

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 19 September 2006

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

**ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA
YANKUNYTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS
(REGULATED SUBSTANCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

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

**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.

CHILD SEX ABUSE

A petition signed by 743 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to introduce a separate, specialist court for child sex abuse cases that will expedite cases quickly and efficiently, employ experts in child abuse and development and use inquisitorial rather than adversarial methods, was presented by the Hon. I.F. Evans.

Petition received.
nil turn

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Adelaide Festival Corporation—Report 2005-06

By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Economic and Finance Committee, Fifty-ninth Report on the Emergency Services Levy for the 2006-07 financial year—Government Response
Regulations under the following Act—
Superannuation—Contributors

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Adelaide—Coober Pedy Scheduled Airline Route, Award of Extension of Route Service Licence
Development Act—Light Regional Council—Heritage Plan Amendment Report
Regulations under the following Act—
Road Traffic—Prescribed Drug

By the Attorney-General (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Criminal Law Consolidation—Vehicle Harm
Rules of Court—
District Court—Sheriff's Duties
Magistrates Court—Sheriff's Duties
Supreme Court—Sheriff's Duties

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Act 2002—Quarterly Report—1 April 2006 to 30 June 2006
Regulations under the following Acts—
Occupational Therapy Practice—General
Pastoral Land Management and Conservation—
General
Pharmacists—General
Physiotherapy Practice—General

Podiatry Practice—General
Public and Environmental Health—Public Swimming Pools
South Australian Health Commission—Cancer Reporting

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Daylight Saving—Daylight Saving Hours

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. R.J. McEwen)—

Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia—
Report 2005-06
Regulations under the following Act—
Primary Industry Funding Schemes—Grain Growers
Rail Fund

By the Minister for State/Local Government Relations (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Boundary Adjustment Facilitation Panel—Report 2005-06
Regulations under the following Act—
Local Government—Members' Allowances

By the Minister for Consumer Affairs (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Liquor Licensing—Victor Harbor Dry Areas.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As I have advised the house previously, in May this year cabinet agreed to the Department of Treasury and Finance undertaking some preliminary work to assess the options for implementing a cap on public servant numbers. The Under Treasurer subsequently wrote to all chief executive officers requesting information on current approved full-time equivalent (FTE) staffing levels. I can inform the house today that yesterday cabinet agreed to implement a cap on public servant numbers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will repeat that because members opposite seem to be hard of hearing: I can inform the house that yesterday cabinet agreed to implement a cap on public servant numbers. This is a further improvement in the government's financial management of the state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The cap will be set with reference to the employee data recently collected by the Department of Treasury and Finance. The Department of Treasury and Finance will liaise with each agency to ensure that the initial cap set for each agency takes full account of their individual circumstances. For the first time in decades an accurate, reliable estimate of public servant numbers will be available.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: First time ever actually! The cap can be adjusted in line with the approved and funded level of full-time equivalent numbers within an agency. For example, should a new program be approved by cabinet that includes funding for additional full-time equivalents, the cap for that agency will be increased; or should cabinet decide to cut back on a program that includes funding for full-time

equivalents, then the cap for that agency will be adjusted downwards.

On Thursday, as part of the state budget I will be announcing the full-time equivalent numbers of public servants from the recent employee census across the state government. Today I give a commitment that, based on this data and the employment effects of the budget to be delivered on Thursday, the number of public servants employed by government is projected to be larger as at 30 June 2010 than at 30 June 2006, that is, for the period of the second term of the Rann Labor Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This is entirely consistent with the Premier's commitment to the Public Service Association made during the recent state election campaign. The government has previously advised the PSA that there will be no forced redundancies and that government reserves the right to have some movement of jobs to areas of high priority, in line with community needs and expectations. This will occur in an orderly fashion with long-established guidelines and will involve meaningful consultations with unions.

DROUGHT RESPONSE

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: Mr Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention the adverse seasonal conditions facing the state. I wish to advise the house of the significant adverse seasonal conditions being experienced across the state and the government's first stage response. In the agricultural areas of the state, rainfall in the critical winter period has generally been either very much below average or the lowest on record. This record-breaking dry has been accompanied by warmer than average maximum temperatures and colder than average minimum temperatures, including an abnormal number of frosts. These severe seasonal conditions have seen estimates of the statewide grain yield reduced by 55 per cent of the rolling five-year average and this is falling further with every rain-free day.

Significant destocking is occurring in many areas of the state as available feed diminishes and farmers seek to preserve the cover required to maintain the condition of their land. At times like these, it is also important to remember that it is not just farmers who suffer during times of drought, as the flow-on impacts reverberate throughout the whole community and are particularly harsh on small rural businesses that have limited ability to absorb these impacts.

The government is taking this emerging situation very seriously and has established a special Drought Committee of Cabinet to consider the advice that will be provided by the recently announced high level Drought Task Force and to ensure that all relevant government programs are aligned. In addition, as Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, I have been given the lead responsibility for the coordination of all matters relating to drought. As announced last week, the government will also be establishing a Drought Information Hotline and supporting drought information workshops in key areas of need.

While there is no doubt that this will be a time of particular hardship for many individuals and families, past experience has shown that times of adversity have helped to bring

communities closer together, created new opportunities and assisted in the development of more resilient rural businesses. Outcomes such as these will have significant long-term benefits for the state and, as a result, it is important that we continue to reinforce our positive belief in the future of South Australia's primary industries and rural communities.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Public Service blow out by over 6 000 extra people over budget during the first term of his government at a cost of over \$400 million per year to the taxpayer? Government figures show that between June 2002 and June 2004 the government budgeted for increased employment of some 666 public servants but employed some 6 909 public servants, an extra 6 200, at a cost of somewhat over \$400 million each and every year.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Very, very slow is our opposition in readjusting its questions for question time today. I have just given a ministerial statement to make very clear what our policy is going forward. What absolute nonsense to suggest that we have wasted \$400 million. I addressed this issue during the election campaign when the shadow treasurer, who sits in another house—members opposite do not even have the courage to put a treasurer in this place to come up against the government; he has to hide in the upper house. I took on Mr Lucas on this one and gave a very detailed answer; that is, that we do not accept those numbers, but we do not walk away from the fact that managing the numbers in the public sector has not been as good as it should have been.

We can do better and we will do better. One thing about government is that it is a work in progress. I am happy to stand here and say that we do not get it right all the time. I am happy to say here that there are times when we have to improve on what we do. However, I and this government have a record of four balanced budgets against your lot, which had four deficit budgets.

HOSPITALS, WINTER DEMAND

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Health.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Now that winter is over, what has been the effect of the cold weather on demands at Adelaide's public hospitals and how has it been managed?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for West Torrens for that very perceptive and intelligent question. In May this year, I announced South Australia's first statewide winter demand strategy. 2006 has been a very busy year for emergency departments in the metropolitan area, particularly over this winter period. While the reported cases of influenza have so far been lower than in 2005—and I hope that part of the reason for that is that we have been very good at getting people inoculated—there has been a big increase in the incidence of respiratory and viral illnesses.

The number of emergency department attendances grew by 4 per cent this last winter compared to the previous year, and there have been particularly large increases at Flinders,

Lyell McEwin and the Women's and Children's Hospital. The number of hospital separations increased to 97 431, over 5 500 more than for the same period last year. The South Australian Ambulance Service also had a very busy winter, transporting an average of 300 patients a day to metropolitan emergency departments. Over the last day of winter and the first day of spring the ambulance service broke all records, transporting 720 patients in 48 hours. From May to August there were 18 occasions when public hospital emergency departments had to go into diversion; however, these were brief and isolated occurrences and contrasted to the 23 occasions of the previous year. So, there was more pressure but they managed it better.

To cope with the demand the government opened up extra beds and employed more staff. Up to 150 beds were available, and, on average, about 100 of these winter beds were open every day—the highest number was on 17 August when 130 beds were open. There was also a significant increase in the number of nurses—as I have told the house before, there were 487 more nurses in the health system than there were last year, with an increase of 386 in metropolitan hospitals alone compared to the previous winter. There were new nurses recruited to the system, increases in contracted hours, casual agency work and overtime.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend the government's gratitude to the doctors, nurses, practitioners and support staff of the South Australian health system for their tireless work during winter 2006. In particular, I would like to thank those who work in the emergency departments who have to deal with very difficult conditions on a daily basis. The strategy was a great sign of how public hospitals, private providers, ambulance services and primary health care services (such as GPs and the RDNS) can work together to deliver important services to our community.

The planning for winter 2007 is already under way so that outcomes for patients can continue to improve next year, as our hospitals continue to get busier.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Premier. What processes did the Premier put in place prior to the election to control the growth of the Public Service and to keep it within its budget during the first term, and, in the Premier's opinion, why did those processes not work?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Excuse me, sir! We actually balanced our budgets, we actually delivered budget surpluses, we cut \$1.5 billion out of government spending in the first two budgets. We have a proud record of being the political party, the government, that regained the AAA credit rating in this state. We are recognised by Standard and Poor's, by Moody's, by investment banks and national banks, and by international financiers as an exceptionally competent and very good financial manager of this state. Be it Wall Street or London, be it Pitt Street in Sydney or Collins Street in Melbourne, this Labor government is highly regarded and is credited with giving this state the AAA credit rating. A sad and sorry opposition cannot speak with any credibility when it comes to financial management.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: I rise on a point of order, and that is on relevance of the answer to the question asked.

The SPEAKER: I think it was relevant but at the end the Deputy Premier was debating.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier did stray into debate at the end.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Can the Premier inform the house on the government's progress in extending renewable energy use in South Australia?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am delighted to answer this question. I am sure that members opposite will be aware that the world wind power conference is being staged in Adelaide this week; it opened this morning. The conference has previously been held in Chicago—and I understand that the Minister for Energy made a keynote address in 2004—and in Paris, so we are delighted to welcome the international and national delegates to the Global Wind Power 2006 Conference being held at the Adelaide Convention Centre today. I am told that the conference will be attended by more than 500 delegates, with half being international visitors from corporations, governments and environmental organisations. Just a few hours ago, in fact, I had a meeting with the minister from India and I understand that there are ministers from other states and nations attending. The conference will explore issues such as national and global policies and programs, Australia's place in the international market, carbon trading and climate change.

South Australia is the perfect place in Australia to be talking about the future of wind energy in 2006. With just 7.5 per cent of Australia's population, South Australia is home to 51 per cent of our nation's installed wind power capacity. In other words, we have more wind power in South Australia than all the other states and territories combined. South Australia has 388 megawatts of installed capacity, and another 250 megawatts will be constructed over the coming 18 months. We have a positive regulatory environment for prospective wind farm operators, and I congratulate the Minister for Energy on his leadership in this area.

Under this government, South Australia has gone from having, from memory, no wind farms at all to occupying clear national leadership. South Australia has a broader approach to renewable energy. Our state is home to 45 per cent of Australia's grid connected solar power, but obviously we have been leading by example by putting solar panels on our major cultural institutions on North Terrace, the South Australian Museum, the Art Gallery, the State Library and Parliament House. We are also installing solar panels progressively on 250 schools across the state and we have also reached agreement to allocate \$1 million for the solar powering of the new Adelaide Airport terminal. If members opposite do not believe us on what we are doing, then they should go down to the World Wind Power Conference being held in Adelaide. Why do you think it is being held here? Listen to Al Gore or listen to David Suzuki about who is leading and who is not.

The other important renewable energy this government is supporting is geothermal or hot rock energy. More than 65 exploration licences have now been applied for or issued in South Australia, with tens of millions of dollars being spent on drilling and trials for hot rock technology. Today, on a smaller scale, the state government, in partnership with the Adelaide City Council, is trialling mini wind turbines on major buildings in Adelaide over the coming year. It is the first trial of these two-metre turbines outside of the UK. It is

designed to capture energy from the wind tunnel effect created by city buildings. One has been installed already on the State Administration Centre and another on Wakefield House. Later this week, a turbine will be installed on the roof of the Adelaide College of TAFE in Light Square. The remaining two of the first tranche will be located in the Adelaide Central Market precinct on Grote Street, and on the new boatshed complex at Mawson Lakes. So, there will be 25 of these wind turbines installed in South Australia.

While South Australia may lead on the renewable energy front, I have to say that Australia, as a nation, is still lagging behind when it comes to climate change. While the federal government continues to bury its head in the sand on climate change, with its refusal to ratify the Kyoto protocol, states and territories are acting. For example, I went to Sydney to join with New South Wales Premier Morris Iemma, and Victorian Deputy Premier John Thwaites, to release a discussion paper on the establishment of a national emissions trading scheme.

Put very simply, the national emissions trading scheme will put a cap on the amount of carbon released into the atmosphere. The proposed model will require companies and businesses to have permits to cover their emissions, and there will be a penalty for any shortfall in permits. Companies will also be able to trade permits. Emissions trading schemes are already operating in the European Union and in regions of the United States; the north-east and the north-west are two that I am aware of.

Importantly, for the renewable energy industry, South Australia has taken the lead in the country by developing ground-breaking legislation which sets out a clear and ambitious goal of reducing this state's 1990 emissions levels by 60 per cent by 2050. I understand that members opposite support this. The legislation will also require South Australia to derive 20 per cent of its energy from renewable sources by the end of 2014. I do not know of any other jurisdiction in the world that has established such a target, and I want to introduce the legislation before the end of the year.

As a nation we need to do more. The federal government needs to adopt South Australia's greenhouse target to cut emissions by 60 per cent by 2050. In addition, Australia needs a renewable energy target of 10 per cent of Australia's total electricity, and an extension of the mandatory renewable energy target known as MRET. South Australia continues to be a leader in renewable energy development and we hope that the Howard government will join the states and territories in what has to be a collective national effort to tackle climate change.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. What has been the reduction in the Public Service numbers since the election? In the Treasurer's ministerial statement today he said that Treasury has recently collated employment data for the Public Service.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): What I said, sir, is that we would be releasing those details on Thursday in the budget.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: But, sir, I've got to tell you, what a mob opposite. What was their key election promise? Sacking 4 000 public servants. Out the door in one year. The only way you could do it was to sack them. And they walk in here as some sort of protector of the worker. I mean, this

opposition—which way is the wind blowing? We'll go this way today, we'll go that way tomorrow. Mr Speaker, this is a discredited opposition, a failure as a government, a failure as an opposition. And I've got to say, Mr Speaker, I'm pretty pumped up about our budget on Thursday, I'm pretty happy about our budget on Thursday, because what it will demonstrate is that, yet again, this government delivers good financial management, yet again this government delivers more essential services, and yet again this government has the interests of South Australia first and foremost in what we do, unlike a whingeing, whining, discredited opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SCHOOLS, CAREER EDUCATION

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. How are schools improving the career prospects and opportunities of young people?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Taylor for her question. This government has, of course, given the highest priority to making sure that young people are involved in serious pathways so that they are employed in schoolwork or training, and we have worked hard with a \$28.4 million investment to make sure that there is not just school retention but also youth engagement strategies throughout our school system. One of the good examples of these achievements, Mr Speaker, is actually in your electorate, in the seat of Playford, where we recently visited Para Hills High School and celebrated the opening of a new science area with special education facilities and also a dramatically improved home economics centre. This investment has significantly enhanced the opportunities for students through investment both from state and federal governments.

