-driven car but on a practical means of transport. I can tell you that they are a mess. I draw the attention of the house to the RAA Report 'Backwater to Benchmark', which should be available from its web site. In it the RAA makes the point that there are 21 376 square kilometres in the South-East, a population of nearly 60 000 people and a massive network of roads (in excess of 26 000 square kilometres). They also make the point that between 2000 and 2004 76 people died on various South-East roads—many of them young men and women—with a further 1 148 seriously injured in that four-year period alone. A lot of those injuries and fatalities could have been avoided had the roads been better.

The report goes through the roads one by one. The Riddoch Highway generally carries traffic volumes of up to 2 800 vehicles per day, similar to the volume found on the Dukes Highway between Keith and Bordertown, which has up to 2 500 vehicles per day. Volumes between Nangwarry and Mount Gambier reach 4 500 per day—much higher than even the busiest section of the Dukes Highway. Much of the Riddoch Highway traffic is commercial vehicles—particularly heavy logging trucks servicing the large forest areas of the South-East, especially between Nangwarry and Comaum Forest Road. Over 15 per cent of the traffic travelling between Nangwarry and Mount Gambier comprises heavy vehicles bound for the Victorian port of Portland. I went over to the Victorian side of the border and I can tell you, Mr Speaker, that their roads are much better than ours—

and there is growing concern in the South-East that more and more business will be heading over the border because of the condition of their roads and infrastructure.

Future planning needs to recognise the anticipated increase in heavy vehicles when the local blue gum plantations come fully on line over the next five years. Ultimately, this will require the duplication of the road and the probable bypass of Penola, and hence the need to secure the inclusion of the route for the AusLink network. That is where I would like to see the government take the lead and argue for greater AusLink funding; we compete around the table for that AusLink funding with other states. If the government is not leading the charge, how are we going to win the money? It is not enough to simply flick it off to the commonwealth and say, 'Oh, well, that's AusLink funding. They're not providing it, so, look, isn't that a shame? We'll leave things in a mess.' The state government needs to show leadership. It needs to lead the delegations and not do as the industry has said on radio—leaving it to go down and walk the corridors of federal parliament, arguing the case. The government should be doing it.

The RAA audit has flagged the need for 10 additional overtaking lanes at a cost of \$10 million and the urgent need to provide better protection to drivers from the large advanced trees that line much of the route. From a safety point of view, the highway is a major concern. One hundred and thirty two casualty crashes have occurred on this road between 2000 and 2004, 20 per cent of which involved young men. There is a greater need for protection. The 10 additional overtaking lanes and the duplication of the road (the works) will cost \$411 million at least and is rated at 5 out of 10.

Let us move on to the Princes Highway. I described it as a goat track when I came back from my tour—and parts of it are a goat track. Of concern is that 91 per cent of this popular coastal tourist route has lane widths less than the required national standard of 3.5 metres, according to the RAA's report. The Princes Highway has not traditionally been regarded as a strategic freight route in the strict definition and, as a result, has not seen any move towards total widening or the construction of consistently placed overtaking lanes at the rate of one every 10 kilometres. There is an absence of sealed shoulders over much of the road, particularly the southern portion, where the grass verges extend right onto the road. If someone gets a wheel onto that, they are off the road.

I commend to members travelling that route from Kingston to Mount Gambier. Having only seven overtaking lanes spread over the length of some 300 kilometres has proven inadequate and hazardous for motorists. That is the RAA, the group representing motorists, making these points. The lane width needs widening; eight additional overtaking lanes are needed; increasing sealed shoulder width to a minimum of one metre should be a priority; and there needs to be increased levels of protection for motorists. The RAA rated this road 3½ out of 10, and I think that is pretty generous.

I will not go into the Mallee Highway in great detail, but it is important to South-East businesses. It also has a high proportion of commercial vehicles using it, with between 25 and 30 per cent of all traffic along the road falling into this category. It needs massive amounts of work. I have mentioned the Princes Highway; there is \$30 million there. Well, on the Mallee Highway, which is a South-East road as well, at least \$2.6 million is needed: to upgrade failed pavement;

to offer better levels of protection for motorists from roadside hazards; and to investigate the provision of overtaking lanes.

The RAA report on these roads is quite damning and, if the member for Mount Gambier has not read it, I really urge him to do so. But the report goes further. I am smothered in correspondence, and I am sure my friend the member for MacKillop is as well—and I am sure the member for Mount Gambier is, too; whether or not he reads it is another question. I have received correspondence about residents and businesses in the South-East worried about their roads, and I will read one to the house, as follows:

I live in Mount Gambier but having grown up in Adelaide do not want an extension of the tram line down King William Street.

She goes on to say:

I want the money spent on South-East roads.

The member for Mount Gambier's and the government's priority is a nice little tramway down King William Street. That is not the priority of people in the South-East and country people generally, where there is a \$200 million backlog in respect of road maintenance. The South-East constituent goes on to say:

Yes our roads in the SE need massive improvements—I cannot understand why when passing lanes were put on the Dukes Hwy why there was no forethought for the future eg a dual lane divided highway from Tailem Bend to the Victorian border. . .

She goes on to explain in far more detail the kilometre length and width of roads that need fixing. She says:

Given the volume of trucks on this road that I frequently experienced tailgating me because I stick to the speed limit, a divided highway would surely reduce the. . . road toll. The Riddoch Highway and Princes Hwy also need upgrading.

This is just one of dozens and dozens of letters I have received. There are others from people who use these roads, who live down there and drive their vehicles on these roads that they depend on for their safety. I read from another letter sent to me from a motorcycle association as follows:

The main concerns are the north and south of Meningie but I believe you witnessed that yourself. South of Keith on the Riddoch Hwy before Keppoch. Trees and scrub way too close to the road and not providing emergency run off for vehicles. This seems to be an Australian Standard of 9 metres for road verges. . . The road from Penola to Casterton Victoria before the border is very rough yet there is a low volume of traffic on that road.

That is some of the material that I have been receiving. I spoke to a truck driver in a cafe in Commercial Street, Mount Gambier, who told me that he frequently worries for his safety on the stretch of the Riddoch Highway from Keith to Padthaway. I can tell you that that road looks much smaller when you are in the cab of a large unit—a \$500 000 semi-trailer, for example. That road looks pretty narrow, and the cars on it look pretty close to the truck. It is a road that needs urgent upgrading.

What has the government done? I have told the house how much money it is raking in from motorists, and I have told members that it is not spending enough of it back on roads, but it has an infrastructure plan. The government calls it an infrastructure plan. If I had a rubbish bin within arm's length right now, I would put the infrastructure plan in it, because that is where it belongs. It is nothing more than a discussion paper. Any plan that I have been involved in tells people what is going to be done, when it will be done, how it will be done, and it tells people what resources will be used to do it. Does the infrastructure plan do any of that? Not a thing. Is there any mention of money? No. Is there any mention of timing? No. I have it in my hand. It has one mention about the South-

East and the Limestone Coast roads. It is on page 67 and it mentions 'movement of freight between the Limestone Coast and Victoria'. That is the government's priority. It continues with 'we need to do work with the Victorian government to facilitate the use of rail to transport between SA and Victoria to Portland'. Let us try to do it on rail—we missed the roads.

*Mr Bignell interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** It says, 'Let's develop plans.' Yes; let us have some more plans. Then it says, 'Let's leverage the Australian government funding to provide additional transport infrastructure.' Yes; let us flick it off. Let us buck pass. Let us blame the feds. Let us not do it ourselves. Then it says, 'Let's upgrade the Riddoch Highway and the Princes Highway section along the Coorong.' What are we going to do—repaint one median strip? It does not give any details. Then it says, 'Let's identify a site for a regional intermodal facility.' That is it. That is the government's infrastructure plan for the South-East.

Is there a 20-year detailed building program? Is there a 20-year vision? Is there a prioritisation of the needs in the South-East and a proclamation of when they will be done, one after the other? Has there been some cost assessment on how much will be spent? None of that. This is not an infrastructure plan: it is a waste of paper—probably from chopped down trees in the South-East which were lucky to get to port. It is not worth a bumper. The member for Mount Gambier, and his Labor colleagues in cabinet, is responsible for producing it. It is nothing but a waste of paper. What my motion calls on the government to do is to get off its backside, take some of the money—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**—it is raking in off motorists, and spend it on South-East roads. The people down there have had enough. Businesses depend on it, as does the timber industry. Other businesses down there depend on it. The safety and daily lives of families in the South-East depend on it, and it ought to be one of the front-of-mind issues for the member for Mount Gambier and every cabinet minister. I spoke to this house on 2 May about this and I spoke again on 9 May. I draw members' attention to the *Hansard* on the subject. It has reached the point now where the situation is dire, where the situation is urgent and where it needs immediate attention. I know that members opposite in the Labor government mainly represent the Adelaide metropolitan area. I know that they have brought in the members for Mount Gambier and Chaffey, and I hope that they are making a contribution. It does not seem that the results are on the ground.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** So, I simply say to members: Read the front page of *The Border Watch*, dated 6 June, and you will see what the member for Mount Gambier thinks about roads in the South-East. Read his remarks. He says that we should all be embarrassed for even raising the issue. That is what the member for Mount Gambier thinks. I say that we probably need a new government.

Time expired.

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries):** I did not intend to speak on this today but, equally, I did not realise that the diatribe from the mover of the motion was going to be as bad as it was. The best way

to start would be to ask what their policy is. We know what their policy is on South-East roads because we can see what they announced during the election. There were two things that they were going to do on South-East roads. They were going to spend \$14 million on a dual lane highway between the City of Mount Gambier and the airport, and they were going to spend \$200 000 or \$300 000 on the Kangaroo Flat road. That \$200 000 or \$300 000 would have probably swept some of the corners and maybe changed a couple of alignments. So, we know where they stand and we know what their policy is.

Equally, we know that the shadow minister has not bothered to read the regional infrastructure plan, so we know that he is not up-to-date on that. But, I think we can also ask a question. We can ask a question of the member for MacKillop, but before I put that question on the record, can I put on the record that the member for MacKillop is a damn good local member and enormously well-respected through his community. I will tell you something interesting about the member for MacKillop. Most of the time he is bipartisan. Most of the time the member for MacKillop is part of a team that actually identifies not only what the issue is but who the players are that need to work together in terms of resolving it. I will come back to that. I am sure the member for MacKillop will speak on this motion. I want to put a question for the member for MacKillop on the record. The question is: given the fact—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the member for Waite and the Attorney-General want to have a discussion, they should not do it across the chamber.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I won't be answered back. The member for Mount Gambier has the call.

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** In this motion, the member for Waite has pointed to a large number of roads, all in the electorate of the member for MacKillop. So, I think it is fair say to the member for MacKillop: show us what you have done in the term of the last two governments in terms of canvassing state government support for these roads. I think that is a fair question to ask. I will tell you why it is so sad that we are having this political stunt today. It is sad because the member for Waite gets on his motorbike, does a quick lap around the South-East in some pretty bad weather and does not bother to talk to any of the key stakeholders. He does not bother to find out for himself who is doing what and how we in the South-East, in a bipartisan way, across three spheres of government, are working on this issue. Did he speak to Dale Baker? No. Grant King? No. Has he bothered to speak to the Limestone Coast Regional Development Board? Did he get off the Moto Guzzi and go in to the Limestone Coast Regional Development Board and say, 'Tell us what we are doing in the South-East.' Not on your life, because they would have said, 'Martin who? Wouldn't know him.' Let us on, let us off, wouldn't now him. Did he speak to SELGA? No. Did he ask whether SELGA had a subcommittee working on this very matter? No. Did he ask Councillor Boylan what they were up to? No. Did he ask Mayor Perryman what they were up to? No. He wouldn't know Mayor Perryman; wouldn't know Councillor Boylan. Did he speak to Mayor Peglar, did he speak to Mayor Fergusson, did he speak to Mayor Bourne? No. He wouldn't bother speaking to any of them, because this is just a political stunt up here. He does not want to know the South-East, and what is more important, the South-East does not want to know him.

It begs the next part of the question. Is he now, for the rest of the state, going to put up the same political stunt? Are we now going to see a whole range of motions in this place because everything he says for the South-East equally applies elsewhere? So, he is not only going to embarrass the member for MacKillop—the rest of you on that side better get used to it—he is going to have to do the same to all of you as well. This is not the heir apparent, this is the ‘heir guitar’ that we are talking about here. This is the man that is not going to show any interest in the rest of the state because this is just a political stunt. When we come to what drives the man—and he now has the audacity, of course, to say that roads have caused death. That was the really sad bit of the speech. The other little cheap shots we will leave to one side. But when the police say that speed and alcohol are the causes of these sad deaths, and he wants to ignore that—because he just wants to have another political stunt in this place—that says as much about the substance of this man as the rest of the diatribe. What is important, though, is that we are working in a bipartisan way—

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, the member for Waite.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** The member for Mount Gambier is making personal reflections on me, instead of addressing the substance of debate. I just seek your guidance.

**The SPEAKER:** No, there is no personal reflection. The member for Mount Gambier has the call.

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** Again, all this does is show you the glass jaw of the man. He can have as many cheap shots in this place as he likes, he can be as selective as he likes, he can be as political as he likes, but do not aim one back at him, because he has a glass jaw. Watch this house during question time when the leader has to sit there grimacing every time this clown gets to his feet. He is a worry for everybody in this place.

To come back to this debate and to what he is trying to do here, he is not trying for one minute to put the facts on the table. He is not trying for one minute to recognise the work that is being done across local government, across two state governments and with the federal government. He is not acknowledging the fundamental flaws in AusLink, which at least the member for MacKillop has got the guts to acknowledge. He does not acknowledge the significance of the port of Portland. He does not acknowledge the impact that the blue gum industry is going to have. He does not acknowledge that the 20:20 vision for forestry was flawed, in terms that it did not deal with the downstream infrastructure implications, and nor does he acknowledge that I put that on the record at ministerial council level.

He is not prepared to acknowledge that leaders across the South-East, across three spheres of government, are prepared to embrace this. No. He wants to come into this place for a cheap political shot. That is the member for Waite, that is the shadow minister and, quite frankly, the people in the South-East know they deserve better. Just to remind you again—because as much as he criticises other people for their policies, it is important to finish with what his policy is—his policy is one little road for a couple of hundred thousand dollars, and one dual-lane highway (which was not even on the list because that, again, was a political stunt), a \$14 million dual-lane highway to the airport. The people of Mount Gambier have got much higher priorities. In closing, the \$14 million was not even costed in their own plan. You can't get any cheaper than that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** How I love private members' business, because we get to see the true calibre of some of the members of this place. It has been my experience that when members of this place resort to personal attack, ignore the question, and spend 90 per cent of their time on personal attack, they have very little ground to argue on. It has been my experience that, when they are in a corner and have very little substance behind their argument, they resort to personal attack.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Might I say, the Attorney-General is an expert at it. Time and time again I have seen him absolutely groundless and resorting to a tirade of personal attack. I am glad the minister is here, because he is not bad at it himself. Can I address the question, because I have spent the last 10 minutes sitting in here listening to the member for Mount Gambier, and I do not know whether he even read the motion. He certainly did not address it. The motion my colleague moved was that the house condemn the state government for its inaction on South-East road infrastructure. I think that is obvious. There has been very little action, if any, on South-East road infrastructure. I will come back to that in a minute. It notes that there appears to be no long-term plans for funding from government to meet road infrastructure needs in the South-East going forward, and calls upon the state government to reinvest more revenue received from motorists and fuel taxation into road maintenance, and the construction of new and improved roads in the South-East.

I do not know what the member for Mount Gambier was talking about, because I would have thought that he would have supported this motion. I would have thought that he would say that it is a very fine motion and is what we need in the South-East. We need action on roads, planning and investment in infrastructure. The member for Mount Gambier is arguing that we do not need any of those things—I think he is totally wrong. We do need them and need them drastically.

