

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 16 November 2006

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 10.31 a.m. and read prayers.

### VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

The **SPEAKER:** I draw to honourable members' attention the presence in the gallery of students from Rostrevor College, who are guests of the member for Morialta.

### TAIWAN VISIT

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

That this house—

- (a) notes the economic, social and cultural success of the people of Taiwan;
- (b) supports maintenance of the status quo in respect of relationships between Taiwan and its international neighbours, in particular the People's Republic of China; and
- (c) expresses its sincere hope that the future will see continued economic cooperation and mutual understanding between the People's Republic of China and the people of Taiwan.

I move this motion with great pleasure, and acknowledge the amazing economic, social and cultural successes of the people of Taiwan. Having moved that the house support maintenance of the status quo in respect of relationships between Taiwan and its international neighbours, but in particular the People's Republic of China, I will be expressing my sincere hope that the future will see continued economic cooperation and mutual understanding between the People's Republic of China, our great friend, and our other great friend, the country and people of Taiwan.

My motion flows from a recent visit to Taiwan in September in the company of my good friends the members for Taylor and Newland. We visited from Monday 4 September through to Friday 8 September as guests of the government and people of Taiwan, who hosted and primarily funded our visit, and it was indeed an honour to be part of that visit as a friend of Taiwan. Of course, we are all also friends of the People's Republic of China and a number of other major countries in the area.

It was certainly an eye opener for me, and worthy of making a point through this motion today. We arrived at the CKS International Airport on a Taiwanese flight and stayed at the Grand Formosa in Taipei. On our first day we were able to visit the Council for Economic Planning and Development, the Executive Yuan. On that day we also called on the Taipei City Council, a very interesting organisation—in fact, a very large organisation that encompasses the whole of the city. It is a very big city, and Australian-style councils almost pale into insignificance in terms of that organisation's budget, capacity and breadth. We were hosted at lunch by the Taipei City Council and on the Tuesday we left for Kaohsiung to visit the south-east of the country and a city called Hualien, where we stayed on the Tuesday evening.

On the Wednesday, we had the great pleasure of visiting some of the natural beauties of Taiwan, including the Taroko National Park, the Tzu-chi University and the Buddhist Tzu-chi General Hospital. We returned to Taipei on the Wednesday evening, where we had a dinner meeting. On the Thursday, we called on Mrs Chang Siao-yue, the Vice-

Minister of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. We also visited the Government Information Office, which is part of the Executive Yuan, and we later called on a private corporation (that visit had been arranged, I think, by the member for Newland) to have a look at a high-tech company at work in Taiwan. It really was quite an interesting visit. We later visited night markets.

On the Friday, we visited the Tourism Bureau of the Ministry of Transportation and Communication for a range of briefings. We had a lunch meeting with Mr Donald C.T. Lee, the Director-General, Department of East Asian and Pacific Affairs. That afternoon, we visited the Taipei Rapid Transit Corporation (in which I was particularly interested, as the shadow minister for infrastructure) and looked at what has been a multi-billion dollar investment in the underground railways and transport structure of that city, which is of a first-class standard. We also visited the Bureau for Energy within the Ministry of Economic Affairs, and later that evening we departed the country for our return to Australia.

We were given a pretty good overview of what is happening in Taiwan. We were also given a good overview of business and government (at both national and local levels) through the Taipei City Council. We also visited the countryside around Taiwan, and we saw some pretty amazing things. I was struck by how normal it was, in the sense of how similar it is to Australia. We saw a lot of families just going about their business and enjoying their time together. We saw many businesses conducting their affairs and working away and a lot of employees going about their daily grind, very much as one would see right here in Adelaide, Sydney or Melbourne. It is a very cosmopolitan country. By and large, the people are multilingual. It is a country that has a lot of get-up-and-go.

I do not need to remind members that this country is about half the size of Tasmania, if I remember correctly, consisting of some 36 000 or so square kilometres, and it manages to support a population of just short of 23 million. This really puts into perspective the debate about whether or not we can sustain a larger population in Australia. The main language is Mandarin. It is a country of growing economic status with, I think, a GDP (in US dollar terms) of about \$350 billion (for 2006, that is certainly what is predicted) and a GDP per person of \$671 billion (or a per capita income of \$US15 160). That is not a bad effort for a country with so many natural disadvantages in terms of its size, its natural resources and its water and energy resources. To me, it really demonstrates what a country such as this—a determined country, whose people are dynamic and prepared to do well—can achieve.

There are few coal reserves; I think 103 million tonnes. There is little in the way of natural gas and forestry. However, it has economic growth rates of which any country could be proud—in 2005, it was over 4 per cent. It has inflation under control, it has a sensible and admirable exchange rate, and it has an unemployment rate of just over 4 per cent, which is less than here. It has strong foreign exchange reserves of \$US253 billion, and it has a strong balance of trade and good economic growth credentials, with good savings and investment performances and strong exports based on strong imports—and, of course, the country is a very important trading partner for Australia.

For me it was really a quite uplifting experience seeing what the people of Taiwan have achieved from virtually nothing. It really reminds me that, particularly since World War II, some of the countries that have had virtually nothing have achieved everything. Countries such as Taiwan, South

Korea, Singapore, struggling to survive World War II, with few resources and with a mass of people, with nothing more than their own human capital have managed to make themselves wealthy and dynamic countries, and leaders, really, for many in the world to follow—and I think Taiwan is no exception.

I am not understating it when I say that I am incredibly impressed with this country. I think there are many lessons for us to learn here in this country, where we have everything in the way of natural resources, with so few people, where we have 5 per cent of the world's land mass and less than 1 per cent of the world's people. Really, to me, it sets out a picture of what we could achieve in this country if we were as determined, resolved and dynamic as the people of Taiwan. There are a lot of messages for us in this country.

I want to thank a few people who helped during the tour, particularly Calvin Ke-ming Yen, who escorted us for much of our tour and who is now here as a senior official of the Taiwanese government, through the Trade and Economic Office in Melbourne. He is a wonderful man who was a great help to us during the trip. I also want to thank Catherine Ruhuei Cheng from the Department of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, who was our escort and a wonderful help to us. However, there were a number of other people we met, such as Charles Chen, a counsellor with the Government Information Office; Ambassador Chang, Siao-Yue, Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs; P.C. Huang of the Garmin Corporation; Shu-Ti Chang of the Mainland Affairs Council; Thomas M.F. Yeh, Vice Chairman of the Council for Economic Planning and Development of the Executive Yuan; Paul Shek of the Ministry of Freight Affairs; and Steven T.Y. Kuo Su of the Tourism Bureau. Of course, there are many others—too many to mention. There was Cheng-Mau Su, Deputy Secretary of the Taipei City Council; Jyuung-Shiauu Chern, Chief of Energy Affairs Section at the Bureau of Energy and Ministry of Economic Affairs; Mr Gwa-Guang Tan, Manager of Operations for the Taipei Rapid Transit Corporation; and Tim Chang, council man for the Taipei City Council. We had a wonderful lunch with Tim; he is a great bloke.

There are just too many people to mention, but to all those people who aided and assisted us during our visit I say a huge thank you. I also thank my colleagues the members for Taylor and Newland. We had a great time. They were great travelling companions, and I think it was a good case of bipartisan-ship at work. We worked out that I cannot run as fast as the member for Newland but, then again, he is 20 years younger than I am, so I suppose that is not surprising!

On the issue of Taiwan and the future, I express my sincere hope that things go well in the relationship between Taiwan and the People's Republic. I am a great friend of mainland China, the People's Republic of China—that wonderful nation and country and that wonderful trading partner, but also a great friend of Taiwan. I think the future for these two countries is one of togetherness. The Australian government's policy towards Taiwan, of course, is based on the joint communique from 21 December 1972, under the terms of which Australia recognised the government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legal government of China, and acknowledged the position of the Chinese government and Taiwan as a province of the People's Republic of China.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** That is the federal Liberal Party position.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I will be interested in the member contributing to Labor's position. Accordingly,

Australia does not accept that the authorities of Taiwan have the status of a national government and the Australian government can have no official dealings with Taiwan. All Australian governments since 1972 (both Labor and Liberal) have adhered to this policy. It is a bipartisan policy and one with which both major Australian political parties agree. Within that framework of our one China policy, the Australian government strongly supports the development, on an unofficial basis, of economic and cultural contact between Australia and Taiwan. The three of us have just had an experience of that during our visit.

Australia supports Taiwan's participation in international organisation conferences, provided this can be achieved in a manner consistent with the joint communique. I thoroughly encourage Taiwan's acceptance into the intentional community as a wholesome part of the international forum of peoples. The Taiwanese people—and wonderful they are—have every right to be so recognised. We encourage Australia to pursue further trade, investment and cultural interchange opportunities with the people of Taiwan and to support the development on an unofficial basis of people-to-people contacts. I think that was the very thrust of our visit. I thank the government and people of Taiwan for the opportunity to enjoy their country, to establish a wonderful connection. I look forward to hosting visits here from people from Taiwan and to an ongoing and promisingly fruitful relationship between South Australia and Taiwan.

Time expired.

**Mr KENYON (Newland):** I wholeheartedly endorse the motion that is put forward by the member for Waite. I, too, went on that trip, as he indicated, and it was an excellent trip. For me it was a real eye-opener. It was an excellent opportunity to see another nation and, as the member for Waite has said, to see a nation that has really made the most of what it has and, in many cases, of what it does not have and the way it has been able to build as a nation and a stable democracy and a stable economy. Even while we were there that was being played out; the democratic processes were in train and it was a peaceful event. All that has developed in the last 50 years, since the Chinese Revolution ended, or at least the civil war was completed.

As the member for Waite has said, while we were there we went to the Tzu Chi University, which was founded by Master Cheng Yen, a Buddhist nun. The Tzu Chi Foundation is now a worldwide charity. One of the sayings of Master Cheng is, 'Know your blessings, cherish them, and sow more blessings.' I think, in some way, that encapsulates the people of Taiwan and the way they have gone about building their country.

**The Hon. R.B. Such:** Like us in here!

**Mr KENYON:** That is true. They have built a remarkable country. Only 20 per cent of the land mass is useable; 80 per cent is mountainous, so that highlights even further the comments made by the member for Waite, in that they have made the most of fairly limited opportunities.

Something that was very interesting to me, being something of a free marketeer, is that there was not so much government intervention in the economy on a company-by-company basis, but certainly government planning, or planning for the economy rather than of the economy, and that has been matched by infrastructure planning and building. They have been very focused in the way they have gone about things. For the first few years they set about building light industry and agriculture so that they could start

feeding their people, then they moved on to heavier industry (petrochemical and steel manufacturing), and then shipbuilding.

As circumstances have changed, they have changed their economy. They have moved into light manufacturing and now, as a result of the emergence and the rise of the Chinese economy, which has really started to suck in all that cheap manufacturing, they have moved on to high-tech manufacturing. There is a lesson in that which is, I think: do not hang on; do not feel that you need to just hang on to sectors of the economy which have been successful previously but which, for whatever circumstances beyond your control, are no longer as successful as they once were. The great strength of the Taiwanese is that they have been able to transition their economy smoothly and effectively by use of government assistance to whole industries rather than to individual companies.

We received some really excellent high-level briefings, and I appreciate the access we were given, particularly to the bureaucracy and its planning. I was particularly impressed by Taiwan's Council for Economic Development and Planning (I think it is), which comprises approximately 300 specialists catering to every area. Every infrastructure project worth more than \$US30 million goes through this group, and it is rigorously assessed to make sure that it is in line with government plans for the development of the economy.

Projects are really put through the wringer. Obviously it is something we try to emulate in the Public Works Committee but, without access to 300 mainly PhD and masters bureaucrats behind us, I do not know that we are able to give issues the same rigour they do. I would like to thank a number of people, particularly Samuel Kuo, Assistant Director-General of the Taiwanese Economic and Cultural Office in Taipei; Calvin Yen who accompanied us on a large part of our trip; and Katherine Cheng (an excellent guide) who met us when we got off the plane and who was pretty much with us until we stepped back on the plane to come home.

I particularly add my thanks to the list of people the member for Waite has already read into the record. I would like to thank the members for Waite and Taylor for their companionship and conversation during the course of the trip. It was excellent to be able to come out of a meeting or briefings and talk through the issues that had been raised and relate them back to South Australia and Australia, as well as thinking through what we had witnessed. I particularly thank PC Huang from Garmin Corporation for taking the time to show us around what was a pretty amazing facility. Also, I thank the government of Taiwan for its assistance in getting us over there.

**The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor):** It gives me pleasure to support this motion moved by the member for Waite. As indicated to the house, I was one of three members of this place who participated in the visit to Taiwan in September this year. I concur with what has been said about the excellent high-level briefings we received. Our hosts were very generous with their time, and we appreciated the access to high-level officials, organisations and, indeed, the very good hospitality shown to us. The members for Waite and Newland proved to be very good travelling companions; and, although it was a very tiring agenda, we all enjoyed the trip very much and gained a lot from it.

Certainly, one thing I gained from the trip was a much enhanced impression and understanding of just what Taiwan

is like today and how far that country has come in such a short amount of time to be the major economic power that it is today. The economic modernisation and success of Taiwan has been very impressive to witness, from its reliance on agriculture 50 years ago through to the success of its manufacturing in the 1960s and 1970s to a situation today where the services sector accounts for around two-thirds of the national output and more than half of all jobs in Taiwan.

Most Australians remember the industrialisation of Taiwan when so many cheap imported products began to appear in Australia. I doubt that those same Australians appreciate just how far advanced Taiwan is today, particularly in the high-technology arena in terms of its electronics, information and communication technology industries.

That certainly applies also to the standard of living it provides for its people. It is a very dynamic, middle-income economy and, for an island with roughly the same population as that of Australia (just short of \$23 million people), we have to admire the fact that this Asian economic tiger has managed to grow to become today one of the world's strongest economies. I might say that it has managed to make that transition a very smooth one, even without the benefit of the sort of natural resources that a country such as Australia has.

It was also very interesting to me to note that the national development plan to which the country is now working not only focuses on the task of strengthening the country's international competitiveness, but it also has a very strong emphasis on improving the quality of life for its people and promoting sustainable development. That strikes me, because they are really the two things that I think mark the strategies of most successful modern advanced economies, and I think it is those two latter factors—the focus on quality of life through a health and welfare system, and sustainable development—that are important differentiators between Taiwan and some of its closest neighbours.

The motion calls for maintenance of the status quo in respect of the relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China, and I certainly support that. In fact, populist surveys conducted in Taiwan suggest that the majority of Taiwanese people, at least for now, support the status quo approach on the question of unification with or independence from China. I think, also, that the sheer proliferation of cross-strait economic activities between these two fast-growing nations of Taiwan and the People's Republic (Mainland China) will eventually have the effect of encouraging the resumption of cross-strait dialogue. Whether, of course, that dialogue will then lead to changes in attitude about a whole range of other matters is perhaps a question for another day. However, I was most encouraged by the attitudes and determination of the government officials to whom we spoke who are determined to see the future enhanced for Taiwanese people and, indeed, their close neighbours in Mainland China.

This motion expresses its sincere hope that the future will see continued economic cooperation and mutual understanding between the People's Republic of China and the people of Taiwan. I think that is a wish shared by members of this chamber. In summary, I again thank the Taiwanese government for giving my colleagues and me the opportunity to enhance our understanding of Taiwan. The trade between Australia and Taiwan is significant and very important. Of course, we provide significant natural resources to Taiwan, a country which itself really does not have many natural resources, being a very small mountainous island; and South Australia also supplies agricultural products to the country.

Of course, there are opportunities for us to enhance that trade, and it is my hope that our governments will work towards that end.

I would like to conclude by saying that this has been a wonderful opportunity for my colleagues and me. We can predict that Taiwan, having shown such capacity really through the resources of its people alone—because it does not have the natural resources that many other advanced economies have—has been able to generate such good economic growth and change in the standard of living of its people, and emerge today as a major economic, social and cultural player on the world stage. I thank our host, the Taiwanese government, for its hospitality in giving us the opportunity to enhance our understanding of a very significant nation indeed. Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr HANNA (Mitchell):** I support this motion, recognising the economic, social and cultural success of the people of Taiwan. I think that almost everyone in this parliament supports the maintenance of the status quo in respect of Taiwan and its neighbours. The civil war is well and truly over, and it would be absolutely catastrophic for Taiwan, the region, and indeed Australia if China were to be any more aggressive toward Taiwan in the future. It is time for the international community to recognise Taiwan as a separate country. The motion moved by the member for Waite recognises the success of the people of Taiwan. I want to add one thing, and that is that we must not forget the status of the indigenous people of Taiwan, many of whom are left struggling with the modern commercial lifestyle imposed upon them in some ways. With those remarks, I think we can only benefit from furthering our ties with Taiwan. There are successful Taiwanese business people and students in Adelaide, as there are in other cities of Australia, and I hope that those ties will continue to strengthen.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I am disappointed that the Attorney did not rise to indicate the state Labor Party's official position on the subject. I thank the members for Taylor, Newland and Mitchell for their contributions. I forgot to mention that, whilst we were in Taipei, we had the great pleasure of celebrating the member for Taylor's birthday—I think it was her 30th birthday. Quite a bit of champagne was drunk, if I remember correctly, on that particular evening, but it was a very good night. I will reiterate some of the comments made by some of my colleagues.

I think the people of Taiwan have good reason to be proud of what they have achieved. I think, too, they have good reason to be proud of the way their government has managed their affairs. I refer members to a strategy document entitled 'The second term plan for national development in the new century'. I have a copy of it, if any member wants to see it. I am sure my colleagues do as well, and I would be happy to show it to them. It indicates the extent to which the government has played a role cooperatively with business in developing this nation into what it has become today. In the 1950s their strategy was the pursuit of stability and self-sufficiency. In the 1960s their strategy changed to expanding exports of light industry. In the 1970s their economic strategy was largely about developing basic and heavy industries. By the 1980s, it was about economic liberalisation and technology intensive development. In the 1990s their strategy

focused on coping with change and setting new priorities. In 2000, Taiwan's focus is on sustainable development and on what they call the 'green silicon island'.

I think therein lies the important point to flow from this motion, that is, anyone who may think that the Taiwanese economy today is built on cheap labour or low cost production needs to look at Taiwan, because that is not the case. That might have been the case some decades ago, but the Taiwanese are smart and they have been smart enough to realise that to grow an economy you need a few things. First, you need a plan and that plan needs to be cooperatively struck between government at all levels: business and the people of the country. Their framework for a new vision sets out basic principles: a unified people; peaceful cross-strait ties with mainland China—they have achieved that; a stable society; a prosperous economy; and realising the goal of constructing a green silicon island. Then they have planning concepts: establishing harmony between what they call 'innovative growth' and 'ecological conservation'—increasingly an important issue in Taiwan—and deepening the humanistic values of the green silicon island, this total engagement between the people of the country and their dream of a green silicon island.

It is not about image when you think about it—a green silicon island—they have constructed a very clever strategy. Then, of course, there is their vision which flows from that of a creative Taiwan; a fair and just Taiwan; a sustainable Taiwan; a maritime Taiwan (recognising their situation geographically); and a vigorous Taiwan. It gets to the point which a number of members who have contributed to the motion have made, that knowledge and innovation are at the heart of Taiwan's success. They recognise the need for a skilled workforce and for education to be their pathway to the future, but they also recognise that they need to build the infrastructure. What is quite amazing are the ports, the railways, the energy infrastructure and nuclear power stations in the country. They are energy short.

They have built the infrastructure but, at the same time, they are protecting their environment—and all this under the umbrella of multiculturalism. There is a lot of cultural diversity within the country. A lot of expats live there and there is a lot of exchange, as well as an increasing recognition of Aboriginal people's needs in particular situations and caring for that. It is really quite an amazing country. There are some parallels to be drawn and lessons learned from their strategic approach and what they have achieved with nothing—they have made something and something good—and what we are trying to achieve in our country where we have everything, yet, at times, we still struggle, to be frank. I look forward to the ongoing relationship between our two countries. I have learnt much from visiting Taiwan and I think all South Australians would if they visited that country—I encourage them to do so. Long may our relationship prosper.

Motion carried.

#### CONTAINER DEPOSIT LEGISLATION

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

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the success of the beverage container legislation; and
- (b) requests the state government to review the refund amount set in 1975 and consider extending the range of containers and wrappers covered by the legislation.

Since I gave notice of this motion some time ago, the government has indicated that it is undertaking consultation on this very issue. I commend it for that, although I point out that I do not believe that we need a lot of consultation. I think what we need is some decisions to be made. The history of this container deposit legislation is quite fascinating, some of it cloak and dagger and some of it surrounded by a prophesy of economic doom and gloom and intrigue within the Liberal Party, which obviously is not new, and I will come to that in a moment.

The deposit legislation took effect in 1977 (it was the Beverage Container Act 1975), and it was extended in 1993 via amendments to the Environment Protection Act 1993. As we all know, a 5¢ deposit is refundable on designated containers and, as I indicated, in 1993 that range of containers was expanded. The container deposit legislation has great support in South Australia. In a survey conducted in June 2004 by the EPA—and one would presume it was done in a scientific manner—92 per cent of South Australians supported the scheme, 88 per cent believed the scheme had been effective in reducing litter in South Australia and 60 per cent of respondents returned beverage containers to collection depots. One-third used kerbside recycling bins and only 4 per cent put the containers into garbage. Those figures would have changed because, as members realise, many councils (to their credit) now have a brilliant system of kerbside recycling. So, those figures would have changed and, in fact, there would be quite a high percentage of containers that would be going into a kerbside recycling system run by local councils.

The amount of containers returned in South Australia annually is of the order of 420 million. I did not realise the member for Schubert drank so much ice coffee, but someone must be drinking a fair bit of ice coffee. The deposits amount to \$21 million. Approximately 15 per cent of these containers are not returned, and that is something that has intrigued me for a while because, if the container is not returned, who keeps the deposit? It is kept by the manufacturers and it adds up to—in my estimation—something like \$3 million to \$4 million a year. The manufacturers say that that is to offset handling and transportation costs.

The origin of this, as I said, is quite intriguing. Before I go on to the history, 5¢ in 1977, translated in to today's money value terms, is approximately 26¢, or 26.3¢ to be precise. I do not support increasing the levy beyond 10¢. The government, as I said, has undertaken consultation. I think 10¢ would be a very sufficient or adequate incentive to people to return/recycle those containers. I believe the 1977 money equivalent (I think 26¢ or rounded off close to that) is unnecessarily high. I think 10¢ would be close to the mark.

Whilst it is not part of the government's inquiry or terms of reference, I believe that we should look at a 1¢ or 2¢ litter levy—not a refundable deposit—on things like hamburger wrappers and coffee cups. I do not know about other members, but I see this type of litter every time I drive—for example, after coming back from the office last night. You see the litter about one or two kilometres from the fast food outlets. Those fast food outlets—and I have nothing against them—have proliferated since 1977 when this law came into place. I think it is time that that aspect of litter was addressed, as well as the resource implications of recycling which is contained in the container deposit legislation.

I do not think a 1¢ or 2¢ levy on these disposable items is an unreasonable imposition, because they do cost the community a lot of money. They cost councils and others a lot of money to collect. I think that money could be used for

education, as well as the collection of the particular items. Around the world, other countries have deposit legislation: 11 states in the United States, 11 states in Canada, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden—and the list goes on. To the credit of the government of the day—it would have been a Labor government; I imagine it would have been the Dunstan government—it created a very far-sighted initiative.