This new facility has made sure that young people have access to skills and job opportunities, and the school has already developed an extraordinary track record in helping young people move from school into work or further training. A career education in this school has made sure that SACE accredited courses occur with industrial certification, and last year 138 young students—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: —did a full industry certificate course, across 14 industries. Indeed, last year, with those year 11 and year 12 students who left school, this has resulted in 97 per cent of them being involved in schoolwork or training in some form, with only 3 per cent still seeking employment. That means that the rest have gone into TAFE's apprenticeship courses, or are involved in further education at university. The improved home economics and science areas will further add opportunities to young people's lives and will encourage them to go into skills areas where there are serious job opportunities. This is particularly good for young people, but is also good for the region, and in the northern area particularly.

I am very pleased to see these opportunities opening up for young people where previously there were limited job opportunities, and now there are massive opportunities for those young people who have skills. I particularly enjoyed visiting the school with the Speaker, of course, and we saw first-hand the great talent of those students with music

performances, as well as opportunities to see the product of their new home economics areas. I should take this opportunity to commend the students for their performances in the music area, and also thank the staff and students who made that visit particularly successful.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management. How many public servants accepted the government's offer of a separation package before 30 June 2006, and what was the total cost to government? On 24 May, the government announced that it had offered TVSPs to approximately 390 public servants who, according to the minister, 'do not have proper jobs that have been basically rattling around the Public Service, in many cases for a number of years'.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management): I thank the honourable member for her question. The answer is: 222 at a cost of \$20.94 million, with recurrent savings of about \$14.97 million.

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson): My question is to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson.

Members interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: I am enjoying this; this is good.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson.

Mr BIGNELL: My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What is the government doing to increase its commitment to providing more training opportunities for South Australians?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): The state government is committed to investing in our greatest asset—our people—in order to provide more job opportunities and meet South Australia's demand for skills. Our training system is robust and dynamic, and continues to punch above its weight by outperforming others in terms of national average growth rates for apprentices and trainees.

The most recent National Centre for Vocational Education and Research figures show that South Australia has achieved its highest number of apprentices and trainees on record, with 34 000 apprentices and trainees in training. The state government will fund at least 2 600 additional apprenticeships and trainees over the next four years. Of the 34 000 apprentices and trainees in training in South Australia, the government already subsidises approximately 24 000 places a year, including all apprentices in the state. The subsidies are substantial, with most of the cost of training being paid for by government.

Work force data indicates that employment growth over the next five to 10 years is forecast at around 0.2 per cent per annum, and with the retirement of the baby boomers, total job openings are estimated to be at 4.8 per cent per year. Strong employment growth is forecast in health and community services, agriculture, forestry and fishing, and property and business services. In addition, the major projects that the government has secured, particularly in defence, mining and infrastructure, will stimulate an estimated 6 000 extra direct and 17 000 indirect jobs over the next five to 10 years.

The additional places that I spoke about earlier will be in trades and occupations that align with the new growth sector areas of existing skills shortage and areas of regional need. I am very pleased to advise that at least 600 places will be made available for people who are disadvantaged in the labour market, including young people who are currently at risk of long-term unemployment. These training participants will be given initial training in pre-employment and pre-vocational programs, and then assisted with employment brokerage to be taken on as apprentices and trainees. Of the 600 targeted training places, at least half will be focused on the minerals industry in the Upper Spencer Gulf.

With more than \$400 million a year currently being invested in South Australia in skills and employment programs, last week the government released details of a \$98 million skills package based on a cohesive set of 24 initiatives aimed at enhancing the skills of our work force in priority industry areas. The record numbers of people undertaking apprenticeships and traineeships is an indication that some employers are recognising the higher value of training in meeting growing industry skills needs.

The government's commitment to further strengthening our training system is undoubted. I call on business, yet again, and industry, as well as the broader community, to fully commit to the challenge and to ensure that we lay the foundation for our state's prosperity for generations to come.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management. Given the number of targeted voluntary separation packages, that is, the 222 advised by the minister, that was accepted prior to 30 June 2006, was there a blow-out in the Public Service numbers over the budgeted increase of 469 full-time equivalents included in the 2005-06 budget papers?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I will take that question on notice and come back with an answer.

HOUSING LEGAL CLINIC

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Minister for Housing. How is the government giving voice to those people who are homeless and experiencing legal difficulties?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing): I am pleased to inform the house that Adelaide's homeless people now have access to a free legal service courtesy of some really fantastic volunteering efforts on behalf of a number of professionals in South Australia. The Housing Legal Clinic pilot project will be funded initially through the Department for Families and Communities with the support of the Welfare Rights Centre. This clinic will provide a fundamental service. It will provide individual advice and support on a pro bono basis to homeless people and people who are at risk of homelessness.

Many factors contribute to homelessness, but there is one very common factor, and that is that people who are homeless have very little access to power. In the words of one of the homeless people when we launched this project, they feel very small. Things change a lot when someone has a lawyer ringing up and advocating on their behalf. The attitude of service providers—people with whom they may be negotiating in relation to financial difficulties—entirely changes. It

is a wonderful thing that can be offered to people in these circumstances.

Often homelessness is a very hard thing to climb out of. The causes are all too familiar. I think there is probably an image in our mind about homelessness, of people who are in a very different strata of society, but they are often people like you or I who have just experienced a sad confluence of events that have conspired to place them into homelessness. The path out of homelessness often starts with someone standing up for these people. The Housing Legal Clinic, together with the Welfare Rights Centre, is crucial. One of the elements that makes it work is that they go into the places where the homeless are. It is an outreach model. It is not a case of just setting up at the Legal Services Commission and hoping that people will wander in: they visit places where homeless people gather. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the two law firms that are putting an effort into this service—Minter Ellison and Thomson Playford—and volunteering their time and energies to this critical element.

Since coming to office, the Rann government has allocated \$23 million over five years to social inclusion initiatives to reduce homelessness. This contribution is in addition to those funds. We believe that we are making very important headway on this most difficult and entrenched social policy issue.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. If the government had not allowed the Public Service to blow out by an extra 6 000 over and above the budget in its first term, would it now need to offer TVSPs or increase its borrowing?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Can I just say that there is something a bit odd about this. For the last three or four days, my memory is that members of the opposition have been going out every day warning of savage job cuts. Today, they are talking about public sector job increases and, therefore, blow-outs. So, apparently both are bad in the opposition's mind. However, they cannot quite decide which is which. Let me tell them this, however. I will make this pledge on this day.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mark my words, I make this pledge: no forced redundancies. And I make a second pledge: no more privatisations. And I make a third pledge: no tolls on our roads. And a fourth pledge: a budget in surplus—five in a row—with more surpluses to come, in contrast to the privatisations of the past under the Liberals, in contrast to the deficits of the past under the Liberals and, of course, in massive contrast to what they really had planned, which was forced redundancies and tolls on roads.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. What changes to the activity trends of South Australians have been reported in the most recent surveys, and how is the government's Be Active campaign contributing to these changes? Also, I ask the minister how he went in the City to Bay Fun Run, what his time was and whether he improved this year.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): It is very embarrassing: I slipped back a little this year; but I can say that our younger daughter did very well.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Not far; about 30 seconds. I went backwards, I have to admit. More importantly, the statewide physical activity survey is conducted at three yearly intervals to gauge rates of participation across our population. I am advised that the results from the third physical activity survey conducted in 2004 indicate that the proportion of people undertaking vigorous physical activity has increased from 34 per cent to 37 per cent. The analysis of these results also indicates a shift from moderate walking towards more vigorous activity—which is extremely encouraging considering the health benefits attributed to vigorous activity. The sport and recreation industry has collected and published population participation statistics annually since 2001 via the exercise, recreation and sport survey. The latest results from that survey are yet to be published, but initial data analysis indicates that more South Australian residents are participating in sport or recreation than in any previous survey. I am told that South Australia has overtaken Queensland and Tasmania with respect to participation, and we are well on the way to achieving the South Australian Strategic Plan target of exceeding the national average for participation in sport and recreation.

The Premier's Ministerial Physical Activity Forum, established by the government in February 2003, adopted the Be Active message. The Be Active message is now well recognised throughout the community. The Be Active initiative supports a range of other participation opportunities throughout the year, including such iconic events as last Sunday's *Sunday Mail/Advertiser* City to Bay Fun Run. The government continues to support this event and has provided more than \$45 000 in Be Active sponsorship since 2002. The six kilometre Half City to Bay Fun Run and the three kilometre event have been introduced to cater for a wider range of participants. I congratulate Joe Stevens, the race director, and Darrilyn Wood and the organising committee for their innovative approach of creating additional events to provide wider opportunities with these alternative distances. The City to Bay Fun Run's record participation of almost 20 000 entrants last year has been further eclipsed. Just over 23 500 people were reportedly involved in the weekend's event, including the Premier and the member for Morphett. We need more members of parliament to participate next year in order to spur us on to better times.

BUDGET DEFICIT

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer advise the house whether he or any member of his office received advice from Treasury immediately after the election that the cost of the government's election promises would put the budget into deficit?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): All will be revealed on Thursday. Will there be broken promises or will there not be broken promises? That is the \$64 question. All week members opposite have been running with this suggestion that we are going to cut Public Service numbers; that fewer public servants would be employed under this government in future years. I have said that, on the data we have before us, in 2009-10 (at the end of this four year term) there

should be more public servants working in this state than there are today.

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

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I'm enjoying this Vick; it's a good warm-up for Thursday.

Ms CHAPMAN: The question was in relation to whether or not the Treasurer, or members of his office, received advice immediately after the election—nothing to do with the number of public servants.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier does need to answer the substance of the question.

INTERPRETERS, RIVERLAND

Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley): My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Will the minister advise the house what the government is doing about the use of interpreters in the Riverland to enable migrant communities better access to services?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Minister for Multicultural Affairs): The Riverland is recognised by many as one of Australia's finest examples of a multicultural community. In and around Renmark, Loxton, Berri, Barmera, Waikerie, Glossop and other Riverland towns there are many established migrant communities from countries such as Greece, Italy, India (particularly the Punjab), Turkey, Germany, the Netherlands, Vietnam and Croatia. In more recent years, we have seen new arrivals in the Riverland from Middle Eastern and African countries. People in the Riverland know the importance of attracting new migrants, and last year they organised a conference called 'Prosperity Through People' to consider ways to increase the Riverland population—after all, the Riverland electorate is represented in a Labor government.

In 2005, the South Australian government provided a grant of \$25 000 to the Riverland Development Corporation to work with local government, business, settlement agencies and community groups on making the region migrant friendly. In a region with lots of non-English speaking background communities and an increasing number of new migrants, it is important that interpreters are available and appropriately used. While in the Riverland, a speaker from the Interpreting and Translating Centre, a unit of Multicultural SA, delivered a lecture to medical students at the Renmark Paringa Community Hospital about working effectively with interpreters. These students are part of the Flinders University Parallel Rural Community Curriculum program.

Whilst there, the Interpreting and Translating Centre employees also met with local interpreters and discussed local issues. In particular, they talked about how to increase the use of interpreters and how to increase the number of interpreters available for some of the recently arrived migrant groups. During the Riverland visit, the Interpreting and Translating Centre used a recently released and widely acclaimed video ('Communicating Through Interpreters') that has been compiled by Multicultural SA and WorkCover. The migrant communities deserve equitable access to services and that often requires interpreters. Members can rest assured that the government will continue to promote the appropriate use of interpreters in the Riverland and in other regional areas where they are needed.

AGL

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Premier explain to the house the difference between AGL's offering redundancies to 200 employees and his government offering redundancies to at least 390 public servants; and upon the basis of what standard does the Premier hold AGL in contempt when his government demonstrates the same actions?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): They are going to enjoy it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They are going to enjoy this answer. There is one small difference that may have escaped the member for Waite; that is, the people at AGL have not been offered redundancies. They have not been told that they can stay, if they like. It is not exactly the same as what we do. It is not treating people with dignity and respect as we do. In fact, and this is exactly the point that the Treasurer was making earlier, members opposite cannot see the difference. That is why they were going to sack 4 000 public servants, because they do not know the difference between a voluntary redundancy and a sacking. They do not know the difference.

Let me tell members a little more about the difference, about the redundancies, the sackings at AGL. Because of the absolute genius privatisation that the honourable member was out supporting just last week; because of a clause that members opposite put in, AGL has the right to send 70 of them back to us, to the government. They privatise the profits and send the workers back to the state government! And the honourable member does not know the difference.

He does not know the difference. What we have heard today from members opposite is that, if they had just had one more year, they were going to balance the budget, because it was so easy for us. Just one more year. All that this stream of questioning has done today is demonstrate that members opposite were a feeble government and remain a feeble opposition. The fundamental difference is that we treat our public servants with dignity and respect. Let me tell members what AGL is doing. It has told these people that they are going to lose their jobs whether they like it or not. They cannot tell them when but, if they find a job in the meantime, they will lose their redundancy payment. The difference is stark: one is corporate thuggery on loyal workers and the other is a government that treats public servants with respect.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell.

Members interjecting:

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

WOMEN IN LEADERSHIP POSITIONS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Will the Minister for the Status of Women inform the house of the progress on the State Strategic Plan targets in relation to women on public sector boards and committees and whether there has been similar improvement in the private sector?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for the Status of Women): I thank the honourable member for her question and note her ongoing commitment to lifting the numbers of women taking up leadership positions in our community. The number of women taking positions on government boards and committees continues to trend upwards. There is still some

way to go, but I am pleased with the progress. As of 1 September, women constituted 41.1 per cent of all membership of government boards and committees and 31.69 per cent of all chairs. In August, nearly 60 per cent of all appointments made were of women. The Office for Women continues to do a very good job of promoting opportunities for women to gain positions on boards in both the public and the non-government sector.