My colleague the shadow minister has put a lot of information on the record, so I will try to not traverse the area he has addressed. We hear that the main route from Mount Gambier to Adelaide is via the Dukes and Riddoch highways. The Dukes Highway is not a bad road and it is funded by the commonwealth. There are problems this side of Taillem Bend. As I have said previously in this place, the road is breaking up and needs some serious work on it. It is not in the South-East, but if you drive in the left-hand lane from Taillem Bend towards Murray Bridge you will find that the road is breaking up and needs some serious work. However, if you go down to the other end of the Dukes Highway between Bordertown and the border—about 17 kilometres—you will find that \$15 million has just been spent on that section.

The member for Napier came down earlier in the year and opened the new section of that road. It is the best piece of road in South Australia. What is the speed limit? It is 100 km/h! The best piece of open road in South Australia has a speed limit of 100 km/h and my constituents are continually on my back because the police are down there knocking off people for going over the speed limit. The rest of the road from Bordertown to Stirling is 110 km/h. That reflects the attitude of this government to country roads and country transport! That accurately reflects the attitude of this government! It is a damn disgrace! That is the first thing I would like to see fixed up with regard to South-East roads.

As my colleague said, some parts of the Riddoch Highway are pretty good and some are awful. As he pointed out, the section from Keith to Padthaway is very ordinary. I travel that road regularly and on a winter's evening, when it is wet and B-doubles are thundering towards you on a road with a narrow pavement that is quite undulating and rough, it is nothing less than frightening. The part of the road from what is known locally as Desert Camp to Keith is a very ordinary piece of road for a major highway. For the other end of the Riddoch Highway just north of Mount Gambier between Mount Gambier and Tarpeena, our policy, which was to build a dual-lane road out as far as the Mount Gambier airport, with the intention of continuing it at least to Tarpeena and further north, was a very fine policy. We have to start somewhere upgrading the infrastructure and that was a good start and a good policy. It is a pity the member for Mount Gambier does not come on board with that. I would have thought that it would be central to his infrastructure requirements around Mount Gambier.

As others have acknowledged, within three or four years we will have a major freight task looming, when we will start harvesting blue gums in the South-East. In an area west of Penola close to 30 000 hectares of blue gums have been planted in the past seven or eight years and a hell of a lot of freight will come out of that area within two or three years. There has been no planning for how we might progress that—none whatsoever. Part of the motion refers to there being no long-term plan, but there is no short-term plan either! My colleague could refer to the short-term or immediate plans. Maybe I should be moving an amendment. There is no planning for how the material will be carted out of the area and, even when it gets to the Riddoch Highway, it will cause a huge problem on that road and in Mount Gambier. That is why we took the policy to the last election to start work on developing a northern bypass around the north-east corner of Mount Gambier.

You can get from the Riddoch Highway to the Princes Highway on the eastern side of Mount Gambier if you want to take freight from north of Mount Gambier directly to Portland. A fair bit of freight is conveyed on that route from north of Mount Gambier to Portland, and we need a bypass around Mount Gambier. It is not in my electorate; it is in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate. I thought he would be here to champion this cause, but instead he has chosen to indulge in a bit of personal abuse. Why? Because, as I said before, he does not have much ground beneath his feet.

I note that the other day the member for Mount Gambier attended the boundaries commission where he said that he is quite bipartisan, but it does not seem that way to me. I think he is in the heart of this Labor government, which does not seem to be very interested in the South-East. When the member for Mount Gambier had a go at my colleague, one of the things he said was that the honourable member did not talk to the local people. This motion is about the state government's response. One of the problems is that this issue has been handballed to the local government sector. It was the South-East Local Government Association and the South-East Economic Development Board that put in the funding application to AusLink. Where was the South Australian government? The Riddoch Highway is a state government responsibility: it is not a local road; it is a state highway. This government stands at arm's length and says, 'Why aren't you talking to the local councils?'—because the motion is about the lack of responsibility of this government.

I commend my colleague for bringing this matter to the attention of the house. It is a long way down to the South-East. I drive up and back every week, and I can tell you that the roads are inferior. They are inferior to the needs of the community and they are inferior to the economic future of this state. It is time that the state government got off its backside and did something about it. I would have thought that the member for Mount Gambier would support this motion because it has a fair bit to do with his electorate. I commend the motion to the house.

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson):** I want to point out a few inaccuracies that we have heard from the member for Waite, one of which is that there was no mention in the State Infrastructure Plan about South-East roads. In fact, a supplement to the State Infrastructure Plan (the Regional Infrastructure Plan), which was launched in Mount Gambier last year, features some spending initiatives on roads and transport needs in the South-East.

**Mr Williams:** What are they?

**Mr BIGNELL:** Part of it involves discussions with the Victorian government, the federal government and local government to work out what we are going to do. There is huge investment in the blue gum industry in the South-East, and there is no point going down one particular road—pardon the pun—if the Victorian government does something that will upset what we have done or if the federal government does not want to do that. We need to work with local government, the federal government and the Victorian government to come up with an overall plan for the South-East. The honourable member wants a bypass for Mount Gambier. What about a bypass for Penola?

**Mr Williams:** Absolutely.

**Mr BIGNELL:** If you stand out the front of John Davison's newsagency you will see a B-double going past every 30 seconds. Do we deal with that with a bypass? There are other proponents in the South-East who want to build a border road. Will we build a border road or will we have a bypass around Penola? You can't have both.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**Mr BIGNELL:** I point out to the member for MacKillop and the member for Waite that planning is underway. Discussions are taking place with the Victorian government, the federal government and local government. That is what you do. You do not spend the money twice and waste it. You guys left us with 8½ years of neglect of spending on roads. There are all sorts of roads around the state that need to be upgraded.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BIGNELL:** It was 8½ years of neglect on spending on upgrading roads in this state. It is not just South-East roads, it is roads right throughout the state that you left untouched and did not do up for 8½ years. We are getting to that big backlog that you left and we are spending money on fixing that backlog of road maintenance in this state.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I thank honourable members for their contribution to this most important debate. I express my disappointment regarding the contribution made by the member for Mount Gambier. I draw to his attention an article in *The Border Watch* on 6 June, where one of the people he mentioned, Hon. Dale Baker, made the following remark:

It will be very important for Martin Hamilton-Smith and others to lobby on our behalf.

He is quoted as welcoming Liberal MP Martin Hamilton-Smith's input.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** He seemed to be suggesting that there was no support, or contact or communication—indeed, there is. The point that I have made is that the government needs to spend more of the revenue that it is taking from motorists on rural roads, in particular, on South-East roads. It is a simple proposition. The other point that I made, to which members have responded, is that there is no long-term plan. I argued that the infrastructure plan is not a plan, that it simply touches on the issues, prioritises them all from one to three, does not mention any dates, does not say how, does not say when, does not say with what, and it is not a plan.

The member for Mawson, for whose contribution I am grateful, makes the point that there is planning underway, and I simply respond that it has been five years.

**Ms Ciccarello:** We have only been here for four.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** This government has been in office for five years.

**Ms Ciccarello:** One was your year.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** We are still planning and talking and having reviews. I am simply making the point in moving this motion that it is time for action. We have had five years to do something; we have had five years to plan; we have had five years to count the money; we have had five years to work out how to spend it; and, yet, nothing has happened for the South-East. I express my regret that in the member for Mount Gambier's contribution there was an over-proportion of personal invective and attack. I did not attack the member for Mount Gambier other than to criticise actions in regard to South-East roads, but I copped back a personal diatribe. I find that disappointing in the house, and I think it is better to stick to the issue.

**The Hon. R.J. McEwen:** Glass jaw.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** No, I do not have a glass jaw at all, member for Mount Gambier. You are welcome to try it any time; it is quite solid. I express my concern that, when held to account, the government minister seems to come back with personal attacks. The South-East wants some solutions to its roadworks problems. The South-East wants a real plan with some money alongside it, and the prioritisation of these projects from one to 20 or one to 30, and some indication of when it will be done. We understand that it may not be done tomorrow, and it may not be done next year, but we would like to know whether it will be done in 2010. Will it be done in 2012? When are we going to schedule these things?

I acknowledge the point made by the members for Mount Gambier and Mawson that the federal government needs to do more. I agree that we have not, in my view, received our fair share of AusLink funding, and I think we could argue for more. But I put it back to the members that it is up to the state government to argue the case.

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I seek your guidance on what you may or may not say in the closing remarks on a debate. I am hearing now new argument and new material. I am not hearing simply closing remarks on a debate and, given that no other member would then have the opportunity to rebut any of this, it is my belief that these closing remarks—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I understand the thrust of the member for Mount Gambier's point of order. As long as what

is in the member's reply is in reference to the debate, new material that he brings into it is not prohibited. If the member for Mount Gambier feels that his position has been misrepresented, or something like that, his opportunity to respond would be by personal explanation, or to correct the record rather than to respond.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** In summing up I would simply like to say that we will be dividing on this issue, and I look forward to seeing where members vote. I think it is an easy motion to support. In particular, I want to thank my friend the member for MacKillop. He and I have had long discussions and debate about this and about the problems of the South-East. I also want to thank the Hons Ridgway and Dawkins in the other place, as well as a number of my Liberal parliamentary colleagues who are stakeholders in the South-East and who understand the issues. This is a matter of concern to us—as we know it is to our constituents—and I urge government members, particularly the Independent members, to carefully think about this motion. It simply says that there has been inaction, there needs to be a long-term plan, and let us spend some more money to develop and deliver on it. As I said, I think it is an easy one to support and I urge members to do so. It has been a useful and, by and large, constructive debate, and I put the motion to the house.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (13)

Chapman, V. A.	Evans, I. F.
Goldsworthy, M. R.	Griffiths, S. P.
Gunn, G. M.	Hamilton-Smith, M. (teller)
Kerin, R. G.	McFetridge, D.
Pederick, A. S.	Penfold, E. M.
Redmond, I. M.	Venning, I. H.
Williams, M. R.	

NOES (29)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Bignell, L. W. K.	Breuer, L. R.
Caica, P.	Ciccarello, V.
Conlon, P. F.	Fox, C. C.
Geraghty, R. K.	Hanna, K.
Hill, J. D.	Kenyon, T. R.
Key, S. W.	Koutsantonis, T.
Maywald, K. A.	McEwen, R. J.
O'Brien, M. F.	Piccolo, T.
Portolesi, G.	Rankine, J. M.
Rann, M. D.	Rau, J. R.
Simmons, L. A.	Stevens, L.
Such, R. B.	Thompson, M. G.
Weatherill, J. W.	White, P. L.
Wright, M. J.	

PAIRS

Pisoni, D. G.	Lomax-Smith, J. D.
Pengilly, M.	Foley, K. O.

Majority of 16 for the noes.

Motion thus negated.

## GLENELG, NEW YEAR'S EVE CELEBRATIONS

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** I move:

That this house calls on the state government to recognise the New Year's Eve celebrations at Glenelg as an iconic state event and that the cost of the event be fully covered by the state government.

This is an important motion—perhaps not on the same scale as South-East roads, but just as important to the people of South Australia. New Year's Eve celebrations at Glenelg have developed from a local community event, with some

local celebrations, a few local bands and a small fireworks celebration, into what can only be described as a state iconic event. It is not unusual to have 70 000 people come down to Moseley Square and spill onto the foreshore at Jimmy Melrose Reserve and around in front of the Town Hall, on the beach side, to participate in what is a terrific family event, namely, the New Year's celebrations at the Bay.

It is a family celebration. It is a dry zone. The families attending come in at 6 p.m. or 7 p.m. and get a place on the lawns and congregate around the many restaurants and cafes down at the Bay. They enjoy the bands and wait for the big countdown at midnight. The cost of running this event has increased significantly; in fact, it has gone beyond what could be called a local event. As I have said, the 70 000 people, or thereabouts, who come down to the Bay for New Year's Eve now come from all over South Australia, not just the Bay or Adelaide, and include visitors who have stayed on since the Christmas break, including those from interstate.

The council has struggled with the cost of this event for a number of years; in fact, for the past three or four years, there has been talk of scrapping the event, because the total cost of providing not only the fireworks and bands but also everything from the toilets right through to the police, security, liaison with traders and road closures is escalating. It has become very costly to have the whole event organised in a way that is family friendly, so that the celebration runs smoothly and in a way that allows the thousands of people to celebrate the coming of the new year. The most memorable occasion for me was the celebration of the new millennium in 2000. It was absolutely packed down at the Bay. At least 70 000 people would have been there that night. While the world did not end as far as the Y2K bug was concerned, there was a lot of celebration at the Bay for the new millennium.

The issue is that the cost of this event is rising. It is costly to provide the police resources (which is covered by the state) and the private security operations, and the temporary toilets, the volunteers and their facilities. St Johns Ambulance also provides areas for people who drink to excess, even though it is a dry zone. Some patrons get over-intoxicated and need some medical attention. They need to be looked after. The cost is increasing significantly and, rather than the ratepayers of the City of Holdfast Bay being lumbered all the time with the cost of this event, I seek the support of the state government for this event.

It is a statewide event. I know that the City of Adelaide is cutting back on the size of its event. The Proclamation Day ceremony has tended to move towards where South Australia was founded, again, at the Bay. We celebrate New Year's Eve in a bigger and better way down at the Bay than in Adelaide, so the state government should come on board to fund this event. It is not a huge ask—we are not talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars. I think that the total cost of putting it on was something like \$130 000 and, when you divide that by the number of people attending, it is a couple of dollars each. I think that with the new trams and the new Beach House, which opens on Friday, people will attend in greater numbers.

I boast to constituents and friends that we have 106 restaurants and cafes within walking distance of my office, and that has increased with the new developments that have occurred. The opening of the new retail section that leads from Moseley Square through to the Beach House, then onto the Holdfast Shores development, will not only improve the attractions down there but also increase the numbers of

people who visit the area at all times, and New Year's Eve will be no exception. People will continue to come.

There was a move to shut down the New Year's Eve celebrations at the Bay. The police were very concerned because people would still come down there. Security is always an issue. It is good to see CCTVs installed in Moseley Square thanks to the federal government's \$90 000, but that is only part of the whole issue. The need to fund the event is something that I urge this government to look at and to receive submissions and any delegations from the City of Holdfast Bay with a note of generosity to support this worthy event.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I am supportive of the New Year's Eve celebrations at Glenelg and, if they can get government funding, all the good.

**Ms Ciccarello:** Why?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** If they are lucky enough to get government funding—

**Ms Ciccarello:** Why should they?

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I am not saying they should; I am saying if they are lucky enough to get it, so be it. My concern is a more fundamental one, and that is what has happened to Glenelg as a result of poor planning and building provisions in the Holdfast Shores development. I think Glenelg, in some ways, has been severely damaged by the development north of Jetty Road. You used to be able to sit on the reserve and see the ocean. You cannot see it now. You cannot see it as you come down Anzac Highway, either.

My wife and I rarely go to Glenelg now because, I think, it has been not totally but partially ruined. In fact, we are more inclined to go to places like Brighton, because that is more in keeping with what a seaside area should be. What has happened to Glenelg is a great tragedy. It is now a collection of highrise in an inappropriate location, built very close to the sand line. If you talk to longstanding residents there, they are fearful that, come a high tide or a king tide, one day that area might suffer. It did happen years ago, when the old breakwater was severely damaged. I hope it does not happen, but I fear that some of those buildings right on the edge of the sand will suffer.

I think one of the most regrettable decisions made by the Olsen government was to allow that development in the form it took, to take away public space and basically obliterate the ocean from the view of people visiting. It makes me feel not only angry but sad that that has happened to what was a beautiful area. It had the potential for some development, but I think the development has been inappropriate, out of scale and in the wrong location. So, I just register my protest at what has happened. As a consequence I, and many others, rarely venture down to Glenelg. It is not the fault of the people of Glenelg. It may be partly the fault of the previous council, but it is primarily the fault of former premier Olsen and his obsession with that development. The state government put quite a bit of money into it and may still own the shops in that Holdfast Shores development. I do not know. I would be interested to hear from the minister whether the community still owns them.

We now have excessive development and ongoing costs to keep the Patawalonga dredged so that people fortunate enough to have wealthy or expensive yachts can go in and out at their leisure, subsidised by the rest of the community. I think it was wrong. Some members of parliament who were involved in that development as ministers profited from that development. In fact, at least one member had two units there

and has done very nicely out of it. I think that was quite wrong and inappropriate. In respect of the builders, Baulderstone Hornibrook, their people were not allowed to purchase units in the development but, somehow, at least one minister was able to do so and has done very nicely out of it. The rest of us can only shake our head and feel sadness at what has happened to a beautiful area of Glenelg.