I come now to the history of the matter. At that time there were predictions of doom and gloom and cloak and dagger. I will quote from *The Advertiser* of 6 November 1973 and evidence given to a committee of this parliament by Mr Gabriel Lafitte, who was an employee of Image Australia. The article in *The Advertiser* states:

[He] said that in his role as an employee of Image Australia he had seen the function of the Steel Can People [the manufacturers of cans] to shift the blame for pollution away from manufacturers and on to municipal councils. Academics and state government officials who visited BHP's recycling plants had been given 'carefully prearranged demonstrations of cans being recycled'. The Steel Can People and Coca-Cola employed people to infiltrate the Friends of the Earth environmental group and BHP had asked the Victorian special branch to keep an eye on the group in Melbourne. Coca-Cola executives had also instructed a young employee to wear dirty jeans and T-shirt and go unshaven to infiltrate the committee planning a demonstration against Coca-Cola in Adelaide in April last year.

So, we had a little bit of cloak and dagger and some interesting predictions. An article in *The News* (that paper which no longer exists) of 17 September 1975 states:

Coca-Cola would close its Port Pirie manufacturing plant if the government's can deposit legislation were introduced, the company's purchasing managing director, Mr Colin Hall, said today. The plant would be converted into a warehouse and 50 of the 70 employees would lose their jobs.

An article in *The Advertiser* of 1 October 1975 states:

Mr Dean Brown (Lib. Davenport) said in the Assembly last night about 150 people in SA would be unemployed if the bill was passed. He said many major South Australian industries would have to seek an alternative supply of cans from other states at increased cost.

There was other doom and gloom. Dr David Tonkin, the then leader of the opposition—someone for whom I have great respect and who, sadly, passed away many years ago—is quoted in *The Advertiser* of 1 October 1975. The article states:

The SA government's bill for deposits on beverage containers was a public relations exercise to keep conservationists happy, [he] told the Assembly yesterday.

We all have seen that those predictions and warnings were wrong and they have proven to be without foundation.

One of the most interesting aspects of the history of the container deposit legislation involves an ongoing difference between the conservative faction in the Liberal Party and what was then called the Liberal Movement. One of the reasons why today we have the container deposit legislation is that one of the most unlikely supporters came forward to support the deposit legislation—none other than the Hon. Ren DeGaris. I will leave it to other historians to respond and comment, but the argument put forward in these articles is that he supported the legislation in order to stick it up Liberal Movement members of the parliament of the day. That is probably an unfortunate reflection on the Hon. Ren DeGaris. One could imagine he supported it because he believed it had real merit.

However, the reality is that, because of his support and ultimately because of a conference between the houses, the government of the day was eventually able to get legislation into place that has enabled South Australia to be a leader in

recycling, a scheme which has been brilliantly successful but which, like all schemes, can be further improved. Hopefully, as a result of the government's recently announced consultation, the scheme can be improved further. There are some aspects that need attention. There are some anomalies in relation to some of the sizes of container that escape a deposit. If you go to the refreshment area of this parliament, you will see some examples where the same manufacturer making a container has a deposit on one and not on the other. They are the sorts of things that need to be looked at.

I encourage the government to go beyond simply the deposit aspect and to look also at litter in the context of resource use to see whether, through the imposition of a one or two cent levy on throw-away wrappers and containers, we can get a reduction in the amount of littering and also shift the cost of those throw-away containers onto the consumer rather than onto councils and the wider community. As I indicated at the start, although the government's announcement has taken the debate somewhat further, this motion is still valid. If in any way it helped to encourage the government to undertake a review, then that is a great outcome and I am pleased about that. I commend the motion to the house.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I support this very important motion. At this time, we need to reflect on the legislation that was introduced into this house so long ago. When it was introduced it was fairly controversial, but I am now a very strong convert of the legislation and a strong advocate of it, yet when it was introduced there was quite a lot of opposition to it, particularly from the commercial soft drink manufacturers. As I said, I am a very strong advocate of the CDL legislation. In fact, I am the longest-serving member of the National Conference of Parliamentary Environment and Public Works Committees. I have been to all 13 meetings, beginning in 1992, and at every one I have raised this matter of container deposit legislation. In fact, it has now reached the point when I stand at the end of the conference and they all know what I am going to say.

I put the challenge to the other states: you all come here, you all congratulate South Australia for leading Australia in this legislation, but what have you done about it in the last 12 months? All the states have great ideas, but they just do not do anything about it. We are still out there doing it and we have increased the range of the CDL that fits into it, particularly in relation to cardboard cartons—and yes, I do drink my share of iced coffee, member for Fisher but, as you can see, I should be cutting back. And I am. Every year I raise this matter of CDL and every state environment committee agrees with us, but every year they come back and they have not advanced one iota.

As a landowner I have a lot of roads on the property, and the amount of rubbish that was always on the roads and that we picked up ourselves was obvious back then. As we sprayed our weeds, we would pick up the cans, bottles and all this stuff. If you go there today, there are no bottles or cans. When you do see one, you certainly stop and pick it up, because it stands out like the proverbial. That is a direct result of well over two decades of this CDL legislation. As landowners, initially we would have been opposed to this legislation, but today we are strong advocates of it. As the member for Fisher has just said, I think that way back then this state was way ahead of its time when it introduced this legislation.

I cannot believe that in a national forum—that is, the National Congress of Environment and Public Works

Committees—no other state has advanced this legislation at all. We need to ask why and whether it is impacting South Australians. When you buy these cans interstate, or you have one on an aeroplane, you see written on the can '5¢ deposit in South Australia'. We need to ask ourselves how many of these cans with the 5¢ deposit that are sold interstate end up coming back into the recycling stream here in South Australia. If they are coming back, who is paying the cost? The member for Fisher said that 15 per cent of these containers do not come back but just get lost in the system, broken, burnt, buried or whatever.

I encourage the government or somebody to ask: as no other state is doing this, with the cross-state trade that occurs (particularly in the case of airlines, etc.), are our commercial people paying an impost? It would be very interesting to know. This issue is not often raised, and I say, 'All credit to our commercial operators, our soft drink manufacturers and our beer manufacturers,' because they have accepted the legislation. I am amazed that they have not gone to other states and said, 'Hang on, it works in South Australia. Why don't you do it in New South Wales or Victoria?' I would ask that question of those states that border ours, particularly Victoria. There is a lot of cross-border traffic, especially during the football season, and a lot of these containers purchased in Victoria would end up in our stream.

I support the member for Fisher in his motion today. I certainly acknowledge the success of the beverage container legislation (which I just call CDL). However, I urge some caution in relation to wrappers. Cardboard cartons are quite easy to deal with because they can be squashed and easily counted, but how are you going to count wrappers, such as chocolate wrappers? I think that it will be much more difficult, as you must have the whole wrapper. We do not want to make it more difficult than it already is, because this CDL is a fairly big impost on our commercial people, and somebody has to pay the cost of handling and counting all these items.

I am a born-again greenie in many ways, and I do not know whether that comes with age or experience. I think that the Dunstan government brought this in. As the member for Fisher said, I was a good friend of Ren DeGaris and aware of the shenanigans going on in the Liberal Party. Generally, I was not a great fan of Don Dunstan, but he did something right with this CDL, and it has stood the test of time. I think that it is great that today we reflect on that and ask whether it has worked and whether we need to look at it again. I support the motion.

**Mr HANNA (Mitchell):** I support the motion moved by the member for Fisher acknowledging the success of our beverage container legislation. I note that he also requests the state government to review the refund amount set in 1975 and consider extending the range of containers and wrappers covered by the legislation. I would like to say first of all that, when motions like this are moved by Independent or opposition members of parliament, it often prompts the government to take action; usually then the government takes credit for the reform. That is fine, as long as it gets done. I commend the member for Fisher for initiating this measure.

One of the features of being an Independent member of parliament in particular is that you tend to get correspondence from all over the state—much as I imagine upper house members do. I would like to read this letter from Peter of Smithfield. Maybe some other members have received it as

well. It is exactly on this point and it is very supportive of the motion. It says:

I would like to comment on the proposed increase to 20 cents on recyclable cans, bottles, soft drink and flavoured milk cartons, but feel that we are missing the point of rubbish/litter on our streets. On my daily walk with the dog, the majority of rubbish/litter littering the streets [is] McDonald's and Hungry Jacks large paper bags, all brands of takeaway drinks in disposable cups [those are the biggest culprits] i.e. McDonald's, Hungry Jack's, Boost Juice, Wendy's, Coke and a host of others, soon to be followed by the latest fad takeaway boutique coffees, McDonald's fries cups, cigarette packets and takeaway snacks of all kinds. If you are unlucky enough to live within a kilometre of one of these takeaway establishments you will know how it is. I have been in contact with the EPA, who says it is too difficult to police, i.e., a disposable drink cup consists of 3 items, the cup, the lid and the straw, for a recyclable refund. I must say I don't see very many tops or straws about except for a clear plastic 2-piece container, bureaucracy gone mad.

Another cause of unwanted rubbish/litter is the cardboard holder of alcoholic mixer drinks so popular with today's teenagers, I never see too many of the cans though, probably picked up by somebody going for a walk. My point being, instead of raising the refundable deposit to 20 cents, raise it to 10 cents and at the same time legislate to cover all, or if not the majority, of takeaway wrappings/containers. If this is not done first, when the time comes, as it will, it will be extremely difficult to legislate to get 20 cents refundable deposit on takeaway food packaging. We have the procedures in place already for recyclable cans/bottles, etc., working well; these procedures can be readily adjusted to take in takeaway food/snack/cigarette packets, whatever, not individually, but stapled together in a minimum of 10 for easy counting; the drink cups should be a 2 piece item and all straws should not be plastic but biodegradable paper.

I have not edited that letter from Peter of Smithfield but I think it contains a lot of commonsense, and it reflects widespread concern about litter. In particular, those cardboard holders of takeaway food products are very visible on the streets.

The member for Schubert has raised some valid concerns about the ease of counting materials, and that is a valid point. It seems to me that it may be difficult to go down to the minute level of straws and tiny bits of plastic but, when it comes to the larger cardboard containers and perhaps when it comes to the takeaway cups which often have a plastic bubble cap, we should be taking some stronger action on those things. A variety of other things have been listed there from cigarette packets to large paper bags and so on. I endorse those sentiments, and I support the motion moved by the member for Fisher. It is a highly successful and unique piece of legislation. It was a great reform in the time of the Dunstan government and it has stood the test of time and, in many respects, I think our streets are cleaner than those of the other capital cities of Australia, thanks to this measure. One flow-on effect might be mentioned which is that some of the homeless people around Adelaide supplement their income by collecting cans and bottles from rubbish bins, and I would not begrudge them additional income if the amount were increased and if the coverage were increased in terms of the deposit on these items.

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

### GLOBAL WARMING

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

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the significance of the greenhouse effect and global warming, and the serious threat they pose for the world; and
- (b) calls on the federal government to adopt the Kyoto protocols among other constructive measures.

This issue has taken the spotlight in a much greater way since I gave notice of this motion a month or so ago. That is good because that is the intent of my motion. There was a very useful article in last Sunday's *Sunday Mail*, headed 'Global warming in plain English'—I commend the *Sunday Mail* for running the article—in which Dr Neville Nicholls, a professorial fellow at Monash University, School of Geography and Environmental Science, was asked to provide some straightforward explanations. This is important because there are aspects of this debate which are quite complex. I will just quote a couple of excerpts from this article. He was asked, 'What is global warming?' His answer:

It is the warming of the atmosphere near the surface of the earth resulting from increases in greenhouse gases due to human activities—for example, using oil, coal and gas. The earth has warmed about 0.74C over the past 100 years, due mainly to these increases in greenhouse gases.

Then he was asked, 'What is the greenhouse effect and what are greenhouse gases?' His answer:

Greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, methane and water vapour. They keep the surface of the earth warmer than it would be if these gases were not present in the atmosphere. This is the 'natural' greenhouse effect. Without this natural effect, life on earth would be very different.

He was then asked, 'Are global warming and the greenhouse effect linked?' His answer:

Yes, global warming is the result of strengthening of the greenhouse effect caused by increases in the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

He goes on to provide a whole lot of very useful information about the consequences. I commend this article to members, because they might be able to use it in their electorate. He was also asked, 'How much has the sea level risen because of global warming?' His answer:

The sea level, averaged across the earth, has increased about 8 cm over the past 40 years.

It is not an alarmist article; it is a scientifically based response. I commend it to members.

I give credit where credit is due. I think Prime Minister Howard has done a very good job in terms of the economy. I have never agreed with the Iraq policy, but in terms of the environment I think, finally, the Prime Minister is getting into gear. The environment does not involve simply the greenhouse effect and global warming—although they are important elements—but I think in respect of things such as biodiversity the Prime Minister is still somewhat in neutral and needs to engage at least first gear. To his credit, in the last few weeks in particular he has really started to give this issue of the greenhouse effect and global warming his serious attention and, I note, Treasurer Peter Costello, likewise, and the Leader of the Opposition. So in this country, at the federal level, we are now seeing some serious attention being given to this matter.

People are often critical of business and business leaders, but I give credit to Rupert Murdoch, the head of News Corporation, who has been saying for some time that we need to get serious about this issue. When business leaders tell you to get serious about an issue you know the issue is serious. I commend him for that and no doubt, not only through his media network but through speaking out, he will bring more attention to this issue and help to raise awareness and, importantly, bring about some action.

Many governments world-wide agreed in 1992 to reduce global greenhouse emissions and prevent dangerous climate change. Ironically, Australia was one of the leaders helping

at that time to establish what became the Kyoto protocol. Sadly the federal Liberal government has refused to ratify the protocol of Kyoto unless the United States does and because others have not ratified it. This is somewhat strange because surveys suggest that 80 per cent of Australians believe we should ratify the Kyoto protocol, irrespective of whether or not the United States does. To be fair, the Prime Minister is saying that in his view the Kyoto protocol is deficient because it does not deal effectively with some of the emerging industrial nations of China and India. His point is: one in, all in. Nevertheless, countries like Australia should take a lead.

I acknowledge that Australia is assisting China and India to help reduce some of their emissions. In some ways it seems strange, given that our manufacturing industry has and will suffer as a result of those countries through competition, that we are giving money to those countries to help them pollute less. There is an irony, but the benefit to the world is nevertheless real.

Eminent people have been calling for action on greenhouse gas and global warming for some time. In June 2004 a group called the Australian Climate Group put forward six solutions, the first being to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 60 per cent by 2050; and this government, to its credit, has indicated that it has set a target as well. The second recommendation is to establish a market mechanism to trade greenhouse gas emissions. We are seeing some action on that, and I will come to that in a minute. The third recommendation is for all Australians to use energy more wisely. We are still very wasteful, even in this parliament. I see us leaving lights on when there is no one in rooms—we could do a lot better even in this place. Generally we are extravagant with energy.

The fourth recommendation is to put in place measures to minimise the impacts of climate change and, fifthly, to allow the development and implementation of new business opportunities to take account of a low carbon energy world and, finally, for Australia to play a leadership role in our region by sharing technologies, and so on. Things are happening. As one of our poets said, there is movement at the station. However, we have a long way to go.

Only this week, in fact yesterday, *The Advertiser* reported that Australia's peak industry groups have cautiously welcomed Prime Minister John Howard's plans for a high level government and industry group to consider an emissions trading scheme. Mr Howard, who has long resisted calls for carbon trading because it could hurt Australian energy producers, told the Business Council of Australia's annual dinner in Sydney on Monday night that climate change was a reality and action was needed. There has been a significant positive move forward by the federal government, despite its reluctance to endorse the Kyoto protocols. We are soon to have a second round of those protocols and I trust that Australia will play a constructive and positive role in that.

*The Advertiser* the same day, Wednesday 15 November this year, highlighted a report by an environmental watch group called German Watch. Its conclusion was that Australia is among the world's worst countries in dealing with climate change. It ranked Australia 47th of 57 nations in an evaluation of greenhouse gas emissions and climate policies. The 10 worst nations in order were: Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, China, the United States, Kazakhstan (and we will not have any jokes about that), Canada, Thailand, Iran, South Korea and Australia. Sweden was ranked the best, followed by the UK, Denmark, Malta, Germany, Argentina, Hungary, Brazil, India and Switzerland. So, it is not a very good report card to get, to be ranked as one of the worst countries in the world

when it comes to dealing with climate change.

The signs are there that the federal government is going to move on this issue. I think the reality is that the public are ahead of the government in terms of awareness and concern. The state government here, to its credit, has made this an issue. I know the Premier has made a personal commitment to doing something about it, and I give him full marks for that. Members may not realise, but one of the likely inclusions in the next round of Kyoto protocols is the recognition of the contribution of what can be called the urban forest. The state government has a program here which started off with a million trees; now it is 3 million, I believe; hopefully, some time down the track it will be 10 million. Forests contribute significantly to an improvement in the threat posed by greenhouse effect and global warming.

The next round of Kyoto protocols is likely to include the contribution of the urban forest, so having trees in the urban setting is not simply an aesthetic thing, it is not simply important for general ecology reasons; it is also important in terms of the role of trees in absorbing carbon dioxide, generating oxygen and dealing with carbon. So, we will see in the next little while a recognition that programs like the 3 million trees, the million trees or, hopefully one day, 100 million trees, will be recognised as a positive contribution to dealing with the seriousness of the greenhouse effect and global warming.

The issue I think now is beyond debate or question. I guess what can be debated is what is the likely rate of change and how we can arrest it, but I do not think anyone can now seriously dispute that we face a serious challenge and that we need to move simply beyond talking about the greenhouse effect and global warming. We really have to do something. So, I commend this motion to the house. I am heartened to see progress at the federal level. I am pleased that the state government is taking positive steps towards trying to deal with it at a state level. I note in the State Strategic Plan some elements which I think contradict what the government is trying to do in other respects, and I note in particular that it is seeking to substantially increase our population. Given our consumption of energy and the consequences for the environment, that seems to me to be a clear contradiction of other policies of the government to deal with these serious environmental issues.

I commend the motion to the house. It shows how quickly things can move because, as I said at the start when I introduced this a month or two ago, there was not the interest that we are now seeing in the media. I am not claiming credit for it, just pointing out how the world—

*Mr Bignell interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:**—can change quickly. Certainly, I accept the member for Mawson's comment that Al Gore has helped, but we all need to be not just evangelists for climate change but part of the practical solutions, and that means looking in our own backyard at what we do, both individually and collectively, and at our impact on the environment.

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** I think the member for Fisher is quite right when he says that there is no longer any serious question that the greenhouse gas and global warming issues are scientific facts. I am reminded that, until relatively recent times—perhaps in the last year or less—the debate about global warming was a bit like the debate we used to have about smoking, where every now and again you would see an article appear that said that cigarettes are actually good for you; all the studies that say they are not are wrong; and



maybe if you smoke too many it is not good for you, but if you only have half a dozen, then you are probably actually better off because you have a good cough every morning. That was the level of idiocy colouring this debate until very recently.

Like the member for Fisher, I am pleased to see that even the Prime Minister (and I say that because he has previously been something of a sceptic) is now saying that he accepts that global warming is an issue, accepts the link between greenhouse gas emissions and global warming, and accepts that in the medium and longer term, unless something is done about it, it is going to have catastrophic consequences globally—and, in particular, for Australia.

To bring it home to people in Adelaide, a number of maps were published (and I cannot remember whether it was in *The Advertiser* or somewhere else) which showed what Adelaide would look like in the event of certain sea level movements—

**The Hon. R.B. Such:** Your electorate would disappear.

**Mr RAU:** A great deal of my electorate would be gone, and the member for Colton's electorate would be completely gone. I think the member for Mawson might be all right because he has some high peaks there that would become islands.

**Mr Bignell:** Willunga Hill.

**Mr RAU:** He could sit on Willunga Island, as it would become. The point is that you do not have to be too imaginative to contemplate the disaster that would mean for everything that we now understand as our way of life. However, one thing that does concern me about some of the debate that has occurred is that people have gone for the glib one-liner when trying to address a solution—and I am not accusing the member for Fisher of this. In the public discourse about these issues we seem to have this rather barren debate about the Kyoto Protocol as if the Kyoto Protocol, of itself, is a beginning and end to the solution to this problem. It is not. In all probability the Kyoto Protocol is a step in the right direction, it is one that I believe people should be embracing, but of itself Kyoto is a small step: it is not the solution to the problem. I personally lament the fact that the debate about this very important issue seems to get caught up in this glib discourse about whether Kyoto is good or bad as if Kyoto is 'it'. It is not it, it has nothing to do with it in the sense of solving the whole problem. It is merely, perhaps, a recognition and set of solutions that are set out in a particular document; it is not going to be the solution in the longer or medium term.

I think the real issue we need to be grappling with nationally is the technology implications associated with dealing with this problem because, one way or another, technological solutions will be the only way we can address this problem without accepting what I believe is politically and socially unacceptable—that is, a return to a lifestyle, in terms of energy consumption, which our forefathers enjoyed at the end of the 19th century. So what are the technology challenges that exist in relation to this? Again, I think some of these are spurious and, ultimately, are there to occupy a great deal of space in the news media but not to achieve much more.

I will give an example. Carbon sequestration is written up around the place as being an answer to these problems. Carbon sequestration involves, first, capturing the carbon dioxide as it exits from wherever it is being produced, secondly, transporting it by some means that is yet to be explained and, thirdly, finding some place to deposit it and keeping up there. I do not think you need to be a rocket scientist to work out that the scale of that undertaking is

immense. While theoretically it may be a solution, or a partial solution, to the carbon emissions problem I suspect that the science associated with carbon sequestration is as possible as the science associated with nuclear fusion reactions—which, again, can be demonstrated on a blackboard but has not yet been demonstrated in reality.

The second area is coal technology and safer burning methods for coal. I think everyone has to look at this, and it has to be pursued. However, those technologies are not even developed yet, and we will not be able to go too far if we are putting all our eggs in that coal technology basket. Where we should be putting considerable resources is in the area of the technologies that are already in development and, in varying degrees, in application. I am talking here about solar power, wind power and other forms of efficient design for buildings and roads, and so forth, which will deliver benefits using technologies that have already at least got through the embryonic stage. One of the things that I think is of great concern here is that the federal government has done nothing serious about providing economic incentives to support large-scale research and development of these technologies in Australia. There is nothing more certain than that, if these technologies are developed here, they will have a global application. It will be a sunrise industry for Australia. It will give us an opportunity to supply markets such as China and India with these technologies, where they will be desperately needed.

In my view, the commonwealth government has been miserable and foolish, first, in failing to recognise the need for support for these technologies and, secondly, in providing no effective support for research and development. We have excellent institutions, such as Flinders University and other places—and I read in the paper the other day that its energy efficient car was to be crushed because there was no opportunity for it to be developed further. That is a crime. The federal government should be doing something through the tax system and through research and development grants to enhance these technologies, which have an opportunity to make real, present day differences, rather than this pie in the sky stuff (which is up there with nuclear fusion, in my opinion) like carbon sequestration.

The third matter is carbon trading. A great deal is said about carbon trading, and it may well be the case that carbon trading ultimately provides part of the solution to this problem. I think that people need to be very wary, indeed, about creating new property rights where they do not previously exist, because once these rights are created they are very difficult to get rid of. We are all observing that now, for example, in the poker machine arena, where previously the individuals who now have a gaming entitlement did not have one. Now they do. It is a tradeable entitlement, it has a value, and look how difficult it is to get any further movement on poker machines. Any carbon trading system needs to be very well thought out and robust and it needs, in effect, to be an international scheme. There is no sign that we are anywhere near that yet. Of course, that is something that we need to continue to look at.

I have to agree to some extent with the sceptics about Kyoto. If we do not have China, India and the United States in the tent, anything we do will be of limited value, or counteracted by what they are doing. That brings me back to the point where I was trying to make my emphasis; that is, there are technologies now in the process of development, which are beyond the embryonic stage, in the areas of solar, wind, design and other technologies, which should be the subject of active support by the federal government. That

active support has the potential not only to make a serious impact on our greenhouse position but also to provide sunrise industries for the Australian manufacturing sector (which this federal government has managed to run down quite successfully over the past 10 years). It will also provide practical assistance to countries such as China and India, which desperately need these technologies in order to bring their own greenhouse emissions under control.