The Premier's Women's Directory is a key tool in identifying skilled women for board placements. This database is maintained by the Office for Women and holds details of over 700 women interested in serving on government and not-for-profit boards and committees. Unfortunately, we have not seen the same trend of increasing the numbers of women on boards in the private sector. In the report of the Australian Census of Women in Leadership, released this month by the federal agency Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace, the private sector has not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:—been quite so good as this state government in promoting and appointing women to boards and committees. In the top 200 companies listed on the Australian Stock Exchange, just 8.7 per cent of board directorships—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:—are held by women, and 50 per cent of companies do not have a single female director.

Mr Venning: Why have you sacked three good women, minister? Ask Steph, ask Lea, ask Trish.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: A mere 2 per cent of the private sector boards, or just four of the top 200 companies, have a woman as chair. These public sector figures are disappointing and are in stark contrast to the inroads that South Australian women are making into similar leadership positions within government. South Australia is leading the nation in this area, and I would like to see the private sector pick up on the leadership shown by our Premier and start getting serious about increasing the number of women on its boards. In a relatively short period of time the state government has managed to inject a healthy dose of excellent women into positions of leadership and, with a concerted effort, the private sector could do the same. It just makes simple, logical, economic sense. When women make up something like 51 per cent of the population, when they are making critical decisions about goods they purchase and are making financial decisions, it just makes sense to have women on private sector boards.

AGL

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is again to the Premier. Can the Premier explain the difference—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Can he explain the difference between the Premier and the Treasurer meeting with the Public Service Association before the last election and promising no redundancies to the Public Service, and AGL meeting with the government and not telling them about staff redundancies?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Bring your mind back to those magic days during the election campaign and, particularly, to my first day in the job. I signed a statement banning any future privatisations and added a postscript saying that there would be no tolls on roads (because that was what the Liberals were going to do). I also made a public pledge during the election campaign that there would be no forced redundancies. The opposition has been tittle-tattling around for the last week or so predicting that we were going to break this pledge—unfortunately it is going to be proven wrong, because there will be no forced redundancies at all and we have already made that patently clear.

As for AGL, not only has it treated its workers with contempt, it has also treated this state with contempt. I invite honourable members to look at its profits for the week before—hundreds and hundreds of millions—and it came to this state and showed how patriotic it was about South Australia by axing jobs.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My question is again to the Premier. In light of his answer to the previous question, and as he has nothing but contempt for AGL, will AGL be invited to tender for any future government supply contracts? In the *Sunday Mail* of 10 September 2006 the Premier stated, 'I have nothing but contempt for AGL.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Let me say that I have nothing but contempt for AGL in the way it has treated its workers; and I will say that generally I have nothing but contempt for AGL in the way it has dealt with this state. However, do not think that I am as stupid as you and that I am somehow going to come out and say that I am going to break the law—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN:—and ban a company from tendering. Come on Marty, that is not leadership; put your head up.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I did enjoy that. My question is to the Minister for Energy. Why does the minister believe that the Premier was 'understating it' when he called power companies like AGL 'bloodsucking leeches'? In an interview with ABC Radio on 7 September, when it was pointed out that the Premier had called power companies 'bloodsucking leeches', the Minister for Energy said, 'Well, I have to say I am not sure he was not understating it.'

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): Let us make clear the difference in our attitudes. Our attitude is that a company—which was sold a monopoly by the previous government, sold the capacity to make all those profits—having made a large profit and having met with the government several times, suddenly sacking 200 workers and continuing to treat them quite appallingly is a very poor standard of behaviour. We stand by that.

Let us compare the difference in the attitude. It is exactly the same with ETSA. When ETSA caused major blackouts we called upon them to meet their responsibility to the public. They said, 'It's your fault; you did not give them enough money.' That is the fundamental difference. They said, 'It's your fault; you should have given them more money for the distribution system.' So, a point that was made completely wrong.

When AGL sacked 200 workers, did they condemn their mates in the private sector that they sold the profits to? No. They said, 'It's your fault because you were not nice enough to them.' I have to tell you that we are going to have to

disagree on this. We expect standards of corporate behaviour that make good corporate citizens in this state. I am not going to be shy about telling people who treat South Australians—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will wait until Vickie is finished. I could be here for about a thousand years because she never, ever stops, does she? Why did I say that he may have been understating it? It was a rhetorical flourish to point out just how disappointed I was in AGL's behaviour. We have not heard at any stage from the opposition one word of disappointment about AGL's behaviour or the treatment of those South Australians. What did we see from them when job losses came? Rob Lucas, who we have not seen for months and months, is out there, luxuriating in the bad news, rolling like a dog in manure, because that is the way he likes to do business.

I have to tell you that we are different. We are fundamentally different. We balance budgets, we respect workers, we expect good corporate behaviour, and we do not go out and say that, if the government is not nice to you, you are allowed to sack workers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

BUDGET FIGURES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer assure the house that the actual final figures for the 2005-06 year will be provided in the budget papers on Thursday and not during estimates or as estimated results? When budgets are brought down on time, that is, before the end of the financial year, it is usual to accept that the figures for that financial year are provided as estimates. This budget will be delivered in late September, some three months later than usual, and well after figures for the most recent financial year should be finalised.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Thank you very much for that Dorothy Dixer. I expect that we will have the 2005-06 results in this budget. To what exact detail I will check and have an answer for the leader by tomorrow's question time. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question, because it gives me an opportunity to get the feel of what will be a very important day on Thursday. I have enjoyed today. This has been an exceptionally good rehearsal for Thursday, which will cement this government's record in financial management.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has a point of order.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I believe the Treasurer has answered the question and is now speaking on something that is not relevant to the question at all.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think he has answered the question.

ION SITE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. Why wasn't the purchase of ION's Castalloy site at North Plympton approved by the Industries Development Committee before it was agreed to?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): They are getting down pretty low now. We can't win! If we assist a company we are in strife. If we do not assist a company we get further into strife. I said at the time that we put a package together

that included the government investing in a facility that is leased under commercial terms to the company. I have already said it publicly. Clearly, the leader is scratching for questions. I am more than happy for the Industries Development Committee to see it. I am quite relaxed about it and happy for it to happen.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): My question is also to the Treasurer. If the remediation of the ION land cost more than the \$5.5 million, will the extra cost be the liability of the South Australian taxpayers or Harley Davidson?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This is a big day for me, sir. I don't think I have had this many questions all four years I have been here.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I suppose if they had a treasurer in the lower house it might be a bit different.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If I had a shadow treasurer I might get some questions.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Oh, Robbie Lucas. Do you reckon he's got this lot hoodwinked? He's got this lot hoodwinked, sir, fair dinkum. He sits up there in the upper house and doesn't do anything.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Minister for Police in the upper house. Where's your shadow treasurer? Not in the lower house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Robbie Lucas, his best effort was four deep-deficit budgets. Robbie Lucas—sold ETSA and still ran four deficit budgets. No wonder they leave him hidden away in the upper house. Now, in relation to ION, I have a brief on this. Let's have a look at this. The issue with remediation costs is that the price paid by the government for the land is below market value by some considerable amount of money. We have estimates that the remediation, I think, should be around the \$4 million or \$4.5 million mark, but the price we have paid for the land is considerably less than the market value. There is more in that than what we believe will be sufficient. But bear in mind the government is leasing this facility for a very long period of time. With rising market values it would be more than adequately covered in the difference. But I will get a detailed answer for the member so he can have it and read it and, no doubt, ask me more questions.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister was reading from a government docket; he acknowledged it was a briefing. I would just ask that he table the document to which he has referred so that it can be read by all in the house.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It's a briefing note.

The SPEAKER: A briefing note is not a government docket and the Treasurer is not obliged to table it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Do you want me to give it to you? Would that save—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Yes.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: All yours.

STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): My question is to you, Mr Speaker. What progress has been made in reforming our standing and sessional orders?

The SPEAKER: I can inform the house that the Standing Orders Committee met yesterday and systematically went through the proposals that the member for Fisher had circulated during his term as Speaker. It has gone through those. Some of those proposals are things that the committee wants to pursue. Some are proposals that the committee does not want to pursue. At the moment members are distilling what the committee decided yesterday. What comes out of that will then be circulated. I point out that standing orders are not in the hands so much of the Speaker but are really in the hands of the house. The house is the guardian of and makes changes to its own standing orders. But, nonetheless, there are important reforms that I think will be able to be made. Part of the process, of course, will involve consulting with all members of parliament.

OMBUDSMAN'S OFFICE

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Can the Attorney-General advise the house if budget cuts have been made at the Ombudsman's Office which have directly affected the capacity of the office to deliver a vital government service? I have been informed that the freedom of information section of the Ombudsman's Office has recently been advised of funding cuts. They have already removed one legal officer earlier this month. I have also been informed that the office currently has not finalised:

- one FOI application which was received over 574 days ago;
- five to six FOI applications which were received over 200 days ago; and
- 14 FOI applications that were received between 100 and 200 days ago.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): All will be revealed on Thursday, but I find it a bit odd. You really have to do a little bit of work on these questions, Iain. You have to get these guys up to scratch, mate; that's pretty rank. You are saying a 'budget cut'. We have not brought down the budget. I am not quite sure—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, they had their funding extended pro rata. I do not know how you can be suggesting that a budget cut, because of this budget, has happened when we have not even passed a law passing the budget.

Ms Chapman: You had one last year.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, that might have been in the last budget; you are talking about it in this budget. It really is a silly question.

ENCOUNTER MARINE PARK

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Can the Premier advise the house of any undisclosed information regarding the Encounter Marine Park that has not been forthcoming in the public arena and is causing angst to professional fisherman, who will be potentially impacted upon in the future? At a public information night on Tuesday 12 September at Kingscote, a local professional fisherman who attended went to the desk containing government material and was told by the government officer there that, 'You only need this form

as the rest will not apply to you.' He was handed a compensation form and was left stunned by the encounter.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for the question. I am happy to refer that to the Minister for Environment and Conservation in another place. I am not aware of the issues which he has raised, but I am sure she will be happy to get a reply for him.

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS REGISTRATION BILL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I wish to clarify a matter that was raised during the course of debate on the Child Sex Offenders Registration Bill on 29 August. During debate on clause 33 of the bill, I shared the member for Heysen's concern about the possible legal consequences for the 18 year old male who had consensual sexual contact with his 16 year old girlfriend. I have since reviewed the *Hansard*, and would like to clarify that the only circumstances in which a court could bypass the mandatory provisions would be if the court found the commission of the offence trifling, which would be uncommon for unlawful sexual intercourse offences. This was not the intention of the bill, and I have instructed parliamentary counsel to draft a suitable amendment to put the matter of 'young love' beyond doubt.

I also said during debate on that clause that it may be possible for unlawful sexual intercourse convictions to be expunged from the record where the circumstances warrant it. However, clause 71 of the bill is clear that a conviction under spent conviction legislation in other states, as South Australia does not have such a law, does not affect the status of the person as a registrable offender. So, I am not entirely confident that my effort to clarify this during debate was plain in so far as it is recorded in *Hansard*.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Mr RAU (Enfield) I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sittings of the house today.

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

KANGAROO ISLAND-CAPE JERVIS SEA CORRIDOR

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Thank you, sir, for the opportunity to raise an issue that in my short time in this house I have thought a great deal about and wish to raise today, and that is the travesty of justice that is occurring in relation to the sea corridor between Kangaroo Island and Cape Jervis, and the impact and cost on the residents of Kangaroo Island. Over many years this has been an issue, but it has now got to the stage where it urgently needs addressing and action by the government. Just the very issue of the wharfage charge by the government on the sea passage between Kangaroo Island and the mainland is one that causes a lot of concern. However, in the vital interests and long-term

future of the members of my electorate who reside on Kangaroo Island I wish to put well and truly on the record today my concern about the long-term future if something is not done expediently by the government.

The issue of freight between here and Kangaroo Island is an enormous factor in production costs. The transport of sheep, cattle, wool, fish, grains, fertiliser, general cargo, forestry (and the list goes on) is becoming exorbitantly expensive and is starting to cripple the economic base of the island, which has been agriculture for so many years. The cost of travel to the island for local residents is exorbitant and this is impacted on, to some extent, by the pure cost of government charges through the wharfage. It is also having an impact on tourism, and it needs to be addressed. The fact of the matter is that Tasmania receives a federal government subsidy on all transport to and from that island, which puts it on a level playing field with the rest of Australia. The residents of Kangaroo Island do not have that luxury. They have suffered long term under the absolute welter of costs that are being imposed and charges on fares and freight to and from the island.

I pay tribute to Kangaroo Island SeaLink, the company that runs the ferry service between the island and the mainland. It has made an enormous effort over 10 years to hold down those costs. It has continually and quite deliberately introduced methods to keep the charges down, even with high fuel costs. However, it cannot do it on its own, and I believe it is way past the time for this matter to be addressed formally at state government level. It is time for that sea corridor to become an extension of the national highway system, with an arterial road across to Kangaroo Island.

Kangaroo Island is hugely productive, high rainfall country. Even this year, when we have had the lowest rainfall on record and much of Australia is experiencing severe drought (the jury is out as to whether that is a result of natural occurrences or climate change, or whatever), Kangaroo Island is continuing to produce, and will continue to produce over many years. However, it is one thing to produce: it is another thing to be able to afford to transport those goods to and from the island and to become self-sustainable and an economic powerhouse of South Australia. Too many people think that it is over there and out of sight. I very strongly urge the government, led by the Premier, to take this on board. Indeed, when he was on Kangaroo Island with cabinet a couple of years ago, the Premier was lobbied on this issue, but we still have seen nothing happen.

Once upon a time the former government service, the *Troubridge* and the *Island Seaway*, was subsidised to and from that part of the world. Unfortunately, a population of 4 500 people does not have a great deal of capacity to belt the government around the ears, so they rely on me, as their local member, through my electorate of Finnis, to take up their cause, and I am very pleased to do so. This is a matter that has received obvious attention for a long time, but it is not being dealt with. It is all very well to stand there and listen and pat people on the head and say, 'Yes, we understand.' It is another thing to grasp the nettle and do something about it.

I am most concerned about the future of the island if this matter is not addressed: if a national highway extension is not introduced through to Kangaroo Island, and that that highly productive centre in tourism, agriculture, fisheries (and the list goes on) and the national parks, which provides quite a deal of employment on the island, is not dealt with and not

held to account and not made sustainable, and if it is not turned into a vibrant economy—

Time expired.