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** I would be very concerned about any support for this motion. I think it is commendable that the Holdfast Shores council does hold this event. It has been doing so for many years. But there are many other special events which are held in different areas and it would be very nice to think that we could all ask for money. In my interjection I mentioned the Norwood Food and Wine Festival. We have more than 80 000 people participating and it costs hundreds of thousands of dollars to put that on. We go out of our way to attract sponsorship. The benefit is not to the council but it is to the businesses in the area.

Glenelg has already had distinct advantages over the years by being considered a tourism precinct. Over the years it has received funding for various events. I know first-hand that, when I asked for money when we first started our event, we were told that we did not qualify. We were also told, 'But, Vini, you do things well over there, so you don't need the money.' At Glenelg, when there were various festivals that were losing money, they were always getting handouts to prop them up. The event obviously will go on, irrespective of whether the state government supports it or not, because the council will need to do something if people are going to gather down there. It has hotels, it has been turned into a precinct and, therefore, the council has to get behind it and support it. I guess any local government area would be saying, 'We've got a special event, we want state government assistance.' I think they should rely on their own resources, make a good event of it, and enjoy it. If it is not something within its means, I am sure the people of South Australia will find other ways to enjoy New Year's Eve.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** It is easy to compare a community event at Glenelg, a community event at Norwood, and a community event such as the Sea and Vines. Community events such as the Sea and Vines and the ones at Norwood are spread over a large area and over a longer period of time. Certainly, you do not get a concentration of 70 000 people accumulating in a very small area, for a very short time, to enjoy a very specific event. It is an event that is held once a year, and it is a huge event down at the Bay. The possibility of it turning into something like the riots of 1982 and 1984 is probably far more remote than it ever was, but we want to make sure this is a family event and that it is going to be maintained at a level where people are not going to turn it into an excuse for antisocial behaviour.

It should not fall to the 31 000 ratepayers of the City of Holdfast Bay to be footing the bill for what really is a state event. When you get visitors from all over the state coming there for a short period of time, for this one particular occasion, and dispersing very quickly after the fireworks at midnight, there is a need for the state to recognise it as a unique event. That is not to denigrate the other events that occur at Norwood and in other electorates. There are thousands of events around the state. But this is a particular event.

As I said before in my first address, the state is recognising the Proclamation Day ceremony now. There are lots of ceremonies all over the state held to recognise Proclamation Day, but now it is moving back down to the Bay, being focused on the Bay and recognised as a state event, and being paid for more and more by the state government, as well as perhaps the local government. Local government will always pay towards these events—always. It is important, though, that the state government should recognise that this is not just another excuse to cost shift to local government.

Motion negatived.

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

#### **PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT (REFUND OR RECOVERY OF SMALL AMOUNTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

#### **LIFE TERMINATION**

A petition signed by 44 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to pass legislation which provides individuals the legal right to terminate their own lives, was presented by Ms Bedford.

Petition received.

#### **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD**

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** When we established the Economic Development Board four years ago, few could have imagined that in 2006 South Australia would be experiencing record employment and investment levels, with \$25 billion worth of projects on the go or in the pipeline. The partnership between the board and the government has been vital to the recent economic milestones enjoyed by this state: the air warfare destroyers contract, other defence projects, the huge growth in minerals exploration following a highly successful PACE initiative, the opening of Carnegie Mellon University, to name but a few. I am pleased that through that partnership we have turned off the tap on the wasteful business welfare approach of the past in favour of strengthening the fundamentals of competitiveness, along with investment in key skills and infrastructure.

I am grateful for the hard work, commitment, dedication, creativity and passionate advocacy of South Australia that has been the hallmark of members of the board. Following the retirement of Robert Champion de Crespigny earlier this month, I appointed Mr David Simmons for a two-year term as the Chairman of the Economic Development Board.

I take this opportunity to thank Robert Champion de Crespigny for his enormous contribution to the board and to our state. I thank him for his generosity and for the massive amount of time that he has committed to so many good causes for South Australia, including (more recently) the Bragg Initiative, which is of course one of Baroness Greenfield's science initiatives. At that time, I also reappointed Mr John Bastian to the role of deputy chairman until 30 June

2007. Mr Bastian will continue as an independent adviser to the Executive Committee of Cabinet until 31 December 2006.

I am delighted to inform the house that I have reappointed to the Economic Development Board: Ms Cheryl Bart, Mr Grant Belchamber, Monsignor David Cappelletti, the Hon. Bob Hawke AC (in an honorary capacity), Mr Wayne Jackson, Dr Michael Keating, Dr Helen Nugent, the Right Honourable Mike Moore, and Ms Fiona Roche. Their term of appointment will be for a two-year period which will conclude on 30 June 2008. Other new members will be added to the board in coming weeks. I take this opportunity to thank the retiring members (Mr Maurice Crotti, Mr Andrew Fletcher and Mrs Jane Fargher) for their major contribution to this state's development.

I have signalled previously that the EDB is entering a new phase. I want the EDB to help us to make South Australia the most competitive place in which to do business in Australia and New Zealand and to lock in the significant gains made to date. I have also agreed to commit to the target proposed by Business SA's Peter Vaughan of a 25 per cent reduction in red tape by 2008.

Earlier this year, the government commissioned Canadian consulting firm, MMK Consulting (and its Principal, Mr Stuart Mackay) to undertake a benchmarking study to determine Adelaide's standing in the global economy. MMK provides an analysis of KPMG's Competitive Alternatives Study. It was necessary for us to commission this work independently as other Australian jurisdictions had decided not to participate in the 2006 survey. I know why they did not want to participate in the 2006 survey: it was because they did not like the fact that we won last time and had proven that we were on track to do it again.

Adelaide was found to have the lowest business costs in its population bracket. Of all the cities surveyed, Adelaide was found to have the third lowest costs in the world. We outperformed Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. In two years we have gone from 10th in the world to third of the cities surveyed, and of course we have remained at the top of the Australian ladder. Although South Australians have reason to feel confident, there is still much to be done. This is not the time to ease off; it is the time to keep our foot firmly on the accelerator. In building our competitive edge, South Australia cannot afford to stand still. So, I have asked the board to provide advice to the government on how to achieve the goal of making South Australia the most competitive place in Australasia and keeping it in that position.

Through the formation of the Competitiveness Council, which I am announcing today, the board will make recommendations to government on practical initiatives to: enhance the international competitiveness of the state's industry; reduce the compliance cost to business of regulations and charges; improve and streamline the planning and development approval processes; ensure the ongoing competitiveness of land and labour supplies in South Australia; and develop efficient and effective infrastructure to support economic growth. I am pleased to announce that the members of the Competitiveness Council will be: the Hon. Karlene Maywald MP, Minister for Small Business and Minister Assisting the Minister for Industry and Trade, who will chair the council; Mr David Simmons, CEO of Hills Industries and Chair of the Economic Development Board; Mr John Bastian, former CEO of Sola Optical; Mr Grant Belchamber; the Right Honourable Mike Moore, former head of the World Trade Organisation; and Mr Stuart Mackay of MMK Consulting

(author of the report I mentioned earlier), who will serve as an external adviser.

I point out that the council will work closely on competitiveness issues with individual companies, employer bodies such as Business SA, the Engineering Employers Association, SA Unions and others. Working with the Economic Development Board, the state government will continue to build partnerships with the business community to foster investment, long-term growth and prosperity for all South Australians.

#### HEALTH DEPARTMENT CHIEF EXECUTIVE

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Earlier today the cabinet in Executive Council appointed Dr Tony Sherbon as the new Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Health. Dr Sherbon has been the CEO of the health department in the Australian Capital Territory since 2003. In that position, he has overseen significant reforms to the health system in the ACT. He has also been coordinating the implementation of the National Mental Health Plan across Australia and has just been appointed Chair of the Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Committee. Tony Sherbon brings a unique mix of skills, being both a senior administrator and a doctor as well as holding an MBA from the University of Technology in Sydney.

He has led health services at the CEO level for the past nine years. This has included experience in rural and regional areas of New South Wales, management experience at a teaching hospital in New South Wales and jurisdictional leadership in the ACT. Prior to that, Dr Sherbon had a long background in health management at a senior level, including administrative and clinical positions within hospitals in New South Wales. Dr Sherbon is a medical graduate from the University of New South Wales. He worked as a resident medical officer and registrar at the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital before working in health administration. His clinical experience gives him an added level of understanding of how the health system works and how the best outcomes for patients, doctors and the community can be achieved.

Dr Sherbon comes to South Australia at an exciting time for health. He will work closely with me, with the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse and with the health community to continue the health reforms started by the Rann government in 2002. Dr Sherbon will take up his new role on 7 August, and I am sure that all members will join with me in welcoming him to South Australia. Mr Tom Stubbs, Executive Director of Health System Management will be acting chief executive for a month.

I also take this opportunity to thank the outgoing chief executive Jim Birch for his three decades of service to public health in this state. Prior to becoming Chief Executive of the Department of Health, Mr Birch was the CEO of the Women's and Children's Hospital and the Whyalla Hospital and was the director of The Parks Community Health Centre. Mr Birch's last day with the department will be next Friday, and I wish him all the very best in his new career.

#### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Gambling (Hon. P. Caica)—  
Independent Gambling Authority—Inquiry into the  
Suitability of a Licensed Bookmaker—Interim Report.

### SHOP TRADING HOURS

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.  
Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** I inform the house that cabinet has appointed Mr Alan Moss to conduct a review of the Shop Trading Hours Act 1977.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** I am not sure why I got the interruption, because it was unanimously supported when it was moved in the house by the Hon. Bob Such. This review is required under the transitional provisions of the Shop Trading Hours (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2003 schedule 4. Mr Moss is currently a senior judge of the Youth Court, a position from which he retires on 4 August. Mr Moss will commence his work on 7 August 2006. Mr Moss has a distinguished legal background and is suitably qualified to conduct the review. Mr Moss will also be provided with appropriate resources from SafeWork SA to conduct the review.

This independent review conducted by Mr Moss will give all interested parties within the community an opportunity to voice their opinions regarding the operation of the Shop Trading Hours Act. Mr Moss is required by the act to report to me as minister responsible within six months of his appointment.

### VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

**The SPEAKER:** I draw to members' attention the presence in the chamber today of students from Sunrise Christian School, who are guests of the member for Reynell, and students from Parafield Gardens High School, who are guests of the member for Wright.

### QUESTION TIME

#### SEXUAL ABUSE, SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. What proposal has the minister put in place for families, carers and victims to raise concerns about sexual abuse of intellectually disabled people in supported residential facilities? On 23 June 2006 the minister announced a series of public consultations inviting people with disabilities, carers and other interested parties to have their say on support needs for people with disabilities and to help develop an accommodation and personal support plan, as well as new legislation, to help protect vulnerable people living in supported residential accommodation. A number of families and carers have advised me that they are reticent about raising their concerns in relation to sexual assault of their disabled family member publicly for fear of retribution or reprisals against their family member.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** I thank the honourable member for her question, and I acknowledge that the question of raising sexual abuse in a public forum is a very difficult matter. Of

course, no-one would expect someone to do that in that way. I acknowledge that the honourable member has raised an issue that is of genuine concern by the people who have approached her, and I would be more than happy to look at ways in which we could accommodate people to come forward with those concerns.

I can say that a number of existing processes are in place that may provide some opportunity for people to come forward if they do have concerns of that sort. Of course, courtesy of the fine work by the former minister for health, we have now a health and community services ombudsman to whom complaints can be made about the standard or quality of care in any community service or not-for-profit provider. Indeed, I think that, despite the opposition of those opposite, we insisted that that extend to the not-for-profit sector. Therefore, within that forum people who have complaints and grievances about the sorts of services they are receiving can obtain assistance in that regard.

Of course, on an outreach basis, the Mullighan inquiry has canvassed the residents of supported residential facilities. Within its scope, that inquiry has made an effort to reach out to people with disabilities. I am therefore more than happy to take on board the concerns the honourable member may have about this issue. If she is prepared to share with me the information she has, I am sure that we can find an appropriate forum within which people can feel safe about coming forward with that information.

### FILM INDUSTRY

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** Will the Premier advise the house about the state's success in meeting the South Australian Strategic Plan targets for film?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I thank the honourable member for her question because, of course, her own electorate is a centre for the film industry in this state with many companies in the area doing the post-production, animatics and special effects on major motion pictures, including some blockbusters internationally. I am very pleased to be able to report that together, as a community, we have been successful in achieving target 4.3 of South Australia's Strategic Plan, which is to significantly grow and expand South Australia's share of the national feature film industry to match our population.

As I said when I launched the plan two years ago, it is a plan for the whole state—for the community, for business and for government—not for government alone. The success of the state with regard to achieving the film target stands testimony to how the community, business and government have embraced the plan's goad to action, and have worked hard to achieve outcomes well in excess of expectations. South Australia has only 7.6 per cent of the nation's population, but in 2003-04 we more than doubled this in national feature film production, and in 2004-05 we almost tripled it.

Contributing to this tremendous success rate was the production of *Caterpillar Wish* (which I understand was filmed in the Robe area, as members opposite would realise), *Elephant Tales*, *Like Minds* and *Opal Dream*, the director of which was the director of the British film *The Full Monty* and which is about to be released. It was a smash hit, I am told, at the Berlin Film Festival and is about to be released in Australia with a very surprise star in a supporting role—but I am not allowed to reveal that until later. There was also *Ten Canoes* (which won the special jury award at the Cannes Film Festival, which I was very pleased to attend), *2:37, Wolf*

*Creek*, *Look Both Ways* and *Modern Love*. As I said, in addition to *Ten Canoes*, 2:37 and *Look Both Ways* were also featured at the Cannes Film Festival and this is a great result for our small but significant industry.

*Ten Canoes*, in particular, has been a tremendous success already, receiving international acclaim. On 9 June director Rolf de Heer opened the Sydney Film Festival to a sold out audience and tonight it will have its opening night screening at the Palace East End Cinemas. I encourage all South Australians to take the time, over coming weeks, to see this unique and special production. Acclaim for this enchanting film is expected to continue to grow as it finds audiences around the globe. With only a few weeks since its international debut, *Ten Canoes* has already been sold to distributors in France, Belgium, Germany, Great Britain, the Czech Republic, Romania, Russia, the United States and Canada.

The South Australian government is very proud to have supported the production of *Ten Canoes*. The Adelaide Film Festival Investment Fund, which I established in 2002, provided \$220 000 and the South Australian Film Corporation provided a further \$220 000 to enable the film to be created. The Adelaide Film Festival Fund provides equity investment in Australian films of \$500 000 per year, providing vital assistance to film-makers in a market in which it can be difficult to attract corporate investment. It is greatly encouraging to see that the fund is paying dividends so quickly—indeed, *Look Both Ways*, which has been a smash hit around the world at film festivals, was also funded by the South Australian Film Corporation and the Adelaide Film Festival Investment Fund.

It is also pleasing to see the rise of tremendous creative talents here in South Australia independent of government, because that is the whole point—some of it by government in the State Strategic Plan, some of it outside of government, some with partnerships and, of course, some independent of government, such as Murali Thalluri's debut film 2:37. In this way, the state's success in achieving target 4.3 is representative of the strategic plan's ideals—community, government and industry all focused and working together.

As part of the upcoming review of the strategic plan I am looking forward to having the opportunity to raise the bar, thereby increasing the challenge for us all in developing and expanding our important film industry. I hope we will be able to invite members—including members opposite—to see some of the outstanding acting in *Opal Dream*, starring Jacqueline McKenzie, Vince Colosimo and others, as well as another outstanding supporting cast member. I am looking forward to the AFI awards later this year.