**Mr HANNA (Mitchell):** I briefly want to support the member for Fisher's motion, which acknowledges the significance of the greenhouse effect and global warming. The member for Fisher also calls on the federal government to adopt the Kyoto Protocol, among other constructive measures. I want to pick up a couple of themes that have already been raised in the debate by the members for Fisher and Enfield. The member for Enfield, of course, is quite right in saying that Kyoto is not the magic bullet. It is only part of the solution. However, I think it is an important part of the solution. It brings into the consciousness of industry throughout all signatory nations the importance of restricting carbon emissions. It also has a positive impact by encouraging people to plant more trees, essentially to enable carbon emissions to be sequestered in vegetation. It is also important as a symbol of the commitment of various nations to countering global warming. It is shameful that the US and our own Australian government have resisted signing the protocol.

I now turn to a point that was raised by the member for Fisher when he said the world can change rapidly—and what we have seen is the political climate changing rapidly in relation to climate change. A few years ago, it was very easy for the sceptics to confuse the issue, and John Howard was probably with the mainstream Australian community when he said that we do not need to do anything. However, that has turned very rapidly, thanks to the popularisation of the issue by means of films such as *An Inconvenient Truth* presented by Al Gore. However, it is not just through those major sorts of productions but also through the many contributions of environmental advocates, through letters to the editor, talking to people, public presentations, rallies and so on that it has become part of the consciousness of the Australian community that we are in trouble.

So, we have seen the Prime Minister, John Howard, retreat to a halfway position, saying that he would be prepared for his government to sign the Kyoto Protocol if absolutely everyone else did. In a sense, that is an admission that it would be a good thing to sign it, but it is placing an impossible condition the Prime Minister knows will not be fulfilled. The real issue, of course, is that the US is resisting signing it because of pressure from US industry, and our national government seems to be utterly beholden to the US when it comes to foreign policy and energy policy. We hope that will change. There does seem to be a wind of change blowing through the US, and I hope it will extend to a more progressive approach towards global warming.

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

### TREENET

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

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the work of TREENET, a not-for-profit organisation which promotes the planting and manage-

ment of trees in the urban environment; and

- (b) congratulates the organisation on the success of its 7th National Tree Symposium held in Adelaide in September 2006.

I had the privilege of being invited to the 7th National Tree Symposium, which was held at the National Wine Centre over two days in September. It is to the credit of TREENET that the symposium was held. Its origin goes back to the work of David Lawry, who founded TREENET, a not-for-profit organisation funded by grants and voluntary contributions from participating councils, nurseries and other groups. To its credit, the Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure was a gold sponsor of this symposium, and I commend it for its sponsorship, along with other sponsors.

David Lawry established Lawrys Nursery in South Australia in 1975, and he was one of the leaders in terms of promoting the growing of native plants—not only native plants, but he made a great contribution to that. Unfortunately, ill health eventually caught up with him, but he still puts tremendous time and effort into the group which he founded: TREENET.

TREENET coordinates trials of different species under varying conditions. It coordinates trials of engineering and maintenance techniques and helps with other street tree related projects. There are some examples of TREENET trials in Coglin Street, Brompton; Highland Avenue, Torrens Park; and other locations. TREENET also has two projects (amongst others) at the moment, one of which is called the Avenues of Honour project. Members may have noticed when driving around not only South Australia but Australia generally that there are many locations which have an avenue of trees, usually to commemorate the sacrifice of soldiers, particularly in World War I.

In 2000, one of the key supporters and members of TREENET, Dr Greg Moore from the University of Melbourne, raised the question: where are all the avenues of trees in Australia? Many of these trees have suffered over time; some have been neglected, some have become diseased, or whatever. He and others associated with TREENET have committed to coordinate the Avenues of Honour 1915-2015 project. What they want to do is restore these avenues of trees and ensure that they are healthy and viable, and that they will continue to provide a lasting tribute to those who sacrificed their lives, particularly in World War I. That is one of the projects in which TREENET is involved.

I offer members this suggestion—it would not have to be an avenue of honour in their own name; I am not suggesting that—because it would be a wonderful thing, not just in a country town but in the suburban environment as well, to create or be responsible for the creation of an avenue of trees. When I was lecturing at what is now the University of South Australia, I created one in memory of Keith Malthouse, a storeperson at the university. He was a wonderful man who, sadly, never got to enjoy his retirement because he died close to retirement age. In memory of Keith I had planted an avenue of lemon-scented gums (*Eucalyptus citriodora*) which are still there. Fortunately they have been retained. Sadly, most of the complex down there has been bulldozed except for some of the facilities on the northern side of the Torrens, but that avenue of trees has been kept and it is a lasting memorial to a wonderful person.

Another project in which TREENET has been active relates to Remembrance Day, which has recently been observed. It created a scheme involving the selling of rosemary plants. This is a very interesting aspect of our

history. The rosemary plants (which have been produced for sale in their thousands as a fundraising activity and in commemoration of the sacrifice at Anzac Cove) were grown from a cutting taken from an original piece of Anzac rosemary brought back by returning soldiers from the hills at Gallipoli in 1915. Purchase of the plants will assist in the replanting of memorial trees and avenues of honour throughout Australia.

TREENET had a lot of interesting debate with the federal government, particularly the Department of Veterans' Affairs, because that department would not allow the rosemary to be called ANZAC Rosemary, even though the benefit of the sale is to restore those avenues of trees and to do things to commemorate the memory of those who gave their lives. It ended up being called Gallipoli Rosemary, and it came from a garden—with the cutting originally from the Gallipoli Peninsula—at Daw Park, here in Adelaide. TREENET is based at Waite Campus at the University of Adelaide; and, if members are interested, I can give contact details.

I want to indicate the range of topics presented at that conference in September. The opening address was given by Professor Chris Daniels from the University of Adelaide, and it was a very enlightening address. I cannot go through all the topics, but a presentation was made on long-term climate change and vegetation response by Professor Bob Hill from the University of Adelaide. 'Urban trees and the global greenhouse effect' was presented by Dr Greg Moore from the University of Melbourne. This presentation highlighted the role of the urban forest and how it can help with the global greenhouse issues.

Another topic was 'Going with the flow—trees, habitat and urban waterways', presented by Professor John Argue from the University of South Australia. His presentation showed how you can control some of the run-off in the urban environment by doing innovative things with trees and other vegetation. The topic 'Street trees and soils as an effective stormwater treatment' was presented by Liz Denman from the University of Melbourne; and 'Green streets—creative stormwater design' was presented by someone from Victoria. Another topic, 'Trees, urban—ecology and community health' was an interesting paper presented by Dr Jane Tarran from the University of Technology, Sydney.

The research showed that where ever people can see vegetation—whether they be in a hospital, or where ever—it does contribute to an increased feeling of wellbeing and improved health. That probably explains why we may have gone off the rails in here, because the only green we can see are synthetic seats. They are not even leather, contrary to what some people think. A very interesting presentation, 'Improving the urban forest by design', was made by Kevin Taylor, a Director of Taylor Cullity Lethlean, South Australia. His company was responsible for much of the design work on North Terrace.

Sadly, the government and the city council did not follow his company's design recommendations. We did not get the eucalyptus maculata we would have had on the northern side if the advice of Kevin, Tim Flannery and the head of the Botanic Gardens had been heeded. The list goes on. Karen Sweeney from the City of Sydney gave a presentation on tree management in Australia's oldest capital. I was intrigued to hear from her that the council responsible for Hyde Park in Sydney (and all members would have been to Hyde Park) is spending \$37 million on that park's current make-over. It is a very affluent council. The topics go on.

Some of the interesting information that can be provided through TREENET includes getting rid of some of the furrphies about trees killing people. Quite a bit of research has been done which shows that nearly all those reported cases of trees allegedly killing people are the result of stupidity by humans, for example, people trying to cut parts of them with chain saws when they are not properly qualified, and so on. Interesting research has been done into the myth of native trees dropping limbs, particularly in relation to spotted gums (eucalyptus maculata), which were to be planted on the northern side of North Terrace.

That research indicates that the rate of limb dropping by them is minuscule and grossly exaggerated by people who have another agenda. If members are interested in the aspect of urban trees, what trees to plant and where to plant them TREENET is a good source of information. TREENET is not purely promoting native trees; it does have an open mind about these things. It has done quite a bit of research—or its members have—in relation to which trees use water in greater or lesser quantities, and so on.

I will conclude by saying what I think is quite a humorous aspect, and this goes back a long way. When there were plans to establish a campus and teacher training facility at Underdale, one of the science lecturers appointed to the new college asked the director whether they could have an arboretum on site, and the director said there was no way they could afford to build something like that. For members who are interested in trees and want to know about them, the Waite Institute, through the University of Adelaide, has free tours I think every Sunday, but members could check. They will take you through the arboretum at Waite and give expert advice and expert information, and it is a good way to learn about trees and the important role they play in our community.

Surveys tell us that the item in the environment that attracts the most interest and support is trees. People identify most strongly with trees. It is not simply because of, often, their large size but, increasingly, people recognise that trees are important in the wider ecology. In terms of street trees, it is not simply having something to help deal with carbon dioxide. Importantly, we need to focus on ecological aspects, particularly to try to save our threatened native bird species. Sadly, councils in the metropolitan area, and in particular the Adelaide City Council in the CBD, seem to have an obsession with making Adelaide look like a transplanted England. I love England and my father was English, but I am an Australian and am proud to be an Australian, and am committed to the local natural ecology. We should be planting more indigenous trees. Perth can do it. If you go to Perth it looks Australian. If you come into Adelaide, it looks anything but Australian when you go down Sir Donald Bradman Drive. I think he probably would be insulted to think that the street named after him is not Australian, and it should be.

Likewise, in the city where we are about to have a makeover of all the squares, the council is planning to do what we used to do. We used to do horrible things. Are we going to have child slavery simply because we used to do it? Are we going to treat Aboriginal people in the disgraceful manner we used to simply because that is what happened in the past? I do not buy this argument that because we did it in the past we should continue to do it. It is time that, in the management of our street trees and the planting of them in the CBD, we look Australian, not for the sake of being Australian but because that is the ecology of this state. We should be planting trees which do not pollute our rivers and support our

native bird life rather than the sterile, non-ecological 'weeds' (as described by Tim Flannery) that the city council and other councils—and, to some extent, the department of transport—seem to be obsessed with planting along our arterial roads and inner CBD streets.

I again commend TREENET and urge members, if they want information about anything to do with street trees and the management of the urban forest, to contact TREENET, care of the Waite Campus at the University of Adelaide. I commend the motion to the house.

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** The government is happy to support this motion, which acknowledges the work of TREENET and congratulates the organisation on the success of its 7th National Street Tree Symposium. TREENET, which has a nationwide focus, makes an important contribution to enhancing urban environments through the coordination of information exchange and research into the successful selection, production, establishment and management of street trees. As a not-for-profit initiative, founded in South Australia in 1997 and based at Adelaide University's Waite Campus, TREENET is primarily a volunteer organisation, overseen and managed by members of an advisory board and management committee.

The success of TREENET's activities and, in particular, as I mentioned, the 7th National Street Tree Symposium held over two days in Adelaide in September of this year, demonstrate the dedication of its members, who are to be commended and congratulated on their efforts. The value of TREENET is reflected in the support this organisation attracts through membership and various sponsors, the major sponsor being the state government, through the Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure. I thank the minister, who is sitting in the chamber.

TREENET draws on and extends the expertise of local councils, state government agencies, educational institutions and other culture related industries in making advances in urban street tree management by bringing together professionals from varied disciplines, through the dissemination of information via the internet and through the National Street Tree Symposium. TREENET has been able to make a significant contribution in promoting an understanding of how effective street tree management can impact positively on the health of communities and individuals, extend the life of civil infrastructure, improve the amenity of local and broader environments, and contribute to improving the sustainability of our cities. TREENET is also to be commended for its research activities, particularly the dissemination of information. This includes topics such as infrastructure design to reduce urban stormwater run-off by trapping it for use by street trees or cleansing before it enters waterways; tree species' effectiveness in stormwater pollution reduction, which is something that we are all very well aware of and much used particularly in parts of my community; and determining sun protection factors of the various shade tree species. We are very happy to support this motion and again give our congratulations to TREENET.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### DEATH PENALTY

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

That this house calls on the Prime Minister and the federal government to consistently oppose the use of the death penalty in any country at any time.

I have been passionate about this issue for a long time. I can remember when the last person was hanged in South Australia—a man by the name of Glen Sabre Valance. To give members some indication of his state of mind, that was not his real name. He changed his name to Valance after the song, *The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance*. That gives us an some indication of a person who may not be what we would consider to be stable. The last person executed in Australia was Ronald Ryan, who was hanged in Victoria in 1967. In 1985 New South Wales became the last state to abolish the death penalty in law, when it abolished the death penalty for offences relating to piracy and treason.

Why am I opposed to the death penalty, and why am I keen for the federal government to have a consistent approach? There are several reasons. First, it violates the right to life. It is cruel, inhumane and degrading. It is irrevocable, can be inflicted on the innocent, and has never been shown to deter crime more effectively than other punishments. If it was the great deterrent people claim, why do we still have so much crime in the United States and drug trafficking in countries such as Singapore? A disturbing number of people are executed in Asia each year. In 2004 at least three and half thousand people were executed in 10 countries in the Asian region, although the true figure is much higher.

At least twice that number were sentenced to death, and China executes more people than the rest of the world put together, yet there are serious inadequacies in every level of the Chinese justice system. Singapore executes more people per head of population than any other country in the world. Indonesia has resumed executions, despite concerns that the death penalty, in many cases, has failed to uphold international standards for fairness. In relation to Indonesia, I was surprised that there was not a greater outcry in Australia when, as reported in *The Advertiser* on 23 September, three Christian militants were executed by firing squad for allegedly leading attacks on Muslims six years ago. I did not hear the federal government protest about this not only in terms of the execution of those Christian militants—and I am not saying that they should get special treatment because they are Christian—but because their court process was described by human rights groups as a sham. It said that while it was 'possible' they took part in some violence, they almost certainly were not the masterminds. That was the report from one of the human rights watch groups.

What concerns me about this penalty is, as I said, if you are executed and you are innocent, there is not a lot that can be done for you. It has happened on many occasions. There was a case of Timothy Evans in England who was executed in the 1950s. He could not read or write, yet he allegedly signed a confession that he had killed someone and he was hanged. It was subsequently found that he was innocent, but it does not do much good for him to get an apology or to be cleared of that crime—it is too late. I will come in a moment in more detail to the inconsistency of the federal government, which is the main thrust of my motion, but I will refer just to a few statistics. Over half the countries in the world (129) have abolished the death penalty; 68 countries retain the death penalty; and, since 1990, the United States has executed 19 children. This is a country—and I have recently said publicly that I have a great love for American people, although I do not have much love for US foreign policy—which supposedly is fighting for freedom and justice in Iraq, yet it has executed 19 children (some allegedly retarded) since 1990.

This is a country that one would expect to perform at a higher level of civilised behaviour than is actually happening there. In the United States, since 1973, 120 people have been released from death row with evidence of their innocence. Since 1976, the United States has executed 1 045 people—it would be more now. As of earlier this year, 3 370 people were on death row, and of these approximately half are black or of Spanish extraction coming from the Caribbean and so on, which is extremely disproportionate in relation to the population of the United States. The south of the USA has the highest murder rate, yet it accounts for 80 per cent of the executions. So, people who say that the death penalty is a deterrent, obviously need to be told that, in the good old south, it is not working. The north-east of the US has less than 1 per cent of all executions and has the lowest murder rate, which tends to suggest that the deterrent aspect is a phoney argument.

The death penalty system is very expensive. It actually costs more because of the appeal process and keeping people on death row. All the apparatus needed ultimately to put someone to death is very expensive and so, on a cost basis, it is not effective either. I know personally that the Prime Minister says that he is against the death penalty and I am sure people such as Philip Ruddock are as well. I would also predict that Amanda Vanstone and Alexander Downer are against it. Where they get into trouble is that they are not consistent, and that is the point of my motion. You cannot be selective and say it is okay to execute some people in Indonesia for some things but not execute other people for other things. We have to be consistent and say: we oppose it in Australia; we oppose it anywhere.

I am not an apologist for anyone engaging in terrorist acts, or for drug traffickers; it is evil behaviour. However, we need to have a consistent policy; we need to oppose such action, and we need to raise with China, Singapore, and other countries, our opposition to the use of the death penalty. We know of an execution recently in Singapore of an Australian of Vietnamese extraction. What did that achieve? The person who is executed almost certainly is not the mastermind behind the drug trafficking involved, anyway, so you are punishing, with the ultimate punishment, someone who is almost certainly a courier. I do not condone this type of behaviour, but what has the world gained as a result of taking the life of that young Australian in Singapore? In countries like China the punishment and the execution is usually a bullet in the head, and the macabre aspect of that is that they charge the family for the cost of the bullet. I think that indicates the unsavoury nature of this particular type of penalty.

In the First World War, the English shot a lot of their troops who were seen to be deserters in the battlefields. We would now diagnose many of those troops as suffering from a stress disorder or mental breakdown, but they were executed on the grounds that they were traitors or deserters. From memory, I think the English army executed about 100 of their own soldiers who ran from their position in or near the front line. That highlights the stupidity of the death penalty. It is irrational. Look at what happened to Breaker Morant. What did that achieve? What does taking the life of anyone achieve in that type of situation?

I am not saying that we should be soft on people who commit crime. I do not have an objection to a genuine life sentence for people who commit the worst type of crime. I do not have any concern about locking someone up for a long time—even for the term of their natural life—if it is a very

serious crime. I am not an advocate for being soft on people who do wicked and evil things, but I do not believe that the death penalty is the appropriate way to punish people. Sadly, in Australia we talk about life sentences but we do not actually carry them out; it is a misnomer. I am calling on the Prime Minister, in particular, to be consistent, because you cannot cherry-pick on this issue and say that Australian drug traffickers in Indonesia should escape the death penalty but it is okay to execute someone else in Indonesia who did something. You cannot do that. You lose all credibility internationally as well as locally if you do that. My point is simple: it is a cruel, barbaric practice.

I will not relate some of the gruesome aspects of the death penalty, but as a young person I was conscious that someone who lived in my area (who was actually executed before I was born) was hanged at the Adelaide Gaol because he killed a money lender in Hindley Street. Even though the jury recommended mercy, the Playford government of the day (through Executive Council) had that death penalty carried out. The consequences for that family were horrific. To this day, whenever I think of that family I am still haunted by the thought that a member of their family was executed and that, even though the jury recommended mercy, no mercy was given.

There are plenty of other examples of Aboriginal people being executed. The British Army in India used to put people on the front of gun barrels and fire the gun as a punishment. That sort of sickening behaviour is the sort of cruel and obscene behaviour that comes from people who see the taking of life as a penalty. I bet those people would not have the guts to carry out the penalty; they would want someone else to do it.

The main thrust of this motion is to urge the federal government to be consistent and the Prime Minister to oppose the death penalty anywhere at any time as a matter of principle, whether it be in the United States, Singapore, China, Indonesia, or wherever. In that way the argument of the federal government would carry a lot more weight. I commend the motion to the house.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### ACCESSIBLE OPEN SPACE

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

That this house calls on the state government to ensure that, with the implementation of urban infill policies and the likely sale of surplus school sites along with other land, whether publicly or privately owned, there is adequate provision made for accessible open space.

The emphasis in my motion is on 'accessible open space.' We hear people say, 'There's a lot of open space.' There is some open space in areas, but it is not necessarily accessible. The Happy Valley reservoir is in my electorate, but people are not allowed in there. I am not saying they should be allowed to go in there; it is not open space but, rather, inaccessible open space. It is deliberately intended to be that way in order to keep 60 per cent of Adelaide's drinking water pure and, also, as a positive conservation benefit because it has some of the best remnants of urban native vegetation within its boundaries.

We are aware that the state government has announced the creation of what it calls super schools. The plan is to close 17 schools and replace them with six new super schools. One

of the motivations for this motion was my inquiry as to what would happen to surplus school sites once these super schools are created. The answer from DECS is that it is not its responsibility. My argument is that it is certainly the responsibility of the government to ensure, particularly in areas which in other respects may be disadvantaged, that the land that is currently in those 17 schools is not lost to the community, especially where accessible open space is not generously provided. We know that with subdivisions there is provision for a cash contribution or a 12.5 per cent of area contribution. That does not necessarily mean that that is what happens. In fact, we might get a combination of open space provisions and cash contributions. It does not necessarily have to result in open space being kept in a particular area. I am very concerned that if the government tries to improve educational outcomes—hopefully, that is its objective in this regard—it does not result in the people, particularly in the northern and western suburbs, losing some of the accessible open space which is currently available.

I refer to a letter from of constituent of mine that was published in *The Advertiser*. I have some very talented constituents. He wrote to *The Advertiser* on Wednesday 27 September as follows:

The South Australian Region of Parks and Leisure Australia notes with interest the state government's intent to sell a number of schools in Adelaide's northern and western suburbs to create several superschools. We understand the rationale behind this approach but are concerned about the consequences of the loss of open space to the community. Each of these schools has a playground, playing fields and general open spaces that have provided for the community for years. Generations have grown up enjoying and using these spaces that have contributed to forming local community identity. More high-density housing and less public open space creates a recipe for disaster. The intrinsic and extrinsic value of the school land to the community cannot be underestimated. PLA [Parks and Leisure Australia] challenges the state government to ensure that, when excess school land is sold to residential developers, controls are in place to ensure an appropriate level of open space is saved for future community enjoyment.

It is signed by Andrew Smith, President, Parks and Leisure Australia, Happy Valley. I commend Andrew for that letter. It was not solicited by me: it was coincidental to my concern about this very issue. We need some elements of urban consolidation, but we have to be careful that we do not literally throw the baby out with the bath water. What is happening with the consolidation in urban development is that we are losing a lot of areas where kids used to play cricket, girls used to throw a netball and, if we are not careful, we could create a situation where not just young people but people of any age are denied the open space necessary for a healthy lifestyle. In that regard, I think the Adelaide Parklands, whilst it was certainly a brilliant idea at the time, has been used as an excuse, in some ways, by people outside the Parklands area not to provide the open space that they should, on the grounds that you have the Parklands.

That is not an acceptable argument. In fact, the Parklands are very intensively used and are not simply the lungs of Adelaide. They are often used for parking vehicles and for a whole range of things. In some ways, the provision of the Parklands has backfired in that it has allowed subsequent residential urban development to escape the provision of adequate open space. My challenge to the government is this: it may not be the problem of the Department of Education and Children's Services but it is the problem of the government, an issue for the government to address, to make sure that improving the educational facilities for people in those

areas—which I think is a great objective—should not be at the expense of open space.

Sadly, we have already seen many schools and other government land sold off, often in a short-sighted way, to provide more housing, but the community has lost open space. I am still very cross about what happened in my own electorate where a large piece of land, owned at the time by SA Water, was sold off to developers by the then minister Michael Armitage. That denied the community access to that area as open space. We have a fine retirement village there now, but it has a big fence and you are not allowed in there unless you are a retiree who lives there, and the consequence is less open space for residents in my electorate.

That is what can happen when a government agency looks to get a quick dollar. In the long term, the community misses out because it loses a valuable, accessible open space. I commend this motion to the house and trust that the ministers in cabinet will look closely at any sale of land and that we do not just get the Department of Education and Children's Services washing its hands of it and saying 'It's not our problem.' It certainly is a problem for the whole of government and for cabinet, and I would hope that other ministers would take a keen interest. I am sure that the Minister for Education (Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith) is quite keen that this land also be kept as open space as far as possible. However, ultimately, it will come down to a decision of cabinet. So, I hope that all the other ministers follow this matter closely and do not see it just as an educational issue, with the ultimate sell-off of land denying those people in the northern and western suburbs their rightful heritage to open space, not just for now but for generations to come. I commend the motion to the house.