SUICIDE AND MENTAL ILLNESS

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): Suicide and mental illness are a national tragedy and shockingly common and affects almost every Australian family directly or indirectly. It can strike a child, a mother, a grandparent or a co-worker. It can strike someone from any background and it can strike at any stage of life, from childhood to old age. No community is unaffected; no school or workplace untouched. Members may be interested to note that deaths by suicide in Australia outnumber those by road accidents, SIDS, AIDS and many other forms of death combined each year. Because of the myths and stigma associated with suicide and mental illness the wider community is not made aware of the tragedy. My interest in this area dates back to my own masters studies on the effect of chronic diseases on youth suicide; and I have continued to keep a watchful brief in the area.

I bring to the attention of the house the White Wreath Association which on 13 October will remember all victims of suicide in a service in South Australia. This organisation (which is well known to me) was started by the family and friends of those who have committed suicide in order to create an awareness of the serious issue of mental illness and the need to address it appropriately and immediately so that early intervention may prevent these tragedies for others. They believe that, by creating awareness that there is a need to support and educate the families and carers of people with mental illness, these families will be better prepared and able to support and care for their loved ones. Part of the work of the White Wreath Association is also to remind governments at every level, together with all Australians from every walk of life, that every life is precious, and to remind them that these people are not just statistics but are or were dearly loved human beings, loved by their families and carers.

There is always some difficulty for professionals in estimating annual suicide figures due to the process of collating data determining a suicide. The Coroner's role is to determine the cause of death, not the circumstances leading to the death, and it can often take two to three years for the Coroner to determine such a cause of death. The current federal government has had a strong and strange aversion to releasing suicide statistics for the past few years, but the federal Department of Health has a best guesstimate for Australia in 2005 of a figure in excess of 8 000 people. This is sheer devastation in anyone's opinion. If we are a caring society there is a range of questions we need to ask ourselves. Do these deaths touch the heart of the country? Are these people remembered with dignity and respect? Are the surviving families helped in any way? Are we caring, compassionate and understanding to those suffering this dreaded illness and their surviving families? In many cases family members are the first on the scene and find their loved ones—their own flesh and blood—in horrific circumstances. All these people are traumatised and devastated, yet they must grieve in silence and cope alone. For those left behind by these tragedies the hurt is no less traumatic, yet society's response to these surviving families and friends is vastly different from the help offered to other kinds of medical and social tragedies.

As a society we all need to take some responsibility. Mental health is everyone's business. With one in five

Australians experiencing mental illness at some time, it is something that is bound to affect us all, whether it be through family, friends or work colleagues. We need to understand what the signs of suicide risk behaviour are, and encourage friends and families to talk about their feelings. I hope that the house will support the White Wreath awareness campaign by joining in its Sock it to Suicide Week, by wearing bright coloured socks in the first week of October, and, when people ask why, talk about the tragedy of suicide in South Australia.

AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONAL PEDAL PRIX

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): I stand here today proud to address the house as the elected member for Hammond, now the home of two remarkable and significant events. The Rural City of Murray Bridge, in which my electorate office is situated, last weekend hosted a world record breaking event—the 25th Australian International Pedal Prix. This is the 10th time the event has been conducted in Murray Bridge and it attracted a world record field of 220 entries, including 3 000 competitors. Between them all during the 24 hour event, continuously circuiting the special course at Murray Bridge’s award winning Sturt Reserve, they circumnavigated the world at speeds of up to 70 km/h. I am told that at 3 o’clock in the morning, the eerie sight of over 200 whispering vehicles, their lights barely penetrating the night’s river mist as they hurtled silently around the track, is a truly spectacular experience.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, I was sleeping. This year’s three-day event attracted a crowd estimated at 30 000. An economic impact survey conducted by council in 2004 calculated that this event injected some \$3 million into the local economy through direct and indirect investment, as well as commercial activity. The excitement and pageantry of this year’s pedal prix was kicked off in grand style, with an opening performance full of colour and fanfare. With the 200-plus competitors assembled on the start grid, the Murray Bridge callisthenics club performed a brilliant display for the crowd and the cameras. This was followed by a march of students from the local Unity College carrying a huge Australian flag. They marched past the assembled competitors, holding a huge flag above them.

This spectacularly choreographed opening was made possible through the hours of arrangement and practice of the local clubs and schools who are to be congratulated for their contribution. The real achievement this year lies in the signing of an agreement in principle for the Rural City of Murray Bridge to host this major event for the next 10 years. This is a wonderful testament to the commitment, foresight and cooperative spirit of the local council and the community. Australian International Pedal Prix Board Chairman, Andrew McLachlan, said that the committee’s decision to continue their partnership with Murray Bridge was borne of many factors: the ideal venue; the town’s capacity to host a major event; climate; location; the enthusiastic participation of schools in the region; and, above all, the willing and growing support of the whole community, council, corporate, business and institutional, as well as the general public.

I applaud the organisers and the host city on their excellent event, which encourages innovation, conservation, participation and, most importantly, inspires youth to create and achieve. As Murray Bridge basks in the glow of this success, comes the news that the town has secured another major national event. On the Australia Day long weekend 2007,

Sturt Reserve will again become ‘the place to be’, this time for thousands of motor enthusiasts from around the country for the SpringNat Car Show. To be known as the Murray Bridge Autofest, this popular event is expected to draw a crowd of at least 10 000. In announcing the coup, Rural City of Murray Bridge Mayor, Allan Arbon, said that similar events in Shepparton and Albury have attracted up to 50 000 fans. Part of the appeal is that it is promoted as a family-oriented and alcohol-free event and is expected to have the close support of the SA Police.

Previous events have drawn high praise from within the host communities and Murray Bridge is to be congratulated on the success of its entrepreneurial activities. These major events promote not just the town and the region but the whole state as a centre for innovation and a destination for national and international tourists. One blight on the pedal prix was a team cutting down limbs from a tree in Sturt Reserve. Let us hope stupidity like this does not happen again. In closing, the government needs to get right behind the pedal prix and similar events.

AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP DAY

Mr PICCOLO (Light): On Sunday 17 September, Australia celebrated Australian Citizenship Day. I congratulate the town of Gawler for holding a ceremony on that day, which I attended. Citizenship Day is a day of celebration. It is a time to reflect on the achievements of this great nation. Ceremonies such as the one on Sunday are an important right of passage for migrants, and it marks the final step for migrants in becoming an Australian citizen. While the ceremony is an important step in the citizenship process, it is not the most critical one. The most critical step is when the migrant makes a decision to become an Australian citizen. Migrants choose to become citizens of this great nation of ours: it is not by accident of birth.

There could not be a stronger statement about the sense of belonging than by choosing to become an Australian citizen. For most migrants, citizenship is a matter of the heart and not of a piece of paper. It is a privilege for migrants to be granted Australian citizenship. Equally, it is an honour for this nation that a migrant should choose to become an Australian citizen.

Migrants come to this country for a variety of reasons and from a range of circumstances. My parents came from Italy to Australia in the early 1960s to overcome years of economic hardship and to give their children a better future. They achieved that goal and they had pride in becoming Australia citizens. However, I do take personal offence, as do many migrants, to the changes to citizenship proposed by the federal government. My mother, for example, has lived in this country for over 43 years. She has raised three children and worked very hard to do so. I take offence that the federal government has now decided that my mother is not a fit person to become an Australian citizen.

While my mother can speak some English for everyday living, she would not pass a written English test. Some would argue that perhaps she does not deserve to be an Australian citizen for that reason. I would remind those people that my mother, like many other women of her generation and circumstances, did not attend school and had no option for an education in their country of birth. As a result, learning a new language is difficult. My mother cannot read or write in Italian, either. My mother has been a law-abiding and hard-

working woman, and for the federal government now to say that she is not fit to be an Australian citizen is an insult and degrading and diminishes this great nation of ours.

The proposed laws also discriminate against women and the poor, the two groups that are less likely to have access to an education in their country of birth. If you look at all the statistics, often it is the poor and women who do worse in terms of access to education. By denying them citizenship, our federal government will be compounding that discrimination. When those opposite in this house are next speaking to an Italian or Greek, Hungarian, Pole, Vietnamese or any other migrant neighbour, I hope they have the courage to explain to them the implications of the proposed changes by the federal government. Hopefully, they will not hide from those, because what they are saying is that some of those people are not welcome to this country.

I fully support programs that encourage and enable migrants to learn English. It benefits all of us when migrants do speak English and learn to read and write, but to make it mandatory is the reintroduction of the White Australia policy by the back door. Citizenship should be a unifying and not a divisive process.

TOURISM, OUTBACK

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I am pleased to participate in this debate and pleased that the Minister for Tourism is here. Of recent days, I have had a number of constituents express grave concern that it appears that the Outback Areas Community Development Trust is being asked to do more with less, because it has indicated to the people cleaning and maintaining the toilets at Blinman, Angorichina and Parachilna that they can be paid only \$20 a week for this service, therefore the people are not going to do it and the toilets will have to be closed. Obviously, there is something wrong in this very important part of the state for tourism.

The Outback Areas Trust has built these toilets. It has been asked to do a lot more. It is a good organisation, but it cannot make one dollar take the place of two. So, there is that problem. I have had the people from the hotel at Blinman on the phone. I have had the people who run the excellent facilities at Angorichina expressing their concerns about this particular proposal. I understand that some of these people have contacted the minister's office, and I hope that they can do something about it quickly, because we are in the height of the tourist season up there now, there are going to be school holidays and a lot of people moving through there, and it would be unfortunate if these facilities are not available to the travelling public. These small communities rely on tourism for a large part of their employment base. They need tourists to keep their facilities open and going so that local communities can also benefit from these enterprises, so I think it is very important that the minister gets her officers to investigate these issues.

I know there is a problem. We have these facilities there, and the Outback Areas Community Development Trust has been asked to do more. I think that in many cases governments try to do more but they spread the money so thinly that they do not do anything properly. That is a real problem. They have a choice, whether to cut out something. The trust has always balanced its books (and my understanding is that it is proposing to do the same) but its costs have gone up and there is a need for someone to help. It would be an absolute disaster if these facilities were closed, and that is what is

going to happen. Then people would be going in the bushes, and I do not think that is what we want. I bring this matter to the attention of the house—and I do so without apportioning blame—to try to ensure it receives some attention.

There is a second matter I want to bring to the attention of the house. The government should be aware that what has happened over the last few weeks and months in South Australian rural areas will have a very significant effect on those rural communities; it is also going to have an effect on South Australia in general. It is not only going to affect the farming community, it is also going to affect small businesses, carriers, fuel agents and mechanics across South Australia.

Coupled with this, I have been advised that in the northern parts of the state grasshoppers are hatching—although one constituent said to me that he did not know what they were going to eat! It is important that a program is put in place to ensure that they are contained and controlled. I suppose if they got down into the gardens of North Adelaide everyone would know that there was a problem—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, something would happen then. There is a program that is going to be put in place and I sincerely hope that it is effective; however, the drought conditions are going to have a dramatic effect on a lot of people in my electorate and I sincerely hope that the government is generous and that it ensures that its instrumentalities keep their costs and charges to a bare minimum. I think the first test will come when we start to examine the new NRM levies which will be imposed. I do not think there was any reason to increase them because I am not sure what benefits have accrued to local communities from the NRM process to date, and I am waiting to be convinced.

Time expired.

COMITES

Ms PORTOLESI (Hartley): Today I wish to inform the house about an important national meeting of local and interstate presidents of COMITES, which took place in Adelaide on Saturday 5 August at the Marche Club.

COMITES, which translates to Committee of Italians Abroad, is a locally based organisation funded by the Italian government to look after and advance the interests of Italians abroad. By Italian law, COMITES is required to meet at least once a year, first amongst themselves and then once a year with the Italian ambassador in Canberra, to discuss issues concerning the Italian community. Dr Daniela Costa, a councillor from the General Council of Italians Abroad, also participated in this meeting, as did the Vice-Consul of Italy, Dr Fabrizio Calabrese. It was my pleasant duty to welcome the group here in Adelaide and, having done that, I can attest to the sense of real cooperation and collaboration around the table. Although I did not stay for the duration of the meeting, which lasted all day, I am advised that it was a full and frank agenda.

I would like to briefly advise the house of a number of key issues which were discussed, and I do so because their issues of concern are also of concern and interest to me as a member of the state parliament, one that represents many thousands of Italian citizens and Italo-Australians in my own electorate. Of course, it would come as no surprise that a key issue for COMITES—and, I know, for just about every organisation involved with the Italian community—is the promotion and encouragement of the Italian language in South Australia. In

fact, this issue also came up at a public meet recently which was attended by the two newly elected Italian MPs, Senator Nino Randazzo and Hon. Marco Fedi. But every year in October, every country in the world that is linked with Italy through the education system, prepares a program to promote the Italian language. This year it will take place from 23 to 29 October with the theme, 'Il Cibo e le feste nella lingua e cultura italiana', which means 'Food and festivals in the Italian language and culture.' In Australia, each state has prepared its own program and I look forward to ours.

Another issue of very great significance to many of my own electors is the issue of Italian pension over-payments made by INPS (Istituto Nazionale della Previdenza Sociale), which is the Italian government equivalent of Centrelink. What this means is that many people who receive an Italian pension, people like my parents, have been overpaid and are now required to reimburse the Italian government, a situation which is causing enormous financial strain.

COMITES, through CGIE, has presented a document to the Italian government to seriously examine an amnesty for those who, having declared their income, having complied, were not at fault. In fact, I am advised that the reason for the overpayment was the delay by INPS in carrying out the income verification. I look forward to that matter being satisfactorily resolved, and I am happy to offer whatever assistance I can.

On a different level, RAI International, a television network for Italians abroad, was also on the agenda. RAI gives Italians abroad an opportunity to stay in touch with the country they left behind many years ago. RAI is received in Australia through Foxtel or by purchasing a satellite dish. The biggest concern about this is the expense associated with it, which is significant for many of the older members of the community, and the Italian community is rapidly ageing.

Also discussed were the future activities of the General Council of Italians Abroad, which does have an important role to play in the process of developing an active local political culture and participation by Italian communities residing abroad, something that I am certainly keen to encourage.

In 2004 the COMITES Presidents agreed that the position of co-ordinator would be taken in turns each year. This year it was South Australia's Vincenzo Pappandrea's turn, and the 2007 co-ordinator is Luigi Casagrande, President of Com It Es in Brisbane. I wish them well for their next meeting, which will take place in Melbourne in March 2007.

What this gathering demonstrates is the ongoing working commitment not only of the Italian government to its citizens living abroad, but the commitment by the local communities themselves. I am certainly satisfied that through COMITES, the Italian community is in good hands. I look forward to doing what I can to support their work so that together we can promote the interests of our mutual constituents. I wish them well.