### SEXUAL ABUSE, SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** My question is again to the Minister for Families and Communities. Has the minister received any advice or reports about the sexual abuse of intellectually disabled people in supported residential facilities? I have been contacted by a number of people concerned that vulnerable family members in supported residential facilities are being forced into sexual activity, often with multiple partners, when they lack the capacity to make informed choices about such activity. I have also been advised by family members that approaches about sexual abuse in supported residential facilities that they have made to administrators, or even to the Office of the Public Advocate, did not result in any satisfactory outcome.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** I thank the honourable member for her question. These concerns, if they are as the honourable member has expressed, should have been brought to my attention. They have not been, but the honourable member has now brought them to my attention by virtue of this question in the house. I am certainly very keen to hear about such suggestions. As I said before, there are some mechanisms for complaint.

The supported residential facilities are presently supervised by local government, and that has been a source of some concern to me. That is why we have announced the review, in the context of the overarching supported accommodation task force which is presently underway and which is conducting consultations around the state. One of the pieces of work that is being consulted upon is the possibility of a new accommodation act. That possibility was also pointed out in the State Housing Plan. I think there is a view that the regulation, such as it is, by local government of supported residential facilities could be better. We are very keen to explore whether a different model may be appropriate. That is one of the things about which we are consulting. These concerns seem troubling, and I would be very keen to hear the details about them so I can take some steps.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIA WORKS

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What is the government doing to provide learning, training and working opportunities for people with disabilities?

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education):** I am pleased to advise members about a successful job skills program made possible through South Australia Works. It is aimed at assisting people with disabilities to obtain valuable work and life skills. Earlier this year, \$25 000 was made available through South Australia Works western region to deliver accredited training to 20 people with disabilities through the disability employment service Heta Inc. This project, known as the Henley Kitchen Project, was developed in partnership with the City of Charles Sturt, Heta Inc. and the South Australian government. The program provided participants with real life work experience by preparing and serving meals to local aged residents and community volunteers. It also offered participants the opportunity to develop valuable life skills. For two days per week participants attended the Henley and Grange Community Centre—an outstanding community centre near the centre of the universe—which provided a supportive community setting to gain hands-on skills. In addition, a full day of theoretical training was provided in Certificate 1 Hospitality to assist participants gain entry into the hospitality industry.

Recently, I had the honour of attending the graduation for this round of participants and had the pleasure of viewing first hand the wonderful impact this program has had and the obvious level of pride shown by families and friends. I know that my colleague the Minister for Disability has had the honour of attending similar graduations and would say exactly the same. I am pleased to report that 11 of the 20 participants have secured jobs already as a direct result of this program, with another two embarking on further education.

Given the success of the project, the state government has provided an additional \$25 000 to Heta Inc. to train another

20 people in the region over the next six months. I am informed that beyond this Heta plans to continue the initiative in 2007 as a self-sustaining program, with support from the City of Charles Sturt—and I congratulate and thank the City of Charles Sturt for its participation in this project. This is just one of many similar projects replicated across the state through the 17 employment and skills formation networks under South Australia Works that are aimed at meeting the needs of local communities. The program makes a significant contribution to meeting our state's shared objective of reducing youth unemployment, most of the participants being under the age of 25. It also addresses our goal of increasing the proportion of people with non-school qualifications.

### SEXUAL ABUSE, SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Is it the case that there is no mandatory reporting of sexual abuse in supported residential facilities? Two people working in the disability services sector have expressly told me that there are no mandatory reporting requirements for sexual abuse of residents in such facilities.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** I am not entirely sure what the answer to that question is. Of course, if the people who are the subject of the abuse are minors and if people working with them stand in one of the occupations listed within the Child Protection Act, then they are obliged to give mandatory notification. If the residents are over 18 years of age, I think the answer to that question is governed by the by-laws that exist in various council areas which regulate the supported residential facility. I think it probably depends on the by-laws that have been promulgated in each of the various council areas. However, once again, that underscores the nature of the difficulty that I mentioned earlier; that is, there is some degree of lack of satisfaction about the way in which this sector is presently regulated. That is why we are consulting on the potential for a new set of arrangements to regulate this sector.

### UNIVERSITIES, MEDICAL PLACES

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** My question is directed to the Minister for Health. What has been the response to the government's call for extra university medical places in South Australia; and how is the medical school admissions process improving?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** Over the past 12 months, the government has been calling for extra medical places for South Australian universities. Our state is facing an ageing medical work force and more doctors are retiring than are entering the profession. While we continue to recruit from overseas—and we do recruit well trained doctors from overseas—in the long term obviously we need to produce more doctors from within our own borders. To manage the extra demands for services, our state needs at least an extra 60 medical places split between our two medical schools at Flinders and Adelaide universities. These universities and the Australian Medical Association have joined with the government to lobby the federal government to grant South Australia our fair share.

I would like to thank the universities and the AMA for their support during this campaign and for putting the state's

interests first. The latest distribution of new medical places across the states is expected to happen at the July Council of Australian Governments (or around about that time). The Prime Minister has already promised Victoria an extra 160 medical places, and that leaves 240 places to be divided amongst the states and territories. Our latest campaign stepped up last month when the Premier took our state's case directly to the federal education minister in Canberra. In the remaining weeks before the COAG meeting, the South Australian government will continue to lobby and to campaign the federal government for our share of those places.

I also take the opportunity to inform parliament of the latest figures from our universities of the numbers of South Australian students gaining entrance into medicine. At the University of Adelaide, the proportion of places going to South Australian students has increased to 61 per cent from 47 per cent three years ago; and, at Flinders University, the percentage of South Australian students has increased to 55 per cent from 44 per cent three years ago. I can also inform the house that, after an internal review, the University of Adelaide has now changed its admissions process for its medical school. In previous years, a student's interview was given a higher ranking compared to the TER scores and the UMAT test. From next year, all three elements will be weighted and the interview will be equally ranked with the student's TER score—

**Ms Chapman:** Hear, hear—about time!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in relation to that. I am glad that at least on one matter we are *ad idem*—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I did; I slipped in a Latin maxim. This is now a similar system to that which is used in most medical schools in Australia. I congratulate the university for implementing these changes to its system. These reforms put Adelaide University on the right track towards attracting a higher quality of medical student graduating in the future.

### SEXUAL ABUSE, SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** My question is again directed to the Minister for Families and Communities. Does the minister recognise that there is a problem in reporting criminal activity involving a person with an intellectual disability, when the person involved may not be capable of making a complaint or the sexual abuse is more subtle, such as being encouraged to sell sexual favours in return for cigarettes?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** I remind the house that, to the extent that vulnerable populations have been living in supported residential facilities and to the extent that those facilities are somehow inadequate in relation to their needs, those opposite took to the last election a policy of actually putting more people into supported residential facilities. This was the big solution to disability services. They were going to pump all this money into the for-profit supported residential facilities. So, now, all of a sudden, there are these Dickensian places where sexual abuse is happening—but they were going to be full of disabled people at the behest of those opposite. So, there is a bit of disconnect between this line of questioning and the policy they took to the last election. But, I acknowledge—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** Well, I think they've acknowledged that the policy didn't work.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** That's right. At least they have moved on; at least it is a new day for them. The concern that has been raised is a serious concern. There is no doubt that this is a genuine concern, at least on behalf of those who have approached the honourable member, and I undertake to look at it carefully to see what the nature of the response is. I am not necessarily suggesting that there are not existing mechanisms, but I do need to take this question on notice and give it some careful consideration.

### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** My question is directed to the Minister for Housing. How is the government helping the victims of domestic violence with safety concerns?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing):** I thank the honourable member for her question. This government is helping eligible domestic violence victims who live in Housing Trust homes with increased security by funding the fitting of doors and security screens. The new funding is in line with the key objective of the women's safety strategy, which was launched by the former minister for women, the Hon. Stephanie Key. The program, which has recently began, will reduce the burden on victims who in the past had to pay for the security items themselves.

For domestic violence victims, feeling safe and secure in their own home is crucial. We believe that it is unfair to add to the trauma of a difficult experience by also requiring those victims to pay for their own security items. The domestic violence victims, most of whom will be women, will be required to undertake an assessment by the Domestic Violence Crisis Service, an independent specialist organisation. Not only will the DVCS conduct an indepth consultation and risk assessment with the client but they will also be able to provide support networks, safety tips and referrals for other assistance.

Most of the people who qualify for the free security screens will already have a recent domestic violence restraining order in place, but this will be considered on a case by case basis. The assessment process is important to make sure that we rule out frivolous claims that might result in someone who really needs the screens missing out. The work will be undertaken by a specialist Housing Trust contractor, who will make and fit the screens to Australian standards.

I know this initiative has the support of my colleague the Minister for the Status of Women, who has welcomed the initiative. The idea will give some sense of security to these women, especially those with children, who suffer when being moved from house to house. There will obviously be occasions when it is no longer feasible for a woman and her children to remain in a house, and we will make allowances for that, but we are trying to encourage people to remain in the one spot, in a secure environment, and begin to rebuild their life.

Up to \$4 000 per dwelling will be made available for the security fit-out, and eligible tenants would be limited to installations on two properties in seven years, unless special circumstances require items to be fitted again. Tenants will also be required to sign a disclaimer around the risks of the security items in the event of a fire.

### FOSTER CARE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is also directed to the Minister for Families and Communities. Why is the health of a 13 year old in the minister's care being neglected and what process is in place to ensure that children in state care have access to the same health services as children who live with their parents? Yesterday, I brought to the attention of the house a letter from a foster carer, in which she detailed episodes of a 13-year-old girls' violent behaviour. The foster carer went on to say, 'I suspected there was some kind of disorder that was overlooked.' The foster carer took the child to her own general practitioner, who subsequently referred the child to the Flinders Medical Centre for an MRI, which found that she had a brain tumour in her right temporal lobe. Fortunately, medication has now greatly improved that situation, but, of course, we do not know where this child is.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** It is difficult to listen to the opposition talk about deficiencies in the system of alternative care and child protection when we have actually increased the funding to that sector by 75 per cent since coming into office. It was in abject neglect during their term of office and, of course, now they find cases. Invariably, things go wrong in the alternative care system when you are dealing with some of the most vulnerable and often troubled children who come into our care. I will answer the question about what it is we are doing to ensure that health services are provided to children in our care, because we are doing an extraordinary amount.

Apart from just increasing the amount of money that has been devoted to specific services for children and young people in our care, we have now introduced a rapid response framework where we work very closely with a range of agencies, including the health department, and where children and young people in the care of the minister go to the front of every queue in relation to their health care needs. That is a new initiative, and it is operating extraordinarily well. It means that as a state we take seriously our responsibilities as parent for these young people.

In addition to supporting the children and young people themselves to have their own organisations which represent their interests, we have established the Office of the Guardian whose prime responsibility is to be there to advocate on an individual basis for children and young people in need of care. That means intervening when our public services are not responding as quickly as they might. Numerous interventions occur on a regular basis by the Guardian on behalf of individual young people. Support is occurring. I am prepared to look at, as I always am, individual cases where it is alleged that things have not worked as well as they should. But the processes and resources are in place to meet the needs of the young people in our care.

### FISH LABELLING

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford):** Will the Minister for Consumer Affairs inform the house of the measures being put in place to ensure that when consumers are buying fish, either from a restaurant or takeaway shop, they get the fish they have ordered and the fish that they are paying for?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for Consumer Affairs):** I thank the honourable member for her question. There is no doubt that we have seafood here in South

Australia that is second to none, but there is a problem with the labelling or naming of fish. Whether the mislabelling of the fish is deliberate or accidental, it has been very easy for a common name to be used in advertising or on menus. You think you are getting one thing, but you end up getting something quite different on your plate. Well, sir; no more. Not only do we have DNA identifying and capturing our crooks, but now fish—whether fresh or cooked—can be identified by DNA fingerprinting; no matter how it is prepared, it can be identified.

However, whilst we can identify them, I am advised that currently there is no single national authorised reference for common fish names in Australia. This is further exacerbated when common fish names can apply to more than one fish species or, indeed, when one fish species may have several common names. For example, since the late 1960s, the term 'butterfish' has been used in South Australia as a generic name to describe imported hake and a variety of other similar low-cost fish.

Food Standards Australia New Zealand has considered a proposal for a primary production and processing standard for seafood. Discussions have been held between Food Standards Australia New Zealand, the seafood industry and Standards Australia to develop an Australian standard for fish names based on an existing list of fish names developed by the fish industry. I am informed that the standard is expected to be completed later this year. Consumers have a right to know what they are getting when they buy fish and, to do this, they must have confidence in the labelling. The new standard, along with the ability to correctly identify fish, will give authorities a formal national reference that will enable them to properly investigate complaints concerning fish identification and labelling.

#### DRINK DRIVING LEGISLATION

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Why was the public told through media outlets yesterday that the government's flawed drink-driving legislation could be fixed overnight when the police advised media outlets this morning that it will take three weeks, and will he advise the house when the fiasco will be fixed? With your leave, sir, I will explain.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I rise on a point of order. It is the second question in a row. We exercise some tolerance and I do not think members opposite are new here, but they always put provocative comment in the question and the explanation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** All I would like, sir, is for them to learn the rules and follow them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! When such things are done the chair is put in a difficult situation because the chair cannot undo the question. It has been asked and the debate in the question has already taken place. But I warn members that when they do that I propose to provide more latitude to a minister in answering the question. I think that is only fair. But I do not think that any explanation to the question is necessary.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** I thought that the member for Waite was rising to apologise for claiming that I had misquoted him yesterday, but no such luck.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Attorney will answer the question.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** The imposition of immediate licence disqualification on motorists who blow 0.08—or, in the case of Sharon Lee Conway, 0.184—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** No, I got it right always. You got it wrong.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** Even the Minister for Health says you are wrong.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I am sure *Hansard* will vindicate me, as a matter of fact—I have read it. The disqualification was struck down by the Supreme Court on the ground that there was a typo in brackets in the footnote to the pro-forma specified in the schedule to the regulations of the act. Presumably, the error by a public servant, involving a mistake that anyone could make, is now going to be sheeted home to the government by the member—

**Mr Hamilton-Smith:** Did you read the judgment?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Funnily enough, I did read the judgment, all 22 pages of it, before I gave my news conference, and I stand by what I had to say at the news conference and subsequently. The pro-forma needed to be corrected and an Executive Council was arranged, attended by the Minister for Transport and me, on Tuesday, within hours of the Supreme Court decision coming down and, from that point, new pro-formas can be printed. It is an operational decision for the police concerning how long it takes to print those pro-formas and give them to officers all around the state to serve on people who are way over the limit. The government has done all that it can do to correct the mistake.

#### SA WATER

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para):** Can the Minister for Administrative Services and Government Enterprises provide an update on planned activities to commemorate the establishment of the Water Works and Drainage Commission in 1856 marking SA Water's 150th birthday?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services and Government Enterprises):** I thank the member for her question. For around 150 years, this government agency has been responsible for the delivery of water and the management of waste water across our state. Over this time, SA Water and its predecessors have been responsible for planning, building and managing significant projects, including the construction and day-to-day operations of reservoirs, water and waste water pipe networks, water and waste water treatment plants, pumping stations and other infrastructure. Today SA Water is the custodian of more than \$6 billion worth of assets.

To celebrate the achievements of its people, SA Water will be holding a series of events throughout the year. School students will be able to learn about SA Water's history and the important role of water in our state through the development of a snapshot booklet, a DVD and a series of posters being made available to schools. Several historical displays will take place, including an exhibition at the South Australian Maritime Museum during October called *The River*, and a further exhibition at the Migration Museum focusing on SA Water's work force by showcasing the migrant workers who have contributed to the delivery of water and waste water services to our state.

Looking to the future, an innovative SA Water scholarship program is being developed as a lasting reminder of this important 150th anniversary. A casual family friendly reunion event will also be held on 9 July for current and past employees of SA Water and the EWS. SA Water employees can be proud of their accomplishments. The determination and commitment of the work force over many years has produced innovative engineering and water supply solutions, which have contributed to South Australia's prosperity and the lifestyle which we all enjoy.

### BUS CONTRACT

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** Will the Minister for Transport confirm that the \$81.8 million Scania bus contract to deliver 170 new buses will be delivered on schedule and on budget?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport):** Can I guarantee that a contract will be delivered on schedule or on budget? Well, I am a risk taker, am I not? I will check the current progress of that matter. I have seen what happens in the real world with projects. Apparently, it is the end of the world if a transport project slips or costs more. I note that this morning AGL said that, before it had started construction of a pipeline, the cost had increased by 30 per cent. But apparently that only happens in here, and it only happens to us. What a load of nonsense! I will check that for the member.