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

## TRANSPORT, U2 CONCERT

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

That this house—

- (a) calls on the government to reverse its decision not to provide additional bus services to move up to 60 000 U2 fans to and from the concert at AAMI Stadium on 16 November;
- (b) notes the potential risk to public safety linked to the number of fans descending upon West Lakes in cars before, during and after the concert should the government fail to ensure that adequate bus services are provided;
- (c) expresses its concern for the pressure the rush of cars at the concert will have on police, emergency services, the environment and the amenity of nearby residents; and
- (d) requests the government confirm the exact amount of GST revenue above \$500 000 it expects to receive from ticket sales and from the sale of other goods and services connected with the concert.

I call on the house to direct the government to reverse its stupid decision, even at this eleventh hour, not to provide adequate additional bus services for tonight's U2 concert.

**Mr Koutsantonis:** Are you going?

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** No; I am not going, unfortunately.

**Mr Koutsantonis:** I've got tickets. I'm going.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** You are going, good. How will you be getting there, member for West Torrens?

**Mr Koutsantonis:** Bus.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** I look forward to seeing that, and I might notify the *Sunday Mail* about it. I want to point out something to the government. It has a stunning revelation

to realise. It needs to go up onto the mountain and suddenly acknowledge that it is responsible for planning public transport services and that it has an obligation to provide the required services to get people safely from point A to point B. Tonight, 60 000 fans will gather at AAMI Stadium for the U2 concert. From experience in other states, I understand that more could gather outside the stadium. Other vehicles will move in to drop off people and go; some will require parking. In all likelihood, it could be an absolute shemozzle. Why is that so? Because the government has refused to provide adequate bus services. Last week, on the Byner show on 5AA, the minister was forced to acknowledge that he had not booked additional bus services for the concert. His argument was stunning.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is the member moving his motion in an amended form or sticking to the original motion?

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** The member started off discussing the motion, but it appears to me that he is moving an amendment.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The member for Torrens will take her seat.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** The government is a little bit touchy on this. It had a job to ensure that adequate public transport was available to safely transport 60 000 fans. Radio 5AA exposed the minister's lack of action. His argument was that, because there was a profit to be made by the promoters, the government had no obligation to properly plan or fund the provision of public transport to and from the concert and that the promoters should organise the buses.

The reality (as was exposed on 5AA) was that the minister had not arranged anything successfully with the promoters. He had not extracted any funding, he had not organised a plan and he had not coordinated bus services. He must have somehow thought that they would magically drop out of the sky from the promoters and be turned on and that the advertising and the organisation of the entire bus movement to and from AAMI Stadium would somehow magically come together, put together by the SANFL or the promoters.

It was a stupid proposition. It was exposed by Byner on 5AA. The minister looked like a mug. I suppose the logic of the minister's argument was that, for example, at the annual show where a lot of profits are made, we should not have additional bus services. For example, on New Year's Eve, the logic is: for heaven's sake, those hotels, function centres and restaurants will probably make a profit. We should not have additional public transport arrangements for New Year's Eve because those terrible small businesses will be making a profit. This is the logic of it. Whenever anyone is making a profit, we will not have public transport, will we? You might as well close up the public transport system and send it home. Guess what, people are out there making a profit every night and every day. People are also getting on buses and going to and from those small businesses and enterprises every day of the week. The minister's proposition is absolutely stupid—another stupid proposition from the minister for stuff-ups.

In light of the public outcry, we had mumblings by Monday to this effect: 'We had better do something. There are no buses. What are we going to do?' So, we march out the public servants. That is what this minister does: any bad news, and we march out the public servants. Heather Webster from Transport SA got the job of going out to calm down the peasants—the people who wanted to get on the buses to go

to the concerts—who the minister feels do not deserve a bus. They are not peasants: they are fans and citizens who have a right to bus transport that is not provided by the government. Don't treat them like peasants—they are not. Heather Webster got that job.

Neil Smith from Torrens Transit got the job of going out there to explain the situation as well. He was directed to argue the case that everywhere else in Australia the promoters pay for the buses. I do not think that is right; in fact, I know it is not correct. In some cases promoters may have contributed towards or provided buses. I am sure there are lots of examples. If the argument the government is trying to run through Torrens Transit is that everywhere in Australia on every occasion whenever there is a concert at which profits are made the promoter always invariably pays 100 per cent of the public transport costs, I can assure members that is not the case. It is a stupid proposition from a stupid government and from a minister who does not even have the courage to go on radio himself this week to argue the case; instead, he sends out the troops. He sent out the public servants and Torrens Transit.

That was Monday. By Tuesday, the concert was getting closer and the feeling was, 'Oh my God, we had better do something.' So, the public servants were directed to announce that something might be organised by tomorrow, so by Wednesday something might be organised. Thank you; we might have something organised. Then on Wednesday (the day before the concert), after everybody had already made their transport arrangements and worked out where they would park the car and how they would manage, another public servant, who should not be put in this position, was sent out to announce, 'We have organised some extra shuttle buses from Currie Street via Adelaide Railway Station at 3 p.m. and they will be coming back after the concert.' I would like to see the science as to whether the number of buses the government has provided at the eleventh hour will be adequate to move 60 000 fans. I doubt if it will even scratch the surface of the public transport demand that evening. It will not, and the government knows it.

The minister stood up in the house yesterday afternoon saying, 'It is all right. I have fixed the problem. I have organised a few extra buses.' It was exposed on talkback radio that the buses would stop at midnight. They will come back from the concert and drop people back in the city but then the normal bus stopping times will remain. Everyone will get back to Adelaide only to find that there will be no buses to get them home. The answer on talkback radio to that was, 'Maybe they will have to drive their car into the city so that they can then drive home.' We have this stupid situation where people will have to drive from the north, the south, the west and the east and from electorates that members of the government represent, but they do not care.

The member for Mawson could not care less; his constituents will have to drive into the city and park and then catch a bus to the concert and then a bus back. People will not be able to get a bus back to Noarlunga, they will not be able to get a bus back to Tea Tree Gully; they will have to get in their car and go.

There is an important lesson this government needs to understand and it is a lesson Mussolini understood: you must have the trains and buses running on time and there has to be enough of them. If you cannot run the buses and trains, you cannot run the government. What the government has cobbled together at the last minute is a hotchpotch arrangement of buses that will not be adequate; they will run at

stupid times, it will not adequately move people to or from the stadium, it simply relocates the car-parking arrangements, and we will still have tens of thousands of fans searching for a car-park.

U2 wrote a great song called *I still haven't found what I'm looking for*. That is what people will be thinking as they drive around looking for a car-park. They wrote another song called 'Lemon' and the member for Mawson might like to reflect on that, with his good mate the Minister for Transport—lemons in a basket. If you cannot organise the buses what can you do? There are 60 000 fans. I am not sure what the price of a ticket is; I have heard \$100 to \$150. Let us say that the amount of ticket sales is around \$6 million: with 60 000 fans and the GST revenue of 10 per cent, \$600 000 will find its way directly into Treasury coffers from ticket sales alone, not to mention sales of goods and services linked to the concert. The minister is happy to make \$600 000 out of the U2 concert, quite happy to put it in his pocket, but he is not happy to provide a few extra buses.

You had better hope that it is not a mess down there tonight. You had better hope that there are not too many accidents. You had better hope that the police activity is not over-stretched; I notice they have been out there expressing some concerns and issuing instructions to the public. You had better hope that the residents of West Lakes are not distressed by the chaos down there tonight, because if it is a mess tonight you will have no-one to blame but yourselves.

There is another concert coming—Robbie Williams—where the crowd will probably be as big or even bigger. I just have a little bit of advice for the government: if you could not get it organised for tonight, maybe you would like to think it through and get it a little better organised for the Robbie Williams concert. There are 60 000 people going there tonight and they will all be thinking, 'I wish I had been able to catch a train or a bus and be delivered to and from this concert a little more safely and a little more sensibly than I have been.' The house should be concerned about the crush of cars at the concert; it should be concerned for our police and emergency services; it should be concerned about a government that takes the view that 60 000 people can just go jump in the creek, because they cannot be bothered to get things organised. It is your job—if you do not want to pay, if you do not want to use the \$600 000 of GST revenue you are making to put on buses yourselves, do not throw it onto the bus operators or the promoters. I would like to know from the minister how much of the money he has for the extra buses from the promoters. Is he putting anything in himself? The government has a responsibility to plan public transport. In this case it has failed.

I have a motion on the *Notice Paper* for a review into our public transport system. The government is yet to contribute. There is a very simple solution: come up with a transport plan, find yourself a minister who can run the public transport system and deliver on the plan. Get some arrangements in place and some adequate funding so that you can provide adequate services—and, most importantly, think ahead. When you know you have these major events coming up make sure you plan them into your public transport arrangements—it is pretty simple. Byner and 5AA, *The Advertiser* and the ABC and others have been quite right to criticise you. It is a major stuff-up.

Debate adjourned.

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

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that written answers to questions as detailed in the schedule I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 8, 18, 25, 26, 30 to 32, 34, 35, 37, 40, 77, 78, 98, 115 and 125.

### SCHOOLS, MATERIALS AND SERVICES FEE

8. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What recommendations from the Review of Materials and Services Charges in 2005 have been implemented in 2006?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** An independent review of the Materials and Services Charges was completed in February 2005.

The review of the Materials and Services Charges recommended a number of improvements, including:

- greater clarity surrounding the materials and services charge
- information regarding the polling process, and
- students not being excluded from undertaking subjects.

The recommendations are being implemented through the Materials and Services Charges Administrative Instructions and Guidelines, issued by the Department of Education and Children's Services.

### SSAB BUDGET SAVINGS

18. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What efficiency dividends and budget savings were made by the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia in 2004-05 and 2005-06?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** The Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia was required to achieve budget savings of \$151,000 in 2004-05 via a general efficiency dividend.

No additional savings targets were given to the agency for 2005-06.

### SCHOOLS, LEARNING TOGETHER PROGRAM

25. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What is the total State Government funding provided for the Learning Together Program and which schools are participating?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** Total funding of the Learning Together Program from its beginning in 2001-02 until the end of 2008-09 is \$6.98 million.

The Learning Together Program operates from 5 school sites: Enfield Primary; Fraser Park CPC; Yr 7 at Murray Bridge; Para West Adult Campus; Carlton School Port Augusta; and Christies Downs and O'Sullivan's Beach Preschools and Schools.

### NATIONAL CHILDCARE ACCREDITATION COUNCIL

26. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** How many metropolitan and rural South Australian child care centres are accredited by the National Childcare Accreditation Council?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** In South Australia there are 293 child care centres licensed under the Children's Services Act and operating in compliance with the Children's Services (Child Care Centre) Regulations. Of the 293 services, 222 are in the metropolitan area and 71 are in the country.

The Department of Education and Children's Services does not keep records on child care centres registered with NCAC. However, a recent National Childcare Accreditation Council report indicates that of the 293 South Australian services 252 have registered with the NCAC Quality Improvement and Accreditation System.

### SCHOOL INVESTMENT FUND

30. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What is the dollar and percentage interest return received per annum from the \$183 million held in schools and SA School Investment Fund units at 30 June 2005?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** The SASIF funds are invested with the South Australian Financing Authority (SAFA).

For the 2004-05 financial year the total interest received was \$11,005,040.

The average rate of return over this period was 5.67 per cent.



### SCHOOL CLOSURES

31. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What was the total net gain received by the department from the disposal of assets arising from the two school closures in 2004-05?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** These properties have been declared surplus to the requirements of the Department for Education and Children's Services and are being disposed of in accordance with The Department of Premier and Cabinet Circular 114.

### SCHOOL REVENUE

32. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What changes has the department implemented to ensure that revenue received from fund raising activities and enrolments are appropriately audited and accurately recorded in the Consolidated Financial Statements for 2003-04 and 2004-05?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** As part of the process of producing the Consolidated Financial Statements variances from previous years results are identified and reasons sought.

In 2004 (relating to the 2004-05 financial year) the Administrative Instructions and Guidelines were amended to include the requirement for schools to report and minute all fundraising activities together with the estimated result to the Governing/School Council. This requirement has been included in the Audit Plan since 2004.

All revenue (including fundraising revenue) within the Consolidated Financial Statements are audited by utilising comparative results from the previous financial year, and comparing actual results with calculated results based on various inputs including enrolments and units sold. Any significant variances are investigated and reasons provided by each school and preschool.

Any revenues generated on an enrolment basis were verified against the audited enrolment statistics.

### SCHOOLS, SINGLE FUNDING MODEL

34. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What are the details of the Single Funding Model and will schools receive more or less money as a result of its use?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** The Single Funding Model was announced in 2004 for the 2005 school year, replacing the previous dual funding model consisting of the Global Budget and Statement of Resource Entitlement. The Single Funding Model ensured that current policy and all industrial entitlements were maintained.

### SCHOOLS, ENERGY AUDIT

35. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

1. How many energy audits have been undertaken on state government school sites?
2. Which schools have reduced their building energy uses by 25 per cent since May 2002?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:**

Audits

More than 400 schools have received 'Energy Savings Kits for Schools'. This resource provides guidance to students on conducting walk through audits for their schools. Surveys are made of lighting, heating, hot water and electrical equipment.

In partnership with Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI), an investigation has recently been commissioned into 120 large Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) sites. The report will:

- Identify sites within the DECS portfolio with the greatest potential to reduce energy consumption.
- Identify sites at which maximum energy efficiency benefits can be obtained.

Energy Uses

South Australia's State Strategic Plan requires that energy consumption in Government buildings be reduced by 25 per cent by 2014. Through development of a portfolio-wide energy efficiency strategy DECS is working toward this target.

Many schools are making significant efforts and reductions have been achieved.

### SCHOOLS, SOLAR POWER

37. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** Which entities have been contracted to install solar power systems in state government schools and what have been the outlay in each year since 2003?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** A whole-of-government tender process was coordinated by the Department for Administrative and Information Services for the State Supply Board for the supply and installation of photovoltaic (PV) panels for the SA Solar Schools Program.

Telstra was the successful tenderer. Expenditure is as follows:

Financial Year	Actual Expenditure
2003-04	\$ 447,979
2004-05	\$ 371,381
2005-06	\$ 393,335
Total	\$1,212,695

### SCHOOL RETENTION RATES

40. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What was the reason for the reduction in the year's 10 to 12 retention rate from 75.8 per cent in 2004 to 74.5 per cent in 2005?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** The change in the South Australian government school Year 10 to 12 full-time-equivalent (FTE) apparent retention rate from 2004 to 2005 was from 75.8 per cent to 74.5 per cent (not 74.5 per cent), a difference of only 0.4 percentage points and this is not significant.

At the same time, the SA government school Year 10 to 12 full-time rate, which is generally reported nationally, increased by 1.5 percentage points.

Examining the number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) enrolments that form the basis of the rate shows an increase in Year 10 FTE enrolments from 2002 to 2003, as well as an increase in Year 12 FTE enrolments from 2004 to 2005.

All Year 8 to Year 12 apparent retention rates in SA government schools showed an increase from 2004 to 2005.

In 2003 the State Government allocated \$28.4 million over four years for strategies to increase retention through the Social Inclusion School Retention Action Plan, and when examined together, the overall apparent retention rate data in 2005 suggests good outcomes for school retention in South Australian government schools.

### SCHOOLS, DRUG STRATEGY

77. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** Which Government schools have adopted a 'whole school' drug strategy?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** By the end of 2005, all government schools were required to develop their own Whole School Drug Strategy Action Plan relevant to their local context.

### SCHOOLS, SPRINKLER SYSTEMS

78. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

1. Has a full cost benefit analysis been undertaken regarding the installation of sprinkler systems in all new school building constructions or substantial renovations and if so, what are the details?
2. How many schools have automatic detection and fire alarm systems connected to private monitoring agencies whenever the school is unoccupied?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** The Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) has undertaken a cost benefit analysis for the installation of sprinkler systems in all new school building constructions or substantial renovations. Analysis results included estimated resourcing commitments for the fitting of sprinkler systems to all DECS sites is estimated at between \$240 million and \$300 million.

Based on current information, 635 DECS sites have monitored intruder and smoke alarm systems installed.

### EDUCATION, ABUSE INVESTIGATION

98. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

1. Has the Department set up a special investigations unit, in consultation with SAPOL, to investigate allegations of abuse by Departmental staff?
2. Have interagency case management processes been enhanced for extra familial abuse cases within the Department and if so, how?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** The Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) Special Investigations Unit was established in 1991, with the assistance of the Crown Solicitor's Office and in consultation with the Australian Education Union, to investigate complaints of serious misconduct, including allegations of abuse, against employees, service providers and volunteers.

The DECS Special Investigations Unit has a close working relationship with SAPOL and Families SA. Notifications received

by the Child Abuse Report Line that are relevant to DECS sites are sent to the Special Investigations Unit and are managed in conjunction with SAPOL officers. Any allegations of sexual impropriety and serious physical assault are investigated by SAPOL. To ensure effective coordination in the investigation of child abuse, guidelines have been developed to outline the roles of the three agencies. The guidelines are regularly reviewed to reflect changes in legislation and policy. Should no criminal charges be laid, the matter is referred for investigation to the Government Investigations Unit within the Attorney-General's Department.

### SCHOOLS, ACTION ZONES

115. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What is an 'Action Zone' project?  
**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** Attendance Action Zones were established in 2003 to address attendance and retention in areas with high rates of absenteeism.

The nine Action Zone districts are Eyre, Flinders, Hills/Murraylands, Kumangka Para, Metro West, Northern Country, Riverland, Salisbury, Southern Sea & Vines.

Action Zone projects have been initiated by schools or clusters of schools in response to issues of absenteeism identified at the local level.

Over the four years of the project, support has been provided for approximately 115 attendance improvement initiatives in 130 schools in those districts.

The projects cover areas such as:

- Increased contact with parents
- Individual attendance plans and case management for chronic non-attendees
- Gender specific programs
- Peer mentoring
- Recognition and achievement incentives for targeted students
- Raising Community awareness of the importance of regular attendance
- Improved attendance accountability
- Increasing skill base of parents.

Many of the initiatives implemented in schools as part of the Action Zones program have proven successful and consequently have been adopted as an integral part of school procedures in those schools.

### MURRAY RIVER LEVY

125. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

1. How much revenue has been collected from the River Murray levy in each year since its inception?

2. What projects has this revenue been allocated to?

3. What is the current balance held in this account?

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:**

1. and 3. The Save the River Murray Levy was introduced on 1 October 2003 under the Waterworks Act 1932 and establishes the Save the River Murray Fund, which is held by the Minister for the River Murray. The Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (DWLBC) is responsible for administering the Fund on behalf of the Minister for the River Murray. The levy is charged to all SA Water Customers across the State, both residential and non-residential and is indexed annually.

Details of receipts, payments and the balances in the Save the River Murray Fund since its inception are shown in the table below:

Save the River Murray Levy	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06*	Total
Receipts (\$ million)	12.773	17.641	21.845	52.259
Payments (\$ million)	8.090	10.719	27.066	45.875
Balance of Fund (\$ million)	4.683	6.922	(5.221)	6.384

\* 2005-06 subject to Audit review

2. The Save the River Murray Levy contributes to a program of works and measures to address the declining health of the River Murray in South Australia and increasing community demands for a high security of good quality water for urban and irrigation purposes. The program, known as the River Murray Improvement Program, is integrated within a larger Murray-Darling Basin Initiative program of works and measures and the South Australian Salinity Strategy.

The funds have been allocated to the following projects:

1. Water Acquisition for Environmental Flows

2. Environmental Flows and Wetland Management
  3. Upgrade of Riverland Drainage Disposal System
  4. Upgrade of River Murray Waste Disposal Stations
  5. Lower Murray Reclaimed Area—Maintenance of Government owned Levee Banks
  6. River Murray Act
  7. MDBC State Contribution
  8. Investment in Salinity Accountability
  9. River Murray Select Committee—Drought Management and other recommendations
  10. Implementation of Water Allocation Plan
  11. Review of the Costs Associated with Managing the River Murray Act in SA
  12. Prescription of Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges
  13. Investing in River Murray Ecology
  14. Improved Information Management
  15. Irrigation Research, Technology Diffusion and Education
  16. Water Quality Improvement
- For further detail, I refer the member to the Save the River Murray Fund Annual Reports that can be accessed on the website at [www.dwlbc.sa.gov.au/publications](http://www.dwlbc.sa.gov.au/publications).

### MITSUBISHI MOTORS

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** On Tuesday evening the federal industry minister, Ian Macfarlane, and I flew to Japan for a meeting with the President of Mitsubishi Motors Corporation. We sought this meeting with Mitsubishi's key decision makers in Japan in an attempt to end the speculation concerning Mitsubishi's future in Adelaide. I am pleased to report that at our meeting on Wednesday with Mr Osamu Masuko, President of Mitsubishi Motors Corporation, we received the assurances that our government and, most importantly, the 1 250 workers and many more workers employed in allied industries were after.

Mr Masuko has given an assurance to both me and the federal industry minister that Mitsubishi Motors Japan is not considering the closure of Tonsley Park. Mitsubishi has given us the assurance that Tonsley Park will remain open and continue to be part of the company's global revitalisation plan. Furthermore, Mr Masuko confirmed that the so-called 'Project Phoenix'—a report that he was not aware of until it was brought to his attention by the media and allegedly contains details to close the Adelaide operations—has not been and will not be considered by the board. Our meeting with the President of Mitsubishi Motors Corporation was productive and has strengthened the lines of communication between the company and both federal and state governments. As a result, Mitsubishi Motors Japan has committed to continue close consultations with both governments and to advise us of any changes.

These assurances about the future of Mitsubishi in Adelaide are fantastic news for the workers at Tonsley and should serve to end the constant media speculation. Mitsubishi must now continue to increase sales of the new 380, which recently won Australia's best large car award. The 380 is a quality built car that deserves South Australia's support. The events of the past 24 hours have not been about politics: they have been about two levels of government working together by putting politics aside and squashing the rumour mill that has only served to harm the loyal hardworking employees of Mitsubishi in Adelaide.

### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services  
(Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith)—

Non-Government Schools Registration Board—Report  
2005-06.

### VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

**The SPEAKER:** I draw honourable members' attention to the presence in the gallery today of Ms Myrna Phillips, the former speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Canada. I also draw honourable members' attention to the presence in the gallery today of students from St Francis de Sales College and Mount Barker TAFE, who are guests of the member for Kavel, and students from St George College who are guests of the member for West Torrens.

### QUESTION TIME

#### BOLIVAR PIPELINE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier explain why his government has failed to act on the Bolivar pipeline project announced 12 months ago? The Bolivar pipeline project was announced in July 2005 and reannounced in October 2005. The federal government has offered \$2 million towards the \$4 million project, which is designed to reduce the extraction of ground water in the region by substituting three gegalitres of ground water with class A treated water from Bolivar. It will reduce the ocean flow from Bolivar by about 6 per cent.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I do not have the details of that particular project with me, but I am happy to get a report for him. It is part of our strategy, as part of Waterproofing Adelaide, to develop a whole range of infrastructure projects to ensure that more water is recycled in our state. We have a very proud record in South Australia—in fact, over 20 per cent of treated effluent is recycled in this state—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Oh, it is your effluent that is being recycled, is it? I do not mind whose effluent is being recycled; we want to recycle both Liberal and Labor effluent. That is our strategy, and we look forward to this continuing bipartisan approach to this important issue.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### FOOD LABELLING

**Ms SIMMONS (Morialta):** My question is to the Minister for Health. What has been the reaction to the minister's call for a system of traffic light labelling for food, such as in the United Kingdom?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** I thank the honourable member for her strong interest in this issue. During October I brought a paper to the meeting of the Food Regulation Ministerial Council calling for a national voluntary system of front-of-package food labelling based on the United Kingdom's traffic light labelling system. Currently consumers are faced with a variety of confusing health claims on products and a nutritional information panel which is often very difficult to comprehend—particularly for people whose eyesight may not be great. Using red, amber and green signposts the traffic light system provides clear, colourful

labelling on the front of the food package demonstrating the levels of fat, saturated fat, sugar and salt.