RESIDENTIAL PARKS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 31 August. Page 838.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): I confirm that the opposition will support the intent of the Residential Parks Bill but will be seeking clarification on several areas on the intent of the legislation as suggesting several amendments during the committee stage. I also note that a further amendment is proposed by the minister today and confirm that the details of this amendment were provided to me late yesterday afternoon. The opposition also wish to acknowledge the efforts, over many years, of the member for Taylor in this important area and congratulate her on it. The protection of people's rights within caravan parks is an important issue, so well done.

On behalf of the opposition I confirm our appreciation to the ministerial and departmental officers for the very detailed briefings provided over the last week to the shadow minister, myself and other members. One frustration in this process, for the opposition, has been the inability of the government to provide, prior to our party room meeting this morning, details of the submissions that were received by the government from interested operators, groups and individuals. I can appreciate that the need to preserve the privacy of these persons who made submissions is important, but requests to receive an edited version of the comments, with all the naming references removed, were unfortunately unable to be met within the tight time frame, between the briefings on the bill and consideration by the house.

A draft version of the Residential Parks Bill was released in early 2006. Following public consultation, a revised version of the bill was introduced by the minister on 31 August. Essentially, the bill is designed to protect the interests of people who live in caravan parks as their principal place of residence. As such, this bill is quite relevant, given the recent cases of people in caravan parks in South Australia who have been given notice of eviction when the caravan parks have been sold and are proposed for substantial redevelopment. The bill sets out basic rights and duties proposed by the government upon residents and operators. As the basis of many of the amendments appears to be the Residential Tenancies Act, residents will be provided with similar rights and responsibilities as other renters. Key features of the bill, as I understand it to be, are:

1. Residents will have a written agreement, be it a residential parks site agreement or a residential park tenancy agreement, depending upon their circumstances. If a caravan park is sold, tenants will have the right to see out their term of tenancy.
2. Park rules can only cover specific topics listed in the bill; for example, the keeping of pets, use of the common areas, and parking of vehicles. It is my intention to raise several issues in relation to the rules.
3. The amount of rent that can be received in advance at the start of the tenancy is limited to two weeks, and the bond is limited to four weeks' rent.
4. Limits on how often rent can be increased have been provided for. Residents must be notified in writing of proposed increases and can apply to the tribunal for a declaration if they believe the rent increase to be excessive.
5. Owners have the responsibility to ensure clean, peaceful and safe sites with 24-hour access.
6. Termination of breach of contract can only be achieved by serving the required notice giving the other party the opportunity to remedy the breach.
7. Termination without notice can occur, however, if the dwelling is destroyed or rendered uninhabitable. Either party can also at any time apply to the tribunal to end the agreement

on the grounds of hardship, and we will talk about that later also.

8. If a resident has committed a serious act of violence in the park, or if the safety of anyone in the park is in danger from a resident or a guest of a resident, the park owner may serve notice requiring the resident or guest to leave the park immediately. The resident cannot return for two days, in which time the owner may apply to the tribunal to terminate their tenancy agreement. A right of appeal exists for residents through the tribunal.

9. The bill does not apply to people who stay in caravan parks as holiday makers; only for period of up to two months.

10. The opposition believes that the bill is generally quite sound, but I will be raising areas that we believe require clarification or amendment during the debate.

My appreciation goes to the Caravan Parks Association for providing to the opposition a copy of its submission on the draft bill. By using these comments and the knowledge opposition members possess of caravan park operations in some of the key holiday areas of South Australia, and the detailed briefing provided by the minister or departmental officers, we have been able to consider this matter.

One issue highlighted is that the bill does not appear to provide any safeguards against tenants with their prior history of violence or rent avoidance in caravan parks, and this is an area that the Caravan Parks Association wishes us to pursue on its behalf. Park owners have a duty of care to the residents, and should take reasonable steps to ensure their safety. Access to information on previous cases of violence and unacceptable behaviour would assist operators in ensuring that this duty of care is enforced as it would allow future occupancy to be refused potentially.

It must not be forgotten that the bill should balance the rights of park owners with those of residents so that a desirable balance can be achieved. There is scope for this to be addressed in the bill. For example, the Caravan Parks Association has noted that, despite most caravan parks having restrictions on the number of occupants or a site or a residence and/or applying additional charges for additional occupants, there is no mention in the bill of this matter. Given that additional occupants can make use of the parks' facilities, services and common areas, it is suggested that it is only reasonable that parks can limit the number of occupants per residence and/or charge for additional occupants. I again confirm our general support for this bill, noting, however, that it is possible that we may be seeking amendments in the other place.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor): I rise to support this bill. Members know that I have been a determined advocate for long-term residents of caravan and residential parks and may remember that I introduced similar legislation as a private member from Opposition on two occasions. Unfortunately, at that time, the then Liberal government did all it could to frustrate the legislation aimed at giving these most vulnerable of residents the same basic protections that other renters have in South Australia. However, today I thank the opposition for its support of this legislation, and note the influence of the lead speaker, because this is something that South Australia needs to do to make sure that we protect a section of our community that truly has been overlooked. There are currently several thousand South Australians living permanently in caravan and residential parks, yet that significant group of South Australians falls outside the

coverage of our present laws when it comes to tenancy protections.

I would like to dedicate my words today to a man who, along with the group of constituents in parks in my electorate, started off my work in advocating for legal protection for caravan park residents some years ago, and that is Mr Ken McParland. He would have been very proud to witness this debate today but, sadly, I attended his funeral two months ago.

There are certain rights that we in Australia simply assume exist, so I think it would come as a surprise to many to learn that there are long-term residents of caravan and residential parks who are often home-owners, that is, they have paid anything up to \$100 000—or perhaps by this time it is even more than that—for those so-called transportable homes, yet they do not have the legal protections that even someone who privately rents has in the state.

You may ask why someone would pay that amount of money to put their home on a block of land for which they do not have legal rights, and instead only rent that site. The answer really lies in the type of community environments that these parks offer. Aside from being a slightly less expensive way to get into home ownership, because, of course, the capital outlay is slightly less expensive due, obviously, to having no land component in it, the benefits are that you can live in a close, quiet community often with people your own age—and the people we are talking about are typically retired, often pensioners—yet maintain your own living space while enjoying communal park activities.

It is quite a popular choice for those who have been widowed, for example. These mostly retired people choose this lifestyle to be part of the community, and in their later years they seek to avoid the insecurity of the evictions that are always possible when you rent a property. But, having shifted into one of these parks, it is not a simple matter to move should you be subject to unfair treatment by the park owner or manager. I understand it can cost around \$20 000 to move your transportable home, so the threat often used by park management that, 'You had better pay this extra money or accept this new condition on your tenancy without complaint or else you are out' is quite an effective threat. I think the most important aspect of the legislation before us today is that it addresses the power imbalance between resident and park operator, yet it also ensures that both parties have a legal obligation to act in a way that protects the good order of the park. In essence, it gives both park operator and resident the protection of having recourse to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal.

I do not want to paint an overly negative picture of operations that are well managed and well run in the state, however I think it is worth identifying for members some of the experiences I have come across in the time that I have been advocating for this measure. Through my work with caravan parks in my electorate and also through my interaction with caravan park residents right across the state, I know that there have been some outrageous abuses of power in these areas in South Australia, which has been one of the last states—it might even be the last—to afford legal protection to caravan park residents.

Residents have complained to me, for example, about unfair fees being added to their rent without justification. Some of those costs have been straight hikes in rent. I have seen up to 40 per cent increases in one jump, which, in anyone's book, is significant. I have also had representations from residents in one particular park I can think of where a

certain discount rent was charged initially to attract residents to the park and then, once they would come in and settle in, up went the rent without warning, and that seemed to be a pattern with that particular park. A recent case of which I became aware is where a special ongoing levy for capital development has been added to the rent, yet when you do a simple back of envelope calculation you pretty quickly realise that the proposed capital development will be fully recovered up-front even without taking taxation concessions into account. Profiteering, I guess, would be a very polite word for that sort of behaviour.

Residents have complained to me of situations where government concessions given to park owners for charges such as land tax, for example, are not being passed back to residents who have been paying a special levy for just those charges, or a component of those rents for those charges. Again, it is unethical behaviour for which residents currently have no recourse.

There have been cases of unfair rules being imposed on residents—for example, park owners refusing entry to potential buyers of a home in the park unless the resident agrees to appoint the park operator as the selling agent and pay a very high commission: 'You cannot bring someone to have a look at your place unless I sell your home for you, and I will charge you this very high commission.' It is very unethical behaviour and is condemned by most operators in the state, but it is happening out there even today. There also have been complaints of park operators unreasonably refusing visitors of residents entry to the park—for example, just because they happen to be children. It is hard to think of a landlord's being able to get away with placing a ban on a grandchild visiting their grandparent in a normal rental situation, but that is the sort of thing that currently happens in parks.

Essentially, this bill allows for situations where there are disputes about a rental increase being excessive, for example, or perhaps a tenant feeling that their amenity warrants a decrease in rent. The tenant would have recourse to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, in the same way as all other rental tenants. Similarly, it provides an avenue for a landlord to appeal to the tribunal to determine all the usual types of disputes that landlords have to contend with—unpaid rent, damage to property and the like. The tribunal will have the same powers it has in other situations to enforce orders on either party. That is the major deficiency in the situation in which residents of these parks operate, because at the moment there is not any accessible independent arbiter covering this group of tenancies. There is currently the potential for a great deal of distrust and resentment between park operators and residents.

In some parks, residents groups have been set up. However, because the power balance between the parties is so skewed and there is no obligation on a landlord to take notice of any view of the residents, even if these bodies exist, in a lot of parks they are not very effective in changing what happens from the point of view of tenancies or conditions or rules applying to the park. So, the potential for unchecked victimisation is keenly felt by many such residents. Similarly, a busy landlord or manager of a property can become very exasperated if residents refuse to acknowledge the business realities of managing increased park costs and there is no formal mechanism for dispute resolution. I think this is a very balanced piece of legislation, which attributes rights and responsibilities on both parties.

In my research on this matter, it has become very evident to me that standards in parks across our state vary markedly. Thousands of South Australians live permanently in these parks. I should also point out that this legislation does not apply to the holiday-maker or the transient. It applies to people who are in these parks for at least two months; permanent residents of the park. I hope members will agree that this legislation is needed to protect the rights and obligations of tenants and landlords in these long-term residential situations, and I urge all members to vote to protect the rights of a very overlooked group of residents in South Australia.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I will speak very briefly on this matter, having had a lot of experience with caravans in my younger days. Certainly, we have seen a big change in this area. In the old days, caravan parks were only for holiday-makers, but today we are seeing more and more long-term residents in these parks. I support my party's position in relation to this legislation, because I believe that everyone needs to be protected, particularly long-term residents. However, I also agree that we must consider at all times the owners of the parks. These caravan parks are not like a normal housing estate; they are quite different. They involve people living very close to one another. If there is a problem tenant in a caravan park I believe that it could be much worse than, say, an unruly person in a suburban street, because of the noises they transmit and the common facilities they share.

I would be very vigilant about allowing the management of a park to evict people who are causing undue duress to the rest of the tenants. I know that many of these places (and at West Beach I see them often) usually consist of only two rooms, and there is one car between them and the next resident. If a row was taking place, I am sure all the residents around would be sharing in that private domestic dispute. I can certainly understand that, in some instances, the management of these parks would say, 'Look, for the peace of the park we would ask you to leave.' I understand that this situation is covered in the bill. I do not think that we should at any time promote or encourage people to live in this way. The way I see it, caravans are great for holidays, but I would hate to live in one. As we know, some people have no choice, so we would certainly support that.

We would hope that every resident in a residential caravan park is either in transit or looking for other alternate accommodation. I am always very annoyed with the West Beach park, which takes in long-term residents at the expense of family holiday-makers during holiday periods. We had a stoush many years ago with the Hon. Mr Virgo, who at the time was chairman of West Beach Trust; and before him the Hon. Murray Hill. We had a stoush about long-term residents in caravan parks and their taking the space of holiday-makers. I believe that most parks are, or were, recreational parks for the use of holiday-makers. Now a percentage of the parks is set aside for long-term residents, but I would like to think that these people are in transit rather than being long-term residents of the area. Certainly, I will be interested to see how this works. This bill has been a long time coming, and I congratulate the member for Goyder for his work on our behalf; and also the member for Taylor who has had an interest in this subject for many years. I support the bill.

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): I am happy to speak in support of this bill. In my previous life, I worked hard to represent the interests of mature-aged people. I was active in

lobbying for a strengthening of the Residential Tenancies Act in order to protect people living in caravan parks who often are very vulnerable to the whim of the owners or managers of such parks. Although many people from different backgrounds make their home in a caravan park, a large proportion of those people are over 50 years of age. This bill will provide much greater protection to this group.

This bill is not designed to cover the so-called grey army or grey nomads, who travel around Australia staying in caravan parks on a short-term basis, or other short-term tourists enjoying the pleasures of caravan or cabin holiday. However, many permanent residents have suffered at the hands of unscrupulous landlords; or sometimes by well-meaning landlords who advocated casual arrangements within their parks. However well meaning, it was nearly always the residents who suffered as a result of these casual arrangements. This bill will require all residential park agreements to be in writing. That will be an important step. It will insist that a new resident will know who the owner of the park is and their contact details, regardless of who is managing the park on their behalf. They must be given a copy of the rules of the park and any other documentation they need to reside safely on that property, with a quality of life to enjoy the facilities provided in the park. For example, a park was advertising that it had a laundry with washing machines and dryers, but new residents were not given any information about how to work those facilities. Although they had a paid a rent, which included those facilities, they did not know how to operate them.

This bill allows residents to form residents committees, and to discuss the rules of the park as they apply to them. If they are not happy with the rules or they think a particular rule is too onerous, they can apply to the tribunal to have any of the rules suggested by the owner changed. This is a big step forward for many residents who are living in caravan parks. Another important change—and one that has caused great stress to both tenants and owners in the past—is that all bond moneys will now be paid into the Residential Tenancies Fund and will not be held by park owners, as previously happened. This will make it much easier for tenants to access their bond money at the end of a tenancy.

It also provides additional safety to tenants who may want to move on—however quickly—either to another park or into private rental housing. Sometimes, when a tenant has left a tenancy there have been considerable problems accessing bond money in a timely fashion from the owner's private fund. This will not only apply to all new tenants but, most importantly, it will also cover all existing bonds. This will mean that park owners will have to pay all existing bond moneys (which they are holding privately) into the Residential Tenancies Fund. The same rules will apply to these bonds as apply to private house rentals, and, at the end of tenancy, either party can apply to the commissioner to claim the bond, depending on the conditions for the end of the tenancy. Owners will still have protection against non-payment of rent.