I cannot resist congratulating the member for Waite on his performance on the steps today as a kind of K-Mart Nick Xenophon in his leathers. It was kind of like a cross between a K-Mart Nick Xenophon and just a little touch of Alexander Downer, I thought. I cannot let this opportunity pass without congratulating him. Imitation is the finest form of flattery, and I am sure that the Hon. Nick Xenophon is terribly flattered today.

### VETERANS' GRAVES

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor):** Can the Attorney-General advise the house what action the Rann Labor government has taken to ensure that veterans' graves in Derrick Gardens and the RSL walls at Centennial Park, the graves of the men and women who have given so much to our state, are given security of tenure?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** The issue of veterans' graves and their possible reuse arouses passions. The overwhelming view of the public and the Rann Labor government is that the integrity of memorial parks dedicated to war veterans should be maintained with respect to their character. Therefore, in conjunction with the Centennial Park authority, we have taken prompt action to ensure that the resting place of about half our state's veterans—Derrick Gardens and the RSL walls at Centennial Park cemetery—offer perpetual tenure to those interred. I am advised that this action has received the approval of the South Australian Branch of the Returned & Services League of Australia and the Consultative Council of Ex-servicemen's Organisations.

This state has sent very few men to war; possibly only those who comprised our colonial contingents to the Boxer Rebellion and the second South African war (better known as the Boer War). Sending young men and women to risk their lives on active service is a serious matter and has since Federation always been the province of the commonwealth

government. One may then ask what role the federal government played in this initiative. After all, the Prime Minister trumpets that we can never repay our debt to our veterans, that is, unless it costs money. We know that earlier this year at Centennial Park there was a risk that, when existing licences expired, we may have been faced with the remains of a veteran being disinterred and the grave being reused after the original remains had been reinterred, albeit at a deeper level. All the while the federal government refused to contribute. So much for repaying debts, honouring responsibilities and respecting veterans.

The Rann Labor government could not allow such a thing to occur. Faced with the risk, we have negotiated a solution that truly honours our veterans, respects their families and preserves our state's heritage. The agreement with the Centennial Park authority is in its last stages of negotiation and it is expected to be concluded shortly. The agreement offers to preserve the resting places of veterans who fought in the Second World War, Korea, Malaya and Vietnam, and who are interred in Derrick Gardens or the RSL walls. I expect the cost to be about \$80 000 a year.

Perhaps members opposite want to express an alternative view. That alternative view has been put before and I think is unworkable. It is characteristic of a party that does not ever expect to gain office. The proposition the opposition had before the election was to give perpetual tenure to all commemorative ex-service graves.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister is now debating the question and comparing views.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Yes, the Attorney-General was debating and he must not debate answers to questions.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I will not comment on the opposition's policy other than to say it is one of fire and forget.

### BUS CONTRACT

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** My question is again to the Minister for Transport. Is the failure by the Minister for Transport to claim liquidated damages from Scania Pty Ltd one of the 'more significant matters' of concern raised in the Auditor-General's Report 2004-05 to parliament, and will the minister be pursuing the damages? Documents released to the opposition under freedom of information indicate that to 30 June 2005 the Minister for Transport was entitled, but had not taken action, to claim \$398 750 in liquidated damages for late delivery of buses in accordance with his contract with Scania Pty Ltd.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport):** I take a rather unusual approach when it comes to matters of legal rights and litigation in that I take the advice of lawyers.

**An honourable member:** You are a lawyer.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I see; I should multiskill. Because I am a lawyer myself I should actually make the decision. Well, I am very flattered that they have that much faith in me.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** You could help the DPP.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** In fact, the Attorney suggested that maybe I could double as the DPP as well and save us all a bit of money.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Help out the DPP.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Help out the DPP. I would sincerely love to help out the DPP. I have to say that the

member for Waite was running about earlier last week with a few friends bragging that he had a big bucket to tip on us this week. Well, I have been waiting and waiting, and here it is. He got something out of FOI and he wants to know what it means; he wants me to explain it to him. I will go and get the advice on why that matter was pursued that way, but what I will say is that I do not actually sit in my office and rub my chin and say, 'Shall I sue them or shall I not sue them?' I take advice on the matter. I will find out what the advice was and bring it back to the house.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** Is the Minister for Transport's failure to disclose a copy of the contract for the supply of Metro ticket passenger buses with Scania Australia Pty Ltd—on the South Australian government's contract web site—a further 'more significant matter' brought to his attention, and the parliament's attention, by the Auditor-General in his most recent report to parliament? Documents released (again, under FOI) reveal that the Auditor-General queried the minister's department about this particular failure during audit, indicating that the department may have breached Treasurer's Instruction No. 27, a most serious matter.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport):** There are a couple of things that need to be understood. One is that, in the process of an audit, in my experience, the Auditor-General will raise many matters with a department, be it the Department of Transport or others. Those matters are usually resolved to the satisfaction of the Auditor-General, but he will ask questions; he is wont to do that. My recollection, despite furious attempts to beat up the last Auditor-General's report, was that it was an unqualified report into the Department of Transport, which had—

**Mr Hamilton-Smith:** You obviously didn't read it.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I actually did read it. The difference between me and you is that I read it, and I also understood it. That is the difference between me and you. There was one matter only on which the department and the Auditor-General could not agree.

Opposition members, through their entire careers, have always used the Auditor-General like a Cadbury's selection box: they only take the one they like. Of course, when the Auditor-General was saying that they had made such a dreadful mess of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium and other matters, the poor old fellow had to come here to get a bill to protect himself from threatened legal action by members of their executive government. Of course, the Auditor-General is a terribly good chap when he says something that suits them but, if it is something that does not suit them, he is a dreadful fellow and he really should not be interfering in their business. I will set the performance of this government in probity and standards in management against your failed government any time. Not only do we have greater probity but, on behalf of the Treasurer, I can say we are the first government actually to balance the books in this state. For 8½ years you could not do it. They told us, when they were selling ETSA, they would have an extra \$2 million a day. It would be 'summon it up', I think, was it not? What happened? They sold ETSA and, year after year, they still put in deficits.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** They do not like a history lesson.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister is now debating the question.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not need any further assistance from the member for MacKillop.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** A supplementary question, again, to the Minister for Transport. Has the minister's department failed to disclose a copy of any other significant contracts, as required by Treasurer's Instruction No. 27 and, if so, which contracts have not been disclosed, and why?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I will ask the department whether it has done that. It has not been brought to my attention, but I will make that inquiry. I say again: if you want to get up and ask questions forever in this house, comparing our performance on probity, our performance with the Auditor-General, we will be happy to do it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister is debating now.

#### LEGAL PRACTITIONERS GUARANTEE FUND

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Attorney-General confirm that there are insufficient funds in the Legal Practitioners Guarantee Fund to compensate clients of the firm Magarey Farlam and, if so, what process is the government considering to ensure that the clients are properly compensated? On 12 February this year it was reported that the legal firm of Magarey Farlam had been wound up and that, according to the Law Society, there had been significant misappropriations which may exceed \$5.5 million. The opposition has been advised the assets of the guarantee fund were valued at only about \$4.8 million.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** Money is being paid from the guarantee fund to an administrator (Karen Thomas from Fisher Jeffries), who is trying to wind up Magarey Farlam. She has been working there for some months already and will report in due course.

#### AUSTRALIAN WORKPLACE AGREEMENTS

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** Will the Premier follow the lead demonstrated by his Western Australian Labor counterpart and now seek to meet with representatives from the mining sector to discuss the potential impact of the abolition of AWAs on that industry, and join the Western Australian Premier to lobby federal Labor to quarantine mining AWAs from Labor's proposed abolition? Yesterday during question time the Premier told the house he had not held discussions with the mining industry to determine the potential impact of the abolition of AWAs on the South Australian mining sector. *The Australian* reports this morning that the Western Australian Labor government supports transitional arrangements being put in place to allow AWAs to continue within the mining sector in that state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I meet with the mining industry all the time. I would have thought that the honourable member could have been in the audience and heard what they said about our government compared with other governments. I wish he had been interested enough in his portfolio to be there. I will be meeting with BHP Billiton and other mining companies over the next few months, as I do all the time. What I said yesterday—and I do not like being verbed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The arrogance! People expect a better standard from their members of parliament. The arrogance! You ask a question and, when one goes to answer, you scream abuse and laugh. I am happy to discuss any matter with any mining company we are dealing with. We have a very strong relationship with BHP Billiton and with Oxiana and I will meet with them and they can raise—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** I met with them last week and they didn't mention it.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Minister for Infrastructure met with Oxiana last week and they did not mention it. I met with mining people in Britain and overseas, as well as interstate and in this state. With regard to Western Australia, I guarantee that, when the figures come out again, our industrial relations record will be a country mile ahead of all the other mainland states, including Western Australia, which is a huge bonus for this state. We are fighting your mates in the federal court, because we put our state before our party. When it came to the so-called fair work legislation federally, the so-called industrial relations reforms, workplace choices, and all the rest of it—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Okay, here is your point: stop the arrogance; stop the abuse; calm down. There are two incidents—two examples—of where the Labor Party and the Liberal Party had fundamental differences in this state, in addition to privatisation, in recent times. You decided to back the federal Liberal government's imposing a nuclear waste dump on this state, and you decided to support a federal Liberal government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —and its industrial relations legislation that will damage our industrial relations record.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** On a point of order—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I know what the point of order of the member for MacKillop will be, but he cannot have it both ways: he proceeded to interject on the Premier almost as soon as he started answering the question and now he gets up to complain when the Premier is debating. It cannot work both ways.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** In conclusion, I am happy to talk to the mining industry about any issue. However, I say to members opposite—and I hope they will listen and not groan and pull faces—that when you are elected into this parliament you have a responsibility to put the interests of South Australia first, which we did when we fought the federal government over imposing a nuclear waste dump on this state and which is what we are doing in the High Court to oppose what the federal government is doing with industrial relations.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** On a point of order, sir—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think the Premier has finished.

#### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** My question is also to the Premier. Which agency had the primary responsibility for managing the contamination incident that occurred at the Adelaide Airport? Is it the Metropolitan Fire Service, the Adelaide Airport management or the police, and is the government satisfied that the incident was handled satisfactorily? On Sunday 25 June, it was reported that approximately 80 people were put through decontamination showers at the

Adelaide Airport and that 500 people were kept in rooms without toilets, food and water for up to five hours after discovery of a suspicious powder which placed the international terminal in lockdown. Distressed passengers were quoted in *The Advertiser* as claiming that the situation was:

... poorly handled, and that there was no control at all. No-one knew what they were doing.

It was also claimed that people had to urinate into bottles.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** Thank you; I am very pleased to have been asked this dorothy dixer. I understood that I was going to be asked this question a couple of days ago following the incident, but apparently it takes a while to percolate. On Sunday 25 June, there was a powder incident at the international terminal of the Adelaide Airport. The response to the event caused inconvenience and upset to a number of travellers and their families. When deciding on the best course of action, emergency services assesses each event for the risk it poses to the health and wellbeing of the public. I imagine, by the way, that, if no action had been taken, we would have had in Tuesday's question time a series of questions about the risk to the public with calls for a royal commission. You could almost write the script for the opposition, but never mind.

The established procedures, I am told, were implemented in responding to the incident. I am advised that three flights landed within a very short time of each other, disembarking in excess of 700 passengers. There were also about the same number of outbound passengers waiting to board these planes. So, that is about 1 400 people not including well-wishers and airport staff who were in the vicinity. That is why I am grateful for the four or five days notice for this question. Given this was clearly one of the busiest periods of the week for the international terminal's operations, actions to contain and make harmless this powder were carried out under enormously difficult circumstances, and it signals how serious a real event could be, but it demonstrates how the state's emergency services need to respond as well as to recover from such an incident. Again, I point out, if they had said, 'We think it might be this, it probably isn't harmful, let's wave people through,' you can just imagine—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the question was very specific as to who was responsible. We do not need a speech or a debate; we need an answer.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Perhaps the Premier should keep to his prepared response.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Yes, Mr Speaker. The complexity of the response is highlighted by the number and diversity of agencies (both state and commonwealth)—and I am sure you are going to stand up and bag John Howard in a minute.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the question was very specific as to who was responsible, and the Premier is going on and on again with this speech.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** In the nearly 21 years that I have been in this parliament I have never seen such arrogance from an opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Now the Premier is debating.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The complexity of the response is highlighted by the number and diversity of agencies both state and commonwealth which responded, including the management of Adelaide Airport Limited, the Australian Customs Service, the Australian Federal Police, the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, SAPOL, the South

Australian Ambulance Service, the Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service, and the Office of Transport Security.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** My darling Clementine—that's a song, isn't it? Let me explain the prominence of this. Following the privatisation of the airports, Adelaide Airport Limited is a private company; the Australian Customs Service is a federal agency; the Australian Federal Police is a federal agency; and the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service is a state agency and it does a brilliant job.

People here want to stop bagging the fireys and bagging South Australia Police. SAPOL is a state government agency. The South Australian Ambulance Service is funded by the South Australian government. The Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service is a federal government agency, and the Office of Transport Security is known to all members. Nevertheless, there is always room for improvement, especially with regard to how people who have been exposed to an unknown substance are treated. I am advised that debriefing for the incident involving—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Can I just say, the arrogance of members of the opposition—they are so concerned—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** On a point of order, sit him down.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms CHAPMAN:** He's sat down; don't worry.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** They are so concerned—

**Ms CHAPMAN:** No, I had a point of order. He is simply going on again.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** They are so concerned about public safety and inconvenience that they walk out during the answer. I have never seen such arrogance by any opposition in the nearly 21 years I have served in this place and the 29 years that I have been working in this parliament.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will now take his seat.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** On a point of clarification, sir, could you steer me to the standing order that rules him out from 'going on again', because I think that was the point of order taken by the deputy leader?

**The SPEAKER:** There was no point of order.

---

## CONSERVATION FARMING

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.J. McEWEN:** I wish to advise the house that a longstanding collaboration between research scientists from the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) and two farmers has recently been acknowledged. Father and son farmers Greig and Ashley Robinson from Balaklava in the state's Mid North have worked with research officers for a 25-year period to advance conservation farming in South Australia. It is rare to see such a lengthy collaboration. I know that the research scientists have been very appreciative of the fact that they have been able to undertake valuable research over such a long period and view incremental changes in soil structure.

Ultimately, this has led to results that have identified a new method of tillage that can address soil compaction and restore crop yields. The key to the success of this work has been the relationship between the Robinsons and the researchers that has grown out of a common goal to foster and improve the sustainable, productive capacity of farm land. Their collaborative effort has enabled the research outcomes to be shared throughout the district, and these research outcomes are now drawing national and international interest.

At a small function held last Friday 23 June at the Waite Institute, SARDI acknowledged the contribution made by the Robinsons, and it is appropriate that their generous support for grains research be brought to the attention of the house. I equally acknowledge their contribution, as does the shadow minister.

## COMMUNITY BUILDERS PROGRAM

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** Today I announce that the SA government will be calling on community leaders in regional South Australia to participate in the Community Builders program. The SA government recognises the value and importance of South Australia's rural and regional communities, the role they play in the continued growth of the state's economy, and the importance of social capital in developing and maintaining sustainable regional communities. Designed to foster community capacity-building by encouraging and developing grass roots leadership and volunteerism with communities, the Community Builders program has become an important tool in the continuing development of South Australia's regional communities.