I am happy to say that South Australia's proposal received broad in-principle support from the other states and territories, and the standing committee will now be investigating the proposal further. I am also pleased with the reaction the proposal received from the community, which shows that there is a demand for this kind of approach. Kay Gallary from Diabetes South Australia said that 'A traffic light system, like the one that's being recommended, would certainly be supported by Diabetes South Australia.' Stephan Knoll from the Food Industry Association said, 'I suppose a good simple system helps to clarify what should be a reasonably simple issue.' I also understand that well-known nutritionist Rosemary Stanton has expressed her support for the system, and I was pleased that when two television stations did vox pops on the subject all the interviewees expressed support.

Of course, when it comes to joining in with support the opposition never lets a good idea with broad public support stand in its way. The member for Bragg immediately said:

Parents aren't stupid. They know what things are laced with sugar and fat and salt. They don't need this sort of gimmick to tell them that.

These comments have sparked off a number of letters to *The Advertiser*, which I am happy to share with the house. Dr Hughes, a GP from Mount Barker, said:

How very disappointing. . . to hear the negative comments about this proposal from the opposition health spokesperson. It would appear that petty party politics stand in the way of bipartisan support for a potentially valuable health initiative.

A writer from Seaview Downs said:

I was disappointed at her reaction and lack of knowledge of how difficult and time-consuming it is to decipher the small print for nutritional content on most food products. . . The traffic light coding is a great idea and would be of enormous assistance to everyone, particularly parents who have problems with their children's weight.

They went on to say: 'Do some research, Vickie.' I am delighted that the front-of-package labelling concept is now being taken to the next stage of development. Ministers have asked for a report on the subject at the next meeting of the council, and I hope I can update the house further at that stage.

#### BOLIVAR PIPELINE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is again to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that the deadline for obtaining federal funding for the Bolivar pipeline project is tomorrow, and can he explain why his minister has failed to secure the project by signing the funding agreement? It has been a year.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** Our relationship with the federal government on water projects can only be described as outstanding—and, indeed, we have been working with the federal government, as the leader would have seen. He would also have seen the comments of the Prime Minister and Malcolm Turnbull on these matters.

#### ARTS PROGRAM

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** Can the Premier provide the parliament with a report on arts programming for the next year?

**Mr Williams:** Oh, yes, he knows all about this one.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister for The Arts):** Pardon?

**Mr Williams:** He knows all about this one—

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Oh, I see. They do not actually like arts projects. Who is the shadow arts minister there; which one is it?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Sir, I rise on a point of order. The Premier is misrepresenting the opposition's position on the arts. As a person whose son performed in the State Opera this week, I object to him—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** —saying that we do not support arts projects.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. I suggest that members do not interject.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** There are times when I look across to the other side of the house and it reminds me of an opera—a Gilbert and Sullivan opera. But the trouble is, no-one can tell us which one is going to be the modern major-general.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Sir, I rise on a point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I think that, quite clearly, it is irrelevant to the question that was asked.

**The SPEAKER:** I point out to members—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I point out that it is a bit rich to complain, when members have interjected during a minister's answer and then, when the minister engages in the interjection, they become upset because he is doing so. I suggest to members that, if they do not like it, they should stop interjecting. I also point out to ministers and the Premier that it is disorderly to respond to interjections.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Thank you, sir. I will try to restrain myself. However, I want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition's son on his performance in the opera. Congratulations and well done; that is terrific.

South Australia will be spoilt for choice in 2007, with the simply amazing programs on offer throughout the year by all our arts organisations. From January through to December, Adelaide will feature some of the best Australian and international theatrical, musical and screen-based productions in the world today. The Adelaide Festival Centre, the Fringe Festival (which has gone annual), the Adelaide Film Festival (and the latest film, *10 Canoes*, I make this prediction today, will do extraordinarily well in the AFI awards, and maybe in next year's Academy Awards), the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra, the Cabaret Festival, the State Opera, the State Theatre Company and, of course, WOMAdelaide (which also has gone annual) are all putting together an amazing line-up, which promises to enthrall, challenge and, most importantly, to entertain.

Just a month or so ago, I launched probably the most ambitious and exciting program presented by the Adelaide Festival Centre in its 33-year history—a program that is poised to reinvigorate an iconic institution, help to create a hub of creativity and re-establish the centre as the beating heart of the arts in South Australia. Douglas Gautier and his team have set the Festival Centre a bold target to double its attendances over the next five years and to sustain those audiences well into the future. Already, thousands of people are flocking to the centre to enjoy the brilliant new 'Sundays at the Festival Centre' program.

In 2007, the Festival Centre will be packed with shows characterised by verve and artistic daring, one of its great strengths being the rock-solid partnerships it is creating

between itself and some of South Australia's great performing arts companies. The member for Norwood, of course, is an artistic figure in her own right, as people would remember from her days as a leading fashion designer, both here and in Rome, I understand, and also as the fairy in the Christmas Pageant in Norwood.

In the field of theatre, the Festival Centre will present its first season of *CentreStage* in 2007. This program boasts the best works from stages all around the world, including *Krishnan's Diary*, by the Indian Ink Theatre Company, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, by the Yohangza Theatre Company. We will also be treated to the first ever season of *Pivot(al)*, which offers the finest dance from Australia and around the world and, when it comes to music, there will be *Trans:mission*, a program of universal beats, grooves and rhythms.

These three main programs of theatre, dance and music are just the beginning. In June, for example, the Festival Centre will present the seventh Adelaide Cabaret Festival. Planning for the seventh festival continues. The very talented Julia Holt has been visiting international cabaret festivals and speaking with numerous artists and managers in preparation for the event. I am very much looking forward to the sneak previews of the event, which we will get next month. In November and December, we will see the inaugural Adelaide International Guitar Festival and, starting in late September, we will host the first OzAsia Festival, which will—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** It is an air guitar festival.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Actually, I think we should have an air guitar sequence in it. There is going to be a Jimi Hendrix finale—I hope I am not giving too much away—in Elder Park, with some of the world's great guitarists—as a sort of Woodstock. The OzAsia Festival will showcase the fruits of the rich culture and artistic dialogue that is today developing between Australia and Asia.

The Adelaide Symphony Orchestra has an amazing line-up for next year. The ASO will feature its 12 master series concerts, including a performance of Mahler's *'Resurrection' Symphony No. 2* with the Adelaide Symphony Chorus. This will be the first performance of this gigantic work in over 30 years—and I can see the excitement of my deputy, who, like Paul Keating—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** And me.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —and the Attorney-General and the Minister for Infrastructure who, like Paul Keating, are enormous Mahler fans. It will be the first performance of this gigantic work in over 30 years. The ASO is also showcasing a number of concerts in a modern vein, teaming with artists such as The Whitlams, Gary Williams, James Morrison, Burt Bacharach and Herbie Hancock to create evenings that will appeal to a broad range of tastes. These showcase concerts have proven hugely successful, recording excellent ticket sales and attracting new audiences to the ASO's performances. As if that were not enough to prove that our ASO is a great orchestra for audiences of all tastes, it will also present a tribute to rock legend Queen and reprise its 2005 sell-out tribute to Led Zeppelin. The State Opera will also be presenting an expanded program in 2007, featuring three main stage operas and two contemporary works: an operetta and a concert. In yet another example of the collaboration occurring between arts organisations in South Australia, the State Opera is presenting Phillip Glass's *Satyagraha*, in collaboration with Leigh Warren and Dancers and the Adelaide Vocal Project.

The State Theatre Company has a packed schedule for next year, with some stand-out productions, including *Hamlet*. I strongly suggest that the state opposition go to see *Hamlet* so they can work out who is to be or not to be! *Hamlet* is a co-production with Adelaide-based Brink Productions and the winner of the 2006 Jill Blewett Playwright's Award for *This Uncharted Hour*, and the award-winning production by the Sydney Theatre Company, *Doubt*.

Of course, next year we will have a very exciting summer with the first annual Fringe event from 8 to 31 March, as well as the Adelaide Film Festival, WOMADelaide and, in July, the Adelaide Festival of Ideas. Adelaide Film Festival Director, Katrina Sedgwick, has pulled together a sharp-edged, unique film festival for next year designed to appeal to all—45 000 film lovers and makers are expected to attend the 11-day event. A fun new addition is the competition for five young people to capture their day at the Big Day Out, the footage of which will then be incorporated into a half an hour documentary to be shown during the festival.

Also, I had the pleasure of recently launching WOMADelaide's 2007 program. As always there is a stunning line-up of acts—some from as far away as Africa, Argentina and Portugal, combining with performances by our local musicians from the APY lands. It is simply an astounding line-up, and I have not even begun to take into account the incredible programs to be delivered by our hard-working, small-medium companies and independent makers across the state. These include the Australian String Quartet, Vital Statistix and, of course, a unique family theatre company, Windmill Performing Arts, which will present its world premiere of the May Gibbs' children's classic *Snugglypot and—*

**Honourable members:** *Cuddlepipie!*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I want to take this opportunity to thank all those involved in working hard to create such a jam-packed year of innovative and diverse artistic experiences. I am sure that all members are looking forward to a wonderful year in the arts.

#### WATERPROOFING ADELAIDE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Premier. Given that he can tell us every arts project for the next 12 months, will the Premier advise which initiatives within the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy will be fast-tracked to completion in this financial year, if any?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** The humour on the other side is forced. Let me tell the house about some of the Waterproofing Adelaide initiatives. I have lots of them here to share with members. Waterproofing Adelaide establishes strategies for the management, conservation and development of Adelaide's water resources over the next 20 years. I say to the house what I have said before: the Business Council of Australia published a report in the last 12 months which said that Adelaide would be the only mainland capital which would have water sufficient for its needs—in fact, surplus to its needs—over that 20-year period. The strategy contains—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I'm sorry, Vickie, you made some sort of devastating comment there. I missed it; I beg your pardon. Waterproofing Adelaide contains 63 strategies, and work is occurring on developing all of these; and seven of the

strategies have already been completed, with many of the others nearing completion or remaining as ongoing activities. The completed strategies include establishing managerial requirements for plumbing rainwater tanks into new homes, the enactment of the Natural Resources Management Act of 2004 and the adoption of the Urban Stormwater Policy for South Australia (a major breakthrough in managing urban stormwater).

Examples of strategies well under way include the \$4.07 million Virginia pipeline extension, which goes from Angle Vale to Bolivar. In relation to that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Why ask questions if you know the answer? It is hard to determine. In relation to that, I am advised that conversations occurred as late as yesterday between the federal and state governments, and this project is well underway to being delivered. Then there is the waterproofing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** They ask questions, Mr Speaker, but they do not want to know. With respect to waterproofing the northern Adelaide area, federal, state and local governments, as well as the private sector, will fund the project to the tune of \$90.2 million. The Urban Water Management Scheme will harvest stormwater for reuse around the cities of Salisbury, Tea Tree Gully and Playford, supplying a massive 38 000 megalitres of water per annum. The initiative will not only reduce Adelaide's demand on the Mount Lofty Ranges catchments and the River Murray but also address over-use of groundwater and help reduce the impact of stormwater and waste water on local and marine environments.

The \$6.5 million Metropolitan Adelaide Stormwater Reuse Project, to which the state government is contributing \$2.35 million, will create stormwater reuse schemes at three major irrigations sites in our western suburbs: the Grange, Royal Adelaide and Glenelg golf clubs. At present all three clubs use around 1 000 megalitres of groundwater a year from the local aquifer to water their greens. Under this new scheme, the irrigators will source their water from local urban stormwater catchments. A number of other reuse projects have been submitted for funding under the Australian Government Water Fund. We are waiting for the federal government to announce its approval. There has been a commitment of \$51.3 million of state government, federal government and private industry funds to the sustainable management of water resources in the Mount Lofty Ranges. That scheme will safeguard water resources by providing formal water allocation arrangements; establishing clear water access entitlements; creating a water training regime; implementing a resource management plan with ecological, social and economic objectives; providing water quality and pollution risk management programs; and improving production resource management—and that is well underway.

A Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards (WELS) scheme, which applies mandatory water efficiency labelling of minimum performance standards to household water-using products has been introduced. A similar national Smart Approved WaterMark scheme is due to be implemented by 2007, and the state government will assist in promoting this scheme in South Australia. Other initiatives to promote more efficient water use which have been implemented, include: permanent water conservation measures; rebates for water efficient shower heads, tap timers and flow restrictions; and,

announced during the election, a \$400 rebate for a water plumbing rainwater tanks into existing homes. Those are some of the issues that we are working on under Waterproofing Adelaide—a very comprehensive strategy.

### GARDASIL

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Has the Minister for the Status of Women conveyed to the Prime Minister the importance of making the cervical cancer vaccine Gardasil available to all Australian women?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for the Status of Women):** I was very concerned at media reports last week that suggested that the federal government wasted the opportunity—

**Mr Pisoni:** Have you expelled Paul Noack from the Labor Party yet?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** How silly and inane. I cannot believe we would have such an inane interjection from the member for Unley on such an important issue.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That is enough. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Thank you, sir. I was very concerned by media reports last week that suggested that the federal government had wasted the opportunity to make the cervical cancer vaccine, Gardasil, widely available to young Australian women through the National Immunisation Program or the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme. By way of background, Gardasil was developed by the 2006 Australian of the Year, Professor Ian Frazer and his team at the Queensland University. Last week it was decided that it was too expensive to fund a national vaccine program. The Prime Minister, embarrassed by the decision of his Minister for Health, has been doing some toing-and-froing, but we are yet to see a firm commitment to fund the vaccine. This is both disappointing and concerning.

The cost of the vaccine is surely outweighed by the fact that studies have shown it to be 100 per cent effective against the human papilloma virus, which is the cause of cervical cancer in about 70 per cent of cases. Cervical cancer is the third most common cancer worldwide, and for women the second most common after breast cancer. Mortality from cervical cancer has been reduced substantially by an effective pap screening program, but this comes at a considerable cost to both the health budget and women who face the psychological impact of having an abnormal pap smear result. The federal government has the opportunity to drastically reduce the number of women who contract cervical cancer, and it would be very disappointing if this opportunity was missed.

This is not the first time that the federal government has stalled on an important health matter like this. I am sure members of this house will remember the campaign that I ran in South Australia to force the federal government to fund the pneumococcal vaccine for babies because of the permanent disabilities that can result from this preventable disease. I must recognise the member for Morphett, who showed some bravery in this place in supporting that campaign. Thankfully, that vaccine is now funded by the federal government, but only after a concerted effort to inform and engage the community. It was common sense and community concern that led to funding of the pneumococcal vaccine by the Australian government.

It would appear that equally sensible reasons exist to favour the listing of cervical cancer vaccine on the PBS or the national immunisation program. I have written to the Prime Minister expressing my concern and I look forward to hearing his response and of a firm commitment of the federal government to fund Gardasil vaccine. I hope that such a unique opportunity to begin vaccinating young Australian women, our babies, against this terrible disease is not thrown away by a short-sighted and penny-pinching federal government. In Australia, about 740 women are diagnosed with cervical cancer each year and, sadly, 270 die from the disease. The bottom line is that, with a universal vaccination program, these deaths are now preventable.

### WATERPROOFING ADELAIDE

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the minister representing the minister for water. Given the minister's previous answer, will the minister advise the house what is the amount of new water savings that will actually be delivered this financial year from the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** I outlined to the leader a range of programs, each of which will have some effect. I do not have an abacus with me to do the calculations but I will seek some advice for the leader. In relation to the Bolivar pipeline scheme, I am advised by SA Water that conversations were held with the commonwealth on Monday of this week, not yesterday, as I formerly said, and the results were positive. They are very confident that they will be resolved. They are talking about financial matters, about the funding that is available, and the commonwealth will not be pulling the plug, as it were, on this issue.

### STRATHMONT CENTRE

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** Will the Minister for Families and Communities outline progress in the Strathmont Centre's Redevelopment and Community Living project?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities):** I acknowledge that the honourable member pays special attention to this important institution, Strathmont, in her electorate, and she has watched very carefully the process of devolution as a range of families who have really called Strathmont home for much of their life are now making the choice to go into the community. It is a program that is working extremely well. The \$23.5 million Strathmont Centre Redevelopment and Community Living project opened with the first two homes at Greenacres. The project involves buying land and buying new homes across the metropolitan area with an extra \$5.3 million in recurrent expenditure to run group homes and provide services. It is not a cheap option: it is actually an expensive option but a much more beneficial option for people with disabilities and their families.

I want to reassure the house that members of the families of people with intellectual disabilities and, indeed, the people with intellectual disabilities themselves have been actively involved and consulted on this process. Strathmont will remain home to around 100 people who, for a range of reasons, have chosen to stay there. The homes at Greenacres sit side by side and house five residents each, each person for the first time getting their own bedroom. It is small things like that which demonstrate the difference between living in a home in the community and living in an institution. The

style of living provides higher staff to resident ratios, a more pleasant working environment and increased privacy, which is not only good for the residents but also for the workers in that area.

The community living project has included a long consultation process with residents and their families. From speaking to parents at the opening, they could not be happier with the new living arrangements for their sons and daughters. That is not to say that there was not some great trepidation about such a major change, but many of them have now recognised that this has been the right decision for their sons and daughters. The visible improvement in their health and wellbeing from shifting into this new community-based environment has been obvious. It is certainly obvious to the parents, in some cases after just a short period of time. That is the entire rationale for the project. When it is complete, 150 residents from Strathmont Centre will have moved into community-living accommodation. Other homes built this year at Northfield and Sturt have housed 30 clients. Eight more homes are planned in Seaford Gardens, Pooraka, Angle Vale and Klemzig, and four at Enfield and Gilles Plains by August next year. We anticipate there will be 30 new group homes built by December 2008.

#### MITSUBISHI MOTORS

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome):** My question is to the Treasurer. Given that the Treasurer has said the key to keeping Mitsubishi in South Australia is to buy more Mitsubishis, will the government revisit their car replacement policy change which will severely impact on Mitsubishi sales to South Australia? The government has changed its policy on fleet replacement and that is now impacting on the car industry. In estimates recently, the opposition was told that the policy change would result in the number of cars purchased falling from 4 254 last year to only 3 000 this year. We were also told the government is purchasing 30 per cent Mitsubishi and 60 per cent Holden. The reduction equals 720 fewer Holdens and 360 fewer Mitsubishis, which is the equivalent of Mitsubishi losing more than one week's production.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** The government manages its fleet in accordance with our financial position. We introduced a new policy to better administer our fleet. We buy an enormous amount of vehicles from Mitsubishi. We are very supportive of General Motors, the other major car maker in this state—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Sorry, Vickie, what's this latest—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I don't have those figures with me, Mitch. We also—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Well, if the criticism from members opposite is that we are not doing enough to save Mitsubishi, I find that extraordinary. We have as a state invested \$35 million in this model, in this Mitsubishi. I do not have any figures in front of me, but we provide payroll tax rebates on exports when they are exporting, and we also provide traineeship—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** We also provide other payroll tax relief to Mitsubishi. I have just spent the last 36 hours,

with little sleep, meeting with Mitsubishi, as I have outlined, with the federal industry minister. This government could be doing no more than what we are doing, and the—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Sorry? We could be buying more cars? You know, I am in some sort of twilight zone.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Members opposite sound like a socialist party. The answer to saving Mitsubishi is the government buying more cars. Fair dinkum, that policy might have kept car makers operating in communist Russia and the Soviet Union, that might have been the Soviet Union's approach to car and industry automotive policy, but it is not this government's.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Oh, yes, let's increase tariffs—that will be the next question from members opposite.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** We buy 30 per cent of our fleet from Mitsubishi, and the silly, silly deputy leader is saying that we are not buying Mitsubishis. Honestly, sir, I find it extraordinary that—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** A member from the back just said the ministers' cars are not Mitsubishi. Well, sir, what does the Leader of the Opposition drive? What does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition drive? Let me think. Oh, a Holden. So, before you make inane interjections, have a look at your own side.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Premier had already taken his seat; he had finished his answer. The member for Newland.

#### TAFE CHILD CARE COURSES

**Mr KENYON (Newland):** My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What innovative training is TAFE SA providing to prepare child care students for entry into the workplace?

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education):** I thank the member for Newland, who takes an interest in new learning methods. A Centre for the Economics of Education and Training report is intended to inform the next stages of the reform of the VET sector to be considered by COAG—and interestingly the MCVTE meeting in town at a TAFE college tomorrow will consider its response to COAG. This report suggested that over the period 2006 to 2016, if Australia is to meet its productivity targets the VET sector will need to supply an extra 2.47 million qualified people. The report also predicts a shortfall of 240 000 people with VET qualifications across Australia over that period.

Flexible arrangements for the delivery of training will become increasingly important. I am pleased to inform members about the innovative online learning tool that TAFE SA regional has developed in response to meeting this state's training needs—the cyber child care centre—which has been introduced to child care students at the Gawler campus, provides certificate 3 and diploma child care students with a flexible online learning environment, whilst providing students with an increased understanding of the complexities of working in a child care centre.

This program was developed in response to a need for classroom learning to be more engaging and relating to industry, giving students experience in how a child care centre actually operates. The program is delivered using the Janison platform, which provides an online framework and repository for students to input all of the resources they develop during the two years of study. There are links in every virtual room to information that relates to the activity of the area. This includes practices and policies the students need to draw on to carry out their responsibilities.

The program gives students valuable experience in how a child care centre really operates and also boosts their employment prospects by giving them a broader understanding of the industry. Importantly, the program will continue to be a valuable resource for students once they have completed their studies and begin to work in the child care field. The originator of the program, Mr Noel Jenson, a lecturer in child care studies at the Gawler campus, recently presented the new training tool to the national child care TAFE teachers conference in Canberra, and I am pleased to report that there has been an active interest interstate in this program—and, again, you cannot necessarily use real babies. This is yet another outstanding example of how TAFE SA is responding to the state's training needs through the delivery of high quality, flexible training to ensure that TAFE students are workforce ready.

### LAKE VICTORIA

**Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Minister for the River Murray. Why did the government allow the storage in Lake Victoria to drop from 680 gegalitres to 230 gegalitres whilst putting water over the barrages last December and earlier this year? Yesterday the minister told the house that one reason 770 gegalitres was allowed to go to sea late last year was that there was no room left in Lake Victoria to store the water, and the amount exceeded the inlet capacity of Lake Victoria. The storage figures for Lake Victoria show us that, whilst the water was going over the barrages, 400 gegalitres plus was actually released from Lake Victoria, leaving it at a very low level.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray):** I am afraid the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has got it very wrong again. The unfortunate thing about the assumptions that have been made is that they are based on flawed information, first and foremost. At the point where we were releasing water through the barrages the Lower Lakes were at 0.85 metres AHD, the level at which they are held at the top of the barrages. They start to spill at 0.81 metres AHD. When the water came over the border into South Australia during the last water year, it came at a time when the lake was at its highest level. We wanted to ensure that we could maximise the use of that water instead of just letting it spill willy-nilly, because the lakes were at full capacity and we did not have anywhere else to put it.