Another aspect of the bill which I support is an increase in the privacy provisions. As with the Residential Tenancies Act, the landlord's right of entry to the tenant's caravan or cabin will be limited, except when the landlord thinks an emergency situation may have occurred. Notice must be given that the landlord wishes to enter the premises. Because of the casual nature of caravan parks this has not always been the case in the past and many tenants have had cause to complain that landlords or managers of parks, or their agents,

have imposed themselves on tenants without any notice, demanding entry without due cause.

In exchange, it is important to the good running of the caravan park, as the member for Schubert said, that owners be able to maintain their site, keep lawns and other gardens in good order, particularly in the case of fire precautions. We have seen instances very recently of fires in caravan parks and, because caravans are very close together, there is always the danger that fire can spread quickly. They also need to ensure that rubbish is removed and that health standards in general are maintained. This service is vital to all the residents of a park and it only takes one resident to resist compliance for all residents lives to be made miserable. Residents also have obligations to act according to the rules of the park to which they have agreed at the beginning of the tenancy and not to make a nuisance of themselves to other residents.

If there should be problems, this bill also details how an agreement can be terminated. The bill allows for greater protection, requiring that notice of between 28 and 90 days be given in normal circumstances, but it also allows for the provision for termination without notice to be applicable in extraordinary circumstances. In conclusion, I commend this bill to the parliament. It will strengthen the rights and responsibilities of those who live long term in caravan parks, giving them the same protection as others living in private housing tenancies under the Residential Tenancies Act.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): The caravan industry is very important to tourism in South Australia, and in my electorate I have a number of caravan parks which provide excellent facilities for the travelling public. Legislation of this nature is well and good, but people have to understand that the people who own and who have invested in these caravan parks have to be able to manage them, because caravan parks rely on word of mouth. If there is one disruptive or bad tenant, then that information spreads like wildfire. It is no good people thinking that there are not bad tenants, because I think that most members of parliament know or have had experiences probably on a weekly basis with people who behave in a quite outrageous fashion, disturb the rest of the neighbourhood, vandalise the property and do not think that they have done anything wrong.

Then, when the hard word is put on them, they race off to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal and you would think that butter would not melt in their mouth. I know of a recent case in which a constituent of mine at Eudunda, out of the goodness of her heart, allowed people to rent a house. When they behaved in a disgraceful manner, she went to the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, but this Anderson woman who conducts some of these tribunals treated my constituent disgracefully. You would have thought my constituent was the wrongdoer. She had to appeal to get these people out. They shot through. They had damaged the property and had not paid some of the rent. However, this person sitting on the tribunal, this Anderson lady, seems to have a peculiar outlook on life and on people who have invested in reasonable houses.

I make no apology because one unreasonable act always generates another and that is why she has an honourable mention in the house today. If she had treated my constituent reasonably, it would not have happened. In relation to permanent residents in caravan parks, if you make the rules too onerous and if you make it too difficult for people to manage them, there will be no permanent residents in caravan

parks. It is as simple as that. In many cases, these people have had to invest a very large amount of money and it is wishful thinking giving permanent residents certain rights. What happens if you have a permanent resident wanting to live in a caravan park and the caravan park proprietor says, 'No pets.'?

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Says no what?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Says 'No dogs.' What happens if these people run off to the tribunal and you get one of these funny people on the tribunal who says that they are allowed to have dogs? Who has the final say? Is it the tribunal or the owner? I want to know because it is a very important issue—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: It is in the rules.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, I want the minister to tell us whether it is the owner or the tribunal who has the final say.

The Hon. P.L. White interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I have; I took the trouble of getting this printed. I want the minister to tell us because we are debating it. The minister has put this legislation before the parliament; that is why she has the title 'the minister'. I want her to spell out clearly to the house exactly what the thing is because it is an important issue. People do not want dogs in caravan parks, particularly people who are staying overnight—

Mrs Geraghty: Only some people; some people like dogs in caravan parks.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes, but there are lots who do not and lots of owners do not because, if you get more than one dog, you get dog fights. That would be good at 2 o'clock in the morning, wouldn't it? It is bad enough when people over indulge and have a few rounds, but if you have a couple of bull terriers or blue heelers, they are liable to bloody well have a bit of a stoush and you have to separate them. That would be great fun, wouldn't it?

Mrs Geraghty: I agree, but most people are responsible with their pets.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Hopefully. Caravan parks cater for a wide section of the community. It is important that we know who has the final say. My view is that it is entirely up to the owner of the caravan park because they have to cater for the needs of the travelling public, and it should be clearly displayed whether pets are allowed or not allowed, because there are not many places where they are allowed. The other issue is that we should be encouraging people to make further improvements and investments in this particular area because more and more people are travelling around Australia. If you drive on the roads as the honourable member who is lead speaker for the opposition and I do, sometimes we have to pass these particular vehicles. All I can say is that I am pleased that there are more passing lanes than there used to be, but there needs to be a lot more. They play a very important role—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: How fast are you going when you go past them?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: At 110, and read what the Commissioner of Police said when I asked him the question a couple of years ago here about a bit of discretion when people need—

The Hon. P.L. White: Yes, Patrick Secker!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I did send it to Patrick Secker. I thought of the Commissioner straight away when I read about Mr Secker, so I sent him the extracts from *Hansard*. I thought I might be able to help him, because I am a considerate fellow. Even though it takes a lot to get me on my feet, I did send it to him. In relation to this matter, I want to see

people make more investments and be given enough flexibility to manage these facilities efficiently. Unfortunately, people do behave fairly outrageously. They block up toilets, they leave rubbish and all these sorts of things, and it is important that they have the ability to clamp down on misbehaviour as quickly as possible.

It does not matter whether you are at Marree or wherever you are, a lot of people want to use these facilities and we need to encourage people, not tie them up in unnecessary red tape. One of the real problems facing people in small business today is the onerous conditions and bureaucracy placed upon them and the amount of time it takes them to deal with bureaucracy. If members have been in private business or had to suffer it, they would know the amount of time and frustration involved. There is nothing worse than trying to deal with petty bureaucracy. I hope that this legislation works well. I would be very disappointed if it became another vehicle to make life difficult for people owning, managing and running these particular institutions, because they play a very important role.

It is important that the minister tells us who is going to have the final say, whether people are compelled to allow people to live there permanently and who is going to have the final say as to whether they can have cats, dogs, donkeys or whatever else there is.

Mr PICCOLO (Light): I support this bill. I acknowledge the work of the minister and her department in bringing the bill to the parliament, and the minister's strong commitment to fairness and equity for the people who choose to live in residential parks. I also would like to acknowledge, with my colleagues, the ground work done by the member for Taylor in her previous role. I will be very brief: I do not want to repeat what has been said by others in this place; but the reason I speak for this bill is because it creates fairness, equity and balance between park owners and residents. The bill is designed to protect the interests of those who choose to live in residential parks. I have a number of those in my electorate and I must say that, as far as I am aware, those in my electorate seem to be very well run and there are few complaints about them, but there are those which one hears complaints about.

This bill helps to regulate the behaviour of people in residential parks and, despite what the member opposite has said, it is quite clear in the bill who has a say in terms of what pets, etc., are allowed in the park, and also in terms of behaviour. It makes very clear that antisocial or violent behaviour does not have to be tolerated by the park owner or by the residents. What this bill does, and why we should support it, is clearly regulate the rights and responsibilities of both the park owners and the park residents, which to date have been unclear. Importantly, also, those agreements between park owners and residents have to be in writing, which removes any doubt. With those few comments, I support this bill.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I, too, will speak briefly on this bill. I have a residential caravan park in my electorate and generally, I have to say, it is very well run and the residents are extremely happy there. There are a number of aged folk in there who are supported by their neighbours, and it is a very nice community for them to live in. I think I did speak to the member for Taylor about it some years ago when she first introduced her bill, so I know that the folk who live in that particular park will be very happy to see this bill pass.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): I support the bill and would like to thank the minister for the time she spent on issues to do with this in my electorate. I have a considerable number of people who are affected by residential parks, caravan parks and everything else, so it is an ongoing battle. I am aware that some possible amendments need to be factored into this bill and hope that in due course some of these are dealt with. I am not quite sure whether the outcome of this will suit everyone, whether it will suit residents or the owners and managers, but it is a step in the right direction towards tidying up what has been a very messy affair. I am grateful to see the bill introduced in the house and debated, and ultimately we will get a good outcome.

The numbers of people who are going to live in these types of arrangement are only going to increase. I have 700 people living in one village in one part of my electorate, and a lot of time in my office is spent by staff handling problems from the residents. One couple today wanted an hour's appointment with me on it, so I might take the minister down to deal with that one. I do support the bill. It will put us in good stead for the future and I am very pleased to support it. I just ask the government that in due course, as amendments and suggestions are put up from our side of the house in this or another place, they be given due consideration, because all of South Australia, regardless of politics, needs to get it right. This is a step in the right direction.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson): I endorse the comments made by the member for Finniss; he put them very succinctly and very well. I rise to support this bill. We have one less residential caravan park in the electorate of Mawson than we did six months ago, and that was very upsetting for a great many families who had called that place home for up to 22 years. I believe this bill will give some clarity to both sides of the agreement.

Many people would have found themselves tossed out on to the street had it not been for the Rann government and the good work of minister Weatherill and the people from the Department for Families and Communities, the Housing Trust and other departments. I commend them for their wonderful work. We had 65 people who lived in The Vines Caravan Park, in the electorate of Mawson, who faced the prospect of living on the streets, yet accommodation was found for each and every one of them. So I commend the Minister for Families and Communities for his work, the work of state and federal government agencies, and the work of organisations such as the Southern Junction Community Service.

Let us hope that in future laws such as this will help to protect those people, and that people who find themselves in such situations will not have to face these sorts of problems again. There will now be some clarity for them, and there will be rules that people from both sides of the fence can look at to know where they stand. I support this bill and thank the minister and the member for Taylor for their work on this in recent years.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for Consumer Affairs): I would like to reiterate what I said in my second reading speech—that, in fact, the bill we are now considering is in this place simply because of the work that has been undertaken by the member for Taylor for many years and because of her very strong advocacy for residents of caravan parks, not only in her electorate but right across our state. She made the very valid point that management and maintenance

of these parks varies enormously, and this bill is about bringing some balance and order in this regard. It defines the rights and responsibilities of both the operator and the resident and provides some clarity and benefits, I think, for both sides.

I thank the opposition for their support of this bill; it is much appreciated. The member for Goyder raised the issue of how we deal with tenants who have a history of bad payments, of defaulting on their rent or of violence, and I reiterate that this is a circumstance faced by landlords every day. No park owner is obliged to take a tenant, and I guess they have an obligation to themselves to seek out good references before they sign up on that—with the proviso, of course, that they also cannot unlawfully discriminate against people. However, they have the same rights and responsibilities as a normal tenant.

The member for Stuart talked about the need to provide for tourism. Clearly, that is an essential factor but no park operator is required to allocate a certain number of sites for permanent residents—so, again, it is about the choice being made by the owners or operators. There is a special provision in this act that is not in the Residential Tenancies Act that enables a park operator to deal very swiftly and effectively with someone who is involved in a violent incident. The member for Stuart made the point that if you make the rules and regulations in relation to caravan parks too hard no-one will take up permanent residence. Clearly, that is not our intention; as I said, it is about a proper balance.

In relation to his query about pets, in part 2 of the act, section 6 (relating to park rules) provides that the park owner is able to make the rules, in the confines of a range of areas, about caravan parks, and the keeping of pets is one of those areas. However, if a majority of residents consider that a rule is onerous or inappropriate they can make a submission to the tribunal, which will declare whether the rule is reasonable or unreasonable, or change it. I hope that clarifies the issue for the member for Stuart; he is busy having another chat, but it was a matter of importance a while ago. Hopefully he will read the bill and understand that, ultimately, if there is an unreasonable rule made by a park operator, the tribunal has the responsibility of ruling on that.

I hope that, as a result of this bill, circumstances such as those described by the member for Mawson will be a thing of the past. Under this bill people will never have the rights of a property owner, but they will have some surety about their tenancy and the term of their tenancy. I thank the house for its support of this bill.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

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

Page 8, line 5—After 'and includes' insert:

a successor in title to the park (or rented property) whose title is subject to a resident's interest and

This amendment adds to the current definition of 'park owner' some extra words to make it clear that a park owner includes a person who acquires the park or part of it if the person's title is subject to the interest of a resident. Further, as set out in a following amendment, it is proposed that there should also be a rule where the new owner takes the park subject to the rights of long-term residents as provided for in the proposed new clause 48A.

Mr GRIFFITHS: The opposition has no problem with that amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My question relates to subclause (2) and the eleven areas in which rules can be created. It is interesting that it does not allow for any area that covers visitors or guests, and it would have been normal practice for most caravan park operators to have a park rule that covered that area. So, my suggestion would be that there be inserted a new paragraph (l), which is guests or visitors, and that the existing paragraph (l) becomes paragraph (m).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Limiting the number of guests to a person's home is not a normal part of a tenancy. The question is: is limiting the number of guests considered to be appropriate in a residential park, where it is a person's permanent place of residence?

Mr GRIFFITHS: The bill also refers to site agreements, which allows for caravans to be on the site too. So, given that the previous history of caravan parks has always allowed some control over the number of people who can occupy those sites, it seems to me appropriate to have that area included.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Is that an amendment that you are proposing now or that you are flagging between houses? We are happy to look at that.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My question relates to the creation of the residents committees, and it was an issue that we spoke about during the briefing. We understand that quite often there are different power groups within caravan parks and residential parks. It is impossible that more than one committee could be established by residents groups. If that is the case, who determines which is the appropriate committee that the manager actually deals with?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: As the honourable member pointed out, under this provision there can only be one committee. So, if there are two or more groups claiming to be the committee, then there is no committee as required by the bill and thus no obligation to consult either group on the proposed rule changes. In effect, residents have to get their act together and decide whether they want to have a committee or they do not want to have a committee that is consulted.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 and 9 passed.

Clause 10.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My query relates to subclause (4)(b), and I refer to advice provided by the Caravan Parks Association, which has questioned the inclusion of the word 'precisely' when identifying the site. The basis of this is that quite often the tenancy agreement allows for occupation within the residential park, but there may be instances in which more than one site is occupied for the period of that agreement. Therefore, by identifying the precise location in the agreement, it creates some difficulties.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: While I am getting some advice, I will wing this a bit, if I may. I cannot understand why it would be a difficulty precisely identifying a site. For example, we are not just talking about caravans. We are talking about people putting homes on the sites. So, the last thing we want is a position of uncertainty, where someone may be required to shift their home. I do not understand why they would want a position where they have to uproot someone who has permanently placed a caravan on site, either. It would create a lot of difficulty, I would imagine, but

I am going to take some advice. Effectively, once you have given someone a right to live somewhere, they should be entitled to live there.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I flag the fact that there may be some discussion on that issue from our members between the houses.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 13 passed.