Each year, the Community Builders program awards four grants of \$25 000 each to local government and community groups to fund community development programs in their regions. Since 2002, over 400 volunteers have participated in 17 individual Community Builders projects across the state that are highly valued by the participants and their communities. I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge two award recipients with close links to the Community Builders program: Heather Baldock, a Community Builders facilitator for the upper eastern and central Eyre Peninsula, was recently awarded the Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation's Rural Woman of the Year award for her work in the region; and the Mallee Xtreme Leadership Program, which was run in affiliation with the Community Builders Program in the Murraylands, has been awarded the Riverland/Murraylands SA Great Youth Award. A call for expressions of interest from host organisations will be made early in the new financial year. The Community Builders Program is an important tool in the development of South Australia's regional communities, and the SA government is pleased to be continuing this important program.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### CHILDREN IN CARE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Today, again, we have an example of the Minister for Families and Communities not reading his mail, not caring or not being prepared to disclose to this house very significant matters that have been brought to his attention. Today

the minister was asked about the plight of a 13-year-old girl who has written to him. Also, the child's carer has written to the minister and his department in relation to the very disturbing circumstances surrounding her foster care; and this child is under the guardianship of the minister.

When asked today about giving an assurance that children in state care have access to the same health treatment as children who live with their parents, the minister had the audacity to say to this house that the government was already doing things to ensure that this happens, namely, that a rapid response framework was in place to enable children in state care to jump up the list for medical treatment. Well, that is not much use, minister, if you do not even have these children assessed in the first place and you do not even know whether they are carrying a very serious health disability, sickness or disease.

The minister then said, 'Oh, we have appointed, of course, Ms Simmons (the child's guardian) under our government to be an advocate for these children.' Well, we have not heard from her. Certainly, this correspondence has not been handed on to her for the government to ensure that children are properly looked after when they are in the care of the minister. I will read the letter from the carer. Information contained within that letter has already been presented to the minister, which information he has failed to address at all today.

Indeed, he has failed to provide any response to the letters that have been forwarded at this stage. Members will recall that yesterday I raised the plight of this child, and the violent circumstances that led to her removal from a carer and being placed elsewhere—at this stage, a place unknown. In any event, this carer wrote to the department about this child's behaviour during the many months that she resided with her. The letter states:

In the months to come, I learnt more about [the child]. I did not have any violent outbursts until the last month she was with me. She was put onto medication for her behaviour Catapres 100. I had her examined by my GP and he took her on as his patient. I suspected [the child] was having seizures again. [The GP] referred her to a neurologist. . . EEG did not show seizure activity. I expressed how I believed that there was more than trauma, abuse and emotional issues causing [the child's] bizarre behaviour. I felt that there was something. . . going on. I suspected there was some kind of brain disorder that had been overlooked. I also suggested that [the child] appeared to have symptoms of bipolar or some other mental health issue. [The general practitioner] agreed with me. He also saw symptoms of bipolar. CAMHS were brought in to assess [the child] and to support me. A psychological assessment started to take place for [the child]. After learning that [the child] had encephalitis and viral meningitis when she was three and had never had a CAT scan or an MRI, I requested that she have one while at one of the appointments with [the neurologist]. [The child] had an MRI at the Flinders Medical Centre. [The neurologist] rang me a few days after the MRI to tell me that they had found a tumour in the right temporal lobe of her brain. The symptoms of the above run true to the symptoms that [the child] had been experiencing. [The workers] at CAMHS are the ones to talk to about how those symptoms of the tumour to the right temporal lobe and [the child's] behaviour run parallel to each other.

Well, here is the answer. We have a situation where a carer has had to undertake all this work to make sure that the very basic access to health services and assessment has taken place. The carer then finds out that there is a very serious medical situation with this child that has been completely ignored during the time that the child has been under the care of the minister. That is an absolute disgrace.

It is quite arrogant of the minister to come into this house and pretend to care about the medical assessments and about access to medical treatment that children in his care (and

there are many of them) should have. They deserve the same care as any other children living in this community—in fact, these children are the most vulnerable and they deserve a better standard of care from this government.

Time expired.

## INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS LAWS

**Mr PICCOLO (Light):** I rise today to speak in support of the working men and women of South Australia who have seen their rights to earn a fair wage and associated conditions, and to work in a safe environment, stripped away by the Howard government through its Work Choices legislation. At the outset, I state my opposition to the Howard government's industrial relations laws, as they do the very opposite to what they claim. They are draconian and reduce the rights of both workers and employers to negotiate on a level playing field. Howard's industrial relations laws are designed to do two things: drive down the wages and conditions of ordinary Australians, and prevent unions from effectively representing their members and, in particular, protecting their members' living standards.

As the rallies across the nation have clearly shown, working people have come to understand (despite rhetoric to the contrary) that the Howard government is leading the attack on Australian battlers. The Howard government has become the friend of rogue employers. This legislation will force good employers to cut the wages and conditions of their employees if they are to compete in the marketplace—and these views are not only shared by Labor people.

**Mr Venning:** Who wrote this?

**Mr PICCOLO:** I can actually write. As I previously mentioned, these harsh and unjust laws are designed to silence the unions, and I can demonstrate this point by an example from my electorate. Recently, a workplace delegate with the Liquor, Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union was sacked on the alleged grounds of workplace bullying. What was this employee's alleged crime? The employee, Kerry Rattray, works in the aged care sector. As an aged care worker and as a workplace delegate Kerry cares for both the aged, frail and vulnerable residents at a Gawler-based aged care facility and for her fellow workers.

This delegate was advised by another worker that she had witnessed a frail, elderly resident being mistreated. The delegate quite rightly asked the employees who had witnessed the incident to provide a signed statement of the event. This act of seeking proper documentation from the employees was construed by the employer as threatening and bullying behaviour, and the delegate was sacked after a kangaroo court-style of investigation. Interestingly, the employer's representative allegedly saw the delegate's action as a minor matter warranting some minor disciplinary action: instead, the employer chose to sack her. Why? To ensure that the employees never speak out again.

No employee should work in such fear but, more importantly, if the workers cannot protect the elderly in our aged care facilities who will? It makes a mockery of the proposed mandatory reporting laws. Who will make a report when their livelihood is on the line? Who will protect the most vulnerable in our society? No-one under Howard's laws: only a federal Labor government can do that.

## TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENERGY PORTFOLIO

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I rise to speak on the portfolio of transport, infrastructure and energy which, at the end of this parliamentary sitting, ought to be a matter of concern to all members. The most recent farrago has been the issue of drink driving legislation which (it is apparent from question time today) is still out in limbo. The police are refusing to enforce the legislation because of a lack of guidance and clear direction, and because of mistakes with its preparation and presentation. Of course, that follows flawed legislation on drug driving (which was the issue last week) and flawed legislation on 50 km/h speed zones (after which the government approached the opposition and sought support for retrospective legislation). Ultimately, it was not needed but, nevertheless, it reflected a lack of detail and attention to detail throughout the legislative process.

Who brought those three bills into the parliament? It was the minister for transport, energy and infrastructure. We have the Attorney-General defending the mistakes yesterday and today and saying that they could be sorted out overnight. As we found out during question time today, they will not be sorted out overnight. In respect of the drink-driving legislation, the police are not enforcing it, the thing is a mess, the forms are incorrect and the detail was not carried through. The police have been put in a very awkward position by the government. The opposition supported the legislation through the parliament on the understanding that it challenged some very fundamental principles about the separation of powers, particularly between the police and the judiciary. It did so on the understanding that the provisions in the legislation would be strictly adhered to and implemented. We see that the court has upheld that view of the parliament; and the court is absolutely correct in doing so. The government, as a result of this bungle, failed to ensure that the provisions were strictly adhered to.

Who is the captain of the ship? It is the minister for transport, energy and infrastructure. I mean the minister no ill will. In fact, if I was going fishing I might well want to be in the back of the boat with the Minister for Transport. He is a very likeable fellow. But you do not have to do much political fishing in this portfolio to find a long list of mistakes, catastrophes and disasters. There are but three pieces of legislation. We have had questions today on the \$82 million Scania bus contract, the failure to apply liquidated damages and concerns that the project is over budget and behind schedule.

Of course, we have also had the major project bungles. The Northern Expressway, possibly, will cost up to \$900 million—a blow-out of \$600 million. The Bakewell Bridge, which has been through the Public Works Committee and which has now been publicly exposed, is 37 per cent over budget from \$30 million to \$41 million. It is a complete mess. The South Road underpass was to have been built for \$65 million. Now it is not only more than \$100 million but also likely to be far more again. Of course, the tunnels under Anzac Highway and Port Road look like facing a major blow-out. It was to have been \$187 million and it now looks like it could be as much as \$400 million—a blow-out of over 100 per cent. We have backdowns on the Marion bus/rail interchange, which was to have been a \$7 million project but which now looks like being a paint job on the railway station, an improvement to the bus stop and some minor modifica-

tions—but certainly not what we were promised. The list in this portfolio goes on and on.

Of course, on top of that, the Auditor-General gave not what the minister has described as an unqualified report—he obviously has not read it nor understood it—it is a highly qualified report. A number of matters of significant concern were raised. I suspect it reflects a culture that has led to these mistakes. We have the red light camera farrago—\$36 million worth of cameras in Germany being fixed—and a \$10 million safety rail management system which does not work. The portfolio is in chaos. We have had two or three months of dramatic announcements concerning it. The house should be concerned. It is fine to be witty and funny in question time and it is fine to be the wise guy, but with it goes an expectation that the portfolio will be competently managed. The CEO Dr James Horne has been sacked, and \$630 000 later the department is without a CEO and without effective leadership from the top down. The minister is the captain of the ship. He is blaming the crew and the ship is running aground: he needs to get a grip of it and fix it quickly.

Time expired.

## YOUTH COLLABORATION PROJECT

**Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley):** Today I rise to speak on the subject of young people in my area. In so doing I refer to a report prepared about a year ago by the Eastern Region Youth Collaboration Project. I note that the Minister for Youth is here in the chamber. The report was commissioned by the eastern local government areas of Burnside, Campbelltown, Norwood Payneham St Peters, Prospect and Walkerville. Of course, the first three council areas fall into my own community of Hartley. The report, which was brought to my attention by Mayor Robert Bria, in a recent meeting sought to paint a picture of young people and their issues in order to guide and inform service delivery in the eastern region.

First, the report sought to get a handle on basic demographic data—who are these kids and how many of them are there? Secondly, the report identifies the current issues for these young people and then, interestingly, goes on to examine what are the emerging issues for them. This work is highly commendable because it is making young people a priority, and that takes time and money, both of which are in short supply, but, instead of coming cap in hand to the state government, which must be very tempting, these councils are firstly sorting out their own backyards and only then deciding the next step. Eastern Adelaide when compared to other parts of the state is generally affluent and well resourced. This is an undeniable fact.

When it comes to government policy and resources, the east is competing against other areas of severe disadvantage such as the Peachey belt. However, what is often forgotten is that the eastern suburbs are not immune from having to grapple with their own difficulties. They are problems of a different nature but problems nonetheless. For instance, in the Campbelltown area there are real pockets of poverty and disadvantage, yet it is in the eastern suburbs. I commend the report for challenging some of these ill-informed views. I will now briefly refer to the findings, and in doing so acknowledge the author Christine Peters.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It has been pointed out that the member for Light is using a mobile phone, which is against standing orders.

**Ms PORTOLESI:** Based on ABS 2001 census figures, the eastern region has a population of approximately 40 000 young people in the age range of 10 to 29.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Ms PORTOLESI:** I think Ivan falls into that category. The population projections to 2020 show that the 10 to 24-year-old category is expected to decline at a rate similar to the Adelaide metro region and the state as a whole. The 25 to 29-year-old category is increasing as per the metro area and the state but at a slower rate. Not surprisingly, the main issues faced by the 40 000 or so young people in the east are not so dissimilar from the rest of the state. The current issues include: substance abuse; education, training and employment; family conflict; mental health—the member for Schubert; sexual health; and affordable accommodation. Interestingly, when one examines the emerging issues, one sees that they tend to reflect concerns about pressure to succeed and other excessive parental expectations of which I will probably be guilty one day.

They are: family pressure to succeed which results in drinking, drug taking and mental health problems; financial pressure on young people from increased costs of higher education—something for which the Liberal Party is responsible; increased incidence of violence by young people towards parents; eating disorders; obesity and its subsequent health implications; changing habits and drug usage; access to good quality career advice and vocational education; and an increasing incidence of sexually transmissible diseases. The findings of this report have been passed on to key agencies in the area so that they can make informed decisions about service delivery.

The report canvasses a number of implementation options which are: the establishment of a working group to identify service delivery strategies; establishing a youth services network which has a mandate to coordinate youth service delivery; lobbying for funding to engage a third party to develop partnering arrangements; and, of course, lobbying state and federal governments. The report recognises that a combination of all these options may be the best way to proceed, and I agree. Mayor Bria informs me that the next step in this project is a series of forums, which will be convened by the youth and community development officers of the council. I look forward to attending them when I can. I commend the report and congratulate the steering committee on this work. I look forward to doing what I can within the state government to progress this fine work. I know that in this government and, in particular, the Minister for Youth (Hon. Paul Caica) they will find a sympathetic and considered response.

#### FIRE HYDRANT MAINTENANCE

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond):** I congratulate SA Water on its 150th anniversary but ask it to recommence a fire hydrant maintenance program in country areas. My information is that a regular maintenance program was discontinued about 10 years ago. The implications of the lack of a regular maintenance program are the risk to life and property. Recently, I came upon some correspondence in the local media about how long it took a local CFS chief to access a fire plug that was unserviceable. He went to an open paddock and found a white post, which supposedly pointed to where the fire plug was situated, but the fire plug was in the

opposite direction. In this case, it was surrounded by overgrown grass and weeds. He proceeded to dig it out.

He had already been to the plug, so he knew where it was. However, at times this can take up to 20 minutes by the time they find the plug, which has been overgrown and covered over with dirt, and then dig it out. At this stage, the people charged with this task go through the sequence of digging out the plug, getting to the cap and taking the cap off. Then they have to get down to the plug, and sometimes the hole is full of dirt and debris. So, after about eight minutes, they would have managed to connect a CFS truck to water. This is a practice that just cannot go on in country areas, or any area for that matter. Current checking of fire plugs is done only when a complaint is lodged, and this can take up to two months. In fact, some CFS brigades have given up reporting faulty plugs, because they say there is no point, as there is not the resources to follow them up.

In relation to my own experience with fighting fires, there was a fire in February, when many CFS brigades were brought from all over South Australia—from down in the South-East and as far away as Lucindale, over to Clayton. I commend the CFS for its efforts in fighting the fires not only in my local area at Coomandook but also at Ngarkat. It was a very busy period for several days, when the temperature exceeded 45 to 46 degrees. It was quite an experience for me out there personally assisting in the fighting of fires, with the CFS assisting property owners and myself in saving our own farms, and I certainly commend the CFS for its efforts. However, the situation is exacerbated when you have fire units coming from out of area, trawling up and down either your back roads or the highways looking for not only fire plugs but serviceable fire plugs.

On this occasion, I was working in my office in Murray Bridge as a candidate, and I remember that, as I drove down there to fight the fire, I had one of the local people ring me to say, 'Which plug is serviceable near your farm?' It is just outrageous. They need to re-invigorate a fire plug maintenance area, because right throughout the region lives and property are at risk, and it cannot go on. I am surprised that the insurance industry has not come out about this issue. Something definitely needs to be done. It will not be long, somewhere down the track, before we will have another Ash Wednesday, or something similar. I really hope not. Fire maintenance certainly needs to be done. The CFS, with its strike teams, and the MFS are all quite ready to fight fires out of area, but we need to be able to access water at marked plugs.

#### FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

**Mr O'BRIEN (Napier):** Yesterday, the federal Treasurer, Peter Costello, was reported as claiming that the Howard government's aim of using the GST to recast the federal system had failed and the states were in danger of becoming mere divisional service deliverers for the federal government. Mr Costello said:

Now, there are only two ways you can take federalism. You can either give state governments more sovereignty and accountability or you can take it forward in the direction that it has been moving, with state governments becoming more like divisional branches of head office. Divisional service deliverers is the way it has been moving, and I think that is probably not capable of being arrested.

There we have it. The federal government is now clearly of the view that it can assume state constitutional responsibilities in areas such as education and health, determine policy, and

then have what it considers to be its branch offices (namely, state governments) implement the policy. If the implementation is not in accord with the federal government's policy, financial penalties invariably follow.