Let me explain this. When you put water in a bath and that bath is full, if you put more water in it spills over the edge. That is what happens. It is not rocket science. What happened in this instance is we let out the plug instead of letting the water go over the edge; we actually directed it into the Coorong, because the Coorong has not had water over the last six years. So instead of letting it be wasted and spill over the sides, we directed it into where it could be best utilised for maximum environmental benefits. Now, when you have

spilling water that is what you should do if you are managing the system responsibly—and that is what we did.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** What we should have done, as someone has just suggested, is turn off the tap. I am sorry, we should have said, 'No, we won't take that water into South Australia; we won't have any environmental benefit. We'll leave it for Victoria and New South Wales to take; they can use it instead of us.' What a great idea! No wonder you are on that side of the house.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### SCHOOLS, ENERGY AND WATER CONSUMPTION

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What is being done in South Australian schools to reduce energy and water consumption?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** I thank the member for Reynell for her question. I know she has taken me to many schools that take great pride in their environmentally sustainable projects and I know that she has a great interest in these issues. I believe this year is probably the driest year since Federation—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I know that the member for Unley is feeling angry this afternoon; he needs to calm down.

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** South Australian schools, despite their careful use of our valuable water resources, remain very high consumers of energy and water in this state, and it makes sense for the government to be community leaders when it comes to energy and water conservation measures. Within our South Australian Strategic Plan there is a target to reduce energy consumption by 25 per cent and water consumption by 10 per cent from the base year use of 2000-01, and many schools have already met this target through energy efficiency and water savings initiatives introduced in recent years and support programs offered by the department. ESD grants have assisted schools to implement water conservation measures such as waterless urinals and energy-saving schemes such as the solar schools program. This program aims to have 250 schools using solar power by the year 2014, and the government has invested \$1.25 million in solar panels for 74 schools, with a further 23 installations to be completed by the end of the year.

It is anticipated that there will be future savings on energy and water costs from reductions in use in a variety of ways. The government, for instance, has awarded grants for water conservation schemes for schools across the state, with a \$1 million program specifically tailored to help schools reduce their water consumption by installing more efficient irrigation, establishing water collection infrastructure, and developing water conserving gardens and landscapes. Schools are given further assistance and advice on how to reduce energy consumption by the department, with students being encouraged to develop skills and values that will enable them to assist their schools in becoming green.

The Sustainable Schools and Children's Services Initiative (or SSACSI) is a joint initiative coordinated by DECS and the Department for Environment and Heritage with support from the federal Department of Environment and Heritage. It was launched in 2004 and encourages schools to develop long-



term sustainability visions for their schools. These, of course, take time, effort and focus. However, we aim to have some short-term goals so that there is a sense of achievement, and many schools have established very strong environmental programs around reference groups made up of students and staff as well as governing councils. This gives broad ownership of the projects to the community. As I move around the state, I am very encouraged by the level of enthusiasm for these projects and, certainly, our schools will become advocates in the future for green products, sustainability, energy consumption and water recycling activities.

### WELLINGTON WEIR

**Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** My question is again to the Minister for the River Murray. Can the minister clarify whether it is the government's intention to let sea water fill the Lower Lakes as part of the construction of the weir at Wellington?

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray):** There is a really simple equation here also. If we have no water coming over the border and the worst case scenario plays out, there is only one place that the water can come from, and that is the sea. If the situation is that we do have the worst case scenario, we will do all we can to ensure that the communities around the Lower Lakes can best manage the situation. We will be looking to those communities to put the issues on the table and to advise us on the best way to manage the situation. That is how we are scoping up this project, and that is how we will deal with it.

Those communities will have a very difficult time whether or not we build a weir. If the worst case scenario happens, there is no water for extractive purposes in the Lower Lakes for domestic use or for irrigation. That is the worst case scenario down there, and we have to manage for that situation. It is mother nature that is taking the water away, or not delivering the water: the problem here is that there is no delivery of water from rainfall. We have to take very drastic measures to help our communities survive through what will be a very difficult time. If the worst case scenario prevails, we will have to do everything we can to assist them through that.

### PUBLIC TRUSTEE

**Mr O'BRIEN (Napier):** Can the Attorney-General provide the house with an update of the importance of the work of the Public Trustee?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** I was pleased to speak at the recent 125th anniversary celebrations of the South Australian Public Trustee, the oldest public trustee in Australia. When the Public Trustee began in 1881—and, indeed, up until 1925—all cash transactions were entered by hand and kept in bound ledgers. These records form part of the extensive archives of the Public Trustee, which were resourced for genealogists, family historians and other historians. Today, as a government business unit within the Attorney-General's Department, the Public Trustee is well positioned to contribute to three objectives of South Australia's Strategic Plan, and they are growing prosperity, improved wellbeing and building communities.

The Public Trustee is recognised for its prudent financial management, and offers a competitive investment service to its clients. With \$660 million in managed funds and an after tax profit of \$2.4 million, the Public Trustee is creating

positive returns for its clients, the government and the people of South Australia. The Public Trustee has a special responsibility to more than 3 500 people who are unable to handle their own financial affairs owing to accident, illness, age or disability. Many of these clients are among the most vulnerable people in our society, and require specialised support and services. The Public Trustee works closely with families, health care and social work professionals to ensure that its clients maintain a good life.

It is fitting that the Public Trustee's symbol is heads of wheat, symbolising growth in investments and the personal growth of those in the Public Trustee's care. An old Public Trustee brochure states:

The many heads of wheat represent the many divisions into which an estate is distributed, and represent judgment without bias. All estates are equally important to the Public Trustee.

With about a third of South Australians still dying without a will, the Public Trustee is determined to play a role in reducing this statistic by educating the public about the pitfalls of intestacy. The family conflict and breakdown associated with inheritance can often be remedied simply by a will professionally written and administered.

*Mrs Penfold interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** If the member for Flinders is without a will, I can help her. The Public Trustee—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** No; I certainly didn't think so.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I would be an astounding executor. The Public Trustee works with the elderly to help them protect themselves from the misuse of their money and property, especially by relations. The most common type of elder abuse is financial, and this can often be prevented by appointing an independent and professional attorney, such as the Public Trustee. I was pleased to note that the value and extensive record of service to the people of South Australia by the Public Trustee was formally recognised earlier this year when it received a Bank SA Heritage Icon Award. Although it seems that many state districts in this house on the Liberal side are inherited, they are not transferred by a will.

### WELLINGTON WEIR

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss):** My question is to the Minister for the River Murray. What referral processes does the government have to go through to build the proposed temporary weir at Wellington, given that the Lower Lakes in the Coorong areas are internationally RAMSAR listed? The Lower Lakes and the Coorong areas are internationally RAMSAR listed as areas of very special environmental significance. The opposition has been informed that no country has made such a significant change in ecological character as is proposed by a weir to a RAMSAR listed site before.

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray):** I thank the member for Finniss for his very important question. I recognise that the community he represents will be one of the most affected communities by the low inflows—not the construction of the weir—if they should eventuate. We will have to undertake a whole range of approvals to build the weir, and we are currently scoping up all of those. We are putting on the table what we will need to do, the time lines that will be required to undertake all that

work, and also to work with the commonwealth on how we deal with those international issues. One of the concerns we also have is the Environmental Protection Biodiversity and Conservation (EPBC) commonwealth legislation, on which we will need to work closely with the commonwealth to have the weir built should we need to do it. Those are all issues that are on the table being worked through at the moment, in cooperation with the federal government, and, as soon as we have the answers to those questions, we will be providing those to the communities concerned and also to members opposite.

**Mr PENGILLY:** I have a supplementary question. In the event of a refusal by the international authorities to allow a RAMSAR approach to it, what is the first fallback?

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** This is a point of clarification for the member. The international RAMSAR agreement that the commonwealth has signed for the Coorong binds us to a moral agreement to do the best we can to improve that site. There is no legal comeback; therefore, they cannot refuse permission for us to operate in that space. However, if we get the worst case scenario, it must be pointed out that it will not be the weir stopping water getting to the Coorong: it will be the lack of rain.

**Mr PEDERICK:** My question is to the Attorney-General. Are any native title claims pending or applying to the area proposed for the weir at the Wellington site and, if so, what will be their impact?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** I understand that there are claims by the first peoples of the River Murray and by the Ngarrindjeri in the Murray area, but I am not sure whether they apply to Wellington. I will get a detailed answer for the member.

**Mr PEDERICK:** My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. As part of the plan for a temporary weir at Wellington, what negotiations are occurring with the Aboriginal community in relation to burial sites and other cultural issues, and what approaches are required?

**The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD:** A number of communities, including the indigenous community, will need to be consulted with broadly in relation to this proposal, and we will be doing that.

## WORKCOVER

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** Will the Treasurer confirm that he believes that South Australia's WorkCover scheme needs major reform to maintain its viability? It has been widely reported that the Treasurer last week told a function that WorkCover has serious problems.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** Hello; where have you been? We inherited a very poorly performing WorkCover. When we came to office the Minister for Industrial Relations—doing an outstanding job—removed the previous board. He put in place an outstanding board. He has overhauled massively the administration of WorkCover and brought in a whole new executive, which is making significant strides forward with the legal services, the service providers—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Yes; and let us remember the sneaky deal the Liberals did before the 2002 election when

it manufactured the cut in the WorkCover levy, which put the organisation under severe stress. It should never have been made. My views on WorkCover at that function were as they are in this house: it is a business under repair by this government. A lot has been done and more will need to be done.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Again, my question is to the Treasurer. Given that the Treasurer has an observer at WorkCover board meetings, when did he first become concerned that WorkCover was under-performing? WorkCover reports indicate that, between December last year and June this year, WorkCover was losing money at the rate of \$11 million a month.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** That is just not correct.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Is the honourable member saying 'unfunded liability' or 'losing cash per month'?

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** He said 'losing money'.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** He said 'losing money per month'. The honourable member cannot come into this place and make allegations that, clearly, are not correct.

**Mr Williams:** What are you going to pay for it with?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Well, there is a difference between the operating performance of WorkCover and the unfunded liability. Actuarial assumptions about WorkCover are what we are now dealing with. As I said, my concerns about WorkCover were from the honourable member's time in government when, in my opinion, you guys doctored the levy cut. The minister responsible is working hard to repair an organisation that was poorly performing under the former government. The former manager has gone, and a lot of his leadership team has gone. The board was removed, a new board is in place and we are fixing it.

## SCHOOLS, ROSEDALE PRIMARY

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Is it on the minister's instructions or authority that I have been told by the principal of Rosedale Primary School that I am not to enter the school grounds? The chairman of the school council—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr VENNING:**—invited me to come to the school to receive its petition opposing the government's recent decision to cut \$30 000 from its school budget. Subsequent phone calls from two sources said that the principal had 'banned me from the school grounds'.

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services):** I must say that this is somewhat delicate, because I do realise that one of the actions of the previous minister was to have legislation enacted that allowed people to be excluded from school grounds. I have no idea what has happened in the relationship between the member for Schubert and that school, but I am very happy to find out what has gone wrong.

## WORKCOVER

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** Again, my question is to the Treasurer. What action is the government proposing to address the concerns of WorkCover claims management raised by the union movement? The Australian Manufacturing Workers Union organiser, Derek Thomas, described

WorkCover as a debacle. He was quoted in the media as saying 'the system already causes harm to injured workers by dragging out the claim's progress'. He went on to state:

It's a debacle. I have to say that, seeing the result of people on WorkCover, the amount of secondary psychological injuries associated with them that should be dealt with quickly.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health):** I answer this as the acting minister responsible for WorkCover. As members would know—and I think the Leader of the Opposition said it during the week—the most important thing that can be done to fix the problems affecting WorkCover is to get workers back to work quickly and safely, and we certainly agree with that point. One of the most outstanding things that the board has done to that end is to engage Employers Mutual. Employers Mutual was appointed by the WorkCover Board in January 2006 as the sole WorkCover claims agent with a five-year contract commencing with effect from 1 July 2006.

The decision to appoint a sole claims agent means that all existing claims, previously managed by four agents, are now managed by Employers Mutual. The potential transition risks are being managed very carefully. The goal of Employers Mutual is to get workers back into their workplace as quickly as possible. Employers Mutual has a good track record of doing that in other jurisdictions, and I understand that the WorkCover Board is optimistic that it will be able to repeat that in South Australia.

---

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I am pleased to participate in this grievance debate. In doing so, I congratulate all those people who were successful at the recent local government elections. I am very pleased that Mr Robert Hornsey has been elected Mayor of the Light Regional Council, and I look forward to Mr Hornsey and his council getting on and providing a very good service to that the community. I say to the member for Light that he ought to get out of the way of that council and let it get on with its job of carrying out its functions without an ongoing barrage of criticism through the media. His mate got beaten, and he should let the elected people get on and do their job. He has had an ongoing barrage of criticism, and I think that he ought to be a little more constructive in relation to—

*Mr Piccolo interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** You had a fair bit to say before that. The second matter is that I have been approached by the Australian National Institute, that is the old ANR, which operates properties for the Australian Railways Institute. It has a number of properties which its members utilise, and their value has increased by 23 per cent while the land tax has increased by 59 per cent. This is a semi non-profit organisation, and it cannot understand why the government wants to continue to wallop people in this manner. It is bad enough if the tax increased by inflation; it is absolutely outrageous that it has climbed to such an excessive rate. ANI has continued to write to the government and it has had the same letter back

three times saying that the government has looked at it, but we know that nothing is going to happen.

I call on the Treasurer to examine this proposal. The properties are: 7 Southside Esplanade, Glenelg; Seaview Road, Henley Beach; Seaview Road, Henley Beach; Stirling Road, Port Augusta. These are the properties involved. The massive increase is unacceptable. An organisation of this nature cannot continue if taxes rise at such an unacceptable rate. I take it, Mr Speaker, that because of my service I am getting extra time.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank the house.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I thank you, because I have a number of things that I could say but, as I am normally a man of few words, I would not want to—

*Mr Piccolo interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** I am a man of few words.

*Mr Piccolo interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN:** The honourable member wants to just have a look in the mirror and enjoy his time here, because I am told that he will be one of the first to fall off the tree when the pendulum swings again. So, enjoy your time here: be constructive and not destructive. The second matter is an unfortunate article that appeared in *The Advertiser* in relation to Farrell Flat on 17 October. This was drawn to my attention by the Management Committee at Farrell Flat, one of whose members wrote as follows:

I am concerned at the standard of journalism leading to the headlines regarding Farrell Flat, on the front page of *The Advertiser* yesterday (Wednesday 17 October). While our community like all others in the state and across the nation are suffering from the current drought, I strongly object to the doom and gloom portrayed regarding our town. As the Chairperson of the Farrell Flat Management Committee, the representative group for the town, I feel it necessary to correct some of the glaring errors mentioned.

The town was founded in the 1870s with the coming of the railway and, like most towns, businesses have come and gone. There are currently 20 businesses operating in the town and these are listed in our town produced telephone directory. This is a far cry from the four failing businesses your journalist mentioned.

It goes on to explain in considerable detail the inaccuracy of this article. I sincerely hope that the journalist in question is more careful in the future, because the then mayor of the Goyder council, Mr Sullivan, drew to my attention how concerned he and his community were that articles of this nature do nothing to help those communities but create unnecessary alarm.

Time expired.

### THE PEACEFUL PILL

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford):** On Tuesday evening, after being in this place I checked my postal mailbox to find that I had received a copy of *The Peaceful Pill Handbook* by Dr Fiona Stewart and Dr Philip Nitschke, which had arrived from the United States. It was serendipitous in that on Tuesday the South Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Association had held a lunchtime rally on the steps of Parliament House. In particular, the rally commemorated the death of Shirley Nolan, who had died some four years ago. I also knew that on 20 September, two days before a national conference on voluntary euthanasia in Sydney, the authorities in Brisbane had seized a suitcase containing 45 copies of the book, *The Peaceful Pill Handbook*. This was intended to be at the conference and to be available to delegates at the conference.

The books are still with Australian Customs, as I understand it. The reason why I raise this matter is that it was a real

concern to me in looking at the book that not only was there information about how to end one's life but also a couple of case studies. One of them I would like to share with the house, and it is on page 157 of *The Peaceful Pill Handbook*. It talks about Richard, aged 76, married and suffering from emphysema. My father, who suffered emphysema for quite a long time, died recently, so it immediately drew my interest. Richard spent much of his life working in heavy industry and the doctors believe that his condition was most likely due to his history of heavy smoking and working in an environment that was often dusty.

The case study in *The Peaceful Pill Handbook* said that it was by his wife Celia, but I do not think these are the people's real names. The case study reads as follows:

Richard was originally diagnosed with emphysema in December 2005. His difficulty breathing had become noticeably worse by May 2006 and he required oxygen much of the time. As his condition worsened, he decided that he could not rest until he felt he had full control over his life, and death. We had both attended Exit's workshop and so knew about the 'Mexican option.' I booked our tickets and in the last week of May we took a five-day holiday in the US. It would have been much easier for me to have gone alone, but Richard knew that if he took a drug that I had travelled overseas to get, and if this were to be revealed, then I would immediately be suspected of assisting with his suicide. He insisted on travelling with me just to keep me safe.

I wanted the quickest and easiest way to get to Tijuana and then back to Australia. By the time we were ready to travel, Richard was too breathless to do much more than be pushed around in a wheel chair.

The story goes on to talk about an overnight stop in Hawaii, which Richard found really difficult, getting to Mexico and going into a veterinary supply shop to get access to the drug that was needed. When the purpose of the trip was accomplished, they came back through San Diego. She wrote:

It broke my heart to see my once strong, proud husband so broken by this illness. The following day we flew out of San Diego and a day later we flew home to Sydney. At each port, the customs and immigration staff were nothing but pleasant to us. After all, we were hardly your typical drug mules.

Once back in Belmont (south of Newcastle), Richard indicated that his time was soon coming.

It goes on to talk about the process of his death.

The last point I want to make is that, when attending the ROTI conference in Sydney on 22 September, I did not take part in the demonstration. The poster that really got to me was held by an older woman, and read, 'My cat can get Nembutal. What about me?'

## WATER SUPPLY

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** The comments by the Premier, by various ministers of the Labor government and by Anne Howe, CEO of SA Water, encouraging people to install tanks, implementing severe water restrictions, installing limiting shower heads, cutting shower times, limiting garden watering but not enabling private desalination plants to provide water for everyone, justify examination of SA Water's role in water issues affecting South Australia.

The policy of the government and SA Water in South Australia is, in my view, a shambles. The government-owned SA Water owns and is supposed to manage South Australia's water. Last year the Labor government put \$291.8 million from our water rates back into general state government revenue as a dividend on top of the 30 per cent of net profits in tax.

People have the right to manage with tanks, have drought-resistant gardens or none, and have dribbling showers if they

wish. Other people have just as much right to have the pleasure derived from large gardens, using normal shower heads and having a good shower; and even having fountains, spas and pools.

There are several factors that I base this comment on. We are not a third world country. We may be the driest state in the driest continent, but should that make us the most miserable with such a basic commodity as water? It is the community's right to have adequate water supplies at the cheapest cost. Water is unlimited; it covers more than half the earth's surface. Unlike most commodities, it is totally recycled when used.

Modern technology enables unlimited supplies of water to be provided by desalination at a cost that is expected to be under a dollar a kilolitre. Using renewable energy means that insignificant amounts of greenhouse gases are produced. There are well over 7 000 such plants around the world. Stormwater collection and similar methods may be economic in special circumstances. However, they usually require costly collection facilities, large storages and a duplicated supply system, which can be very expensive.

Throughout Australia water is controlled by similar government monopolies to SA Water. Sydney Water is reputed to have spent \$1.5 million trying to prevent private enterprise supplying water to its system. We remember what occurred in the former USSR, now Russia, 20 years ago when there were shortages and people queued for everything. Our market system, for all other commodities, matches supply with demand through price. A shortage increases the price, which makes the greatest supply possible and eliminates the shortage. This cannot happen in South Australia due to the price-setting mechanism plus SA Water's limiting outside supply to its pipeline systems.

SA Water, while still owned by the government, is corporatised and should act like a public company. It pays tax on its profits to the state government of 30 per cent, plus 95 per cent of the balance of the profits to the government as a dividend. Thus, 96.5 per cent of its profits go to the government as general revenue. Public companies normally retain 50 per cent of profits for reinvestment in their businesses, but not SA Water. SA Water in 2005 paid \$291.8 million in dividends to the government, up from \$164.1 million or 77 per cent from the previous year, and decreased capital works expenditure by 42 per cent over the same period. In five years the government has transferred about \$850 million from SA Water to general revenue instead of providing additional water. Last financial year SA Water increased the number of employees earning over \$100 000 by 32 to 98, with the top pay being \$370 999, and a total cost of over \$10 million for just the top managers—more than the cost of wages for all state politicians—and SA Water is now building a new, ecologically friendly office block costing about \$46 million to house them.

For some years SA Water has overdrawn the current underground supplies in my electorate covering Eyre Peninsula. As a result of excessive draw-down, some basins have become saline. This is the risk with excess drawing from the basins now in use south of Port Lincoln, yet the Coffin Bay underground water lens has still not been assessed to see if there is the water to supplement the supply, despite millions of litres flowing into the sea. Instead, SA Water is building a \$48.5 million pipeline to bring River Murray water 470 kilometres through Kimba on Eyre Peninsula, with all its consequent pumping costs. This will supply 1.4 gigalitres.

People in South Australia need to consider the future of water supplies. There is considerable—

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

**Mrs PENFOLD:**—pressure to deny supply of this basic commodity.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! You started new material, member for Flinders.

### HEALTH, MEN'S

**Mr PICCOLO (Light):** I rise today to speak about a national health awareness program being promoted and supported by the Freemasons. I am aware that the Freemasons are better known, unfortunately, for their alleged secrecy and their so-called secret handshake. The Freemasons are an active service club and charity who undertake a great deal of work in the community from managing homes for the aged to a number of local community projects. Over the past few years I have gained a better understanding of the work of the Freemasons, as the Grand Master for South Australia and the Northern Territory is a Gawler resident, Mr Graham Bollenhagen. In April of this year I attended Graham's installation as Grand Master. It was a grand event at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre attended by thousands.

During October–November this year the Freemasons have and are running an extensive range of seminars across the country to promote men's health under the banner of 'Men's health: No more secrets'. The no more secrets initiative by the Freemasons has been aimed at the widest possible audience. The door has been swung open as wide as possible so that many community groups can join with Freemasonry to promote the campaign to as many men as possible. Health awareness groups involved in the campaign include The Cancer Council, Beyond Blue and the Heart Foundation. Freemasons have worked with as many services clubs and community groups as possible to spread the men's health awareness message. Local lodges have sought out groups such as service clubs, sporting groups and churches so the message of men's health can get to the widest possible audience.

Why 'Men's health: No more secrets'? Research has shown that males in western society are less likely than women to take an active role in maintaining their own health. In addition, men are known for being secretive about their health. Freemasonry is also considered secretive, so the title is simply a play on words to emphasise that there should be no more secrets about men's health or Freemasonry.

The seminars have stressed the need for men to get regular check-ups, and there is also information about depression awareness and other non-pharmaceutical treatments. I attended two such seminars as guest speaker: one in my own right in Gawler and the other at Para Districts representing the Premier. One of the key purposes of the seminars has been to share information, knowledge and experience about men and their health and well-being. Evidence shows that too many men are ignoring the early signs and symptoms of chronic diseases such as heart disease, diabetes, bowel and prostate cancer and other diseases. I would certainly support these concerns, as I have previously told parliament about some of the significant health issues and difficulties raised by men whom I have spoken with within the community. These issues include youth suicide, depression, prostate cancer and violence. I have also spoken about the need for men to seek

advice from others who have experienced and triumphed over these problems.

Fortunately, many of these significant chronic diseases can be dealt with very effectively by early treatment or can be prevented altogether by men taking a more active and positive role in managing their health. There is no doubt that many more men need to attend to their health needs if, as a society, we are to improve the situation revealed in the current men's health data. For example, South Australian health department data shows that 63 per cent of men are overweight or obese, and it is well known that being overweight or obese has a significant impact on chronic illnesses such as diabetes. In 2002 the ABS revealed that, compared with women, about 62 per cent more men died from cancerous tumours, 38 per cent more men died from Type II diabetes, and 58 per cent more men died from heart disease. We also know that far more men than women died from preventable accidents and injuries, including self-inflicted injuries. This and other information about men's health, combined with what appears to be many men's reluctance to use the health system to obtain early help, leads to poorer health outcomes and puts a greater burden on our health system.