Clause 14.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I seek some clarification. During the briefing we talked about the need to provide a plain English draft of the documentation that is mentioned quite often throughout this bill. The commitment given was that the relevant body would help park operators in providing this so that they could use it as a basis for any documentation that is needed to be produced.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: One of the things that the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs is very skilled at is writing very clear, user-friendly documents and information leaflets, so I would expect nothing less.

Clause passed.

Clauses 15 and 16 passed.

Clause 17.

Mr GRIFFITHS: The query here relates to subclause (3)(b) which provides the opportunity via the park rules to limit occupancy of the park to people who are over the age of 50. The clarification that we seek concerns the condition of ill health suddenly being forced upon the tenant, who is then required to have a carer live on site with them and that carer is below the age of 50. How would that be covered?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: This clause is really about facilitating those people who want to live in a location that does not have a lot of children, but it really comes back to the rules, and my advice is that, if they want to make a rule that clearly excludes anyone under 50, they can do that, or they can make a rule that is more relaxed than that. It would really be up to the park owner whether he or she was going to serve notice on someone if they had a carer come in who was 40 or 48 or whatever, and whether that would be considered by the tribunal to be fair and reasonable. It is not so much about precluding people who are a few years younger and is covered by the rules, so I think that common sense in that area would prevail.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I appreciate that explanation by the minister, and I recognise that I am probably being somewhat pedantic about it, but we just identified this as an issue during the briefing that we wanted some clarification on, but I am happy with the explanation provided.

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 to 47 passed.

Clause 48.

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

Page 29, line 22—After 'consented' insert:
, or refuse to consent,

Mr GRIFFITHS: I appreciate the inclusion of that amendment, but in its submission the Caravan Parks Association suggested it may be appropriate to remove the words in line 23, 'receipt of the notice of the assignment', and replace them with, 'completing interview and evaluating references or information supplied by the assignee'. Again, this is only to ensure that the person who is becoming the tenant on this site is someone that the management is happy with.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We would oppose that because that clause is about giving some definite date in

relation to knowing whether or not the assignment has been allowed. That is the purpose of that, to give a specified date.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am not suggesting the removal of the date. I am only suggesting that the management of the site should have the ability to review who the assignee would be and to ensure they are an appropriate person to move into the residential park.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: There is nothing to preclude the making of those inquiries, and they have the time in which to do that and then give advice. They just need to give an answer within seven days, and if they are not happy, they say no.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 48A.

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

Page 30, after Part 5—Insert:

Part 5A—Residential park site agreement—acquisition of park or site

48A—Residential park site agreement—acquisition of park or site

(1) This section applies if—

- (a) title to all or part of the land within a residential park is acquired from the park owner by a person (the new owner); and
- (b) the land acquired includes land on which a person has installed a dwelling under a residential park site agreement for a term exceeding 12 months; and
- (c) but for this section, the new owner's title would not be subject to the resident's interest under the residential park site agreement.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Real Property Act 1886, the new owner's title to the land is subject to the resident's interest under the residential park site agreement.

(3) The new owner may, however, by notice of termination given to the resident, terminate the residential park site agreement without specifying a ground of termination.

(4) A notice of termination by the new owner must—

- (a) be given to the resident within 14 days after the date of the new owner's acquisition of title to the land; and
- (b) specify the day on which the agreement is terminated which must not be earlier than whichever is the earlier of—
 - (i) the end of the term of the agreement as fixed by the agreement; and
 - (ii) 12 months from the date of the new owner's acquisition of title to the land.

(5) If the new owner gives notice of termination to the resident under this section, the resident is not necessarily bound by the residential park site agreement until it terminates as a result of that notice, but may, by notice of termination given to the new owner, terminate the agreement without specifying a ground of termination.

(6) The period of the resident's notice to the new owner must be at least 28 days.

(7) A notice under this section must comply with the requirements of Part 8 Division 5 as to the form of a notice of termination and, in the case of a notice given by the new owner, include any further information required by the Commissioner.

(8) A notice terminating a residential park site agreement under this section is not ineffectual because the day on which the agreement is to end is not the last day of the term of the agreement as fixed by the agreement.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Our party room has not had an opportunity to consider this amendment, so I cannot really flag what the position will be, so it is possible that we may reserve the right to consider this in between the houses.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Do you want me to simply clarify this amendment? We have a situation where people may have nine months left to run on a lease. If the property is sold and vacant possession is required, they are entitled to have the nine months of their lease to live there. This clarifies

the situation for those very long-term residents, some of whom have been given five, 10 or 20-year leases, and signed up to those with good faith. However, if they are not registered on the title, they have no rights in relation to that, so, as far as I understand, they would not have the benefits of someone with even a short-term lease. This gives them up to 12 months tenancy, and that is inserted on any lease the day they sign up so that they understand that that is the situation.

New clause inserted.

Clause 49.

Mr GRIFFITHS: This relates to the Residential Park Agreement and the sale of dwellings on-site. In my previous role as chief executive officer of the Yorke Peninsula Council, my history has been that, where permanent sites have been occupied, often for some time, and money has changed hands for the purchase of the improvements on that site, there has also, unfortunately, been occasions where people have paid for the position of the site. That has created a lot of problems because there is no guarantee of the occupancy of that site in the long term.

Certainly, this bill recognises that it is only for a maximum period of 12 months, and then after that there is potential for a movement to occur. It is really just a clarification issue, because I think it is important that the park managers have the opportunity to be involved in some way in the process of the sale of the on-site improvements to ensure that the value being paid for is for the improvements only and not for the site location itself.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: This is about the sale of the dwelling itself; it does not create any rights to the site.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I understand that, but sometimes purchasers do not, and the purpose of the amendment. I just wanted to raise the issue; that is all.

Clause passed.

Clauses 50 to 79 passed.

Clause 80.

Mr GRIFFITHS: This one relates to the termination based on hardship. During the briefing, it was again explained that, in the case of illness occurring in the family by the tenant or tenants, there was certainly the option for the agreement to be terminated. The question that we raise, which we are not sure is adequately covered, is: given the possibility in many cases that people who reside in these parks need to actually move residence if they gain employment somewhere else, is that also sufficient grounds for the termination of the agreement?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Basically, the tribunal has historically made the determinations in relation to hardship, and in relation to occupying a house has generally not considered taking a job somewhere else a case of hardship. But it does have the authority to consider these issues on a case by case basis, and we would expect that to happen.

Clause passed.

Clauses 81 to 87 passed.

Clause 88.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I seek clarification as to why there is a need to provide a forwarding address on the presumption that the agreement has been terminated, all financial responsibilities have been met, and facilities provided as they were when they moved in.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am advised that this is in relation to abandoned property that may be left behind. The operator has an obligation to try to locate the tenant. Having that address helps them do that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 89 and 90 passed.

Clause 91.

Mr GRIFFITHS: This query relates to the action to deal with the abandoned property other than personal documents. Again, a question I raised during the briefing was: is there a requirement for the park managers to produce some form of audit statement so that, when the funds are provided to the previous tenant, if they are able to be located, it ensures that the money in is appropriate, and the money that has gone out is appropriate, and that the previous tenant is therefore assured that they actually gain the maximum return on their property, and that only appropriate costs were taken out of that?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The answer is, apparently, no; there is no such requirement. But, my advice is that there have been no disputes for monies from abandoned goods before. Presumably, the tribunal would ask for receipts and justification for that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 92 and 93 passed.

Clause 94.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Again, in the Caravan Park Association's submission, it sought the ability to actually expand the serious acts of violence. I note it said that this area needed to be expanded to include behaviour such as offensive and abusive actions, drunkenness, sexual harassment of other residents or park staff and antisocial behaviour. It wishes to strengthen these areas.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Sexual assault would obviously come under a serious act of violence and be covered by this measure. However, the line was drawn in relation to acts of drunkenness and harassment, for example, which could take various forms. We did not want to make the park operator, if you like, the policeman of those sorts of issues. So, the line was drawn under those sorts of serious acts of violence.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Therefore, it is a discretionary issue for the park manager. There are no prescriptive actions by which they can evict people; it is at their discretion?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: This is not prescriptive, either. This is a power that they can use, but they do not have to do so.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (95 to 142), schedules and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GROUNDWATER (BORDER AGREEMENT) (AMENDING AGREEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The purpose of the Bill is to approve and ratify an Amendment Agreement to the Border Groundwaters Agreement (the "Principal Agreement"). The Amendment Agreement is set out as a Schedule to the Bill.

As some Honourable Members will know the Principal Agreement entered into between the States of Victoria and South Australia in 1985 provided for the coordinated management of groundwater resources in the vicinity of the Victorian and South Australian border. In most areas adjacent to the border, groundwater is the only

reliable water source. Over the last 20 years the Principal Agreement has provided a realistic and equitable framework for inter-governmental co-operation in the development of long-term strategies for protecting and sustainably harvesting the groundwater resources in the border area.

The Principal Agreement is expressed to operate in both States for a distance of 20 kilometres from the border and extending for its full length. This strip of border land, defined in the Principle Agreement as the "Designated Area", is therefore 40 kilometres wide. It is divided into 22 zones, 11 in each State. The Principal Agreement provides that the available groundwater resources be shared equitably between the two States. It applies to all existing and future bores in the Designated Area, except stock and domestic bores. Extraction licences or permits may not be granted or renewed within the Designated Area other than in accordance with the management prescriptions set out in the Principal Agreement. The prescriptions limit water use in a particular zone to that specified as the Permissible Annual Volume for total withdrawals from all aquifers, or to an average annual rate of potentiometric (water) levels as specified, or a permissible level of salinity.

Along the Victorian/South Australian border, groundwater occurs in two main aquifer systems comprising the "Tertiary Confined Sand Aquifer" and the "Tertiary Limestone Aquifer". The Tertiary Limestone Aquifer is the primary source of groundwater for existing users. The use of the Tertiary Confined Sand Aquifer is generally limited to municipal supply, but there are increasing demands to use the aquifer where the Tertiary Limestone Aquifer is fully allocated.

The current management prescriptions were drafted with only the Tertiary Limestone Aquifer in mind. They enable only broad-based management to be applied. This has served well to date, but is no longer adequate due to the increased demand for groundwater resources and the need for more targeted management approaches that can be applied to specific circumstances, aquifer types, geologic conditions and hydraulic conditions.

The amendments to the Principal Agreement proposed are:

- firstly, to distinguish between the two aquifers and enable sub-zones to be established for more effective local management;
- secondly, to allow management prescriptions to be set for the different aquifers and sub-zones within a zone;
- thirdly, to simplify two of the management prescriptions which are unclear; and
- finally, to update references to other legislation

In conclusion, it is clear that the simple model set out in the Principal Agreement, which was developed in the 1980s, has proved to be a sound basis for the equitable sharing of the resource. Both Victoria and South Australia have undertaken considerable investigations into the status and use of groundwater along the border and have established a sound framework for management of this important resource. The Amendments to the Principal Agreement and the continuing goodwill of the contracting parties will ensure the groundwater resources along our common border continue to be managed sustainably and effectively.

I commend the Bill to Members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

The measure will be brought into operation by proclamation.

3—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Groundwater (Border Agreement) Act 1985*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends section 4 of the *Groundwater (Border Agreement) Act 1985* (the "Act") to provide for new definitions of *Agreement* and *Amending Agreement*.

5—Insertion of section 5A

This clause inserts new section 5A into the Act to provide that the Amending Agreement is approved.

6—Amendment of section 12—Bores for observation and providing data

This clause updates a cross-reference to reflect the arrangements that now apply under the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*.

7—Repeal of section 14

8—Repeal of First Schedule

These clauses repeal redundant material.

9—Substitution of heading to Second Schedule

This is a consequential amendment.

10—Insertion of Schedule 3

This clause inserts a new Schedule into the Act. The Schedule contains the Border Groundwaters Agreement Amendment Agreement as signed by the Premiers of Victoria and South Australia.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): I confirm that the opposition will be supporting the bill without the requirement for amendment. I note that the bill was supported as presented following several questions by the shadow minister and comment by honourable members in the other place. On behalf of the opposition, I also extend my appreciation to ministerial and departmental officers for the very detailed briefing provided last week. My understanding is that the basis of this agreement is to create necessary amendments to the Border Groundwater Agreement of 1985, which was and remains groundbreaking and a model for other states when considering water resource sharing needs and proposals.

This bill approves and ratifies amendments to the Border Groundwater Agreement, an agreement between South Australia and Victoria, to provide a coordinated management of the groundwater near the South Australian and Victorian border. The principal agreement operates in both states for a distance of 20 kilometres from the border and extends the length of the border. This strip of border land, as defined in the principal agreement, will thus be 40 kilometres wide and is divided into 22 zones, with 11 zones in each state. This amendment bill will provide, first, for some adjustment to create subzones within each of those zones; secondly, to allow management prescriptions to be set for the different aquifers and subzones within a zone; thirdly, to simplify two of the management prescriptions that are unclear; and, fourthly, to update reference to other legislation.

I found the information on the control of water extraction from the two aquifers (the basis of what this bill will do) to be very interesting. Along the South Australian and Victorian border groundwater occurs in two main aquifers, the tertiary sand aquifer and the tertiary limestone aquifer. The tertiary limestone aquifer is the primary source of groundwater for existing users, while the tertiary confined sand aquifer is generally limited to municipal supply, but there are increasing demands to use the aquifer where the tertiary limestone aquifer is fully allocated. The prescriptions limit water use in the particular zone to that specified in the permissible annual volume for total withdrawals from all aquifers, in accordance with the water and salinity levels. I also note with interest that similar, if not identical, legislative amendments have been considered and supported by the Victorian parliament.

The current climatic conditions are making us realise that the efficient management of water resources is absolutely critical to this state. The current drought situation affecting much of South Australia—and, indeed, the nation—and the growth of farms and industries has made all South Australians realise the importance of ensuring the protection of our water supplies. While the majority of South Australia's water supply comes from surface water, within the South-East area groundwater is the only reliable water source. The government has stated that the principal agreement will provide the framework for the protection of sustainable harvesting of groundwater resources. The new powers of review under this bill will go some way towards ensuring proper use of this natural resource. I confirm my support for this bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): Under the principal agreement, available groundwater is shared equitably between South Australia and Victoria. The increasing demand for groundwater has prompted this bill. In this time of low rainfall and the looming threat of drought, I bring to the attention of this house some matters of concern in my electorate that my colleague the Hon. David Ridgway has raised in the other place. There are four different matters, all of which relate to the quality, distribution and use of the groundwater resources in the Upper South-East and further north in the Mallee along the South Australia-Victoria border.