This brings me to Wayne Goss, whose appointment to the review of South Australian government activities I warmly welcome. Wayne Goss for some time has been proposing the establishment of a state secretariat, based in Canberra and representing the interests of all the states. The role of the secretariat would be to constitute a permanent presence for the states in Canberra, given the incapacity of the Senate to perform this role, and to take a dominant role, as opposed to a subordinate role, in dealings with the federal government in areas which are the constitutional responsibilities of the states.

Very few people doubt the need for coordination at the national level on issues like education, health, infrastructure, public transport, skills formation and industrial relations. In the absence of a state secretariat, the federal government has filled the vacuum and, in the process, it has assumed constitutional responsibilities which lie within the purview of the states. This leads me to another highly constructive proposition on federal/state relations, namely the Bracks/Brumby proposal to replace competition payments with specific payments to allow the states to pursue agreed reform plans.

Under the Bracks/Brumby proposal, the states would put forward specific economic reform proposals which would need the agreement of the Council of Australian Governments with outcomes that could be measured. Federal government funding would then be provided to the states for these reforms. The Productivity Commission would play a role in this process. A decision on this proposal is expected to be made next month. If the decision is in the affirmative, and I hope that it is, the states should see an end to the type of micromanagement and prescriptive funding by the commonwealth government that has led to such inane requirements as the erection of flagpoles at all state schools.

Australia has the greatest vertical fiscal imbalance of any federal political system in the world. This means that the federal government has a far greater ability to raise money than state governments, yet it has fewer constitutionally assigned spending responsibilities than the states. In other words, the national government can and does raise far more revenue than it requires, whereas the states are in a reverse situation. This imbalance is the worst of any federal system of government anywhere in the world. A highly effective state secretariat, working closely with the federal bureaucracy, but taking its lead from the states, is the only way I can see of dealing with this vertical fiscal imbalance, given the disposition of taxation powers between the federal government and the states.

If the Bracks/Brumby initiative is embraced, such a secretariat would be the driver of the reform process within the states. It would also specifically restrict the role of the federal government—particularly that of the Productivity Commission—to a role of assisting the states in the establishment of benchmark criteria for specific reform undertakings. To do nothing at this time on this issue will see this parliament further relegated to branch office status, and the South Australian government become a minor functionary of the Australian government bureaucracy.

Time expired.

---

## CHILD SEX OFFENDERS REGISTRATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 21 June. Page 578.)

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** I indicate to the house that I will be the lead speaker on this bill but, more importantly, I will be the only speaker today from our side on this bill, because it was only introduced into the parliament on Wednesday of last week and we have not had a joint party room meeting since then. Whilst I can indicate our tentative support for this legislation, I am not able to go further than that until we have that party room meeting.

As the name suggests, this bill requires sex offenders to be registered with the police and to comply with certain other conditions relating to their registration. It creates the nature of what is a registrable offender, and that is generally people who have committed sex offences or offences of violence with a sexual element against children. Basically, there are two types of offence set out at the end of the act in the schedule, which are class 1 and class 2 offences and, essentially, things like rape appear in class 1 and attempted rape in class 2 and so on down the list.

The bill establishes three different classes of registrable offenders, and they are:

- mandatory offenders, and that is persons who have actually been sentenced for a class 1 or a class 2 offence, so they become mandated to be on this register if they are convicted and sentenced for either of those levels of offence;
- corresponding registrable offenders, and they are people who are convicted in another state or another jurisdiction (possibly a territory or even overseas) of an offence corresponding to something that would classify them as a mandatory offender in this jurisdiction; and
- discretionary registrable offenders, which is the third class and those more difficult to define, and they are people who come within three different categories.

Firstly, it includes a child who has been found guilty of a mandatory registrable offence (so that is one of the offences noted in the schedule, but a child who has been found guilty) where the court, having taken into account any matter that it considers appropriate, is satisfied that the child poses a risk to the sexual safety of one or more children. That is the first category of discretionary registrable offenders. Secondly, it may be a person who is found guilty of an offence that does not fall within the class 1 or class 2 offences laid down by the legislation but the court is nevertheless satisfied that the person poses a risk to the sexual safety of one or more children.

Thirdly, the last category, which is a bit of a catch-all, is a person who is subject to a paedophile restraining order which has been issued under section 99AA of the Summary Procedure Act and does not already meet the definition of a sexual offender. It is possible at the moment that you could have a paedophile restraining order without having actually been convicted of a child sexual offence. So the effect of the bill is that anyone who has been made the subject of a paedophile restraining order, if they are not otherwise caught, will be caught by this provision and will have to register.

Registering will require the person to provide certain information for the register, and obviously that will, first, include their name (including any aliases or previous names); date of birth; address; the names and ages of all children with whom the offender resides or has regular unsupervised contact; the name and details of employment they may undertake, including training or voluntary work; the nature of the employment (and the bill goes on later to say that certain employment is prohibited for people who are on the register); any affiliations with any club or organisation which has child membership; the details of cars owned or regularly driven; the details of tattoos or other distinguishing marks; and the details of any convictions or terms in custody.

So, that is the information that is initially supplied to the register and then, in essence, the bill provides that if any of those things change there is an obligation on the person on the register to notify the Commissioner of Police, who is the person who maintains the register, within 14 days. So if they make no changes to any of those things they simply make an annual report to confirm that the details remain unchanged but, if they change a tattoo or have a tattoo or change another distinguishing mark, that has to be notified. If they change address or jobs, they have to notify the new details to the Commissioner within 14 days.

If the offender intends to leave the state for more than 14 days, they also have to provide to the Commissioner details of that absence in terms of where they are going and how long they will be gone, and there will be reciprocal reporting arrangements for people coming into and out of each state. I understand that this legislation is actually based on the Victorian model and that, indeed, we are the last cab off the rank in terms of introducing this legislation, so the corresponding legislation does already operate interstate. The bill does not spell out the details but I understand that it is intended also to operate, if appropriate, overseas so that people, for instance, with a conviction that led them to being registered as mandated or in any other discretionary way, or any other way, in this state would be tracked if they were going overseas and the appropriate authorities notified if they were heading into a country where they might be intending to engage in inappropriate activities. Having set out those requirements, the act then makes it an offence to fail to comply with them, punishable by up to \$10 000 in fines or up to two years' imprisonment.

The length of time for which someone has to be on the register varies according to the nature of the offence. If someone commits a single class two offence (class two being slightly less, but they are still very serious offences; attempted kidnap or attempted rape) they will be on the register for eight years. If someone commits a single class one offence (that is, a rape or a murder) or multiple class two offences, they will be on the register for 15 years, and for life if they are an offender who is already registered for a class one offence and they are found guilty of any subsequent registrable offence (either class one or class two), or if they are registered because of a class two offence but are found guilty of a subsequent class one offence.

There is another provision, which is a little complicated, but what it really requires is that, with respect to offenders who are already registered because of one or more class two offences and who are found guilty of one or more class two offences (so, all their offences have been at the lower end of the scale, although, as I said, they are very serious offences), if they are found guilty of, in total, three or more such offences (and it does not matter whether they have gone on

initially for more than one and then committed one subsequent, or they have gone on initially for simply one class two offence and they have more than one subsequent), any combination that leads to their having a total of three offences means that they will also be on the list for life. Of the mandated group, the only persons who could avoid registration for life upon conviction for a subsequent offence are those who are registered for a single class two offence and who are subsequently convicted of a further single class two offence.

They are the rules that apply in terms of how long a person registers if they are on there as a result of the mandated provisions. If they are placed on there as a result of the discretionary provisions, their registration will apply for the period ordered by the court for their conviction for a non-registrable offence in the relevant circumstances, or for half the period ordered by the court if the registration is discretionary and the offender is a child. In other words, a child cannot be liable for registration for life, and the act specifically has a provision to that effect.

If someone is placed on the register as the third category of discretionary offender (that is, if they have had a paedophile restraining order against them), and if that is the only reason they are placed on the paedophile register under this bill, they will be on it for as long as the paedophile restraining order is in operation.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Correct.

**Mrs REDMOND:** I am glad the Attorney recognises that I do, I think, have my head around what the provisions say. If a person is made subject to lifetime registration (which, of course, is pretty serious, because they are not being put on it for life originally; they have been put on the list originally and have then have committed some sort of subsequent offence, so they are already in a very serious position), after 15 years of having a clear record and no further complaints they can apply for a suspension of those reporting obligations. A discretionary person (that is, a person who has been placed on the list under the provisions relating to discretionary registration) can apply at any time to have the provisions lifted in terms of their requirements.

Most importantly, this register, once it is established, is to be maintained by the Commissioner of Police and its access is to be limited. I note that the government, in its second reading, made it very clear that its intention is that this will be a severely restricted list in terms of who can actually see it. The offence for intentionally or recklessly disclosing information other than in accordance with the provisions of this bill—information from this register—has an even higher penalty than the penalty for failing to comply with the terms of the registration in the first place. You would recall that the penalty for failing to comply and to notify within 14 days of changes to any details is a maximum of two years imprisonment. This has a maximum penalty of five years. So, at least in terms of the level of penalty being imposed, the government is clearly indicating that it is taking very seriously the issue of trying to ensure that people who have access to this information are extremely restricted.

The bill then sets out principles governing when information on this register can be disclosed. It provides, firstly, that information must not be disclosed unless there are good reasons for the disclosure, and, secondly, that the disclosure is otherwise in accordance with the rest of the provisions. These provisions provide that there has to be an assessment of the rules of disclosure or non-disclosure; the information to be disclosed must be proportionate to the disclosure; the

information disclosed must be reliable and accurate; and details of the disclosure must be documented. In other words, if someone obtains this information from the register and uses it in some way, they are going to have to keep a record of the fact that a certain person on a certain date accessed the information of a particular person on the register and supplied it, for whatever purpose, to another person or organisation.

The bill sets out two different categories in which people can get access to the information. Essentially, it is either without the authorisation in writing of the Commissioner, or with the written authorisation of the Commissioner. In the case of disclosure of information without authorisation, that can occur, firstly, if the offender consents; secondly, if the disclosure is required by order of a court or tribunal; thirdly, if the disclosure is made to a supervising authority in connection with the supervision of a registrable offender—so, I assume that would include the Department of Corrections, possibly the Youth Court (if they were supervising a young person), or someone who has authority to formally supervise an offender who is registered. The fourth is if the disclosure is made to a law enforcement or prosecution authority of this state, or of a foreign jurisdiction, and is reasonably required for the purpose of investigating a suspected registrable offence.

Although it is not specifically spelt out in the act, I suspect that, if a person who is going to access this information without a specific written authority on the basis that it comes within the category of that which may be accessed without specific authorisation, given that they have to keep a record of the disclosure and document it, that record will involve identifying the law enforcement or prosecution authority of this state or another jurisdiction to which the information is to be supplied, what the suspected registrable offence is, what the nature of the information is, and why it is reasonably required. However, I suspect that we might deal with that more extensively during the committee stage of this bill.

The fifth basis upon which it can be accessed without authorisation is if the disclosure is to a legal practitioner for the purpose of obtaining legal advice or representation relating to a matter under this bill. It does not spell it out again in the bill, but I suspect that the intention is that it must be the legal practitioner representing a person who is actually the registered person. I will ask more questions about that in committee, but I assume that is the intention.

The sixth circumstance for disclosure without authorisation is if disclosure is made to the Police Complaints Authority for the purposes of an investigation under either this bill or the Police Complaints Authority legislation. Disclosure can also take place if the disclosure is required under any other act or law. So, if another act actually specifies that the information can be accessed, then it will be able to be accessed without further authorisation under that act or law. The final circumstance where information may be disclosed without authorisation is if the disclosure is prescribed by regulation. I suggest to the Attorney that we would look pretty closely at any regulations promulgated under that section to ensure that this will not allow inappropriate access to the information without authorisation.

Under the category of where information may be disclosed with authorisation, four circumstances are provided, as follows: first, if disclosure is made to a person exercising official duties under an act relating to the care or protection of children; secondly, if disclosure is made to a government or non-government agency for the purpose of safeguarding the welfare of a registrable offender; thirdly, if the disclosure

relates to information already in the public domain; fourthly—as is provided for in the preceding clause—if it is of a type prescribed by regulation as needing authorisation. I was a little confused by the idea that information could be disclosed with authorisation only if it related to information already in the public domain. I will canvass this issue more fully with the Attorney during the committee stage of this bill.

There is no doubt, having looked through the provisions of the bill, that the government's intention is good. It seeks to put in place further mechanisms to protect children from people who are likely to commit, or attempt to commit, sexual offences against them. However, there is no certainty that requiring convicted offenders to register will have any effect on preventing the sexual abuse of children. For a start, we know that a large number of perpetrators are not convicted and never brought to justice. As a result, the largest number of perpetrators will not appear on this register.

It also needs to be borne in mind that there could be ways around the requirements which would still allow a registered person opportunities to gain access to children. As I read the bill as it stands, someone could, for instance, travel away from home—their home address would not change—quite regularly to somewhere else where they regularly manage to gain the confidence of a child or children with whom they come into regular contact. If they did this on a regular basis—having not changed their address or left the state for more than 14 days—they could develop a sufficient pattern to actually get around the terms of the legislation—if they wanted to do so.

The same applies, of course, to going interstate. If someone goes interstate for less than 14 days, there is no requirement to notify that. If they made regular trips interstate for periods of up to 14 days—which is a fairly long time—then I think there would still be an opportunity for a determined predator to develop contacts and relationships which could place children in jeopardy.

As I see it, the major difficulty with this legislation is the potential for the disclosure of information which could give rise to vigilantism. Whilst I appreciate that the government is trying to put in place everything it can to make sure that people recognise that it would be a very serious offence to disclose information inappropriately, nevertheless, it seems to me to be broad enough so that there is the potential for that information to get out.

If we look at the circumstances in which authorisation is not needed (and information can be disclosed without authorisation), it could go to a legal practitioner. Legal practitioners are subject to all sorts of restrictions, but even then the bill is not clear about what restrictions might be placed on anyone receiving that information. If we look at the circumstances where information can be disclosed with authorisation, it can be made to a government or non-government agency for the purpose of safeguarding the welfare of a registrable offender.

If that information gets out—whether it be to a member of the police force, a member of a child welfare agency or whoever—my suspicion is that there is simply a risk that, if you know that a registrable offender, who has been convicted of a class 1 offence of, let us say, the kidnap and murder after rape of a child, having been released from prison had moved in next door to your sister and her kids, you may be a bit concerned about that and may just let it be known. There is every reason to think that that sort of human reaction could occur, and it worries me.

I am not trying to suggest that we need to protect offenders; we need to be more careful to protect victims and potential victims. However, we need to be aware that, once it is known that someone has a history of having committed a sexual offence, there is a real risk of vigilantism in communities. If people know that someone with a sexual predatory history against children moves into their neighbourhood—I have seen it on television news—they do all sorts of things. In a way, that is understandable.

On the one hand, we say that, if someone has committed a crime and done the time, they have a clean slate, but in the case of sexual offenders it is not as simple as that, because largely these people somehow have embedded into their psyche something which is simply unacceptable to us, and there is no guarantee that, having done the time for their crime, they will do anything other than go out and try to commit the same sort of crime again.

**Mrs Geraghty:** Sometimes they get it wrong.

**Mrs REDMOND:** As the member for Torrens says, sometimes they get it wrong and an innocent party can be targeted by such a group. There is another potential problem—which touches upon what the member for Torrens said about getting it wrong—because sometimes people are technically guilty of what would be classified as an offence of paedophilia, where in reality on any reasonable definition you would not call them a paedophile. I am talking of circumstances where, for instance, a young male over the age of consent has a sexual relationship with a young female below the age of consent.

By virtue of that barrier, if they engage in a consensual sexual relationship, technically he becomes a paedophile. As I understand the legislation, there is no protection for that person, other than the fact that they can, if they are listed as a discretionary offender, apply for the removal of their name, but there is no way of avoiding being put on the list in the first place. I have come across that circumstance. In fact, in the past year or so it was put to me by a mother that her child was living with its father, who was a convicted paedophile. I thought that it was odd that a court would award custody to the father if he was a convicted paedophile. When I checked it out, it transpired that the father was in his fifties and, some 40-odd years ago, he was a young man in a consenting sexual relationship with an even younger woman, but she was below the age of consent. So, in having sexual relations with her—notwithstanding that they felt that they were in love, and all the usual things that young people will use to justify it—technically it was a conviction for a paedophile offence.