In September minister Hill announced that the Department of Health is developing a men's health plan and strategy to respond to these and other health issues that challenge men. Unfortunately, the drought in our rural and regional areas will increase the physical and mental health risks to men, who are often not well equipped to deal with the emotional stress resulting from additional economic pressures. Our socialisation processes do not equip men as well as women in this case. I commend the work of the Freemasons.

### URANIUM MINING

**Mr PISONI (Unley):** Those in the legal fraternity who disagree with Premier Mike Rann are referred to by him as 'mullet-headed lawyers'; however, he has moved from fish to poultry, describing left-wing Labor power broker Anthony Albanese as a goose for asserting that the ALP ballot was a referendum on uranium. But what is good for the goose is also good for the gander, and the animals which inhabit the jungle of ALP factionalism are restless; the claws are out, even within his own cabinet team. Go Panthers!

Premier Rann would once have been lionised by the left for his championing of the anti-uranium mining cause as author of *Uranium: Play It Safe* but now, as the leopard that has changed its spots on the issue of uranium mining, he has become a victim of the tug-of-war that occurs when ALP politicians are caught between loony ideology and the real world. You have to feel some pity for the member for West Torrens who had to report to Don Farrell that no cabinet member from the left would sign Mr Rann's nomination form for ALP President when he did the run-around of their offices. I believe he would have had more luck selling tickets for a chook raffle to vegetarians.

As someone who was referred to in this parliament on 12 April 2000 by the member for West Torrens as 'a brave young warrior called David Pisoni', I would like to repay the compliment and acknowledge him as a brave young warrior gallantly doing his part in Labor factional warfare. However, he should have given Senator Conroy a call; he could have arranged his contact in Victoria who corruptly filled out hundreds of voting slips on other people's behalf. I support Simon Crean's campaign to stamp out corruption in the Labor Party.

In some ways Mike Rann finds himself in a similar position to MLC Norm Foster, who crossed the floor on the issue of uranium mining in 1982 to allow the establishment of Roxby Downs. Norm Foster wore the odium of his party and the label of 'Labor rat' because he knew that South Australia needed a mine for its future prosperity. Premier Rann has done an optimistic U-turn, well aware that he needs the uranium mine expansion to make good the loss of manufacturing and associated jobs on Labor's watch. Of course, the Premier knows good spin when he sees it. He asserts that 23 000 jobs will be created by the Olympic Dam mine, and minister Caica spruiks that 23 000 jobs will be created by the Olympic Dam mine and the air warfare destroyer. Anyway, the figures are big and they sound good, so there is no need to be accurate to justify them.

What we do know for certain is that, according to the Premier, on 20 February, the Olympic Dam mine was poised to more than double in size; on 27 February it was to nearly triple in size; and, by 17 March (the day before the state election) the Premier told the ABC that the Olympic Dam project would definitely triple in size. BHP Billiton might still be in the pre-feasibility stages, but the Premier is way ahead of that.

The author of *Uranium: Play it Safe* certainly is not showing much prudence with uranium mining figures these days. According to the latest report on the estimated demand for labour in the mining sector, published by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, the total number of direct and indirect jobs created by the mining industry as a whole in South Australia by 2014 will be 17 200. This figure is a long way from the 23 000 new jobs that the Premier told this house would be created by Olympic Dam alone—job figures pulled out of hats and large elastic holes in the ground. No wonder Premier Rann has developed ideological amnesia on uranium, with the world of spin that it opens up for him.

The ideological hypocrisy shown by unions in gagging debate on uranium mines at the ACTU congress, while still signing up workers ahead of the Olympic Dam expansion to benefit from their union fees, will, no doubt, persist at the ALP National Conference. I congratulate the Premier on his second place achievement.

#### MAWSON ELECTORATE, FESTIVALS

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson):** I rise today to inform the house of two very important festivals in the electorate of Mawson and the many great events that have been taking place in the McLaren Vale and Willunga region. Across the Fleurieu Peninsula we are being treated to a three-week program of world-class art exhibitions, workshops and performances. The major category of the Fleurieu Peninsula Biennale program is the Fleurieu Peninsula Art Prize. The landscape art prize awards \$50 000 to the winning artist, making it Australia's richest landscape art prize and, therefore, very attractive to artists.

Last Saturday night, I was fortunate enough to attend the award night of the Fleurieu Peninsula Landscape Art Prize in the Tinlins Barrel Hall at McLaren Vale. The barrel hall was a credit to the management and staff of Tinlins, who had transformed it from a huge shed to the perfect setting for an exhibition and a fine dinner. The Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts (Hon. John Hill) was there, and the following day I ran into the member for Finnis, who was there with his wife having a look at the fantastic work of the entrants. Some 35 artists from across Australia were short-

listed for the Fleurieu Peninsula Art Prize, including South Australian artists Keith Cowlam, Robert Emerson, Abie Loy, Richard Maurovic, Ian North, Winnie Pelz, Arthur Phillips and Geoff Wilson.

The winner of the Fleurieu Peninsula Art Prize for 2006 was Ken Whisson for his painting, *Time Is*. Born in Lilydale outside Melbourne in 1927, Ken Whisson studied at Swinburne Technical College between 1944 and 1945. To have Ken Whisson's name up there among those who have won this prestigious prize is a credit, indeed, to the organisers of the event, and is an indication of the attention that this fantastic exhibition and prize attracts worldwide. As I said, over 900 entries were submitted, making the judges' task extremely challenging.

There are several exhibitions as part of the Fleurieu Peninsula Biennale that have taken place not only in McLaren Vale and Willunga but also in places as far away as Goolwa and Victor Harbor. Many sponsors have been involved in supporting the Fleurieu Peninsula Biennale. I would particularly like to thank the City of Onkaparinga for getting behind it with its support, Tinlins Wines, Hardy's Tintara Winery, Wirra Wirra Vineyards, Heli Air, D'Arenberg Winery, Alongshore Aquatics, Santos, Qantas, Channel 9, *The Independent Weekly* and the Australian Hotels Association. Without sponsors, we cannot have fantastic art exhibitions and expensive prizes.

The organisers have put together the largest event program in the history of the Fleurieu Peninsula Biennale. The program not only featured the five prize category exhibitions, with a \$90 000 total prize pool, but also the 2006 Greg Trott Debate on the topic 'Landscape art—dead or alive?'. I look forward to attending that event at Wirra Wirra this weekend.

The Fleurieu Peninsula Biennale lecture to be delivered by the Director of the Art Gallery of South Australia, Christopher Menz, is another feature, along with a family day with the Ruth Tuck Art School and Cirkidz, as well as two community sculpture projects, 18 community exhibitions, seven workshop programs, three community-driven special events, and two live performances, including 'The Gospel According to Elvis'. The member for Giles might like to get along to that one—I have seen her Elvis impersonation, and it is a feat to behold and a great artistic performance.

The 2004 Fleurieu Peninsula Biennale attracted 18 000 visitors to the region, which has to be good for the local economy. Organisers expect this year's event will match or even exceed previous visitor totals. If the main streets of McLaren Vale and Willunga in the past few weeks are any indication, this will surpass all other biennale turnouts. As I have said, it was good to see the member for Fisher down there. Of course, the member for Kurna is always down there; he is a vital member of our local community and a great supporter of the arts.

*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**Mr BIGNELL:** I'd like to see you down there as well, member for Kavel.

*Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**Mr BIGNELL:** Down in McLaren Vale and Willunga—one of the great parts of the world. In November we are having the Festival of Arts down there, and in October there was the Festival of Food and the Fleurieu Peninsula Fiesta program. Of course, the member for Reynell was at many of those fiesta events and many of the biennale programs.

## INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION

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

That pursuant to section 29 of the Fair Work Act 1994, the nominee of this house to the panel to consult with the Minister for Industrial Relations regarding the appointment of the President of the Industrial Relations Commission be the member for MacKillop.

Motion carried.

## CHILD SEX OFFENDERS REGISTRATION BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

*Amendment No. 1:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

This is a technical amendment. It is proposed to make sure that there is no ambiguity in the legislation. It is made owing to the peculiar wording of section 39 of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act. The status of becoming a registrable offender attaches at the point of being sentenced. The notion of 'sentence' is defined. That definition refers either to the imposition of a penalty or to the making of an order consequent on a finding of guilt. A person may successfully apply to be found guilty without a conviction being recorded under section 39 of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act.

It was always the intention behind the bill that an offender in that situation should potentially be a registrable offender. However, section 39 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act states:

The court, upon finding the defendant guilty without recording a conviction and without imposing a penalty, must order the defendant to enter into a bond.

It might be thought that the bond is therefore not a penalty. It looks like it is an order consequent upon a finding of guilt, but it is best to be clear about this. Therefore, the amendment makes it clear that any bond is a penalty which, after all, is its common meaning.

**Mrs REDMOND:** As I understand it, the situation is as the Attorney has indicated. It is really of a technical nature to clarify what was always understood to be the intention of the legislation. It was really an oversight in the drafting that this particular provision was not covered. We agree to it.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 2:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

This amendment is designed to make the application process for discretionary orders simpler and less unnecessarily wasteful of resources. A paedophile restraining order may result in a child sex offender registration order under clause 9(1)(d). If that is done in a magistrates court that would mean that it would be done on application by a police officer, and that is what clause 9(5)(b) provides.

In drafting we overlooked that a sentencing court may make a paedophile restraining order imposing sentence. If that is done, a police officer would need to be present to make the application. That is not sensible. The prosecution should be able to make the application. This amendment is drafted to allow that to happen.

**Mrs REDMOND:** I want to ask a question, because I had a little trouble following the numbering of it in accordance

with what appears in the bound folder of statutes. Is the child sex offender registration order referred to at the bottom of page 10 in this edition clause 9(5)(a), or is it something else?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Yes, that is the paragraph I mentioned in my remarks. The court can make the order under the Summary Procedure Act or as part of the sentence.

**Mrs REDMOND:** As far as I am able to ascertain, this appears to be simply a technical amendment. As the Attorney has indicated, it should make the process simpler in being less restrictive as to who can actually make the application. I think that is the way I read it. So, we will be agreeing to it.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 3:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be agreed to.

This amendment is consequential upon the previous one.

**Mrs REDMOND:** The opposition agrees to it.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 4:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

In the course of continuing consultation with SAPOL about its requirements for monitoring compliance with the child sex offender registration legislation, the government has determined that a further amendment to the bill is necessary. Originally, the government intended that operational police would gain access to the information necessary to monitor compliance by accessing the register. As such, clause 61 of the bill confers on the Commissioner the authority to issue guidelines about access to the register or part of the register.

Disclosure of information from the register was intended for purposes other than monitoring compliance. Hence, the information disclosure principles in schedule 2 of the bill that govern disclosure of information from the register do not make allowance for disclosure to police officers for the purpose of monitoring compliance with the act. SAPOL has advised the government that it no longer intends granting officers, other than members of the Sex Crimes Investigation Branch, access to the register. Rather, to monitor compliance by registrable offenders, SAPOL intends notifying operational police about registrable offenders through the police PIMS system.

The PIMS system is effectively a secure intranet. It is used by operational police officers to conduct checks on persons in the course of their duties. It includes details such as a person's status as a witness, victim or offender, whether they are subject to a restraining order, whether there are any outstanding warrants about them, or whether they are a person of interest in the investigation of an offence. Members may have seen the PIMS screens attached to the dashboard of police cars.

About maintaining the confidentiality of the information contained on the register, the government believes this is preferable to granting operational officers access to the register. It is also, according to SAPOL, a lot easier from a technical point of view. It will, however, require an amendment to clause 67 of the bill to ensure that the information disclosure principles in schedule 2 of the bill do not apply to disclosure to police officers. To ensure the type of information that may be disclosed to operational police is appropriately limited, clause 67 as amended will disapply the information disclosure principles only for information disclosed to police for law enforcement purposes and, importantly, only for prescribed details.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Interestingly, I comment in passing that when I was in the business of drafting speeches—first, second and third—for both houses, it was always forbidden to provide exactly the same wording as was used in the other house.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** There had to be elegant variation.

**Mrs REDMOND:** That is right. I was following almost word for word what the Attorney just read in the stuff that I already read in the *Hansard* from the Legislative Council.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** But you will see some stylistic differences. I always edit for style.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Except for the Attorney's elegant style and presentation. However, I did have a question or two. I understand the thrust of this, I think; that is, rather than allowing all the police officers to have access to this register, there will now be selected information put on to PIMS and they can then call it up on the dashboard of their police vehicles or wherever else they locate PIMS. They no doubt have them in other places than simply their motor vehicles. I understand, therefore, that we must make an adjustment to the schedule, but there are two things that I want to know. First, what obligation is put on those officers who are receiving that information—and I appreciate that it is limited information. What is the nature of the limited information that will be put on there? Will it simply say name, address, registered sex offender, or what will be the nature of the information?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Up on the PIMS screen will be the name, the fact of registration and, possibly, a risk rating.

**Mrs REDMOND:** What obligations then apply in terms of the privacy of that information, limited as it is, to those officers who receive it? My concern, as I have expressed before, is the case of someone who, although they are registered because of the way the act operates, may be someone who is in reality not someone of a sex offender nature but someone who is convicted because as a teenager they had a relationship with their girlfriend, and so on; the unlucky person who is not really there for the reasons we are all thinking about when we are dealing with this legislation. I worry about what happens to them. What is the obligation of an officer who accesses that information in terms of keeping it confidential?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** It is the standard obligation of confidentiality imposed on all sworn police officers.

**Mrs REDMOND:** I know that the Attorney is not the Minister for Police, but is he able to inform me as to what that might be?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** That information will be confidential under guidelines under the Police Act.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 5:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 5 be disagreed to.

New section 72A will require the minister, not more than one year after the commencement of the provision, to appoint an independent person to carry out an investigation and review of the electronic monitoring. The independent review is required to examine the systems available for electronic monitoring; whether any of the available systems would be of benefit to the monitoring of registrable offenders, or any particular class of registrable offender; and the feasibility and costs of introducing such a system. The minister must provide

assistance to the independent person to allow for a trial of any available system if the person considers the trial to be necessary or desirable. The independent person must report within two years and the minister must table the report in both houses within 12 sitting days of receipt.

This amendment is, in the government's view, unnecessary. The government promised at the last election to fund a feasibility study of satellite monitoring technology and the potential for its use in monitoring serious repeat offenders. \$200 000 has been earmarked for this study, which is to be conducted by the Department of Correctional Services in 2007-08. The department advises that the ground work for this feasibility study is already under way. The department has consulted industry about adapting existing technology for use in the monitoring of offenders. South Australia is also cooperating at a national level.

The department has representatives on the national Correctional Services Emerging Technologies Working Group, comprising representatives from all states and territories and New Zealand. This working group is also examining satellite-tracking technology along with other emerging technologies in correctional services. As such, this review would duplicate this effort and therefore add unnecessary costs. Irrespective of whether an independent person—whatever that term is supposed to mean in this context—conducts a review of technology, the department will have to conduct its own review. The department is the customer. The department will be the organisation using the technology. It will have to see how the technology fits with its current or proposed practices, and determine whether the technology adds value.

Given its funded pledge and the work already done, the government sees no reason to mandate a feasibility study in legislation. Nor does it see any benefits in its being conducted by someone outside of government in any event. It is not clear just what is meant by 'an independent person'. Presumably this means someone free of government control. This would rule out the Department for Correctional Services, the police, the Parole Board, etc; in other words, those agencies with the expertise and experience in monitoring offenders. 'Independent' would also rule out any industry expert who had connections with any of the companies developing this kind of technology. This reduces the pool somewhat. If a truly independent industry expert could be found, it is likely that he or she would be most expensive to engage.

Unlike proposed section 72A, each other legislative requirement for a review—for example, section 194 of the Gene Technology Act 2001, or section 38 of the Construction Industry Training Fund Act 1993—are concerned with a statutory regime, body or—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** —is concerned with a statutory regime, body or regulatory system established by the relevant legislation, or with the operation of the legislation itself. Of course, it is disjunctive—you are right. These amendments do not require a review of the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act or even a review of the operation of the act. They require a review of technology. The push for satellite tracking of registrable offenders is misplaced. It appears to be founded on the idea that satellite tracking can be used to monitor registrable offenders so they may be prevented from going to places where they are not supposed to go: schools, kindergartens, playgrounds.

Although these sorts of restrictions may be true of offenders who are subject to parole or licence conditions, or



people who are subject to paedophile restraining orders, it is not necessarily so of registrable offenders. The child sex offender registration legislation will not, and is not intended to, restrict a registrable offender's movements except insofar as they will be prohibited from engaging in child-related work; something GPS monitoring will be unable to detect. For these reasons the government says the proposed section 72A is unnecessary, may slow down the review process currently under way while making it more expensive, and that its inclusion in the legislation is misplaced.

**Mrs REDMOND:** I wonder if I should stand up and say we do not believe that this is an ideal solution, but the Liberal opposition is prepared to support the Hon. Nick Xenophon's amendment. I noted several occasions when the Attorney's responses were much more eloquent than those given by the Hon. Mr Holloway in the other place. For instance, instead of using the term 'and so forth', the Attorney substituted the term 'etc.', and instead of using 'reducing the pool considerably', he decided it was 'reduced somewhat', and whereas the person in the other place referred to 'while these sorts of restrictions may be true for offenders', the Attorney worded it as 'although these sorts of restrictions'.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** If you use 'while' instead of 'although', you get into the conundrum of saying two things that could not possibly have occurred simultaneously.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Exactly. So, the Attorney's response was much more eloquent by far. Like my corresponding person in the upper house, I indicate we support this and will disagree with the government's disagreement to this amendment. I do not intend to go through all the detail of what was said by the Hon. Mr Lawson in the other place. Suffice to say that we think it has some merit, particularly given the rapidity with which technologies are developing at this stage and noting that some seven states in the US have introduced monitoring by electronic means and noting that this is not restricted to GPS monitoring, but most importantly noting that the intention is to engage someone who is independent.

I think the minister in the other place was correct when he suggested in the first instance that it was independent, meaning not controlled by the government. It could be anybody with some knowledge in the area. My view is that a person outside government is much more likely to have some knowledge of the technology and the development of technology than the bureaucrats who are engaged in actually working with it. Whilst their input would be valuable once the technology is proposed, it is reasonable to say that specialists who are developing the sort of technologies we are talking about here would be appropriate to be considered as independent experts. Given that the proposal is simply to engage that independent person a year after commencement, and to have a report a year after that, knowing that the rate at which technologies are developing, it would seem to be reasonable. It is not something I will die in a ditch over, but it is reasonable it seems to me.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** What if the person worked for the companies producing the technology—would they be independent?

**Mrs REDMOND:** I would be suspicious and would want a second opinion if it was someone simply promoting their own goods. I know when I was in practice we used to get people from the various institutes attached to universities and so on to be experts to give us opinions on all sorts of things, and it seems that there is a clear argument to be made out to say that this will be the way of the future—and the Attorney is no doubt aware of how much I love technology—and it is

likely to have a good effect ultimately. It is something the government has indicated it is looking at, and I would have thought that it is not too onerous to suggest that the government be obliged to. I think the Hon. R.D. Lawson in another place pointed out that on other occasions there have been promises to do something. In fact he says:

When we passed the tort law reforms a couple of years ago all sorts of undertakings were given about reviews that would be undertaken. This minister himself as Attorney-General at the time—so it must have been when the current Attorney-General was stood down from his duties—

said there would be an undertaking that there would be an investigation into the highway immunity rule, for example. We have never seen that review.

He concluded by saying:

It does not happen unless you have the legislation to require it to happen.

I absolutely agree with the comments of the Hon. R.D. Lawson in relation to that and indicate we will support the amendment and therefore disagree with the government's disagreement to the amendment.

Motion carried.

*Amendments Nos 6 to 10:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 6 to 10 be agreed to.

These amendments are all about the young love exemption. Much discussion happened here about the onerous regime imposed where the defendant is convicted of a serious sexual offence, but that offence occurred as part of a consensual sexual relationship between two teenagers of comparable age. As everybody knows, the criminal law creating the offences makes no real concession to this fact of life. During debate on this bill I made clear the government's intention was that these situations should not be subject to mandatory or automatic registrable status. I believe I am correct in saying that the member for Heysen and I were together in thinking that an offender having a sexual relationship with a child of similar age should have a chance to argue that there should be no liability to suffer from the registration regime. These amendments deal with this matter. There is a clear upper age limit as the policy applies to offenders. If the offender is a child, registration is discretionary, so the mandatory problem does not arise.

Under clause 9 of the bill a court may only make an order against a child if it is satisfied that the person poses a risk to the sexual safety of any child or children. So, if the offender is 17 or under the person is not a registrable offender unless the court exercises a discretion to make it so, and that is the test that applies.

There is also a clear lower limit as the policy relates to victims. The government recently amended the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to make it clear that sexual offences committed on a child under the age of 14 years are particularly heinous and deserve an enhanced maximum penalty. Logically, it follows that an offence committed on a child under the age of 14 should not fall within this penumbral category.

The next criterion is similarity of age between offender and victim. The government has decided to make the three year differential an exemption from listed offences. These offences are: amendment No. 7—unlawful sexual intercourse; amendment No. 8—persistent sexual abuse of a child; amendment No. 9—indecent assault; and amendment No.

10—gross indecency. The net effect of the exemption is that an offender, being sentenced for these offences with the exemption, will be being sentenced for an offence that is not a class 1 or class 2 offence, and therefore the court will retain a residual discretion to impose registration obligations if it is of the view that the offender is a risk to the sexual safety of a child or children.

The government is of the opinion that the proposal fairly reflects the discourse between the parties during the second reading debate on the bill, and, in particular, I would like to thank the members for Torrens and Heysen for lobbying me on this matter. They were right.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Isn't that nice; and I would like to thank the Attorney for moving this amendment, which I am very pleased to support. I think, as a society, we will probably have to visit this again because, whilst all of us in here may think that these ages are appropriate, the reality of modern life is that girls are reaching puberty much younger and, in a way, I suspect that we are burying our heads in the sand when we put the lower limits. However, I think it is right to try to balance the ages of the individuals involved and, whilst it is perfectly fine for people to have vast differences in their ages when they are in a relationship, it is probably appropriate to leave that until one is an adult.

I am wholehearted in my support, and I thank the government for listening to the issues raised by the member for Torrens and me during, I think, the second reading speech. We will be very happily supporting the proposed amendments.

Motion carried.

#### EVIDENCE (SUPPRESSION ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

*Amendment No. 1:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

The bill has been amended in another place and the government supports the amendments. The first amendment is to clause 4, page 3, line 9, dealing with the obligation on the court to forward the suppression order to the register. It proposes to delete the word 'immediately' and substitute the expression 'as soon as reasonably practicable'. This will address the concern about interim suppression orders having to be notified to the register as soon as they are made. Such orders may be of quite short duration and it may be problematic for the court to arrange for them to be notified immediately. It will suffice if they are notified as soon as reasonably practicable. A similar amendment was previously made in this place to clause 9 dealing with variation or revocation of orders, and this matches that.

**Mrs REDMOND:** I think we discussed this amendment one in this chamber and at the time we were satisfied—in fact I was a little surprised because I thought we had agreed to the change, but it was the change to the other clause to which the Attorney has just referred. I understand this reflects something that Judge Worthington, as Chief Judge, requested for practical reasons, because it is nonsensical to require the immediate registration of orders which might be revoked during the course of the same day of sitting of the courts. We support the amendment.

Motion carried.

*Amendments Nos 2 to 4:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 2 to 4 be agreed to.