The first concerns the extraordinary situation facing a potato grower over his entitlement to access groundwater. This access appears to be affected by an anomaly in the location of the edge of the 20-kilometre border zone, which, accidentally, has left him in no man's land. As this matter is currently before the court, we must be careful about what we say in relation to the case. However, on the broader issue of the actual delineation of the 20-kilometre zone, the minister responsible for natural resource management, the Hon. Gail Gago, at the urging of my colleague has agreed to seek the Border Agreement Management Committee's advice on the realignment of that zone boundary.

The second issue which arises from this groundwater debate concerns the use rates of the resource. These rates, which are the same for both South Australia and Victoria, are based on regularly monitoring volumes and salinity levels, which are adjusted following reviews conducted every five years. Vegetable growers' allocations are based currently on theoretical factors that may or may not be appropriate for different regions. The minister has assured the upper house that DWLBC is remodelling the groundwater usage levels, taking into account specific crop and location factors in South Australia and Victoria, to present to the Border Review Committee for its consideration.

The third issue concerning the groundwater resource is the salinity level, which is increasing as a result of various clearing and farming activities since white settlement. The concern is that the salinity is spreading towards the aquifer itself. CSIRO studies confirm that there is a possibility this might eventually render the water in the aquifer useless—too brackish for any purpose. This raises the question of whether the current use rate might be increased to maximise the available resource before the saline drift reaches it or, alternatively, be reduced in an effort to extend its useful life. The current policy would seek to preserve and prolong, but the subsequent reduced rate might simply limit the overall amount of the resource's usefulness before it is contaminated and, at the same time, impact too heavily on the local economy.

Finally, in an effort to relieve some local flooding problems in South Australia, groundwater was channelled by Victorian counterparts into the aquifer on the Victorian side. Subsequent run-offs were found by them to be of poor quality, affected by such things as fertilisers and farm chemicals, amongst other things. As a consequence, this apparently contaminated run-off was left to run unfiltered by natural percolation throughout the soil into the area from which Bordertown's water supply is drawn. We understand that the EPA is responsible for monitoring the quality of this water. As growers adjust from receiving water on a hectare (IE) allocation to metered allocations, we need to ensure that they receive enough water to operate effectively but, in so doing, we need to ensure that users of stock and domestic groundwater do not lose the amenity of that supply.

We must ensure that the thriving horticultural industry in the Mallee has available sufficient water of suitable quality to keep up its vital contribution to the economy, both local and state. We urge and request all authorities, committees and other involved agencies, as well as the minister, to ensure these matters receive close and constant attention. A poor result through a lack of priority and commitment will affect far more than the lives of those who live in the immediate area. Given the record low rainfall this year and weather forecasters' warnings of the apparent return of El Nino so soon after its recent devastating presence, the possible consequences on regional population centres, employment, lifestyle, the local ecology and commodity prices could affect the whole state.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): It is terrific to receive strong support from the other side in relation to this bill. It would be one of the few bits of legislation dealing with water resources in the South-East where there is unanimity of purpose. I thank members for their contributions on this bill and their support to ratify the South Australian-Victorian Amendment Agreement for the effective amendment of the common groundwater resource along the state border. The Border Groundwater Agreement was forward thinking legislation when it was adopted in 1985 as one of the few interjurisdictional agreements to manage water resources across state borders. Being on the downstream end of a number of groundwater and surface water catchments with Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and the Northern Territory, South Australia has a keen interest in the effective management of the water resource of these catchments and groundwater resources. I must say we are the main beneficiary of these agreements, as the member for MacKillop knows.

Other than the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement, the Border Groundwater Agreement is the only interstate agreement that is underpinned by legislation; in this case, by mirror legislation in South Australia and Victoria. The support today of the bill to ratify the amendment agreement affirms the support given to the agreement by the Victorian parliament and by the governments of both states. I commend the bill to the house and, in so doing, I thank parliamentary counsel and departmental officers, particularly Neil Power (who is in the chamber), for their work on this legislation.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I move:
That the house do now adjourn.

DROUGHT

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise to speak about a very serious matter, because when we left the parliament two weeks ago I did say that we were looking at a very serious situation in relation to the weather. I have to say that, since we last met, it has not rained. This state has reached a very serious situation. I think most members are aware of what is happening. The state is 75 per cent affected by this dry weather, and I would say that almost 50 per cent of the crop is lost for the season. It is ironic because it is actually raining in various parts of the state. I do not know to what degree it is raining but, as we speak at 25 past 5 on Tuesday

19 September, it is raining a little. Let us hope that we get some worthwhile rain tonight because half the state can certainly be saved by a lifesaving rain.

I have been involved with farming all my life, and my memory stretches back 55 years—and I have a good memory of farming and what grows—but I cannot think of a worse year than this one in the Mid North of our state. I can remember nothing like it. Never in our family's history have we not reaped a crop. I can recall going out in the morning with the harvester, returning home for lunch and saying to my father, 'Well, dad, the box is not full yet.' The box held about eight or nine bags in those days, but we got our seed back then. However, until this evening, it looked as though we would not be getting the header out at all. In fact, at the moment the men are cutting hay—not just on our farm but on all farms in the area. Where there is some growth, they are trying to cut it for hay before it dies.

That is extremely disappointing because not only is it an extremely expensive operation to cut hay but when you are receiving less than half a tonne to the acre—I say 'acre' because it sounds better than hectare—it is very marginal as well. However, I think we are doing it because many people will need the hay, rather than our trying to make money, because I do not think that they will make much money out of it. You almost write the year off. I have just received a note from the member for Hammond which succinctly says that it is not raining. I hope it is raining. I noticed a wet roof just outside my window at parliament house. I did ring Kapunda about half an hour ago and was informed that there had been some useful falls in Kapunda. I do not know how far that extends.

I think that everyone in this house, in one way or another, would be affected by this unusual, freakish, horrific weather event. The worse thing about it is that this is the year when there has been no talk of El Nino or anything else. Next year is a seven year and I always fear the seven years because, if you go back through history, the seven years have been the shockers. There is a lot of apprehension about what could happen next year. I appreciate what the minister (Hon. Rory McEwen) said today. The government is being proactive and I congratulate it for that. I know full well that many farmers will not meet the criteria in relation to exceptional circumstance drought relief, because most drought relief criteria is only activated in the second year. I know that many farmers will be in a serious situation this year because of this weather, even though they had a reasonable year last year.

I also put on notice, too, my concern about the level of grain stocks in Australia. Years ago it was law that the grain merchants had to keep a certain amount of grain on hand, that is, carryover stock. That all changed about 20 years ago, and I am very concerned about the level of grain stocks in Australia. You cannot eat it if it is not there. We will be relying upon exports from overseas. I have to say that there is not much grain in other countries either. I believe that we could have, without knowing the full facts, run our stocks down to a dangerously low level—and the same could be said about Adelaide. I am also very concerned—and I think we as politicians need to think about this—about Adelaide's water supply. Adelaide relies on the River Murray for its water, as we all know—and the ex-minister for water resources is sitting here and we do miss him in that portfolio. I am very much afeared, should we get a blue-green algae event in the River Murray, what Adelaide does about its water. Is there a contingency plan somewhere if Adelaide could not pump water from the River Murray?

Mr Piccolo: 'Contingensea'?

Mr VENNING: The member for Light laughingly says, 'The sea.' Well, he is dead right.

Mr Piccolo: No, I didn't say 'the sea'—

Mr VENNING: I believe that there is an emergency plan that we could get a desalinating plant. Heavens above, to supply Adelaide just with drinking water and domestic use would have to be a huge plant. I hope these things have been thought through.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: They have: Waterproofing Adelaide.

Mr VENNING: 'Waterproofing Adelaide' was a term the previous member for Unley often used when he was minister for water resources. We talked about it, but what actually was done I do not know.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: We're doing it.

Mr VENNING: We are doing it now? I hope that is well down the track, minister, because it may be called upon sooner than you think. We as MPs have to think—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: We are in better shape than any other state.

Mr VENNING: The minister assures me that we are in better shape than any other state. I hope that he is right, because I was only looking at the rainwater tanks the other day and not too many people have full rainwater tanks. Most of them are a third empty, or two-thirds empty, depending on which way you look at it, because they have been using the water, thinking that it will be topped up. Unless we get October rains, they are going to start the summer with very little rain water in them. It is high time that we stopped talking about giving people some incentive to buy rainwater tanks—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: We are.

Mr VENNING: Or give them more incentive, in fact, supply them at cost or whatever, or give them a huge rebate to fit them.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: \$400.

Mr VENNING: I hope these interjections are going on the record: they are actually helpful.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: \$400 we are subsidising to have rainwater tanks plumbed into houses.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. P.L. White): The Minister for Health will pay the respect that the member for Schubert deserves.

Mr VENNING: No, Madam Acting Speaker, I asked for that interjection and I am pleased to have it on the record, because I was not sure of the finer details. People who have put rainwater tanks in are going to be very thankful, because it could be the only clean water they are going to get. We really do have to advance ourselves in the use of our grey water. We can no longer afford to put grey water down the drain into the sewage. It can be used on our gardens, for washing the car or in the toilet. In Israel they have been doing it for years, and in this country it is high time that we got the message to all our people out there. This is a pretty difficult time for our state: let us learn from this and prepare, as they did in biblical times. They always prepared for those times.

Members will remember Joseph and the Israelites with the wheat, when they sold it to the Egyptians. The same principles still apply. Those who prepare for droughts and difficult times are usually the ones who are in it for the long term. In the old days, all farmers cut hay and stored it in their barns and sheds for that time when they had a lean year. In recent times, the farmers have not been doing that. Many have been out pursuing the illustrious dollar and they have been selling their total production. Some still do, of course, but generally

it is no longer a practice that you would call normal. Let this be a wake-up call for all of us, that these times happen. There is nothing we can do about it.

I cannot blame the Labor government for this! I really cannot. There is nothing that anyone can do when the weather just refuses to rain at all. There is nothing that anyone in this house, either in it or departed from it, can do about it. I certainly hope that we are going to get some rain this evening and in the next couple of weeks for those farmers who can still reap a crop, because we are going to need to get our seed wheat from somewhere. Most members of parliament would be aware of this, and I welcomed the announcement today by the minister that the government is doing all it can with the preliminary set-up of the committee to see what can be done, because there are going to be some desperate farmers.

Just the other day, a woman came up to me and said, 'Ivan, you've had a good life on the farm.' I said, 'Yes, the farm has been good to me, but what are we going to do about our young farmers?'

Time expired.

DOORWAYS 2 CONSTRUCTION

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para): In the recent winter break, I had the pleasure of being invited to look at a project in my electorate under the auspices of a statewide program called Doorways 2 Construction and was really impressed with what I saw. The Doorways 2 Construction statewide project was established in 1999, and for members' information it is a unique program that has been developed specifically to assist the building industry in Australia. The program was developed in partnership between the industry, the Department for Education and Children's Services and the Construction Industry Training Board. It supports the recruitment and induction of young people into the building and construction industry.

This year, 557 secondary students are enrolled in this program across the state. There are 25 clusters of schools, with 70 individual public and private schools involved, an increase from six clusters at the beginning of the program in 1999. Its vision is to have a sustainable, nationally recognised VET in Schools initiative that is a program of first choice for schools and students and is recognised by industry as the doorway to employment in the building industry. It aims to introduce the building and construction industry to young people and to provide basic skills and work experience for students wanting to get into the industry.

It has four main components: first, the certificate 1 in building and construction; secondly, four weeks (that is, 20 days) minimum work placement; thirdly, career advice, site visits and career talks; and, fourthly, there is no time frame for the completion of the certificate. The particular site that I visited was part of the northern cluster, and Salisbury High School is the base school of that northern cluster. The other schools in that cluster are Trinity College, Saint Columba's College, Craigmore High School, Fremont/Elizabeth City High School and Paralowie High School. There are currently 25 students involved in the certificate 1 program, and 13 of those are from Salisbury High School.

Salisbury started running Doorways 2 Construction in 1999 and the other schools send their students to the base school. It is seen as the best metropolitan Doorways 2 Construction program and equal best overall with the Mount Gambier cluster. This cluster works on one project at a time and is currently working on renovating a Housing Trust house

in Holcomb Street, Elizabeth East. The students can either enrol at the beginning of term 1 or term 3, and they use the house in Holcomb Street as their practical work placement.

I visited the house with a number of people because on that particular day the project was receiving the donation of a large shipping container from a local business, who had donated the container so that the students could store all their working materials on site rather than having to transport them on a daily basis. It was quite an amazing situation, and I had the opportunity of talking to the young men (and at this point it was all young males, although I understand that it is not only for males) involved in the project on that day. All the young men were working away at a very high skill level, transforming the inside of this old Housing Trust house. They had redesigned it, had knocked down walls and built new spaces, and had completely renovated floors, walls, ceilings and windows—the whole lot.

On speaking to those young people it was clear that what they really liked was the fact that they could spend whole days on the site—I think they spent two days a week there and the others days back at school. They were incredibly keen and committed to the project, and wanted to get out into the trade after school. At that time I was informed that the northern cluster was the only one to be directly involved in restructuring projects such as I have just described. Most of the clusters aimed only for small projects—building pencil cases, tiling small areas and small painting jobs. This project

is a large, complex one and, as I said, involves the remodeling and restructuring of a house.

Most of the students who have been in this particular project go into an apprenticeship. Four students finished the certificate last term, two have re-enrolled, one is working and one has gone on to do an electro-tech course to be an electrician. Last year one female completed the course and she now has an apprenticeship in carpentry. There are also two special needs students currently completing their certificate. At present, students who receive their certificate I either have to go back to school the following year or leave to find work; however, it has been proposed (and I understand it is likely to go ahead) that next year, in 2007, certificate II will be introduced into the northern cluster so that students can continue with their practical skills into year 12. Certificate II will also include a mentoring component, where students mentor new certificate II students.

I would like to congratulate all those involved in that project, and speak in favour of projects like this across the state. They engage young people in practical demonstrations of a vocational nature, and students are then likely to stay on at school and not only finish their secondary education but also get qualifications leading to an apprenticeship. This project is a very highly regarded example of what really does work for young people.

Motion carried.

At 5.43 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 20 September at 2 p.m.