I also came across a circumstance where a young man was convicted of an offence which classifies him as a paedophile, when he was invited by the mother of a 12 or 13 year old girl to move into the home that the mother occupied with the daughter. The daughter was clearly below age, only 12 or 13, and the young man, although of adult age, had an intellectual capacity even less than the age of the daughter, so he was maybe 11 or 12 years of age intellectually and, basically, not the full quid, as we would say. He was encouraged into a relationship with this girl by the mother of the girl, who invited him to live in the home and, yet, by engaging in that relationship, he is classified as a paedophile.

I think we need to be pretty clear about this and try to draw that distinction because, clearly, these are not people by force of some intrinsic thing in their psyche who want to have a sexual relationship with children; they are simply young people in a consensual sexual relationship with the person that they are involved with. I think we need to try to prevent

them having to face this. Over the break, I will have a think about whether there is a way to amend the legislation to deal with that, because I am sure that it is not the government's intention to capture those people.

My advice from the government's advisers is that, indeed, they are caught, and we do not really want to penalise those people who have probably already been penalised enough merely by force of the fact that they have had that sort of a case made out against them. I do not think that there is going to be a simple answer to that, by the way. I think that it is quite complicated, but we do need to address it and come to a reasonable landing because we do not want to punish people unnecessarily.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** As the member for Torrens indicates, we also need to be very careful. I am a mother, and happily my children are now adults, but I know that, if a sexual predator had moved in next door, that would have worried me far more than just about anything else that could happen. I always try to judge things when people are talking about this NIMBY mentality—not in my backyard. Would I want disability accommodation next door to me? Yes, I would be quite happy to have that next door to me. Would I want this sort of thing next door to me or that sort of thing next door to me? Yes, I would be comfortable about that. However, if I had very young children and a sexual predator moving in next door, I would have to say that I might be a bit cautious about saying yes to that one.

I think that we need to be very careful and try to find the right balance between protecting people from the potential because, clearly, some of these people are predators. On the other hand, we need to make sure that we protect their rights as well because, at the end of the day, if they have done the time and, theoretically, if they have been rehabilitated, maybe they should be left alone. I have seen occasions where people have ended up living virtually like hermits and recluses because they simply cannot go out as a result of the nature of their offending, notwithstanding that it might have been a long time ago.

I recognise that the government says that, even if you are on the register for life, you can apply after 15 years to get off, so that is a good thing. If you have not committed any more offences in 15 years, that might be a good indicator. I am not entirely persuaded that this will have any effect in terms of lessening the behaviour of paedophiles, most of whom are not caught and convicted, let alone registered. However, it certainly will not hurt the situation, and it will probably do a little to help the situation in terms of making it harder for them to simply move about, change their name, change their appearance and engage in their predatory behaviour.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** As the member for Torrens says, it puts them on notice. They do know that they are being watched, potentially for even failing to notify appropriately of changes that they make in their circumstances. They could be found guilty of an offence and imprisoned for a further two years. Of course, the bill does make allowances for someone who has a disability or who lives remotely, so that appropriate arrangements are made for them to notify changes without the necessity to come in and do so in person, and so on.

In general, as far as we have been able, we can indicate support for the bill but, in the absence of our upper house colleagues, we cannot finalise our position on this bill and there will be a number of things that we may wish to explore

and pursue in the committee stage. For the time being, I indicate the opposition's support for the government's bill.

**Mrs GERAGHTY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the house do now adjourn.

#### WINERIES SALE

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I appreciate this opportunity to speak this afternoon, as I am probably raising one of the more important issues that I have in this house.

*The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** If the honourable member would listen, he would find out. I was shocked to hear at 12.45 this afternoon through a phone call from Foster's the intention of the Foster's Group to sell two major wine facilities here in South Australia, more particularly, in my electorate in the Barossa Valley. They will put up for sale the heart of the wine industry here in South Australia, that is, the Seppeltsfield Winery, and not just the winery but also the vineyard and the fortified wine label with it. I am shocked, to say the least, because this is without a doubt the heart of the historic Barossa Valley. Also, they will sell three quarters of the Penfold's Nuriootpa wine site, the area mainly used for white wine making, and also the packaging. They will also sell wineries in the upper Hunter Valley, the Rosemount Denman winery, and also a winery in France.

The sale of the Seppeltsfield historic area and the fortified label is tantamount to selling off the heart of the Barossa. I am not saying that Penfold's or Foster's cannot do this, because they have to make business decisions, but I hope that it will be purchased by a group or groups of people who will appreciate what a significant area this is. I would love the Seppelt family to buy it back. The question also is: will the fortified wine stocks be sold? Some of it is 100-year old ports, and I have sampled some of them, which are absolutely magnificent. We have some magnificent muscats and sherries, and I name one, the DP38 that I have in my office. It is absolutely magnificent; not that I am a great fortified wine drinker, but these are absolutely magnificent wine stocks and I hope that they will be retained as part of our museum wine stocks.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Are you offering us a snort?

**Mr VENNING:** I am offering the member a taste, if he wishes. It is quite serious that we see this happening. Is this a victim of the difficult position our industry is in? Obviously it is, because they have all had to rationalise everything they do. And I am sorry, but I am critical of the federal government. People in my electorate, including Mr Leo Pech, have been telling me for some years that the federal government needed to drop section 75AA of the taxation rulings, in other words, encouraging people to plant vineyards. We could see three or four years ago that we would have trouble with oversupply.

To his credit, Mr Pech, like a voice in the wilderness, had been saying that for seven or eight years. The federal government did not move until last September to stop it, but people right now are still planting vines as a result of the rule that was signed off some time ago. I am quite critical of the federal government's inaction. It should have been listening

to the grape growers and not just the wineries. It should have been listening to both groups many years ago. That really does give me a lot of grief. I try to put a positive spin on most things I do and say in this place.

I can understand why the Fosters Group is doing this. It has rationalised its huge operation—Berringer Blass—at Nuriootpa. It built a huge facility and it is divesting itself of some of its lesser operations. When you see a picture of the Barossa Valley, what do you see? You see those palm trees and you see the Seppelt's mausoleum.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Pat Conlon got married up there.

**Mr VENNING:** The minister got married there; that is right. The most magnificent museum stocks of wine in Australia are kept there. I hope like mad that someone will buy this facility. I am happy to be a partner if anyone wants to look into this. I am happy to be a partner to preserve it for the sake of all South Australians, because it is probably the mecca of all our international tourism. Yesterday I noted that a very good working mate of mine, the CEO of the Barossa council, Mrs Judith Jones, retired this week after many years service.

**Mr Piccolo:** After 38 years.

**Mr VENNING:** The ex-mayor of Gawler, the member for Light, tells me 38 years. Thank you very much. I have had good dealings with Mrs Jones for many years. I became the member for the Barossa in 1993 and, at that time, she was the CEO of the Angaston council. Since then, of course, a lot has changed. We have been through a huge period of prosperity. We had the amalgamation of councils, and she then became the CEO of the greater Barossa council. Most women would be proud of such a role model. She can tough it out with the best of men. She had a strong point of view, she knew her stuff and she was not afraid to tell me or anyone else if we got it wrong.

I often sought her advice and she never gave me wrong or bad advice. As the member for Light would know, you did not mix it with her because she usually knew her stuff better than you did. It is sad that she has retired, but she has a life to live. I pay great credit to her not only for her service to the Barossa but also for her service to local government in South Australia. She is a prominent person. I say that, as a woman in power, she is a credit to all women, considering that she started off as the dog and cat lady in council and finished up as CEO. Let it be a lesson to everyone: with good work and honest dealings you can certainly make it. I wish her all the best in her retirement.

I was also concerned to learn via a press release this week (either from the minister or the South Australian Farmers Federation's grain section) that the minister is setting up a barley marketing advisory committee to replace the single desk of the Australian Barley Board (ABB) with something else, whether that be a grain licensing authority (GLA), or whatever. I have heard many speeches in this house, particularly from the member for Enfield, of a recent poll of growers which established that 82 per cent of growers were in favour of maintaining the Australian Barley Board's single desk. Why then are we setting up a committee to destroy this? If it is not broke, why fix it?

Yes, I am the first to agree that, since it got its company status and went private, the ABB, because it is a monopoly trader, had to have in place an umpire to make sure that all its dealings were commercial. I would be happy to see an independent auditor, umpire, call it what you like, put in place. I am opposed to the setting up of a GLA similar to that

which exists in Western Australia. All I know is that we have had a very good system, because our ABB takes everyone's barley.

By statute, it must take everyone's barley and it does—whether it be Ceduna, Bordertown, or wherever, if you had barley for sale they took it. They gave you an outlet and they paid for it. All I can say is that, if we put the ABB through full privatisation, that will go. They will not be taking some of this stuff; they will take only as much as a trader takes and cherry-pick the market. They will pick the best of the barley and put it in the plum markets. Where will that leave the rest of us? This single desk has served us very well for a long time.

Again, I draw the attention of the house to my conflict: I am a barley grower and my brother happens to be deputy chairman of the company. However, that does not matter; I still represent barley growers, and I am one. I can remember, from my younger days, how our fathers were very concerned about destroying our single desk, because back in the old days you became prize-takers. Individually, we farmers are not great businessmen, but under a single desk operation everyone is protected.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** When did you become a socialist, Ivan?

**Mr VENNING:** The Attorney says that I am an agrarian socialist—yes I am, if that helps everyone, because the system has worked well. The big target is not the ABB; it is the Australian Wheat Board. It also has a single desk, and that is the big target. I am concerned that this committee has been set up, and I will be interested to see what happens. I only hope that there is no skulduggery going on behind the scenes—and I do hint that there might be—between the SAFF head office and the minister's office. I am fairly sure that we should give this matter a bit of scrutiny and see whether a double deal is being done here, because I know that the SAFF people want to raise an industry commodity levy and the minister also wants this measure through the house. I do not know whether they have done a deal on this but no doubt we will find out. I am very concerned, because this is a serious matter. I appreciate the input of the member for Enfield and others over many years, and I hope that we will see something sensible come out of it and don't destroy a positive we have.

### HAWKER SCHOOL BUS

**Ms BREUER (Giles):** I rise today to put the picture straight on the Hawker school bus service and rebut some of the sentimental comments made by the member for Stuart in the past week or two. I am not putting the member for Stuart down, because he is certainly very passionate about this issue; I remember being very passionate about the same issue over a number of years when his party was in government.

It is a fact of life that small communities do lose their school buses and it is very sad for those communities, but many of the comments that are being made about this particular bus service are, I think, unfair. It sounds very much as if this harsh government is turning its back on the Hawker community, and I do not believe that that is the case. I have followed the arguments very carefully and have been involved in a number of discussions with the minister and her office, and I have kept track of what has been happening in this process.

A review of the Cradock to Hawker area school bus service was undertaken in term 4 in 2005, and this review

revealed that the bus was transporting a total of seven eligible students to the Hawker Area School. This number of students does not justify the continuation of the service so the principal, the governing council and the parents were advised by the transport services unit of the department that alternative transport arrangements should be considered by the school and that they should commence from term 2 in 2006. This was not the first time this bus service was reviewed; it was previously reviewed in 2003 because of the low number of eligible students. At that time the then minister, the Hon. Trish White, approved that the bus was to continue through to the end of 2004; however, the bus continued to operate throughout 2005 as the then principal of the school indicated that it was likely that they would get additional students moving into the area. Unfortunately, that did not eventuate.

During the process of these school bus reviews the number of eligible students has actually further declined, and the policy criteria cannot be met. If this is the case, DECS implements changes to bus routes, and that may include the withdrawal of school bus services. In terms of policy, a school bus service may be established or continue where at least 10 school-aged students reside some 5 kilometres or more—by the shortest, most practical route—from the nearest government school or school bus service provided by DECS, and the majority live beyond 8 kilometres. A review officer visited the school in late 2005 to discuss the issue, and the school requested that the bus be maintained until the end of term 1 this year so the governing council could have time to consider the alternative transport options to cater for the remaining students.

I have listened to the comments that have been made, and it sounds very much like these students will be left by the side of the road when the bus stops. That is not the case. The department never does that. It always makes sure there are suitable arrangements to cover the students' transport. One of the alternatives being considered is the reassignment of travel allowances to the governing council, so that the governing council can hire and operate a Fleet SA vehicle to provide transportation to the eligible students in the Hawker district. The governing council has written to the transport services unit requesting the bus remain at the Hawker school until the end of 2006. This matter will be, or has been, discussed with the governing council and recommendations will be, or have been, made.

Parents and the school community have been aware of this issue for many years. It was previously proposed to withdraw the bus at the end of 2005. As I said, the principal requested that it remain. Some people thought that more students and families would come into the area, but, unfortunately, this did not happen. One of the problems is that, if an area has fewer than 10 students and we allow the bus to remain in the area, it sets a precedent for other schools across the state to retain their buses. This has always been the case whenever school buses have closed in the past.

Despite the sentiment of this matter, I do not believe it is possible for this bus to remain. I feel sad about it, but it is not possible. I believe that the alternatives which are being considered are very good alternatives. If the school were to hire a bus from Fleet SA it would be able to use the bus for transportation of its students on excursions, trips down south, if necessary, sporting carnivals, and so on. A community vehicle is driven by volunteer drivers. Very often that is a parent, or sometimes a school teacher will volunteer to drive the bus—and I believe that happened in the Mintabie-Marla

area when they lost their bus service. Other schools pay a driver. Some schools have used SSOs, who are already being paid by DECS, and some use other employees. That has happened at other schools. Currently, Salt Creek Primary School and Brown's Well District School are leasing vehicles from Fleet SA—and it is working very well.

I said that the member for Stuart's comments have been poignant and forceful at times, but this is not a new issue. I have to point out that between 1994 and 2002—in the time of the Liberal government—110 buses were deleted from school services. The department's policy has been in existence for many years and it does make sense. If every small community in the state got a school bus or got their bus service restored, it would be money that would not be going into education in the schools and it would be a very expensive exercise. I think the policy is quite fair. I also point out that, in the time of this government, six new bus route services have been established in country areas. We are not just taking away buses: we are establishing bus routes where there is a need.

The school community has been offered two choices. It can get a travel allowance for families to cover the cost of operating the average family car over the distance from home to school or the nearest school bus. There is some question about the amount of money that is paid per kilometre, and I believe the minister and the department are looking at that issue, because we all know about the increases in costs.

There is a possibility that, down the track, the amount paid per kilometre will be increased. That option is available if parents want to take it up and they will be paid to take their children backwards and forwards to school. The other alternative is to pool the travel allowance of these families, which would enable the school to hire the vehicle and the

driver. Certainly, I think that this is a good and very satisfactory arrangement, and I would urge the Hawker community to accept this arrangement because it will be able to use the vehicle for so many other excursions, etc. Currently, the school bus policy provides a consistent and very fair process and manages more than 500 school buses throughout the state, plus assisting families in those communities where a bus service is not available. Six new bus services were created in the regional areas this year where student numbers have increased.

The department does not withdraw bus services suddenly or without consultation. This has been an ongoing process for some three years now. Every effort has been made to work through issues with the school council and the community to ensure that individual circumstances are taken into account. While it is sad that the Hawker community will lose its bus, I urge it to look at the alternative. I think that, if in the future its numbers were to increase, then certainly the bus service would be restored. I have certainly kept a close eye on this matter. I will be talking to the community, and I hope that they will accept what has been offered. I hope that perhaps, in the future, their numbers will increase.

I congratulate the Hawker school. It is an excellent little school. They have mounted a very strong campaign on this issue—far more so than most school communities are able. I congratulate them on doing that and on using the individuals whom they have chosen to push their cause. I conclude by wishing everyone a good break from this place. Contrary to media opinion and opinion in the community, I know that we will not be going on holiday and that we will all be working very hard. I look forward to returning at the end of August.

Motion carried.

At 4.42 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 29 August at 2 p.m.