These amendments work together, so they should be considered en bloc. We had some debate previously about the proposal that the court should be able to authorise a member of the news media to receive notice of suppression orders, and I agreed then that the matter should be further considered between the houses. It is now proposed that the court should not have the responsibility of deciding which news services should receive the orders; rather, the news services themselves should authorise representatives. Thus, under the amendment an authorised news media representative will be defined as a person who is nominated by a member of the news media. The broadcaster will publish or give the registrar a notice setting out the representative's address for the receipt of notices. The registrar will then fax or email the information to that person.

This amendment has been designed to address the concerns expressed by the member for Heysen in earlier debate by removing any discretion from the officers of the court. Given that the maximum penalty for breaching a suppression order has been increased to \$120 000 (despite the Hon. Robert Lawson's best efforts), I think there is a very strong deterrent in making sure that the news media does the right thing, so perhaps there is not the need to filter out fringe elements, as I had feared.

**Mrs REDMOND:** I agree that these amendments should be dealt with en bloc: one follows from the other in each case. I again thank the Attorney for introducing this amendment, because it largely reflects the issue that I have been trying for some time (somewhat unsuccessfully) to get across to the Attorney. I was pleased to note that it was dealt with as promised and an amendment was introduced in the other place. However, I want to ask the Attorney a question in relation to these amendments. I will refer to what the Hon. R.D. Lawson said in the other place, because he asked a question and the Hon. P. Holloway was unable to give the answer. The Hon. Mr Lawson said:

The registrar is defined in this amendment 'as a person to whom the functions of the registrar under this section are assigned by the Attorney-General'. I take it that this is not the registrar of the particular court in which the proceedings are being conducted but, rather, a registrar for a different purpose. Will the minister indicate whether that is the case?

The minister said that that was the correct interpretation. The Hon. Mr Lawson then asked:

Will the minister indicate who it is envisaged will be appointed by the Attorney-General as the officer to have the title 'registrar' . . .

The Hon. Mr Holloway said:

I am afraid I do not have any information in relation to that. We will have to speak to the Attorney-General in relation to that matter . . .

Can the Attorney-General indicate whether he has an answer to that question at this stage?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** I do not, but I would take the advice of the head of jurisdiction. In the case of the District Court, that would be Judge Worthington, and I presume he would recommend to me Michael Moore, the current Registrar of the District Court. That is just my guess: I do not know for certain. However, I would take the advice of the head of jurisdiction.

**Mrs REDMOND:** As I indicated, we are very happy to see this amendment in place. I think it makes for a much

more sensible regime and removes the discretion (which I always thought should be removed) from either the Chief Justice, who clearly did not want it, or the registrar, and puts the onus onto the news media to make sure that it has someone who is authorised to receive the appropriate information. As the Attorney said, our amendments in the other place in relation to penalty were not successful, and there has been something like a 6 000 per cent increase in the maximum penalty for corporations. No doubt, the media will be most anxious to ensure that it does the correct thing. We support the amendment.

Motion carried.

#### UPPER SOUTH EAST DRYLAND SALINITY AND FLOOD MANAGEMENT (EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF SCHEME) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 1269.)

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder):** The opposition supports the bill in its current form. Given the lengthy debate and consideration of amendments that occurred in the other place with respect to this bill, it is not my intention to make lengthy comments on what is proposed by the government, but I wish to place a few comments on the record. I extend my appreciation and thanks to the departmental and ministerial staff who provided me with a very detailed briefing on this bill this morning. As a new representative in this place (and I must admit that I have only been to the South-East twice in my life, which I am rather embarrassed to admit, and I will have to make sure that I correct that situation as soon as possible), this project and the need for it are not something of which I was previously aware.

The briefing this morning made me aware of the history behind the act and the details of what is eventually intended to be a \$75 million project. Developed as a project to address concerns on the dryland salinity of the South-East, the information provided to me about what the negative effect upon the economy of the South-East would have been if this project was not undertaken highlights that something did, in fact, need to happen. As I understand it, the aims of the scheme are for the control and management of surface water, the removal and management of saline groundwater and the provision of fresh water for wetlands and other environmental uses.

Within the provisions of the legislation is the opportunity for landholders to seek compensation within six months of the handing back of land not required for the scheme from the 200-metre wide corridor previously compulsorily acquired by the government if they have experienced a net loss of land value. Given that delays have occurred in completing the project (and I am advised that delays of probably two years were experienced as a result of the extensive community consultation and the consideration of concerns expressed by property owners and those with environmental concerns), the need for this extension is evident. This delay has resulted in the need for this bill, which extends the provision of the current act until 19 December 2009. The bill also extends the period in which claims for compensation by property owners who have experienced a net loss of value can be lodged to 19 December 2010 or, if proclaimed by the governance, to 19 December 2011.

As part of its consideration of the bill, the opposition has consulted with numerous landholders in the region and the

Conservation Council. It is fair to say that not everyone is happy with the project. That was evidenced by the fact that on Tuesday a rally was held on the steps of Parliament House and, I believe, the recent tabling of petitions signed by 472 residents seeking to stop the Didicoolum drain. While I will always support the ability of our communities to make others aware of their concerns in any form, I am advised that the majority of landholders who are affected by the project actually support it.

The opposition is pleased that, as part of the debate on this bill in the other place, support exists from the government and other Legislative Councillors. Interestingly, the Acting Chairman commented on the fact that bipartisanship existed in such a strong way during that debate on an amendment proposed by the Hon. David Ridgway. This amendment requires the government to introduce a flexible management plan for all drains in the South-East, that is, drains being constructed as part of the Upper South-East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management and the connecting drains in the Lower South-East. As a result of support for a further amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr Ridgway, this principle of a flexible management plan will remain a requirement beyond the life of the bill being considered. I confirm the opposition is prepared to support the bill in its current form.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** It is a fair while since I have had the opportunity to stand up and talk about water in the South-East and drains and such matters.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Too long!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Far too long.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** It hasn't been your most glorious contribution to parliamentary debate.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I have just been going through my contribution from December 2002—and I would recommend it to the Attorney to read, because he might find a fair bit about the South-East, a part of the state he probably does not know a hell of a lot about—and I have not changed my opinion of this piece of legislation much in the intervening years.

I commend my colleague in the other place who successfully moved some amendments to the bill introduced by the minister. I will come back to those in a moment, but there are a couple of other things I want to talk about. In 2002, when the member for Kaurana was the minister and I think introduced this bill, I stated at the time that I did not believe the minister needed any of the powers that are conferred by the principal act. I have not changed my mind about that. All of the powers in this act are already contained in other acts and statutes and have been available to the minister for many years. So, nothing has changed there; the minister does not need those powers. Notwithstanding that, we are in a situation where the Upper South-East drainage scheme has been continued under this act (which has been a consolidation of that range of powers) and has continued for a considerable amount of time.

I did pull out the *Hansard* record of what I said but, unfortunately, I have not had it for very long. It was a lengthy contribution, and I have not had the opportunity to read the last seven or eight pages of it but, if my memory serves me correctly, I think I can repeat some of the things I said at the time. One of the things I am sure I said at the time was that the minister did not require this power, and I am pretty certain I also made the observation that I doubted the minister would complete the scheme by 2006. If I did not, I will

apologise right now to the house, but I am pretty certain that is one of the points I did make.

I know that I did make the point—and, again, I have not confirmed this by reading the *Hansard* record—that there were only three sticking points where the minister at the time was having some difficulties negotiating with the various landholders or landholder groups. The bill we were discussing at that time (now the act) would enable the minister to fast-track those negotiations by basically telling the landholders what he was going to do and just proceeding to do it, without proper consultation. Of course, we have a different minister now—not that that makes any difference because, once we finish with a bill and turn it into an act, rarely is it the minister who administers it: the faceless bureaucrats out there administer these things and carry them out.

I referred to the extension of the Didicoolum drain, or the Marcollat drain. Only yesterday, a group of my constituents from the Padthaway and Marcollat areas demonstrated on the front steps of this house, complaining that they did not want a drain. In fact, I remember Ian Johnson, who has for some years owned the property known as Amherst in the area, telling minister Hill when he was the minister, down there on Prosser's property, that he was contributing \$100 000 towards this drainage scheme and that he was quite happy to pay the \$100 000 on the condition that they did not dig the drain. I am certain that, at the time. I questioned the necessity to dig the Marcollat drain. I certainly questioned the necessity to dig it along the alignment that is proposed. I have always argued that, if you wanted to provide relief to the landholders in what I guess will become the headwaters of this drain if it is constructed, you should put another cutting through the range and run the water back into the Ballater East drain, I think it is. The problem for the government with that proposal, of course, is that the bureaucrats have argued that putting another cutting through the range would come at a significant cost.

The reality is that, some time in the future, that may well prove to have been the cheaper option. I was told in no uncertain terms on the front steps of this very house yesterday that the people in that area intend to oppose that part of the drainage system with every means available to them. I am fairly confident that in defending that decision it will involve considerable cost to the taxpayer. I am still not convinced that digging a drain up through the old Marcollat water course and through the people's properties—such as Dean and Sue Prosser's—is the best option. At first glance it may be the cheaper option, but I am not convinced that it is anywhere near the best option.

Another concern in that part of the world with respect to the drainage scheme relates to the people of Padthaway. As members will know, Padthaway has become a very important wine grape-growing area. Unfortunately for the irrigators in Padthaway (who traditionally grow small seeds, lucerne and phalaris seed utilising flood irrigation), most of the land area there now is under the grapes using dripper irrigation, but still there has been a significant salinisation of their aquifer. I think that the drier years we have had—at least in the last decade—have contributed to that.

The people of Padthaway believe that the drainage scheme has contributed by lowering the water tables in their area and increasing the salinity levels. We heard the Minister for the River Murray in the last couple of days say that if you lower the water levels in the River Murray and if you lower the water levels in the lower lakes you will increase salinity. It is exactly the same with groundwater systems: if you

decrease the volume of water in there (generally the amount of salt that is in there will stay the same), of course you will increase the ratio of salt to water or the salinity level.

The people of Padthaway are very concerned about yet another drain going in even closer to their valley. They are very concerned at the impact that might have. My colleague in the other place, as a result of discussions over a period of time now, put forward some amendments which, through consultation, will oblige the minister to undertake the development of management plans, not just for that particular area but for the whole of the Upper South-East Drainage Scheme and, I would hope also, the Lower South-East Drainage Scheme, and I believe that is necessary.

My colleague the Hon. David Ridgway and I have come to the same conclusion that, once we construct drains (and as part of that construction), we should put weirs into the drains so that we can manage water flows rather than just dig the drain and then let nature take whatever flows into the drain and deliver it to the sea. We believe that we should have a system of weirs right throughout our drainage schemes in the whole of the South-East so that, when we get into dry periods such as this, we can manage water flows and hold water tables up to a higher level. We believe that this will also benefit the wetlands which, in some cases, we are trying to recreate or keep in good health by keeping the watertable to a certain level.

When we do get a rainfall event less of the water will be soaking into the unsaturated soil profile, and we will quickly gain run-off of fresh, high quality water which then can be directed into the wetlands across the South-East. Hopefully, eventually a considerable amount of that water will get to the Coorong, and therein lies another difficulty. When the agreement was originally struck with the commonwealth government to be a funding partner for the Upper South-East Drainage Scheme one of the conditions was that we would be able to transfer into the Coorong no more than 40 000 megalitres (40 gegalitres) of water in any year on a rolling average. Again, that is something which I have always thought was a nonsense.

I have always thought that a fair bit of the water generated in the South-East before white man appeared on the scene did end up in the Coorong system. I thought it nonsensical for us to cap the amount of water that got into that system. It would be great that any fresh water or even relatively fresh water we could generate could flow to the Coorong and/or other wetlands. I had the experience quite recently of being on one of the very many properties owned by Tom Brinkworth in the Upper South-East, and I saw first-hand where fresh water was supposedly being directed onto the Mandina Marshes, which is a very important wetland in the Upper South-East.

There was a unique system where a drain and a floodway were virtually at right angles to each other. Supposedly, the drain was taking saline groundwater. There was a very wide bridge over a series of culverts where fresh water was designed to flow across the landscape into and out across the Mandina Marshes, whereas the drain (which was underneath) was picking up saline groundwater from upstream and the reasonably immediate area, delivering that via a different route and, in this case, taking it off down through the Tilley Swamp drainage system into Martin Washpool, which would eventually take off into the Coorong at Salt Creek.

I saw a problem first-hand, probably six or eight weeks ago. This fresh water was supposed to be flowing into the Mandina Marshes. However, through lack of management, we had allowed the water table to fall so dramatically in the

area of this small part of the drainage system that the hydraulic pressures were such that the fresh water was going straight into the soil profile, running along in the fairly open rock structure (which is reasonably shallow in that area) and running into the drain. Very quickly it was becoming incorporated with the saline water and running out to sea with it. This was high quality water which could quite easily have been redirected into other wetlands in the area; or we could have weired up the saline drain at that time of the year when the water levels were very low, allowed it to back up to a certain level and bring the water table up to within probably 1½ metres of the soil surface. Then we would have got a much greater yield of fresh water flowing into the Mandina Marshes. They are some of the things that we need to address in the South-East in regard to this drainage scheme, and that is why my colleague in the other place successfully moved his amendments.

I have addressed two of the very significant issues with regard to the Upper South-East scheme, which I think have been very poorly administered to date. The last issue that I want to address concerns the collection of the levy for the drainage scheme. As members know, we have had two goes at constructing this drainage system. For the first one, we set a budget of some \$24 million, and that was contributed at the rate of \$9 million from each of the state and federal governments, and \$6 million from the local landowners. I repeat that this was all done before the principal act, which we are talking about amending today, was enacted, under powers that had been on the statute book for many years.

When we established the levy, we tried as best as we could to make an equitable system where those who got the most benefit from the drainage system paid most for it. We split the whole region into four zones: A, B, C and D. Zone A basically covered lands that would get direct benefit from the drains, that is, the lands through which the drains flowed, or very close to, and it would be very simple and easy for the landholder to build a subsidiary drain, which would flow directly into the main drain. Zone B comprised lands adjacent to zone A. Although they were a little more remote, they were still more likely to derive a significant benefit from the drains. Zones C and D comprised those other lands in the South-East which would gain no benefit from the drainage system, but it was judged that they contributed to the rising groundwater problems to the west through the original clearance of those lands and the extra contribution to groundwater flow from those lands.

It was always my expectation at the second round, when we introduced the second levy to raise another \$11 million, this time from the local landholders, that the landholders in zones C and D would be exempt. Right up until the announcement of the levy, I was quite confident that that would be the case. Those in zone D, which is probably the higher land very remote from the drainage works in the South-East, were exempt, but those in zone C were still levied. I think that was probably the most outrageous thing we have done to any group of people in South Australia, certainly in the time that I have been in this place.

These people, totally remote from the drainage scheme, were levied on the pretence that they were creating the problem. It included people in the hundred of Stirling around Keith. A huge amount of the hundred of Stirling is irrigated to lucerne. The irrigators in the hundred of Stirling, some years before this levy was struck, took a 35 per cent reduction in their irrigation licences because the watertables were falling, yet this government is levying them on the pretext

that they are allowing too much water to get into the water-table and causing salinity to the west. It is absolutely outrageous. There are people as far away from the drainage scheme as Frances on the Victorian border who have been levied to pay for drains which are dug 40 or 50 miles away, on the same pretext.

I remember having a delegation of my constituents in minister Hill's office at the time, and saying to him, 'If you honestly believe that these people are contributing to the excess groundwater to the west, why don't you allow them to do some more irrigating where they are, because they are all screaming out for water?' It is the only place in the world, I would imagine, in which you are levied by the government to extract water out of the ground for irrigation purposes, yet you are levied by the same government for allowing too much water to get into the groundwater system. It is just unbelievable. They are at least three management decisions relating to this scheme over recent years which have upset a considerable number of my constituents. I can tell the house that it has seriously upset me.

Some of them I think we can redress. I really think that, morally, the minister should rethink the levy on the landholders in zone C. However, to be honest, I do not expect the minister to do that. Incidentally, some weeks ago I suggested in the house that, regarding the impact that the current drought is having—and I said at the time that I think the Upper South-East is suffering from the current drought probably more, but at least as much as, any other part of the state—the minister should offer all the people in the Upper South-East drainage area a levy holiday for at least 12 months, and possibly a little bit longer, and push their obligation to pay that levy out for a year or so. I think I said at the time—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Don't tax you; don't tax me; tax the man behind the tree.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I am not saying do not levy them; I am just saying push it out for year or two. We are only debating this bill because the Attorney-General's government is so far behind in doing the work. These people have been charged and the work has not been done, and it will not be done for another couple of years, but we are still charging the levy. We still have the money coming in. One of my constituents recently told me that, by the end of June, he will have to fork out \$13 000 for his share. Incidentally, on two properties that he owns, he will be shelling out \$80 000 on each, I think it is. I can take the Attorney down to show him the drain he has for that. He is not very happy about it. It is better described as a gutter than a drain. If you are going to dig a drain to ameliorate dryland salinity, you need to draw the watertable down to at least 1.2 metres below the surface, and it is impossible to do that when you have a drain that is only 0.6 or 0.7 of a metre deep, and that is what he has for his \$160 000. I can tell you, he is not happy either.

I have highlighted a number of my concerns. The scheme has been mismanaged for a long time. I hesitate to say it, but I suspect that it will continue to be mismanaged into the future. I would have thought that, in this period, suffering the water crisis that we do in South Australia, a few people might take a little bit more interest in this particular subject. I would have thought that in this time, suffering the water crisis we do in South Australia, a few people might take a little more interest in this subject.

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

### STAMP DUTIES (LAND RICH ENTITIES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

### APPROPRIATION BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

### ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the house do now adjourn.

### SCHOOLS

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** I have a short speech in relation to the question asked by me today in relation to my being banned from attending the Rosedale Primary School to pick up a copy of a petition that has been generated by the school, which has nothing to do with me or the opposition. They have done it themselves. I did not even seek to attend, and I was asked by the school council chair via a phone call, and within about three hours I got another two phone calls saying they were very embarrassed that the principal had banned me from attending the school to pick up the petition. I do not wish to create trouble for the lady who is the principal at the Rosedale school, whom I have met and have a lot of time for. I do not want to cause her any problem. I do not know whether she did this to try and avoid any embarrassment, but I have never struck this before, and I hope the minister is able to check it out. I hope it was not an instruction from her or her office, because if it was I will certainly be very concerned about it.

The whole issue generally has been very emotive in my electorate; that is, the taking away of the \$30 000 from seven small schools in my electorate. You might say, 'Well, what is \$30 000?' For these small schools that is a big lump of their budget taken away; taken away after they had done their budget for the school, and notified by fax only. There was no consultation whatsoever. There was a public meeting that was called last week at Springton, which as we all know is just near Mount Pleasant, and over 200 people attended, and I just said to my leader, who was with me, 'I don't think we need to do anything tonight, we just listen.' I could not have orchestrated a meeting better than that, and we did absolutely nothing but sit there and listen.

Federal minister Hon. Alexander Downer was there and he spoke very strongly and with a lot of passion about how much small schools mean to him and his electorate. We also had, of course, my leader, Iain Evans. The shadow minister was also there, as were Isobel Redmond and myself, as well as the council representative. So it was a good meeting and the hall was full. People spoke with a lot of passion. A young girl stood up—she might have been seven or eight years of age—and she said, 'Mr Minister, what can I do to save my school, because I love my school.' Nobody in the room could have said it better than that.

I compare Springton to Yacka. Yacka is north, between Clare and Georgetown or Gulnare. Yacka is almost exactly the same size as Springton. The school in Yacka was closed in 1991 or 1992, back in the time of the Arnold Labor

government. Yacka was quite a thriving community. It had two shops, a hotel, a bank—all those things. If you go there today you can see what happens when you shut the school. There are no shops, the pub is closed, there is nothing in Yacka, yet it is still quite a large small town. So, if you shut a school, whether it be Springton or Palmer or any school like that, that will be what happens.

I am very concerned about it because these schools are certainly valued by the community. They are valued by the parents who choose to send their children there, and I think it is a deliberate ploy by the government, without any doubt whatsoever, to take this funding away, resulting in school closures. And you can also put with that the taking away of the funding for the music programs and the aquatics programs, all targeted at these small country schools, or country education generally. I think it is a disgrace what this government has been doing. It takes away on the one hand and it gives nothing back on the other—nothing.

**Mr Williams:** An orchestrated program to shut them down.

**Mr VENNING:** As the member for MacKillop reminds me, the end result is that it is an orchestrated campaign to shut these schools down—it really is. Okay, I might have had the same thoughts myself some time in my 16-year career here, in early days, but I now know these schools are most important in their communities, and the type of education—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** Yes, what a disgrace that was. What a shemuzzle that was. I didn't do it. I now know how valuable these small schools are in these communities, and I just get very concerned about what the agenda really is here. I also want to briefly explain to the house, and to you, Mr Speaker, particularly, the chain of events that led me to be in *The Advertiser* peering behind a tree. I raise this matter because I am not ashamed of anything I did.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** I was not banned from the school for that reason, no. It started off as a press release in my electorate, quite a lengthy press release, detailing at length, after a long conversation with SA Water and others and the website, what you can do to save water. There is a plethora of things you can do—things I had not thought of. One was taking a cooking timer into the bathroom and timing your shower. You would be amazed how long some of our showers take because, if you are like me, I switch off in the shower and just vegetate there. All of a sudden it is 10 to 15 minutes and all that water has gone down the drain. So you take a clock. Anyway, I listed all these water-saving ideas and, at the end of the press release, tucked away in an inconspicuous place, was this little phrase where I said, 'Gentleman, where appropriate, should consider doing it with nature.' That is all I said.

I was amazed, because it was the Mount Barker *Courier* which picked it up, and a week before I had had cause to ring their office and have some sort of altercation with the editor. I thought that he would probably stitch me up, but I did not quite consider he would do this. It was he who had on the headline, 'MP's tips on water-saving devices'.

That is when the Matt and Dave show picked it up. They did a great job and if anybody was listening the response was very good. A lot of people rang in and told them what they do. Let us be really honest: every male in this place would be accused, if not all the time most or some of the time, of going down the backyard, particularly at night, and doing what comes naturally. It is more hygienic for men to do it outside

anyway. I have heard that many women complain about men who do not lift the lid, leave the lid down, do not lift the seat or leave the seat up. I have heard that many women over the years complain about what men do in bathrooms. Here is an opportunity to solve that and do a bit for nature, while saving water at the same time. It was a fun story. I apologise to you, sir, and the house if I have cast any reflection on you or the position I hold as an MP. It was not quite what any MP would want to do. I would not do it again, in hindsight, but it certainly got a story. When people from 5AA rang up for their story, I said—

**Mr Piccolo:** It just leaked out.

**Mr VENNING:** It did leak out. I said to 5AA, 'You are the last; I'm not taking any more calls on this issue,' because I think we had extracted every bit out of it that was worthwhile. We certainly can save water. I am concerned, after all the publicity and all the effort that has gone in, that Adelaide has not saved a drop. You cannot say that you should use the

tap only every second day, as that means nothing. You will have to tell people to read the meters and cut back usage by 40 per cent and do it. If you do not physically read your meter you will not do it. Saying that you can use water on odd and even days is a nonsense, as you will just use twice as much water every second day, particularly as most gardens are on irrigation systems; you just change the setting. We must do our bit, as there will be a lot of hardship up the river with irrigators. People will lose their trees; they will die, particularly citrus trees. People in Adelaide need to cut back, as there is still a lot of wastage of water. You see a few dry or dead lawns, but we could all do a lot more, particularly in the bathroom, where most of the wastage occurs. I can be the butt of anybody's joke; I do not care, as long as it helps sell the message.

Motion carried.

At 5.03 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 21 November at 2 p.m.